

**The London School of Economics and Political Science**

**Establishing Tate Modern:  
Vision and Patronage**

**Caroline Donnellan**

A thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology at the  
London School of Economics for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy, London, July 2013

## **Declaration**

I certify that the thesis I have presented for examination for the Ph.D. degree of the London School of Economics and Political Science is solely my own work, other than where I have clearly indicated that it is the work of others, in which case the extent of any work carried out jointly by me and any other person is clearly identified in it.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Quotation from it is permitted, provided that full acknowledgement is made. This thesis may not be reproduced without the prior written consent of the author.

I warrant that this authorisation does not, to the best of my belief, infringe the rights of any third party.

## **Abstract**

Tate Modern has attracted significant academic interest aimed at analysing its cultural and urban regeneration impact. Yet there exists no research which provides an in-depth and contextual framework examining how Tate Modern was established, nor is there a study which assesses critically the development of Tate's collection of international modern and contemporary art. Why is this important? It is relevant because a historic conflict of interests developed within the Tate's founding organisation which was reluctant to host it. The outcome was that gaps were created in the original National Modern Foreign Collection, which had to be later compensated for within the spaces of Tate Modern.

Furthermore, Tate Modern was established by the Tate, in place of a London or national government. Manoeuvring to the position of civic patron was a long process for the Tate, which had been affected by changing political and cultural circumstances. From the organisation's inception, a complex model of public and private vision and patronage emerged, which was impeded by conflicting national and international agendas. Modernisation and modernity impacted on the organisation through political and cultural necessity, forcing it to adjust to the new social climate. However, the underlying theme in the Tate's development has been the relationship between culture and commerce. These are the reasons why this thesis examines how Tate Modern was established in the particular way that it was, and why it was re-imagined as a distinct kind of museum of modern art in London, and one that was relevant for the new millennium.

## Acknowledgements

The topic of Ph.D. research began when Professor Robert Tavernor, Cities Programme, London School of Economics and Political Science, and Dr Victoria Walsh of Tate Britain made a joint application to the Arts and Humanities Research Council, for the funding of collaborative research studentships. The outcome was that two grants were awarded: *Establishing Tate Modern: Vision and Patronage*, and *Establishing Tate Modern: The Cultural Quarter*.

During the research period for this thesis — *Establishing Tate Modern: Vision and Patronage* — I have received the utmost attention in my supervisions from both supervisors. Professor Tavernor has given my work meticulous consideration concerning the aims and objectives of the Ph.D., by reading the various drafts from beginning to end. Dr Walsh has also spent considerable time in her direction, with her extensive knowledge of the Tate. I am extremely grateful to both of them for their professional direction and expertise, as well as support and encouragement throughout this Ph.D.

## Table of Contents

Title Page	1
Declaration	2
Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
Table of Contents	5
<b>Chapter 1. Introduction</b>	8
Background	8
Case Study Method	10
Thesis Structure	12
Cultural Policy: Museums and Galleries	14
Impact on the Tate Gallery	17
The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: A Civic Vision	21
Literature Review	25
Central, London and Local Government Publications	27
Cultural Policy and Economics Publications	33
Art History Publications	39
Tate Gallery and Related Publications	41
Museology and Theory Publications	44
Branding and Marketing Publications	51
Chapter Synopsis	55
<b>Chapter 2. Creating the Tate</b>	58
The Museums Act (1845)	58
Henry Tate's Enterprise	62
Creating the National Gallery of British Art	64
A Nineteenth-Century Model of Partnership	66
Building the Urban Vision	67
Developing the Organisation	70
The Hugh Lane Bequest	73
Trustees and Funding	76
National Gallery Millbank	78
The Modern Foreign Art Galleries	79
Rejecting Matisse, Rejecting Modernism	80
Traditionalism and Modernism	82
London and New York	85
Arts Council of Great Britain	89
The Festival of Britain	92
The National Gallery and Tate Gallery Act (1954)	94
The State and the Arts	97

The Modern Museum of Art as Spectacle	98
<b>Chapter 3. Towards Tate Modern</b>	101
New Government, New Tate Gallery	102
Patron: Industry Supports the Arts	106
<i>Neue Nationalgalerie</i> , Berlin	108
'The Bricks'	115
<i>Centre National d'Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou</i> , Paris	116
A GLC Lottery	118
The Arts: the Way Forward	119
Action for Cities: the Tate Gallery Liverpool	123
Tate Prize, Turner Prize	127
Partnership: Making Arts Money Work Harder	128
Grasping the Nettle	129
<b>Chapter 4. Vision and Concept</b>	132
The Tate Gallery St Ives	136
Defining the Vision	137
Operation Moby Dick	141
Site Proposals	142
Tate Canary Wharf	144
Tate Vauxhall	144
Tate South Bank	146
Tate Greenwich	146
Tate Bankside	148
Selling Bankside	151
Purchase and Consultation	153
Creating the Brief, Completing the Vision	155
<b>Chapter 5. Patronage and Funding</b>	158
Funding Strategy	158
Buying Bankside	161
Quantifiable Evidence	163
The National Lottery	165
English Partnerships	167
Southwark Station	170
Branding Tate	173
The Tate Gallery of Modern Art Becomes Tate Modern	175
The Change Management Programme	178
<b>Chapter 6. Competition and Building</b>	182
Researching the Process	183
Architecture Competition Reception	186

The Tate Gallery of Modern Art Assessors	189
Architecture Competition	190
Shortlisted Designs	191
Architect's Vision	193
Millennium Bridge	202
 <b>Chapter 7. Conclusion</b>	 205
The Final Analysis	205
Communicating Change	209
Defining Moments	210
Testing the Public Realm, Testing the Market	211
The Museum in the Market Place	214
Shifting Public Geographies	216
Re-thinking the Museum of Modern Art in the City	218
Evaluating the Impact	219
The Cultural Box Office	221
Debating the Tate	223
Signposting for Future Research	226
 <b>Bibliography</b>	 228
<b>Appendix A</b>	243
<b>Appendix B</b>	268

## **Chapter 1. Introduction**

This Ph.D. examines how Tate Modern was established. From the founding organisation's inception, a complex model of public and private vision and patronage emerged, which was affected by conflicting national and international agendas. Through political and cultural necessity, modernisation and modernity impacted further on the Tate Gallery, forcing it to adjust to new economic and social circumstances. Additionally, the interconnected relationship between culture and commerce continued to shape the practices of the Tate Gallery, which resulted in its creating a new type of museum of modern art, for the twenty-first century. Owing to the scope of these themes, to comprehensively examine Tate Modern, this thesis is cast within the framework of an interdisciplinary case study, which utilises archival data and a range of secondary sources. Furthermore, in reviewing the related literature, this has revealed a gap of relevant scholarly research in the field which this PhD aims to fill.

### **Background**

There are two branches of Tate in London. The older is Tate Britain, at Millbank, which was founded originally as the National Gallery of British Art, in 1897. The aim was to exhibit work by British artists born after 1790, and non-nationals that produced work on British shores. Owing to a change in circumstances, a modern foreign collection was later given to the National Gallery of British Art. Subsequently, the organisation was renamed the 'National Gallery Millbank', to indicate that it was no longer solely responsible for British art. A further change in the title arose when the organisation was officially named the 'Tate Gallery', in 1932, after its founding benefactor. By the end of the twentieth century, however, the combined British and modern foreign art works had outgrown the available space within the Tate Gallery at Millbank. The decision was taken for the modern foreign art to be relocated to a new site, to be named the 'Tate Gallery of Modern Art', which later became 'Tate Modern'. The British art was to remain at the Millbank site under the name the 'Tate Gallery of British Art', re-named 'Tate Britain'.

When Tate Britain and Tate Modern opened in 2000, they were established under very different circumstances from when the founding organisation had opened. The Tate



organisation had become responsible for four permanent exhibition sites rather than one, including Tate Liverpool and Tate St Ives, as well as a much expanded collection.

Overseeing the entire development was the Tate's governance in the body of the Director and Trustees, which was much more powerful than that of the original institution's as it operated with far greater autonomy. Owing to this re-positioning of responsibility the organisation was able to re-cast the initial aims of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art into Tate Modern: Museum of Modern Art. Furthermore, the Tate's governance, aware of the ongoing debates concerning the changing role of the modern art museum, took these accounts into consideration when defining the vision for the new exhibition site.

Tate Modern was therefore, required to facilitate a number of roles.

The question to arise since is: What is Tate Modern? Is it the National Museum for the Tate's collection of international modern and contemporary art? Is it the revitalised Bankside Power Station building, at the hub of a cultural regeneration project led by the Tate, working to a wider government agenda? Or is it a product of the Tate brand? While Tate Modern responds to all of these objectives, it is important to understand that it would *not* have been created had it not been for its primary purpose which is to exhibit the Tate's collection of international modern and contemporary art. Despite this primary objective, there is no scholarly research which examines the development of this part of the Tate Collection. Why is this important? This is relevant because when the original organisation was appointed to host the modern foreign collection, it did not want it. The outcome was that serious gaps were created.

Consequently, when Tate Modern was being established these gaps were taken into consideration, which is why the building was required to facilitate an experiential visit. On this basis, Tate Modern proposes a different kind of museum of modern art, distinct from its international counterparts. Furthermore, Tate Modern, instead of being established by the Government, City Council, or independent patron, was driven by the Tate Gallery. Manoeuvring to the role of civic patron had a long gestation period, which was rooted in the organisation's complex history. The Tate had been able to shift to this position because it had changed its original aims and objectives. The Tate had developed into a more commercial and professional style arts organisation and it was this, defining feature which enabled it to establish Tate Modern.

## Case Study Method

In order to examine the phenomenon that is Tate Modern, the case study method has been selected because it provides a clear research strategy where the boundaries between a phenomenon and its wider context, are not clearly definable.<sup>1</sup> This Ph.D. examines Tate Modern within the context of the Tate, with the awareness that the margins between the two are not always clearly discernible. Furthermore, as the research uses archival material and secondary sources, the case study provides a firm foundation with its ability to use multiple data collection.<sup>2</sup> The qualifying reason for using this research method is that it offers the most comprehensive way to reveal new insights and scope to generate further work in the scholarly field. Additionally, as the development of the founding organisation and its relationship with the modern foreign collection is assessed, to provide a holistic account of how Tate Modern came to be established the format undertaken is as a longitudinal case study to examine the period 1897 to 2000.

Useful publications include Martyn Hammersley and Roger Gomm's *Case Study Method* (2000).<sup>3</sup> Hammersley and Gomm advocate the use of the case study as a viable research method for a complex phenomenon. While most organisations are complex, given that Tate Modern and the international modern and contemporary art collection have had a complicated history, this further supports this research being posited within this investigative method. Hammersley and Gomm also emphasise the importance of the case study in capturing the 'uniqueness' of the thing, but warn against using it as the basis for generalisation or for 'theoretical inference'.<sup>4</sup> This case study will assess the unique nature of Tate Modern, and counteracts generalisation by providing a systematic analysis of the organisation which created it.

Following Hammersley and Gomm's argument, Robert K. Yin's *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2003), states that the case study must also be significant.<sup>5</sup> This case study is significant in that it constitutes an opportunity to consolidate material and previously unresearched data. For this interdisciplinary research,

---

<sup>1</sup> Yin, R. K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, California, London & New Delhi: Sage, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Baxter P. & Jack, S. (December 2008) *The Qualitative Report*, Vol. 13, No. 14, <http://www.nova.ed/sss/QR/QR13-4/baxter.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Gomm, R. Hammersley, M. & Foster, P. (eds) (2000) *Case Study Method*, London: Sage.

<sup>4</sup> Gomm, R. Hammersley, M. & Foster, P. (eds) (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Yin, R. K. (2003) *Op. cit.*, p. 161.

which draws on archival material, the case study presents itself as the most rigorous research method. Robert E. Stake's *The Art of Case Study Research* (1995) further supports the use of the case study with a qualitative research method, in order to tease out the nuances in meaning.<sup>6</sup> This is because the qualitative method investigates the wholeness of the phenomenon and looks at the why and how of decision-making rather than relying on observances based on empirical data.

As Tate Modern was established through a set of processes which are best investigated by understanding what motivated them, similar to Stake's model, this thesis chooses a qualitative over a quantitative method. The qualitative method is fundamental to this research because it enables a discussion on debates concerning the Tate Gallery's changing governances. It provides a way to address how decisions made by the Tate Gallery were not always taken in unison, and how issues concerning the Director and Trustees erupted at various points. The impact of these decisions contributed to the later position of the organisation, which led to the particular way that Tate Modern was established. Furthermore, as previous studies have adopted a singular narrative account of Tate Modern, this case study aims to provide a wider, contextual analysis.

The research will be supported by documentary material, which is assessed by using John Scott's method of evaluation as discussed in *A Matter of Record: Documentary Sources in Social Research* (1990). In this Scott proposes a four part criteria for evaluating documentary source material: i) Authenticity, is it genuine? ii) Credibility, is it to be trusted? iii) Representativeness, is it typical? and iv) Meaning, what is its purpose?<sup>7</sup> Authenticity, credibility and representativeness can be assessed, by comparing a wide range of sources which explore the same area. Meaning is the most ambiguous of all to consider. This is because there was sometimes an ambiguity in the way the Tate Gallery interpreted its own decision-making. These interpretations have provided useful insights into the make-up of the organisation. Finally, the reason for examining a mix of sources within the scope of the case study is to generate new knowledge in the field, and to provide a legible format for the thesis structure.

---

<sup>6</sup> Stake, R. E. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*, London: Sage, p. xii.

<sup>7</sup> Scott, J. (1990) *A Matter of Record*, London: Polity Press, p. 6.

## **Thesis Structure**

Chapter 1: Introduction will begin by mapping the position of cultural policy in relation to museums and galleries. Additionally, certain cultural initiatives were realised by the government through urban policy initiatives. For example, the Conservative Government created the Merseyside Development Corporation, which led to the establishment of Tate Liverpool. The cultural impact of this type of urban policy will be discussed in the Literature Review under ‘Central, London and Local Government Publications’. The reason however, for focusing separately on cultural policy is because there is no published literature which examines it in relation to museums and galleries, in terms of history, development and impact. The aim in discussing cultural policy is to understand what it is, why it was established and how it affected the Tate Gallery, and is also, to understand why the organisation’s governances chose to make the decisions that they did.

The case study research method, as discussed, has been undertaken because it provides a clear framework, and has created the scope to create a register of modern foreign art works which were declined by the Tate Gallery and are listed in Appendix A. This register is important as it identifies the way that the Tate’s early modern foreign collection was created; something that scholars have otherwise overlooked. This case study is distinct because it charts the development of the modern foreign collection and bridges this gap in the research field by providing an account of why Tate Modern came to be developed in the particular way that it was.

Furthermore, there is no interdisciplinary work contained in a single volume which addresses the multiple themes relating to this research. The interdisciplinary areas are reduced into the following key words as: art, branding, city, collection, commerce, culture, museum, policy, public and private and urban regeneration. They are relevant to this thesis because they identify inter-related research areas and have been grouped into the following sections for the Literature Review: Central, London and Local Government; Cultural Policy and Economics; Art History; Tate Gallery and related Museology and Theory; and Branding and Marketing. The publications have been evaluated to identify the theoretical and practical considerations relating to this thesis.

What has emerged from the combined primary and secondary source material has formed the basis for the research questions. The questions are structured in pairs. The

first question addresses the role of the Government, and the second examines its impact on the Tate Gallery. The research questions are summarised as follows:

- 1) What determined successive governments in adopting a laissez-faire or interventionist position towards the public funding of museums and galleries? How did this affect the Tate Gallery?
- 2) How did modernity become a government concern and change the political vision of culture? How did this impact on the development of the Tate Gallery?
- 3) Why did culture become a government initiative and ascend the urban agenda? How did this affect the Tate Gallery?
- 4) How did government policy communicate change and impact on cultural vision and patronage? How did this directive facilitate the establishment of Tate Modern?

Signposting is included throughout the chapters to make explicit the mapping of the thesis. The principal argument is that Tate Modern was created as a civic-led initiative by the Tate Gallery, which functioned as an independent agency rather than a national organisation. The reason that the Tate Gallery had been able to manoeuvre to this position was because it had responded, notably from 1988, to government directives, which resulted in it taking greater autonomy over its own decision-making process. Owing to the cuts to arts grants by the Conservative Government, a sink-or-swim paradigm was created, whereby arts managers had to think out of the box, in order to generate alternative methods of income.

By the time of the opening of Tate Modern, it had been funded by a mixed model of 60% public funding and 40% private finance. To understand how these government changes were implemented, they are assessed by examining the development of cultural policy and its changing position. The purpose of this is to situate this thesis within the broader political context and is to make explicit the different systems of public funding for museums and galleries. The following section, therefore, identifies grant-in-aid, which was the funding mechanism whereby the government appointed public funds directly from the Treasury. This type of funding was later replaced by the establishment

of the National Lottery. The idea of a lottery funded cultural initiative had already been implemented earlier in the eighteenth century with the creation of the British Museum.

### **Cultural Policy: Museums and Galleries**

The antecedent for cultural policy begins with The British Museum Act of 1753.

Overseen by Henry Pelham's Whig Government, the British Museum was established at the embryonic stages of the nation's ascendancy as a world power, with London at its hub. Pelham's Whig ministry supported the supremacy of parliament over the monarchy and free trade, which saw barriers of regulation removed. The impact began the reduction of the national debt as a new market economy flourished. During this wave of prosperity, the Government undertook the initiative to create the British Museum which was to function as a symbol of an increasingly powerful nation. The Government raised funds of £300,000 through the British Museum Public Lottery.<sup>8</sup> The money was used to purchase Montague House in Bloomsbury, as well as Hans Sloane's collection of art, antiquities, natural history and manuscripts, which had been offered at a reduced price to the Government for the benefit of the nation.

The British Museum was created with the aim to promote knowledge, and was established at the vanguard of Enlightenment thinking.<sup>9</sup> The British Museum Act was passed two years after the first publication, in 1751, of Denis Diderot's (ed.)

*Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*. The Encyclopedia was a literary response to the Enlightenment which classified the known world. The British Museum was the physical embodiment of that same world. The first British Museum Chairman of the Trustees was the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Herring, who requested that public admission should be free. What this directive marked was the birth of the modern public museum and a shift away from the 'cabinets of curiosities', viewed exclusively in the private and wealthier homes.<sup>10</sup> Admission to the British Museum was, however, by means of a letter from the visitor, which excluded a

---

<sup>8</sup> Weinreb, B. & Hibbert, C. (eds) (1995 [1983]) *London Encyclopedia*, London: MacMillan, p. 92.

<sup>9</sup> Wilson, D. M. (2001 [1989]) *The Collections of the British Museum*, London: The British Museum Press, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

large section of the illiterate population. The British Museum was also closed at weekends when working people had time to visit.

Despite its limitations, the British Museum proposed a new kind of modern institution that was free to the public. Another modern public institution was established later with the founding of a new national collection of pictures which opened at 100 Pall Mall. The previous year, in 1823, George Agar-Ellis, a Whig politician during Lord Liverpool's Tory administration, proposed that the Government purchase John Julius Angerstein's Collection of Old Master paintings, with the aim of creating a National Collection of Art. With thirty-eight paintings purchased from Angerstein's Collection and a Government grant, the initiative was unlike other major European galleries, which had been formed by nationalising a royal or princely collection. The following decade, the Government funded a new building on Trafalgar Square to house the national collection. The National Gallery in Trafalgar Square opened in 1838, with the aim of exhibiting Western European painting and was different from the role of the British Museum, as it was intended as an exhibition site, rather than as a place of edification.

The Museum Act (1845) formalised this position when it decreed that museums were created as places for education, and as such were a government concern.<sup>11</sup> The educational role of the museum was given greater momentum with The Education Act (1870). The outcome of the legislation saw the curriculum of Board Schools broadened to include music and art. As there was no guidance on how these subjects would be taught it became the role of the museum and not the gallery to fulfil the latter function.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, when the National Gallery of British Art (Millbank) opened it was established with the sole aim of exhibiting British art.

Henry Tate's vision to create a National Gallery dedicated to British Art was changed later by the government, when the organisation was also given a modern foreign collection to curate. The directive came from the National Gallery Board of Trustees. The National Gallery Trustees had asked Herbert Asquith's Liberal Government to provide a review of the national and provincial art collections. Earl Curzon of Kedleston led a committee which recommended that a national modern foreign art collection be

---

<sup>11</sup> The Museums Act (1845) 8 & 9 Vict. c. 43.

<sup>12</sup> Ford, B. (ed.) (1989) *The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain: The Later Victorian Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 35.



established.<sup>13</sup> As will be discussed this led the National Gallery of British Art being appointed to host the National Modern Foreign Collection in 1917.

A more wide-sweeping government initiative was implemented after World War II, when Clement Attlee's Labour administration oversaw the creation of the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB), established by a Royal Charter in 1946. The ACGB was part of a programme of nationalisation by the Labour Government, which impacted across industry, transport and culture. Some galleries and museums, including the Tate Gallery, remained outside the jurisdiction of the ACGB and continued to receive its grant-in-aid directly from the Treasury.

The interventionist position continued under following political administrations and included Sir Winston Churchill's Conservative Government which oversaw The National Gallery and Tate Gallery Act (1954).<sup>14</sup> The Act accorded the Tate Gallery with separate status from the National Gallery Board of Trustees. While the Tate Gallery's affairs were to be conducted by an independent body of Trustees, it was, however, to be appointed by the Prime Minister. The Tate Gallery was also required to use the Treasury for financial matters and the Treasury Solicitor as its legal advisor.<sup>15</sup>

The Labour Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, later made an even more radical gesture to the arts than Attlee when he created the first Ministry of Arts, in 1964. The new government department under its Minister, Jennie Lee, provided the first piece of formal cultural policy legislation with *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps* (1965). The White Paper was a defining moment in Labour's vision, outlining that culture had a major role to play in the political agenda.<sup>16</sup> The role of the Arts Minister was as a Parliamentary Secretary of State whose office was within the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works. From 1965 to 1967, the position of the Minister changed to Under-Secretary within the Department of Education and Science. During a cabinet reshuffle from 1967 to 1970, the role was increased to that of Minister of State.

---

<sup>13</sup> Earl Curzon of Kedleston, Sir Edgar Vincent, Robert H. Benson and Sir Charles Holroyd (1915) *Report of the Committee of Trustees of the National Gallery appointed by the Trustees to inquire into the Retention of Important Pictures in this Country and Other Matters connected with the National Art Collection*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

<sup>14</sup> The Tate Gallery (1955) 'Treasury Minute, 5 February 1955'. In *The Tate Gallery Handbook*, Note 2.

<sup>15</sup> The Tate Gallery (1955) *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>16</sup> Her Majesty's Government (1965) *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 5.



The Ministry of Arts was placed under the jurisdiction of the newly created Office of the Arts and Libraries (OAL) in 1970 by Edward Heath's Conservative Government. The OAL remained the same body in terms of executive power during the following Conservative administration of PM Margaret Thatcher (1979–1990). However, while the OAL continued to operate, the arts budget was cut. John Major replaced Thatcher as leader and, two years later, led the Conservative Party to its fourth election win. Major replaced the OAL with the Department of National Heritage (DNH) in 1992.<sup>17</sup> The DNH was appointed as a Department of State with representation at Cabinet level, providing it with a higher government position than the OAL.

The DNH acquired greater responsibilities than the OAL, and oversaw media, heritage, sport and tourism, while amalgamating the areas of the arts, broadcasting, film, sport, architecture, historic sites, royal parks and tourism. The DNH assumed funding for the ACGB, as well as for national museums and galleries in England. The DNH oversaw the Museums and Galleries Act (1992), which resulted in the National Gallery, the Tate Gallery, the National Portrait Gallery and the Wallace Collection being accorded the rights of corporate status and invested all property, rights and liabilities with the Board(s) of Trustees. For the Tate Gallery Board of Trustees, the legislation provided it with greater autonomy to speculate for the future.<sup>18</sup>

### **Impact on the Tate Gallery**

Major supported the same ideological political system as his predecessor Margaret Thatcher, which had been to reduce the role of the State and to cut expenditure in all areas of public spending, including the arts. Furthermore, government demands were also made of the more limited public funds being matched with private sector finance. Therefore, museums and galleries had to find new ways of generating alternative funding streams. The situation forced some museums and galleries to close, while some chose to adopt admission charges, and others looked to the private sector for financial aid. A new enterprise culture ensued, as arts organisations had to generate their own box office by

---

<sup>17</sup> Strange, I. (1996) 'Local politics, new agendas and strategies for change in English historic cities.' In *Cities*, Vol. 13, No. 6, p. 435.

<sup>18</sup> The Museums and Galleries Act (1992) Schedule 2: The Board of Trustees of the Tate Gallery. The Act revised the earlier legislation set out in The National Gallery and Tate Gallery Act (1954).

extending their activities to fundraising. Better public accessibility with a greater emphasis on the idea of the visitor offer was, therefore, becoming a necessity.

Museums and galleries were required to create a higher standard of service and quality than ever before and reassessed their collections and buildings as assets. This was the climate in 1988 when Nicholas Serota was appointed as the new Director of the Tate Gallery by the Civil Service Commission. Previously, the Treasury had been responsible for the appointment of the Director of the Tate Gallery, but instead passed the task over to the Civil Service Commission. The move indicated that the role of the Tate Gallery Director was repositioned as a public servant and, as such, was accountable to the Crown, represented by the Government, and to the public that they would serve. The outcome of this new way of envisioning the Director's role was that the Tate Gallery was seen as a more publically responsible body.

After Serota's appointment, a number of organisational changes were made which ultimately led to *The Tate Gallery Preliminary Audit Report* (1991) being undertaken to ascertain which areas within the organisation required further development. The report identified that the British and modern foreign art had become 'gridlocked' within the building.<sup>19</sup> The solution was to create a new exhibition space at another temporary London site. These plans were unveiled at a Tate Gallery press conference in December 1992 and what made the proposal especially ambitious was that the announcement was made when the country was in recession. The Stock Market had crashed in 1987, and bounced back only to anticipate the US savings and loans crisis. This led to a sharp financial downturn, which impacted on the UK's economy.

During this period of economic instability, the Tate Gallery established a Development Office to raise finance from the private sector. The initiative demonstrated the Tate Gallery's level of confidence despite the difficult financial climate. What was even more ambitious was that the Tate Gallery also announced that London was the only major capital without a dedicated museum of modern art, and that this type of cultural facility was necessary for it to compete with other international cities. What this indicated was that it was going to create an important major new cultural initiative for London and

---

<sup>19</sup> Francis, R. (January 1991) *The Tate Gallery Preliminary Audit Report* (Studies undertaken October 1990–December 1990) printed in *The Tate Masterplan* (12 June 1991) p. 25 (Archive: TG 12/1/1/2).

was already aiming high in terms of what it was going to deliver. What this also demonstrated was that even though the Tate Gallery was a national organisation, it had begun to act as if it were an independent civic patron.

The Tate Gallery undertook this responsibility because the Conservative Government was increasingly unwilling to support cultural projects. One reason for the resistance was a result of the British Library project. Edward Heath's Conservative Government had overseen The British Library Act (1972) which made the provision to create a separate institution from the British Museum. The British Library project spanned from 1978 to 1997, and was designed by Colin St John Wilson and Partners for the Property Services Agency. The British Library proved disappointingly expensive, costing almost £500 million and was the kind of financial debacle that the Conservative Government never wished to repeat.<sup>20</sup> Plans were later proposed for a new mechanism for public funding, whereby the reliance on the Treasury was removed.

The National Lottery Act (1993) provided the legislation for this new system of public funding. Regulated by the National Lottery Commission, it appointed independent operators to manage the project, which involved selling lottery tickets and awarding prize money. A portion of the remaining money was awarded to government-appointed distribution bodies to fund public arts, sports and community venues and activities. From this fund an allocation of National Lottery receipts was to be spent on new building projects, through funding from the distribution body of the Millennium Commission.<sup>21</sup> The Chairman of the Millennium Commission, Sir Peter Brook, specified that for designated projects it would provide 50% of the funding, but did not advocate how the other 50% of funds might be realised. This created a competitive edge to achieving the funding awards. The Millennium Commission's major award was for Capital Projects, offering up to £50 million to create 'landmarks for the 21st century'.<sup>22</sup> The opportunity to

---

<sup>20</sup> Ryan, R. (2004 [2000]) 'Transforming Bankside Power Station'. In Ryan, R. & Moore, R. (eds) *Building Tate Modern*, London: Tate Gallery Publishing, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> The Tate Gallery (2 July 1992) *Tate Masterplan*, p. 3 (Archive: TG 12/1/1/2).

<sup>22</sup> The Millennium Commission (1995) *The Millennium Commission Annual Report and Accounts 1994/95*, London: Millennium Commission, p. 6.

secure a Millennium Commission Capital Project made the Tate Gallery rethink its strategy, by considering a permanent rather than a temporary exhibition site.<sup>23</sup>

The Tate Gallery recognised that it would have to provide quantifiable evidence for the project's viability, which became a strategically managed undertaking and included appointing the services of the management consulting firm, McKinsey & Company.<sup>24</sup> The London Borough of Southwark also appointed the urban regeneration consultancy, Martin Caldwell Associates, for its own verification of the project's viability. The outcome of the combined research equipped the Tate Gallery with the confidence to pursue its Millennium Commission application. The Tate Gallery's strategy also extended to hosting an international architecture competition. The competition was undertaken to meet with the Millennium Commission's criteria, which was that any project seeking funding should be of 'high architectural design'.<sup>25</sup> The Tate Gallery's objectives in implementing the competition were twofold: one was to find an architectural practice that would design a suitable exhibition space; the second was to stimulate public interest and attract funding.

The Tate Gallery's Development Office was already campaigning to secure private sector finance. The Tate Gallery was, therefore, responding directly to the government directive for partnership funding. The strategy continued when the Labour Party was voted into office at the General Election in 1997. Labour replaced the DNH with the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). The DCMS was intended to propose a clearer mandate from the DNH. While the DCMS echoed many of the aims of the DNH, it became a more powerful body with greater UK jurisdiction. The DCMS took on the DNH's core responsibilities for the arts, sport, gambling, alcohol licensing, libraries, archives, museums and galleries, broadcasting, film, the music industry, press freedom and regulation, the historic environment and tourism.

The Golden Jubilee and Millennium projects were also overseen by the DCMS; however, many of the executive functions continued to be carried out by quangos,

---

<sup>23</sup> Brooke, P. (22 June 1994) *A Strategy for Supporting Millennium Projects*, London: Millennium Commission, p. 2.

<sup>24</sup> McKinsey & Company (1994) *Assessing the Economic Impact of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art at Bankside*, London: McKinsey & Company, p. 1.

<sup>25</sup> The Millennium Commission (1995) *The Millennium Commission Annual Report and Accounts 1994/95*, p. 12.

including the National Lottery Commission.<sup>26</sup> The DCMS, therefore, retained much of the character of the DNH and also demanded financial accountability. The cultural analyst, Sara Selwood, assessed the position of culture under the DCMS. Selwood claimed that it was evaluated by economic impact rather than cultural value and stated: 'The rise of statistics has paralleled an extension of government control over the arts, and the tendency to value culture for its 'impact' rather than intrinsic value'.<sup>27</sup> DCMS-sponsored bodies were required to provide a delivery of outputs. Consequently, New Labour emulated the Conservative vision in continuing to promote an enterprise culture which impacted on arts organisations, including the Tate Gallery.

### **The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: A Civic Vision**

The Tate Gallery, in accordance with the DCMS's aims, continued to become a publically accountable and commercially viable arts organisation. This vision was turned into political capital when Tate Modern opened, when it generated high visitor figures and economic returns. McKinsey & Company had estimated that approximately 1.5 million visitors would visit Tate Modern in the first year of opening, whereas 5.25 million people came through the doors.<sup>28</sup> It was also estimated that Tate Modern generated approximately £100 million for the annual economy.

Tony Travers, Director of the Greater London Group, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), claimed that Tate Modern had become one of the most successful and largest cultural projects since the nineteenth century:

It is on the scale of institutions created by the Victorians. [...] It was not the product of a major government initiative, but rather a voluntary and civic effort that managed to generate a major new gallery that has contributed significantly to the wider economic rebirth of a classic British inner city.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.ndad.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ah/39/detail.html>.

<sup>27</sup> Selwood, S. (2002) *Measuring Culture*, <http://www.spiked-online.com/index.php/site/article/6851>.

<sup>28</sup> McKinsey & Company (May 2001) *The Economic Impact of Tate Modern*, London: McKinsey & Company, p. 3.

<sup>29</sup> Travers, T. (2005) 'Renewing London.' In Gayford, M. et al., *Tate Modern: The First Five Years*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 23.

Comparing Tate Modern to a Victorian institution had a special resonance. Since the project's inception in the 1990s, the Tate Gallery had in some ways mirrored the role of the organisation's founder, Henry Tate, in the 1890s. Similarly, the Tate Gallery had become a major patron of a new national gallery, in a part of London which was in need of renewal. The scale of Tate Modern, however, was unknown in the twentieth century for arts buildings in London, with the exception of the Royal Festival Hall building. The LCC Architect's Department had been responsible for designing the Royal Festival Hall, which opened in 1951. The LCC proposed developing the surrounding area as a new cultural hub, but, with no funding available, the project was put on hold. Owing to a later ACGB directive, the adjacent area along the South Bank Complex was developed. The LCC was replaced by the Greater London Council (GLC) in 1965. The South Bank site was overseen by LCC and GLC architects, which demonstrated the scope of their responsibilities to project-manage and create a major cultural city initiative. After the demise of the GLC in 1986, the opportunity for future public projects was lost in the absence of any public authority to provide a new vision for London.

Following the British Library, the Millennium Dome became the next large-scale London cultural project. Implemented by the Conservative Government in 1996, it was intended to develop contaminated land on the northern section of the Greenwich peninsula.<sup>30</sup> The freehold of the land was owned by the National Government Regeneration Agency, English Partnerships, which granted a lease to the Millennium Experience Company. The Millennium Experience was created within the Millennium Dome as 'a celebratory, iconic, non-hierarchical structure offering a vast flexible space'.<sup>31</sup> With the incoming New Labour administration in 1997, Prime Minister Tony Blair refocused *The Millennium Experience* into the *New Millennium Experience*. The Millennium Dome offered Blair the opportunity to rethink the project. Believing that the Millennium Dome would be a success, New Labour increased the scale, scope and funding of the project.

The appointed architects, Richard Rogers and Partners, created the now well-known tent-like dome with a mast-supported cable exterior. The structure was intended to

---

<sup>30</sup> Central Office of Information (1995) *Urban Regeneration*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, pp. 4-5.

<sup>31</sup> [http://www.richardrogers.co.uk/work/all\\_projects/millennium\\_experience](http://www.richardrogers.co.uk/work/all_projects/millennium_experience)

create a distinctive building for London on the River Thames, at the tip of the Greenwich peninsula. While the exterior of the building provided a new landmark on the London skyline, the Millennium Dome project failed. The Millennium Dome provided a space of 100,000 sq m, which included a main performance area in the centre of the building, but its purpose was unclear. The Millennium Dome costs escalated when it received only 6.5 million paying visitors in the first year of opening, instead of an estimated 12 million visitors. The Millennium Dome cost £789 million, with the National Lottery providing a total of £628 million in grants. The remainder was made up from earned income.<sup>32</sup> The Millennium Dome, which opened to the public on 1 January 2001, went into liquidation on 31 December 2001 and was returned to English Partnerships.

According to the urban theorist, Graeme Evans, the proposal was doomed as it lacked a clear identity and he claimed that it was: ‘New Labour’s nightmarish *New Millennium Experience*’.<sup>33</sup> The government had focused on the Millennium Dome at Greenwich rather than on the Tate Gallery at Bankside. The German art dealer Karsten Schubert accounts for the disinterest in Bankside as ‘a deeply ingrained English brand of philistinism’.<sup>34</sup> Schubert was referring to the fact that the government lacked the imagination to recognise Bankside’s cultural potential as a major site for regeneration. As a result of the government’s inability to oversee such a project, it had taken a national institution, the Tate Gallery, to act as a civic patron to realise Bankside’s potential.

Consequently, this is why this thesis is titled: *Establishing Tate Modern: Vision and Patronage*. Had the project been created by the government it would have been worded: ‘Establishing Tate Modern: Policy and Funding’. The words ‘vision’ and ‘patronage’ are used instead to indicate that the directive was undertaken by a non-governmental body. ‘Vision’ infers that the directive was mediated by an independent patron, group, or organisation, and ‘patronage’ underlines the cultural rather than fiscal imperative of the project. ‘Patron’ derives from the Latin *patronus*, meaning to provide

---

<sup>32</sup> National Audit Office (2002) *Winding-up The New Millennium Commission Experience Company Limited*, London: National Audit Office Report, p. 6.

<sup>33</sup> Evans, G. (2001) *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance*, London & New York: Routledge, p. 235.

<sup>34</sup> Schubert, K. (2000) *The Curator’s Egg*, London: One-Off Press, p. 109.



influential or financial support to advance the interests of a person, institution or cause without the expectation of a financial return.<sup>35</sup>

The original patrons were the mythic muses, the goddesses of inspiration and learning, who provided benefaction without expecting monetary reward; accepting, instead, commemoration, to be memorialised eternally.<sup>36</sup> The memorial gift became the chosen benefaction of wealthy benefactors. These private benefactors included Henry Tate whose patronage of the National Gallery of British Art (popularly known from the onset as the Tate) provided a lasting legacy, of British art and of himself. Tate made the major bequest in place of the government, which had, by the end of the nineteenth century, reduced funding for a number of these kinds of cultural public projects. As discussed, the position changed in the twentieth century, under the Labour administration of Clement Attlee, but it was not unique to Britain. The German, Dutch, and French governments shared a similar vision in undertaking responsibility for public arts funding.

The German model was realised through city municipalities, which usually financed cultural initiatives. The Dutch model implemented a state system of patronage through the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. The French model was the most centralised system and, rather than being city-led, relied on 'state bureaucracy' for its administration of the arts.<sup>37</sup> Additionally, a greater proportion of German, Dutch and French public funding was awarded to their modern foreign art collections compared to Britain. The European galleries were able to augment their collections with good representative examples of modern foreign art. The Tate Gallery did not benefit from the same funding. Furthermore, it had also practised a retrogressive purchasing policy towards its modern foreign art collection.

The Tate Gallery only began to modernise its collection and practices with the appointment of the Directors Norman Reid, in 1964, and Nicholas Serota, in 1988. Notably, Serota led the organisation to being a more professional style arts organisation, but was also criticised for adopting a business-like approach. Another criticism levelled

---

<sup>35</sup> Garber, M. (2008) *Patronizing the Arts*, Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, p. 17.

<sup>36</sup> Gould, S. J. (2008) 'The Diverse Worlds of Museums.' In Kotler, N. G. Kotler, P. & Kotler, W. I. (eds) *Museum Marketing and Strategy*, San Francisco: John Wiley, p. 19.

<sup>37</sup> Garber, M. (2008) *Op. cit.*, pp. 46f.



at Serota was that he had created ‘a quintessentially British institution’.<sup>38</sup> This was because when Tate Modern was created the Tate Gallery became ‘Tate Britain’, a national gallery dedicated to British art, which appeared to support a nationalistic agenda defined by its public. These claims usefully identify how, by the millennium, the Tate was required to exhibit the British Collection and, out of physical necessity, needed to create a new space for the National Modern Foreign Collection.

## **Literature Review**

Owing to the multifaceted nature of the Tate, a range of reading has been undertaken to examine where Tate Modern sits within the field of existing scholarship. What is reflected in the published literature is that a body of work has emerged, discussing Tate Modern from a single, disciplinary perspective. While these accounts are valuable in terms of subject focus, they are based upon a series of contextual assumptions and use information already in the public domain. The published literature, therefore, has not provided new insights into how Tate Modern was established, nor into why it is distinct from other international museums of modern art. Consequently, the Literature Review has been undertaken in conjunction with primary source material to understand the debates surrounding the establishment of Tate Modern. The aim of this Literature Review is to provide a framework of related research, and it identifies a gap in the field of scholarly knowledge which this thesis aims to bridge.

This Literature Review begins by identifying the primary sources, as they have provided the focus for the secondary source reading. The material has been drawn from The National Archive, which holds records from the Office of Public Sector Information Archive and Her Majesty’s Stationery Office Archive. This has been invaluable in examining the effect of cultural policy and related legislation on national galleries and museums. The information has been supported by additional data from the UK Government Web Archive and the LSE’s Archive. Otherwise, the main body of the research has been undertaken in the Tate Gallery Archive Records.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.

<sup>39</sup> Due to the Freedom of Information Act (2000) when this research was undertaken access to the Tate Archive’s Minutes of Trustees’ Meetings was restricted up to, and including 1986.

The earlier section of the Tate Gallery Archive Records does not hold comprehensive information concerning the art works which were rejected. As noted, an Appendix A has been included to identify the modern foreign art works which were declined by the Tate Gallery; however, this data is fragmentary as there are omissions of costs, dates, sellers, with some of the art works being given a description rather than a title, while others are listed as unidentified. What Appendix A illustrates is the level at which the organisation operated in an arbitrary way in developing the modern foreign collection. The Tate Records relating to Tate Modern — the TG 12 Archive are more complete than the earlier records.

The TG12 Archive is formed from the papers of: Dawn Austwick, Project Manager; Nicholas Serota, Tate Director; Denis Stevenson, Chairman of Tate Gallery Trustees; Sandy Nairne, Tate Director of Public and Regional Services; George Cochrane, Community Relations Officer; Frances Morris, Curator; Damien Whitmore Head of Communications; Victoria Walsh, Tate Modern Launch Co-Coordinator; and Adrian Hardwicke, Project Officer. The archive has been filed thematically, and the papers arranged chronologically by Ross MacFarlane, between 2000 and 2001. The TG 12 Archive list was revised and transferred to the Archive Management System Calm, between July and September 2001, by Alan Crookham.

Material from the Project and Estates office was catalogued by Luke Smythe, between November 2002 and April 2003, who produced a revised list of classifications which are: TG 12/1: Concept and Discussion; TG 12/2: Project Management; TG 12/3: Site Selection; TG 12/4: Archive Competition; TG 12/5: Legal Papers; TG 12/6: Finance; TG: 12/7 Correspondence; TG 12/8: Construction; TG: 12/9 Fundraising; TG 12/10: Publicity; TG 12/11: Bankside related projects and TG 12/12: Bankside Operations.

The TG 12 Archive consists of predominantly formal documents, including minutes of committee meetings. The files have been ordered thematically and can give the impression that the process of creating Tate Modern was a seamless process, as there are few documents holding information concerning human error. There are, however, a small number of unofficial documents, such as hand-written memorandums, which give a different picture. For example, the Cost Consultants, on more than one occasion,

complained about rising site expenditure which indicated a more fraught and challenging development period than has been recognised.

Press, media and related sources have also been used to include Karl Sabbagh's *Power into Art: Creating the Tate Modern, Bankside* (2000), which was published to accompany the Channel 4 documentary series. The television footage includes Frances Morris, Head of Tate Gallery Collections, negotiating with the artist, Louise Bourgeois, for the installation of her work, *Maman* (1999) for the Turbine Hall. The footage of Morris suggests that this aspect of Tate Modern did not develop smoothly. What this and other events indicate is that Tate Modern emerged from a series of false starts, challenges and opportunities. These were the result of internal and structural changes, owing to individual and collective decisions, and were also to do with external factors, mediated by Government. This is why the next section discusses Central, London and local Government publications, and identifies how a dialogue between national government and local councils impacted on policy, which had implications for the Tate Gallery.

### **Central, London and Local Government Publications**

The Central Office of Information's *Action for Cities* (1987) provides a synthesis of Conservative urban policy. The report states that the 'right framework for action' had been implemented to aid inner-city deprivation, by providing aid for rebuilding, increasing skills and enterprise.<sup>40</sup> Created by promoting partnership between the public and private sectors, urban development grants were established, with 75% being allocated from central government, with the remainder coming from local councils and private developers to secure inner-city sites.<sup>41</sup> The aim of this kind of urban intervention was, according to Andrew Thornley, Professor of Geography and Environment, LSE, because the Conservative Government became increasingly involved with urban planning.<sup>42</sup>

The Conservative Government demanded that councils ensure that all proposals were viable before the development grants were awarded. A key urban directive had been the creation of the Urban Development Corporations (UDCs). The UDCs were to provide

---

<sup>40</sup> Central Office of Information (1987) *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>42</sup> Thornley, A. (1998) *Institutional Change and London's Urban Policy Agenda*, The Annals of Regional Science, London: Springer, p. 167.

the framework for self-sustaining urban regeneration programmes for inner-city areas, through public and private partnership. The Merseyside Development Corporation was the government's flagship project. 'Operation Groundwork' saw the reclamation of Liverpool Docks, and the surrounding area being regenerated through commercial and residential developments. The Tate Gallery and the International Slavery Museum in the Albert Dock were appointed to provide the cultural draw for the regeneration programme. A further consequence was that the initiative equipped the Tate Gallery with the knowledge to manage a public and private partnership regeneration project.

While Tate Liverpool was in development, the Conservative Government oversaw The Local Government Act (1985), which began the demise of county councils and the abolition of the GLC. Ken Livingstone, the leader of the GLC's brand of municipal socialist politics had clashed with those of the Conservative leader, Margaret Thatcher. Originally, the GLC had been responsible for the administration of the fire service, waste disposal and flood prevention. Additionally, the GLC shared responsibility with the London boroughs for providing roads, planning, housing and leisure services. The closure of the GLC meant that some areas were left with no civic body responsible for overseeing them, such as the development and integrated planning of urban spaces. The GLC's other powers were delegated to the London borough councils and to The London Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC).

Created in 1986, LPAC was created as a strategic agency to advise the government on planning matters that affected more than one borough. LPAC, with The Corporation of London, Greater London Arts, The London Docklands Development Corporation, London Transport and Westminster City Council, co-sponsored *London World City* (1991). The report identified that wealth, employment, the quality of life and the environment had to be improved if the city was to improve its image.<sup>43</sup> It further stated that London had suffered compared to Paris, where there had been highly visible publicly funded prestige arts projects. Central Government was not censured for the

---

<sup>43</sup> Kennedy, R. (1991) *London World City*, (Co-Sponsored by The London Planning Advisory Committee, Greater London Arts, The London Docklands Development Corporation, London Transport & Westminster City Council Greater London Group), London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, p. ix.

situation; instead, London's independent bodies were criticised. Arts organisations were rebuked for being publically perceived as 'exclusive', 'old fashioned' and 'high-brow'.<sup>44</sup>

Museums and galleries were specifically targeted to change the public's perception of them. The audit acknowledged that museums and galleries and other arts organisations had been forced to focus their energies into funding initiatives. Otherwise, while London was commended for being a world-class city for culture, the report claimed that there was a resistance to experiment and speculate for the future. The conclusion was that London had to change from a drab, dirty and difficult-to-navigate city into an accessible destination. London and its diverse independent bodies from businesses to arts organisations were required to provide more attractive business prospects and leisure facilities. The report did not specify how this could be achieved and stated that the independent sector instead of the government had to take responsibility to improve the public realm. 'London must find a way to restore its perception of itself [...] This would require a city wide audit to identify where [...] action is needed'.<sup>45</sup>

The city audit fell to the private sector to take up the initiative. The outcome was that these initiatives were realised by independent bodies including the Somerset House Trust, which was formed in 1997 as a charity. Using grants from the Heritage Lottery Fund, the charity oversaw the restoration of three floors of Somerset House's south wing. Additionally the courtyard had new water fountains installed, powered by underground pumps. Fountain Court and the redeveloped site of Somerset House provided 40,000 sq ft of new public space.<sup>46</sup> As Somerset House re-opened, Bankside Power Station was in the process of being redeveloped to provide another kind of urban space in London. These initiatives marked a change in what had been considered public space, which formerly had been green areas such as parks but had now relocated into the urban realm.

Ricky Burdett, Professor of Urban Studies, LSE, stated:

Historically, London's public spaces have been residential squares or larger parks. The city's current imagination of public realm encompasses

---

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 117.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 123.

<sup>46</sup> Somerset House Trust (2010) *Somerset House Trust Annual Report for the year ended 31 March 2010*, London: Somerset House Trust, p. 3.

spaces that are less green and more densely occupied — a shift in lifestyle that is both threatening and enriching.<sup>47</sup>

Public space had begun to relocate to a new pavement culture to accommodate a wider demographic with new customer demands. The new public spaces geared themselves increasingly towards consumer activities through the provision of goods and services, such as coffee and, more recently, wi-fi. The public spaces were reconfigured because the post-war citizen had morphed into the modern consumer. The shift from citizen to consumer had been orchestrated by Thatcher, who ended the idea of post-war consensus politics, where the State had played a major role. Thatcher's political philosophy had been mediated by her mentor Keith Joseph, which was set out in his Stockton lecture *Monetarism is not enough* (1975).

The economic theory of monetarism, formulated by Milton Friedman, proposed the most radical shake-up of British politics during the twentieth century. This is why Thatcher commended Joseph for weathering the storm 'before the tide of opinion was finally turned'.<sup>48</sup> Thatcher was referring to the abandonment of the Keynesian model of government intervention, by controlling markets through fiscal means, for the new model of monetarism, which promoted a reduced role of the State towards privatisation. Joseph and Thatcher's brand of neo-Conservatism reverberated with the values of neo-liberalism and its global agenda. For the neo-liberal economy to thrive, this meant privileged access to international trading with developed and developing countries. Consequently, neo-liberalism provided 'individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterised by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade'.<sup>49</sup>

The outcome was that the consumer was given greater access to goods and services from around the world. Commerce was at the heart of neo-liberalism and became the guiding principle of British Conservatism in the 1980s. Organisations contrary to neo-liberal values and, therefore, to Thatcher's Conservatism, and which included the GLC, came under attack. As noted, some of the GLC's planning powers were passed to LPAC.

---

<sup>47</sup> Burdett, R. (2007) 'The Capital of Suburbia.' In Burdett, R. & Sudjic, D. (eds) *The Endless City*, London & New York: Phaidon, p. 151.

<sup>48</sup> Thatcher, M. (1976) 'Foreword.' In Joseph, K. *Monetarism is not enough*, London: Centre for Policy Studies, p. 3.

<sup>49</sup> Harvey, D. (2009 [2005]) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 69.

Consequently, as LPAC's role was advisory, it directed that local borough councils produce proposals outlining their future development guidelines. The outcome was that there was a resurgence of Unitary Development Plans (UDPs), which focused on all aspects of planning and also identified areas of potential economic growth.<sup>50</sup>

The London Borough of Southwark's *Unitary Development Plan* (1995) had been in development from 1989. Overseen by the Council's Planning and Regeneration Department it identified the economic potential in supporting cultural and tourist activities, but did not indicate that Bankside was a possible area for this kind of regeneration.<sup>51</sup> What this demonstrated was that it took the vision of the Tate Gallery rather than Southwark Council to recognise the potential of Bankside. Possibly, Southwark Council may have decided that Bankside was problematic, owing to its limited access. The Tate Gallery recognised the access issues, and proposed that a pedestrian bridge would have to be built linking Bankside and the City of London. The responsibility for the bridge was undertaken by *The Financial Times*, the London Borough of Southwark and the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) who oversaw the competition to find an architectural practice.

When Millennium Bridge opened it created a new public space and a vital corridor between the north and south banks, as well as an arterial link for Bankside with the City of London. The Millennium Bridge was important for Bankside because it and the surrounding area of Southwark had suffered from de-industrialisation. Southwark with its south-of-the-river location and poor transport access had suffered from 'fragmentation' from the rest of London.<sup>52</sup> Across the board, all inner-city areas which had relied on a manufacturing base had gone into decline. The situation was made worse by the fact that there was an absence of a London government to oversee the welfare of the areas within the city. The lack of a government for London became a public concern, and the question of creating a new city council was proposed.

Tony Blair, when leader of the opposition Labour Party, agreed that if elected into government office he would hold a referendum to vote on whether London should have

---

<sup>50</sup> Thornley, A. (1998) *Institutional Change and London's Urban Policy Agenda*, p. 165.

<sup>51</sup> London Borough of Southwark (1995) *Unitary Development Plans: The Southwark Plan*, London: Southwark Council, Section 1.14.

<sup>52</sup> Thornley, A. (1998) *Institutional Change and London's Urban Policy Agenda*, p. 166.



an elected city council. Post-election, overseen by the new Labour Government, The Greater London Authority Act (1999) was passed, which established the position of Mayor of London and the Greater London Assembly (GLA). Ken Livingstone was elected as the new London Mayor in 2000 and proposed his own vision for London in *The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London* (2004). The report stated that London should continue to develop ‘as an exemplary, sustainable world city’.<sup>53</sup> *The London Plan* aimed to improve London’s urban fabric and strengthen the economy, and acknowledged that the cultural sector played a key role.<sup>54</sup>

The Mayor next proposed a strategy focusing on the creative industries in *London Cultural Capital: Realising the Potential of a World-Class City* (2004), which stated that London was ‘an exemplary, sustainable world city’ supported by its culture.<sup>55</sup> *The London Plan* and *London Cultural Capital* both stressed that London was ‘sustainable;’ this referred to economic development rather than ecological balance, and was used in the same way that Thatcher had used it.<sup>56</sup> Economic sustainability was adopted by the London Mayor as a key buzz word. Consequently, *London Cultural Capital* emphasised that London had become a flourishing creative industries’ hub and was identified as a major wealth creator for the city. The creative industries were estimated at generating revenue of £25–29 billion per annum to the UK economy, by attracting over half the UK’s overseas visitors.<sup>57</sup>

What the proposal indicated was that the Mayor’s intentions reverberated with those of the Labour Government, which was to support London’s culture in providing ‘excellence, creativity, access and value’.<sup>58</sup> Tate Modern was already demonstrating the aims set out in *London Cultural Capital: Realising the Potential of a World-Class City*. The impact of Tate Modern was that the high visitor figures generated income for the creative economy. Tate Modern was envisioned as a high-end project to promote London as a major cultural centre. The creation of Tate Modern also provided London with a

---

<sup>53</sup> Mayor of London (2004) *The London Plan*, London: Greater London Authority, p. xii.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>55</sup> Mayor of London (2004) *London Cultural Capital: Realising the Potential of a World-Class City*, London: Greater London Authority, p. 11.

<sup>56</sup> Strange, I. (1996) ‘Local politics, new agendas and strategies for change in English historic cities.’ In *Cities*, Vol. 13, No. 6, p. 435.

<sup>57</sup> Mayor of London (2004) *London Cultural Capital: Realising the Potential of a World-Class City*, p. 18.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.



landmark building and established a new public space in London. Tate Modern therefore pre-empted the Mayor's directive for London to develop as a world-class city supported by its creative industries.

### **Cultural Policy and Economics Publications**

This section discusses the cultural sector through policy, economics and related publications, and begins with John S. Harris's *Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain* (1970). Harris examines the development of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) in 1939, and states that it was to aid the readjustment to wartime conditions, by providing a range of entertainments on the home front. Clement Attlee's post-war Labour Government oversaw the reconstruction of CEMA into the professional body of the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB). Under the direction of its first Chairman, John Maynard Keynes, the ACGB became responsible for the administration and funding of the arts and, specifically, for the theatre, opera, ballet and some museums. The ACGB was only intended as a temporary government measure until the economy stabilised. The creation of the ACGB also demonstrated the Labour Government's belief that it was responsible for the arts.

The Harold Wilson administration from 1964 is also discussed for taking a further interventionist position when it established the first Ministry of the Arts. The Golden Age of government-spending, of which the Tate Gallery was a beneficiary, however, came to an end with the devaluation of sterling in 1967. This was after the Bank of England spent £200 million trying to shore up the pound from its gold and dollar reserves. The General Election, in 1970, saw the Conservative Party voted into government office and begin reducing financial aid to the arts. Despite these shifting government positions, Harris commended 'the highly successful British system of artistic patronage' and suggested that it might serve as a future model for US patronage.<sup>59</sup>

Hugh Jenkins's *The Culture Gap* (1979) discusses the Labour system of British patronage. Initially, an overview of cultural policy is provided, focusing on Jenkins's time as the Labour Minister of the Arts from 1974 to 1976. Jennie Lee was commended

---

<sup>59</sup> Harris, J. S. (1970) *Government Patronage of the Arts in Great Britain*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, p. 10.

when, as the first Labour Minister of the Arts, she repositioned the role of culture and put it on the social agenda. According to Jenkins, because of this directive there was no longer a cultural gap, as cultural activity and choices defined society rather than class.<sup>60</sup> Jenkins's assessment is useful in understanding how the Labour Government changed the value of culture by identifying that it had a social value.

After the Labour Party lost the General Election in 1979, rapid changes were implemented, which saw state intervention being reduced drastically by the Conservative Government. These changes to the arts are discussed in Nicholas Pearson's *The State and the Visual Arts* (1982). Pearson focuses initially on the reasons why the post-war Labour governments chose to make the State take an increasingly dominant role in the administration of the arts.<sup>61</sup> Pearson then examines how the political pendulum swung to a new extreme as the Conservative Government reduced the role of the State. According to Pearson, this created major problems for the ACGB and arts organisations.

Christopher Bradley's *Mrs Thatcher's Cultural Policies: 1979–1990: A Comparative Study of the Globalized Cultural System* (1998) argues from a different position. Bradley proposes that Thatcher created a cultural economic paradigm which some arts organisations, including the Tate Gallery, followed. The government model demanded that arts managers be more financially accountable and business-minded. Bradley's overall assessment was that museums did well in the 1980s.<sup>62</sup> While this point is questionable, certainly a sink or swim paradigm was created. Bradley's proposition is, however, useful in that it identifies the kind of thinking that arts managers were forced to adopt: if they were to survive they would have to come in line with government directives. The position taken on public funding was also to do with the legacy left from the previous Labour administration of James Callaghan.

Clive Gray's *The Politics of the Arts in Britain* (2000) examines how Callaghan took over the leadership of the Labour Party in 1976, and was forced to approach the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for a loan of £2.3 billion (\$3.9 billion).<sup>63</sup> According to Gray, the IMF's intervention in public spending was the turning point in Britain's

---

<sup>60</sup> Jenkins, H. (1979) *The Culture Gap*, London & Boston: Marion Boyars, p. 53.

<sup>61</sup> Pearson, N. (1982) *The State and the Visual Arts*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, p. 2.

<sup>62</sup> Bradley, C. H. J. (1998) *Mrs Thatcher's Cultural Policies: 1979–1990: A Comparative Study of the Globalized Cultural System*, New York: Columbia University Press, p. 145.

<sup>63</sup> Gray, C. (2000) *The Politics of the Arts in Britain*, Hampshire: Macmillan, p. 35.

cultural history, rather than the Thatcher administration. The public expenditure cuts impacted on the arts, and initiated the shift from public to private sector funding to begin 'the commodification of the arts'.<sup>64</sup> Consequently, the Association for Business Sponsorship of the Arts (ABSA) was established in 1976, to stimulate aid from the business sector. The government directive was based on an American business model, established by David Rockefeller in New York.

David Throsby's *Economics and Culture* (2001) leaves the national perspective to investigate international arts funding governmental directives. Throsby identifies how, with the establishment of the United Nations in 1945 and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation in 1946, the role of culture rose to prominence as a way of fostering diplomatic relations.<sup>65</sup> Describing the shifting position of culture, Throsby proposes that from World War II culture played a vital role in the reconstruction of cities. On this basis, there was an understanding by international governments that money needed to be allocated to rebuilding and funding arts initiatives.

Toby Miller and George Yudice's *Cultural Policy* (2002) discusses how the US government did not legislate for cultural policy in the same way as European governments. The US government agency, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), had been created solely to focus on community arts projects.<sup>66</sup> Miller and Yudice state that most US museums and libraries were created through private patronage and not the government. They concur that these institutions have played, and continue to play, a major role in shaping US national and international cultural identity. While the US created a culture of private patronage, in Europe government-led patronage functioned for equivalent projects.

Britain had been slow to provide the same kinds of projects as its European counterparts which is discussed in Steven Fielding's *Labour and Cultural Change: The Labour Governments 1964–1970* (2003). Fielding examines how post-war cultural shifts were based on class, nationality, gender and generation. Fielding's research assesses the rise of British working-class culture and its association with popular music, while middle

---

<sup>64</sup> Gray, C. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>65</sup> Throsby, D. (2001) *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 142f.

<sup>66</sup> Miller, T. & Yudice, G. (2002) *Cultural Policy*, London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage, p. 35.

to upper class culture's preference continued for the visual arts and opera.<sup>67</sup> In contrast Western Europe wider sections of society embraced higher culture as their countries endeavoured to recover from the war by rebuilding economies, cities and confidence through cultural initiatives. According to Fielding, an international Golden Age emerged in Europe in the early 1950s. Culture became a tool for regeneration and a demonstration of an emergent modern state. Britain did not participate in this repositioning of culture, as the polarities of high and low culture remained entrenched within a class-based system.

Fielding claims that the Labour administration failed to recognise that the post-war electorate had changed: 'Coupled with high taxation and a failure to recognise the increasing affluence of the new working class on the eve of the 1960s, the working class was richer than ever before'.<sup>68</sup> The Labour Party's Manifesto *Britain Belongs to You: The Labour Party's Consideration by the British People* (1959), instead, focused on economic inequality for the working-class. The Labour Party under Hugh Gaitskell misjudged the political climate and lost the General Election in 1959. Under Harold Wilson, the Labour Party reformed when he became leader in February, 1963. Wilson recognised the need for Britain to modernise and underlined that it was no longer at the heart of an Empire.<sup>69</sup> Modernisation was at the heart of the Labour Manifesto, which criticised the Conservative Party for enforcing controls on public spending.

Wilson's own economic policies later ended in calamity when he resigned during his second term as the Prime Minister in 1976. Neil Mulholland's *The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the Late Twentieth Century* (2003) also identifies 1976 as the point when culture began to change in the UK.<sup>70</sup> Mulholland identifies key cultural turning points to include the Tate Gallery's display of Carl Andre's *Equivalent VIII*. The art work commonly known as 'The Bricks' caused a public furore when it was reported in the media that the Tate Gallery irresponsibly spent tax-payers money on a pile of bricks during the looming economic crisis. The incident opened up the debate about the value of modern art in the UK and was given further momentum when the Institute of

---

<sup>67</sup> Fielding, S. (2003) *Labour and Cultural Change: The Labour Governments 1964–1970*, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, pp. 3f.

<sup>68</sup> Fielding, S. (2003) *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>69</sup> The Labour Party (1964) *Let's go with Labour for the New Britain*, Labour Party Manifesto, London: Labour Party.

<sup>70</sup> Mulholland, N. (2003) *The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the Late Twentieth-Century*, Hants: Ashgate, p.5f.

Contemporary Arts controversial exhibition 'Prostitution', funded by ACGB, provoked further outrage from the media and Conservative politicians.

The same dialogue about modern art was ongoing over twenty years later, when 'Sensation' opened at the Royal Academy of Arts in 1997. The exhibition generated an even greater level of press attention in provoking public outrage. However, 'Sensation' was not funded by the government, as the Royal Academy of Arts was (and remains) an independent, privately funded institution. The arts works for 'Sensation' were from Charles Saatchi's private collection. One of the exhibits, Marcus Harvey's image of the female child murderer *Myra* [Hindley] (1993), created from pixelated children's handprints, had ink and an egg thrown at it.

'Sensation' attracted further media attention when it travelled to the Brooklyn Museum of Art. Notably, Chris Ofili's *The Virgin Mary* (1995), made up of pornographic, cut-out images and elephant dung, representing the image of the Virgin Mary, caused particular offence. A campaign led by the Republican New York Mayor, Rudolph Giuliani, threatened to cut the Brooklyn Museum of Art's \$7 million City Hall grant.<sup>71</sup> Hilary Clinton, the First Lady, came to the museum's defence, asking that it not be penalised because of the content of the exhibition. Sensation went ahead and the outcome was that the Brooklyn Museum of Art, like the Royal Academy of Arts, received record audience figures. The role of Charles Saatchi as the modern art patron also came to the fore, after having established himself as the foremost advertising guru.<sup>72</sup>

Charles, with his brother Maurice, formed the highly successful advertising agency Saatchi and Saatchi in 1970, which went on to create major national and international campaigns. Prior to this period, Charles Saatchi had begun collecting modern art, and then began to buy the work of more contemporary artists. During this time, Saatchi was invited to become a Patron of New Art at the Tate Gallery until a controversy arose concerning his involvement in two Tate Gallery exhibitions. The first exhibition displayed the work of Julian Schnabel, much of which was from Saatchi's collection. The second exhibition included work by Jennifer Bartlett, who had designed Saatchi's private dining room. The issue of the Tate Gallery promoting the art of one of

---

<sup>71</sup> Span, P. (24 September 1999) *The Washington Post*, p. 1.

<sup>72</sup> Mulholland, N. (2003) *Op. cit.*, p. 151.

its own Patrons of Art was never raised directly, but the details became public. Saatchi withdrew from his role at the Tate Gallery.

Following his resignation, Saatchi opened his own gallery in St Johns Wood in 1985. Within three years, Saatchi began to collect the work of the Young British Artists (YBAs). The media-savvy tactics used by the YBAs reverberated with Saatchi and Saatchi's own marketing style. The style of marketing earlier attracted the attention of the Conservative Party, who procured the services of Saatchi and Saatchi for their election campaign in 1979. Saatchi and Saatchi, as will be discussed, created a more combative image of the Conservative Party, which directly attacked the Labour Government for having ineffectual policies, notably around unemployment and the economy. The tone underscored the new approach of the Conservative Party led by Margaret Thatcher.

The political style left a lasting impression on her successor John Major, and later on the Labour leader Tony Blair.

According to Mulholland, Blair recognised as had Thatcher the necessity of reinvention. Blair decided to replace the former socialist vision of his Party with more Thatcherite values.<sup>73</sup> What Mulholland, however, does not address is that the process of reinvention had begun under Neil Kinnock, when he was the Labour Party leader from 1983. After replacing the left-wing Michael Foot, Kinnock steered the Party to a more central position and criticised the Militant division at the Labour Conference in 1985. Kinnock also appointed Peter Mandelson to head the Campaigns and Communications Directorate, to create new ways of appealing to the electorate. Under Mandelson, the Labour Party modernised its public image, which involved a rebranding process. The evidence of this was seen at the Labour Conference in 1986, when the red rose replaced the red flag as the Party's emblem.

Following Labour's fourth consecutive defeat in the General Election of 1992, Kinnock resigned as leader; his successor, John Smith, continued the process of change and began by tackling trade union embargoes. After Smith's sudden death in 1994, Blair was voted in as the new Labour leader. Blair modernised the Labour Party by changing its own ideology. At a Special Conference in 1995, Clause 4 of the Labour Party Constitution was revised. Clause 4 which had been set out in 1918 advocated for the

---

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 155.

public ownership of industry and finances and established the basis for nationalisation. Blair replaced Clause 4 in favour of the private market to operate and to create greater opportunities for individuals to gain and contribute to the wealth of the nation. In order to present these new ideas to the nation a format for them had to be created. When the Labour Party was voted into government office, Blair appointed the journalist, Alastair Campbell, as Director of Communications and Strategy and out went the idea of Great Britain and in came 'Cool Britannia'.<sup>74</sup>

Cool Britannia became an effective marketing tool as it played down former core party issues, such as class, race and inequality barriers, and appeared to encompass a broader spectrum of society than being British had ever done, and offered a vision of Britain which extended beyond geographic boundaries. Cool Britannia was also able to ignore the idea that being British had also come to encapsulate a particular position; that of being English and from a privileged class, to the exclusion of other British citizens. English nationalism masquerading as 'Britishness' is discussed in Krishnan Kumar's 'Englishness and English National Identity'.<sup>75</sup> Kumar identifies how the meaning of the words 'British' and 'English', and 'Britain' and 'England' are complex and can be fluid in meaning. Problematically, these words have sometimes been used interchangeably. Consequently, the next section, which examines Britain's response to foreign modernism, draws on publications which address both British and English art.

### Art History Publications

The art historical publications initially assess the changing position taken to European art from the post-war period. The literature begins with Herbert Read's *Contemporary British Art* (1951) which also comments on how modern foreign art was received in Britain. Read explores the insular position taken by the official bodies of the National Gallery and the Tate Gallery towards collecting modern foreign art. The role of particular British artists that endeavoured to make connections with modern foreign art practice is examined. The London-born artist Graham Sutherland worked as an official war artist which, according to Read, enabled him to understand 'the complex development of

---

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>75</sup> Kumar, K. (2001) 'Englishness and English National Identity.' In Morley, D. & Robins, K. (eds) *British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality and Identity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 41–55.



modern art on the Continent'.<sup>76</sup> The 'complex development' of modern art indicates the level of anxiety that it evoked at this point. Furthermore, although in common usage, Read's description of mainland Europe as the 'Continent' had the ring of 'them and us' to it, which indicated a cultural, as well as geographic, division from Europe.

A more entrenched position is taken in Denis Farr's *English Art 1870–1940* (1978), which provides a broad overview of the role of dealers, collectors and art historians in shaping English collections. Farr identifies the complex issues between public and private patronage concerning institutions and their collections.<sup>77</sup> He notes the evolution of the Tate Gallery, which saw a complicated relationship emerge among the private patron, the Government and the National Gallery. Farr does not address the issues of nationalism and internationalism, nor the problems faced in accepting modernism and how this impacted on the development of the modern foreign collection.

Charles Harrison's *English Art and Modernism* (1981) broadens the argument by examining the isolationist approach taken in England to foreign modernism, and how it was met with resistance at the official level of national organisations, including the Tate Gallery. Harrison discusses how particular individuals forged their own vision and were instrumental in bringing about major changes towards the position of modern foreign art. A key figure for championing modernism was the artist and writer Roger Fry. With the support of his friend the critic, Clive Bell, Fry organised *Manet and the Post-Impressionists*, which opened in 1910 at the commercial Grafton Galleries in London. A second exhibition was staged in 1912, which exhibited the work of Vincent Van Gogh, Paul Gauguin, Paul Cézanne, Henri Matisse and Pablo Picasso. These commercial art exhibitions exposed the public to modern foreign art in London before World War I.

Fry was an important player on the art scene, but was not part of the formal establishment. Fry was, however, offered the position of Keeper of the Tate Gallery in 1911, which he declined in order to oversee the autumn programme at the Grafton Galleries, for the showing of non-academic English art alongside contemporary modern French art.<sup>78</sup> Fry's decision indicated that the Tate Gallery was so conservative an institution that he would rather take temporary control of a commercial space than hold a

---

<sup>76</sup> Read, H. (1964 [1951]) *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>77</sup> Farr, D. (1984 [1978]) *Op. cit.*, p. 327.

<sup>78</sup> Harrison, C. (1994 [1981]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 61f.



permanent appointment in a national gallery. The Tate Gallery's anti-modern position is discussed in Frances Spalding's *British Art Since 1900* (1986). Spalding also provides a contextual basis for understanding cultural politics after World War I, and discusses the 1920s as a period of 'relatively little exchange between British and foreign artists'.<sup>79</sup>

Spalding proposes that the position changed the following decade, which saw more exchange among British and foreign artists, but not with the official bodies of arts organisations. The backdrop to this was that, following the General Strike in 1926, the period was one of extreme financial instability. The Conservative Government, led by Stanley Baldwin, implemented massive cuts to public spending from 1935 to 1937. Spalding proposes that this was a turning point, as British artists due to the austere measures taken by the British government, began to engage more freely with modern foreign art as a new style within their own art work. In the meantime the Tate Gallery continued to prevaricate over the modern foreign art works which were being offered to it. The next section provides an overview of Tate Gallery and Related Publications, to assess the changing position taken towards the National Modern Foreign Collection.

### **Tate Gallery and Related Publications**

Key publications focusing on the Tate Gallery and the modern foreign collection have been included in this section to understand why and how gaps were created in the modern foreign collection. A revealing account of how the Tate Gallery viewed the modern foreign collection was written by the Director John Rothenstein in *The Tate Gallery* (1958). In this account of the Tate Gallery's collection, Rothenstein laments 'the relative neglect of the native [British art] in favour of foreign schools'.<sup>80</sup> As will be discussed, the modern foreign collection suffered greatly when Rothenstein was the Director.

Ronald Alley's *Catalogue of the Tate Gallery's Collection of Modern Art* (1981) provides a useful insight into the history of the organisation.<sup>81</sup> Alley was Keeper of the Tate Gallery's Modern Art Collection for twenty-one years, until his retirement in 1986, when Alan Bowness was the Director of the Tate Gallery. Possibly out of diplomacy with

---

<sup>79</sup> Spalding, F. (1986) *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

<sup>80</sup> Rothenstein, J. (1958) *The Tate Gallery*, London: Thames & Hudson, p. 9.

<sup>81</sup> Alley, R. (1981) *Catalogue of The Tate Gallery's Collection of Modern Art other than works by British Artists*, London: Tate Gallery Publications.

regard to the Director and the Tate Gallery, Alley claims that the gaps in the modern foreign collection were a result of picture transfers to the National Gallery. The National Gallery picture transfers created problems, but so did the Tate Gallery, which refused to speculate for the foreign modern art collection.

Frances Spalding's *The Tate: A History* (1998) discusses the Tate Gallery Directors and the decisions they made. Spalding notes that, by 1959, John Rothenstein had 'confined foreign art to the lower galleries', to make space on the ground floor for the British art hang and, notably, the Tudor portraits.<sup>82</sup> As noted earlier, Rothenstein had indicated his preference for the British over the modern foreign arts works. Spalding's research provides a useful map of the development of the organisation, but does not address the broader implications of why Rothenstein may have taken this particular position regarding the modern foreign art works. Rothenstein was replaced by Norman Reid who steered the Tate Gallery towards becoming a more professional and accessible arts organisation and exhibition space.

The Tate Gallery as a public exhibition space is discussed in *Contemporary Cultures of Display* (1999). The editor, Emma Barker's own case study 'The Museum in the community: The new Tate' states 'public museums and galleries in Britain and elsewhere [have] to justify their share of government funding by demonstrating that they function for the benefit of a broad public rather than a privileged few [...]'<sup>83</sup> Barker is right in the assumption that, from the 1980s, there was pressure for state-funded museums to demonstrate through visitor numbers that they were offering value for public money. Barker emphasised how the Tate Gallery's publicity for the New Gallery of Modern Art stated that London was the only major capital without a museum of modern art, which would aid 'cultural vitality' and economic performance.<sup>84</sup>

The piece was written before Tate Modern opened, but its future development was already being viewed as a support for London in achieving international status. Frankfurt was London's economic European rival and as a world city provided a nodal point in the global economic system. The city government initiated a programme to

---

<sup>82</sup> Spalding, F. (1998) *The Tate: A History*, London: Tate Gallery, p. 137.

<sup>83</sup> Barker, E. (1999) 'The Museum in the Community: The new Tates.' In Barker, E. (ed.) *Contemporary Cultures of Display*, London: The Open University Press, p. 178.

<sup>84</sup> Barker, E. (1999) 'The Museum in the Community: the new Tates', *Op. cit.*, p. 194.

revitalise Frankfurt, which involved the building of the *Museum für Moderne Kunst* (MKK). The MKK was established to promote Frankfurt's cultural and international standing.<sup>85</sup> The initiative was financed by the city of Frankfurt matching local government funding with private sector finance from Commerzbank Group EuroHypo, DekaBank Deutsche Girozentrale, Ernst Max von Grunelius-Stiftung, Helaba Landesbank Hessen-Thüringen, Stefan Quandt and UBS Deutschland AG.

The MKK was created to contribute to the cultural and social fabric of the business-orientated city.<sup>86</sup> The Tate Gallery, similarly to Frankfurt City Council, recognised that a new gallery of modern art would help to promote London as an economic world city. Consequently, the Tate Gallery sought funding from the City of London's financial services sector. What was also of dual importance was that the Tate Gallery focused on education and accessibility for their new museum of modern art, recognising that, while the collection was paramount, so was the audience.<sup>87</sup> The physical spaces of Tate Modern would, therefore, have to work in attracting high visitor figures.

Rowan Moore and Raymund Ryan's *Building Tate Modern: Herzog and De Meuron Transforming Giles Gilbert Scott* (2000) was published to accompany the opening of Tate Modern. The editors provide an architectural review of the building and its history. Gavin Stamp's essay, 'Giles Gilbert Scott and Bankside Power Station', contributes to this volume, and discusses how the oil-fuelled power station was built on a prominent River Thames site, opposite the historic, landmark building of St. Paul's Cathedral in the City of London.<sup>88</sup> Despite public opposition, construction of the industrial power station began in 1947.

London had maintained a working relationship with the River Thames since the Roman settlement in AD 47 remained a vital artery into London. This was not the same in Paris, which is why the building of a power station on the Left Bank of the River Seine opposite Notre Dame would have never been possible, let alone proposed. The River Thames appeared to function as an invisible curtain separating the north and south banks,

---

<sup>85</sup> Grunenberg, C. (1999) 'The Modern Art Museum.' In Barker, E. (ed.) *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

<sup>86</sup> [www.mmk-frankfurt.de](http://www.mmk-frankfurt.de)

<sup>87</sup> Kotler, N. G. Kotler, P. & Kotler, W. I. (2008) *Op. cit.*, p. 84.

<sup>88</sup> Stamp, G. (2000) 'Giles Gilbert Scott and Bankside Power Station.' In Moore, R. & Ryan, R. (eds) *Building Tate Modern: Herzog and De Meuron, Transforming Giles Gilbert Scott*, London: Tate Gallery, pp. 177–190.

masking off the more undesirable areas. The River Thames became defined by the industrial urban landscape of the London Docks. Downstream from the City of London, built along the Wapping river front, the London Docks had begun to decline with the introduction of containerisation and new technology from the 1960s, and finally closed in the 1980s, because the Conservative Government stopped public subsidies to the Port of London Authority. The impact was that the Thames ceased to be a working river, and its potential to be revitalised as a new public space for London was slow.

The essay ‘Renewing London’, by Tony Travers (LSE) discussed the changing circumstances of Southwark and notes how bombing in the 1940s, followed by poor planning in the 1960s, and de-industrialisation in response to the running down of the manufacturing industries in the 1980s, had ‘made a bad situation worse’.<sup>89</sup> Southwark had become one of the poorest boroughs in the country, but with the arrival of Tate Modern, as well as Shakespeare’s Globe Theatre, the area changed. The regeneration of the area was commended for stimulating further urban renewal to the areas of London Bridge and Elephant and Castle. Travers praises the Tate Gallery for creating a major cultural institution for London, which would attract further international visitors. The question was how had the Tate Gallery changed from an arts organisation, holding a national collection, to become the patron of a major cultural initiative for the new millennium? The next section discusses the original aims of the public museum and gallery, and how these changed.

### **Museology and Theory Publications**

Museology and theoretical studies focusing on museums and gallery organisations and collections have been included in this section. These publications are included in order to understand the processes which drove Tate Modern. This section begins with consideration of the seminal works of the French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1979) and *The Forms of Capital* (1986). Bourdieu’s work underpins much of the literature in the field relating to museology, whose theory is that privileged networks exists within museums and galleries

---

<sup>89</sup> Travers, T. (2005) ‘Renewing London.’ In Gayford, M. *Op. cit.*, pp. 23f.

based on class and money.<sup>90</sup> Accordingly, these networks facilitate an educational and cultural capital system, which is endemic within public cultural institutions and also that, the people who work in these organisations' professional departments have specific profiles and qualifications which draw on the same model.

Drawing on the work of Bourdieu, Tony Bennett, in *The Birth of the Museum* (1995), argues that privileged networks and practices ensure the museum functions as a contested space. By this Bennett means that the museum is an exclusive space preserved for those with vested, mutually beneficial, cultural, education and political interests. Bennett argues that museums have become regulatory space, which manifests in institutional practice codes of conduct informed by governmental agendas.<sup>91</sup> Many accounts of museums and their practices have embraced this approach, but applying such a method to the Tate Gallery is limited in value when considering the complex development of the institution. These networks are more fragmented than imagined and cannot be reduced to a single theory.

To suggest that the Tate Gallery was built on a privileged network assumes it operated as a broadly consensual group. Researching this thesis has indicated that the network was more fragile and less consensual than envisaged. The primary source, documentary evidence suggests that the Tate Gallery developed in an amateur way, which reflected a prosaic rather than an exclusive body. Consequently, when Henri Matisse's *Woman at a Table* (undated) was presented in 1929, as a free gift from the Contemporary Arts Society (CAS), it was declined. This indicated a lack of consensus and communication between the official bodies of the CAS and the Tate Gallery.

The incident demonstrated how the Tate Gallery's initial position of defiance had turned to one of hostility towards the National Modern Foreign Collection.<sup>92</sup> The CAS was disappointed and would be again by the Tate Gallery Trustees, which reflected a governing body which was at odds with what it was meant to be the custodian of; the modern foreign collection. The position taken with regard to the modern foreign collection by the Tate Gallery only began to shift in 1964, owing to a change in

---

<sup>90</sup> Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The Forms of Capital.' In Richardson, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York: Greenwood, pp. 241–258.

<sup>91</sup> Bennett, T. (2006 [1995]) *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*, London & New York: Routledge, p. 5.

<sup>92</sup> See A (25 February 1929).

governance, and again in 1988. As will be discussed, the latter governance, headed by Serota, looked at ways of making the modern foreign collection appear stronger than it was, and at ways of marketing the Tate Gallery.

The brand consultants Wolff Olins were appointed by the Tate Gallery in 1998. One of the changes they made was in the new project's name, which had been referred to, from 1992, as 'The Tate Gallery of Modern Art'. Wolff Olins rebranded it 'Tate Modern' (Museum of Modern Art); a new, shorter name that was easier to remember. The name also associated Tate directly with the modern. The full title of Tate Modern Museum of Modern Art turned it into a 'moma' rather than a 'goma' (gallery of modern art). Tate Modern becoming a museum was an important decision. Due to a question of semantics, a linguistic difference had arisen between Britain and Europe and the USA, concerning the use of the words 'museum' and 'gallery'. Carol Duncan, the American art historian, discusses this point: 'In Great Britain, there is an understood distinction between the art gallery and the museum that does not exist in the United States [...]',<sup>93</sup>

The museum's premise in Britain had previously alluded to a place for the appropriation of ancient to scientific objects, which were for display and educational purposes. Since the British Museum opened, the word 'museum' also conjured up the idea of the historical, whereas in the USA and Europe, museums also accommodated modern art works. The objects are for display and not for sale, and have usually been built around a nucleus collection. The definitive European model was Louis XVI's former palace in Paris, where the former private royal galleries were taken by the French State and turned into the *Musée du Louvre* in 1793.<sup>94</sup> London has no comparable institution to the *Musée du Louvre*, but instead holds a number of smaller public museums and galleries. Many of the institutions were created in the nineteenth century, including the Victoria and Albert Museum, which remains object-led rather than painting-led (although it holds a number of art collections).

The idea of the museum was different from that of the National Gallery and the National Portrait Gallery which, as discussed, were intended for the display of art works. In the USA, Europe and Britain the word 'gallery' is also used by commercial dealers

---

<sup>93</sup> Duncan, C. (1995) *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, London & New York: Routledge, p. 1.

<sup>94</sup> Kemp, M. (ed.) (2000) *The Oxford History of Western Art*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 406.

where objects are sold. Following the US and European model, the term ‘museum’ began to be used initially by the Tate in a more fluid way, from the 1990s, in Britain, to mean both museum and gallery.<sup>95</sup> Leaving the linguistic implications of the museum and gallery, but continuing to investigate their aims, Duncan’s thesis in *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (1995) focuses on how European public museums were shaped by ‘the politics of their ruling founders or the collecting habits of their patrons — art museums [...] belonging to the larger, international history of bourgeois culture’.<sup>96</sup>

Duncan’s argument is that the museum’s ideology is based on ‘values and beliefs about social, sexual and political identity’ and that the *Musée du Louvre* and the National Gallery share the same founding principle.<sup>97</sup> Duncan states that ‘the transformation of the European princely gallery into the public art collection [was] a transformation that served the ideological needs of emerging bourgeois nation-states by providing them with a new kind of civic ritual’.<sup>98</sup> The National Gallery, however, was not created by nationalising a royal collection. It was established when Parliament agreed, after some lobbying, to buy Angerstein’s private collection. Parliament’s reticence was owing to the question of who was responsible for patronage: the public or the private sector?

Dianne Sachko Macleod’s *Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Cultural Identity* (1996) responds to this question, and examines how it became the responsibility of the private sector to fund public projects towards the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>99</sup> Her thesis is that this kind of private patronage promoted the interests of the business sector. It would have been useful if she had examined the broader economic context, to identify why the government chose to undertake this laissez-faire position, leaving the private sector to step into the breach. One factor for the government’s position can be traced back to the recession in 1817, which saw a return to the Gold Standard and control of the money supply. As public money became limited, Lord Liverpool’s Tory Government shifted towards creating a laissez-faire state.

---

<sup>95</sup> Kawashima, N. (1997) *Museum Management in a Time of Change: Impacts of cultural policy on museums in Britain 1979–1997*, Warwick: University of Warwick, p. iii.

<sup>96</sup> Duncan, C. (1995) *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>99</sup> Macleod, D. S. (1996) *Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Cultural Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 50.



The laissez-faire state resulted in a reduction of government money for public projects and also enabled a 'free-market capitalism' to flourish.<sup>100</sup> The impact saw economic liberalism thrive which allowed individuals to profit unimpeded by government regulations. A number of the beneficiaries that prospered from trading their goods and services freely came from the business sector. As discussed by Macleod, some of these businessmen chose to spend a portion of their profits to fund public projects. Focusing on their motives, she claims that Henry Tate and his contemporaries' philanthropy created 'a cultural system that inevitably profited some more than others'.<sup>101</sup>

What Macleod was proposing was that a mutually exclusive system was established between the new patrons and cultural institutions which was not for the greater public good. To reduce the argument, however, to suggest that a space such as the National Gallery of British Art was created as a site of social and privileged exclusion, contributes to the growing litany which adopts a well-trodden theoretical position. This thesis will, instead, investigate how there was a myriad of agencies which sometimes worked in unison and sometimes did not, in shaping the development of the Tate Gallery and its collection. What is useful in Macleod's thesis is that she outlines how there was a strong connection from the mid-nineteenth century between culture and commerce.<sup>102</sup>

Similarly, Brandon Taylor's *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions for the London Public 1747–2001* (1999) adopts the theoretical viewpoint that public galleries were created by privileged networks.<sup>103</sup> Taylor discusses the museum as a purveyor of cultural capital; a space defined by those who have access to it and those who do not. Taylor's proposition is that a set of interlocking relationships exist ideologically between the government and public galleries and museums. Taylor's assessment of 'Managing modern foreign art: An extension at the Tate Gallery' reads as a theoretical exposé of duplicitous practice by the organisation and the people that were involved with it. Helen Searing's *Art Spaces, The Architecture of the Four Tates* (2004), instead, argues that the Tate Gallery was not the

---

<sup>100</sup> Gray, C. (2006) *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

<sup>101</sup> Macleod, D. S. (1996) *Op. cit.*, p. 373.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>103</sup> Taylor, B. (1999) *Art for the Nation*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, p. xiii.



same privileged space as seen by Taylor, and was one that encompassed a wider demographic in also attracting visitors from lower incomes.<sup>104</sup>

Aware of these competing claims, this thesis examines how the Tate Gallery focused on its primary obligation, which was initially to serve nationalistic interests in representing British art. The issue was that when the National Gallery of British Art was later given custodianship of the National Modern Foreign Collection this became its secondary rather than joint obligation with the British Collection. The dilemma created a dichotomy of interests between national and international agendas. The national was the *modus operandi* and only from the appointment of Norman Reid did the organisation begin to modernise its practices and collection. After Reid retired, the following Director, Alan Bowness, took a retrogressive approach and promoted the interests of the British art over the modern foreign collection. In doing so, Bowness reflected an institutionalised compliance with the idea that the Tate Gallery was a British national organisation.

Paul Barlow and Colin Trodd's *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London* (2000) proposes how these systems of nationalised acquiescence began in nineteenth-century public arts organisations. Barlow and Trodd re-examine the claim that cultural institutions act as agents of social control and state that this position has 'become something of a cliché'.<sup>105</sup> The body of essays instead assesses 'the dynamic, fluid nature and multidirectional character' of the organisations, and unpacks the narratives that have built up around studies which focus on Victorian arts organisations.<sup>106</sup> Barlow and Trodd's research has been useful in understanding the complex relationship of the Tate Gallery, the National Gallery (Trafalgar Square) and the Royal Academy of Arts. It has also been useful in understanding why they were resistant to change.

The Royal Academy of Arts began to modernise its practices in 1977, when the Friends of the Royal Academy of Arts was created by Sir Hugh Casson to provide additional financial support. At that point, Norman Rosenthal was the Royal Academy of Arts Exhibition's Secretary, whose principal role was to organise major exhibitions. Rosenthal was successful in organising blockbuster exhibitions financed mainly through

---

<sup>104</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Art Spaces, The Architecture of the Four Tates*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 36.

<sup>105</sup> Barlow, P. & Trodd, C. (eds) (2000) *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*, Hants: Ashgate, p. 1.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

the corporate sector which attracted large crowds and generated revenue. The commercial practice, employed by the Royal Academy of Arts and other arts organisations, came under the attack of many critics, including Chin-Tao Wu's *Privatising Culture:*

*Corporate Art Intervention since the 1980s* (2002) which assesses the role of corporate sponsorship and how it impacted on art institutions and the role of their governances.

Wu discusses the Tate Gallery's system of funding from 1980, and identifies how the former Director, Alan Bowness, relied on state funding, whereas Serota was employed on the basis that he would seek alternative methods of finance.<sup>107</sup> Serota had previously demonstrated his capability in this area when he had been the Director of the Whitechapel Gallery and had raised significant funds independently. Owing to a building extension to the Whitechapel Gallery, designed by the architects Colquhoun and Miller for a first-floor gallery, restaurant, lecture theatre and other rooms, the project went into deficit by £250,000. From an auction of artists' works £1.4 million was raised which cleared the debt and left an endowment fund. With this kind of experience, Serota recognised that, at the Tate Gallery, it was no longer viable to rely solely on public funding. Wu's thesis is that, in Thatcherite Britain a new breed of 'entrepreneurial' museum director was created, of which Serota was one.<sup>108</sup>

Michaela Giebelhausen's *The Architecture of the Museum: Symbolic Structures, Urban Contexts* (2003) follows a different trajectory to investigate museum practices. Giebelhausen claims that museums shifted from didactic spaces to those which were 'allegedly neutral, devoid of symbolic significance and simply functional' spaces of the 'White Cube', although still with a commercial basis.<sup>109</sup> Giebelhausen's thesis is that museums returned to their former position in dialogue with their urban context and discusses the ways in which the museum has been used to reimagine the city. The premise is that the public museum has become 'instrumental in articulating the city's cultural aspirations' and, like a microcosm of the city itself, it was also established by a process of divergence and experiment.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Wu, C-T. (2002) *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Interventions since the 1980s*, London: Verso, p. 105.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 136.

<sup>109</sup> Giebelhausen, M. (ed.) (2003) *The Architecture of the Museum*, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, p. 1.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6 & 11.

Bruce Altshuler's *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art* (2005) takes a different approach to the museum. Altshuler claims that most museology related literature, which focus on historic collections, tend to examine how they have been formed. By contrast, studies of modern and contemporary art collections focus on display and exhibition, and the area of acquisitions and policies remains under researched.<sup>111</sup> Altshuler examines the early acquisitions policy for the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York and discusses Alfred Barr Jr., MoMA's first Director from 1929, regarding the art works in the collection.<sup>112</sup> Barr's vision was to update and replace the old with the new. This meant that when an art work became 100 years old it would be de-accessioned and passed onto the Metropolitan Museum of Art. MoMA's Trustees objected, seeing that their most valuable assets were about to be jettisoned. Barr's approach indicated a modern, radical approach to formulating MoMA's art collection.

A different position was undertaken by the Tate Gallery, and similarly to Altshuler this Ph.D. also examines the area of acquisitions and the issue of implementing a purchasing policy. What has also been useful to this research is Andrew McClellan's *The Art Museum from Boullée to Bilbao* (2008), which discusses the importance of collections in shaping their organisation's development. McClellan asks that as museum's operations have been understood as a culturally mediated set of practices – are they still 'the engines of bourgeois assimilation they once were [...]?'<sup>113</sup> McClellan proposes that they have become wider social institutions, and that they are changing their core values, as they are forced to adapt in order to face new challenges which are increasingly market-led.

### **Branding and Marketing Publications**

The Tate Gallery appointed Wolff Olins in the knowledge that by positioning itself in the marketplace it would become more enticing to the modern visitor/consumer and is why this section discusses branding and marketing publications. As a point to consider, the Tate Gallery was being marketed *before* Wolff Olins created the Tate brand. Over

---

<sup>111</sup> Altshuler, B. (2005) *Collecting the New: Museums of Modern Art*, Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, p. 1.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6f.

<sup>113</sup> McClellan, A. (2008) *The Art Museum From Boullée To Bilbao*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, pp. 3 & 7.

twenty-five years earlier, the Tate Gallery had negotiated with London Transport, regarding its marketing campaign for the newly built Victoria Line. London Transport opened the nearby Pimlico underground station in September 1972. For the advertising design, London Transport used the geographical association with the Tate Gallery for its marketing through a series of promotional posters. The series began with Hans Unger's *Pimlico for the Tate Gallery* (1972). The poster depicted the London Transport logo represented by the red roundel and horizontal blue bar as a modern art object. The poster was one of the ways that the Tate Gallery began to be marketed.

Two decades later, Serota focused on a wider in-house strategy for the organisation. The Communications Department was created to oversee the public relations work for developing the profile of the Tate Gallery. Additionally, the 'New Exhibitions' introduced alternative forms of gallery display, which were intended to be experiential rather than cerebral, to help entice visitors. The New Exhibitions broke with formal modes of representing the art historical cannon, and marketed the Tate Gallery as a more accessible exhibition space. From this point, there was greater awareness by the Tate Gallery to expand its mandate beyond collecting, display and interpretation. Consequently, Serota's *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art* (1996) discussed how traditional art spectatorship needed to be replaced by the more experiential museum visit.<sup>114</sup>

Serota's objective was to modernise the museum visit to attract visitors:

Our aim must be to generate a condition in which visitors can experience a sense of discovery in looking at particular paintings, sculptures or installations in a particular room at a particular moment, rather than finding themselves on the conveyor belt of history.<sup>115</sup>

The objective was to create an easy and interactive cultural exchange. The thinking was underpinned by a strategic business vision.

---

<sup>114</sup> Serota, N. (1996) *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art*, Walter Neurath Memorial Lecture (1992) London: Thames & Hudson, pp. 8f.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.

Tina Mermiri's essay, 'The Transformation Economy' (2009), built on Serota's proposition. The research undertaken on behalf of the Arts and Business Agency claimed that art audiences demanded experiential cultural interactions to transform them, as they sought 'an even deeper relationship with the products and brands they consume'.<sup>116</sup> Mermiri concluded that if the cultural visit were successful the visitor may repeat the experience, which would generate further income. The idea of the repeat visit was based on the work of James H. Gilmore and P. Joseph Pine's *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre and Every Business a Stage* (1999). Gilmore and Pine state that successful businesses, offering quality goods and services, need to create memorable experiences which become part of the product itself. Gilmore and Pine propose that the modern consumer demands experiences to participate in the product or service. Their proposition is that as the market is determined by consumer, the experience has become a requirement rather than a potential add-on.<sup>117</sup>

When Tate Modern was envisioned it was to offer a choice of interesting experiences for the visitor.<sup>118</sup> Visiting an interesting building at an exciting new London venue by the River Thames formed part of that visitor offer. The Architectural Competition brief specified that the visitor should be eased through the building by the creation of accessible spaces, to help them form their own personal spaces.<sup>119</sup> Having personal space within the public museum was to help the visitor make choices, which would lead them to engage in other activities, including visiting (and spending money) in the cafes, restaurant or shops. What was essential to this kind of marketing being effective in Tate Modern was that the visitor did not see themselves as a consumer.<sup>120</sup>

Tate Modern also needed to appeal to international visitors without having to become a global brand, and in this way was different from certain other museums of modern art, which extended their franchises internationally. The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation extended its franchise to centres in Bilbao, Venice and Berlin,

---

<sup>116</sup> Mermiri, T. (2009) 'The Experience Economy.' In Hunter, M. *Beyond Experience: Culture, Consumer and Brand*, London: Arts & Business, pp. 61-61.

<sup>117</sup> Pine, B. J. & Gilmore, J. (1999) *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre and every Business a Stage*, Boston, Mass. Harvard Business School Press, p. x.

<sup>118</sup> Paliwoda, S. (1994) *The Essence of International Marketing*, New York & London: Prentice Hall, p. 35.

<sup>119</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 9. (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6/)

<sup>120</sup> Paliwoda, S. (1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 1.

with Abu Dhabi set to open in 2015. Unlike the internationalism of the Guggenheim, the Tate remains, for the foreseeable future, a national rather than a global brand. However, the Tate did emulate to an extent its US counterparts in terms of marketing. This was because in creating Tate Modern the art and architectural design had to complement each other, to promote the commercial activities of the museum.<sup>121</sup> As a result, the Tate's role was no longer confined to the curation of art and display, but was repositioned as a more business-like arts organisation.

A similar approach to the Tate's business practice is discussed by Gilmore and Pine, who reassessed their earlier research in *Authenticity: What Consumers Really Want* (2007). They propose that a key factor in competitive marketing is in creating the authentic experience, because 'goods and services are no longer enough';<sup>122</sup> the premise being that authenticity is essential for the individual to feel that the transaction is genuine, and that organisations which create this kind of condition are successful.<sup>123</sup> The authors discuss how the consumer is prepared to pay more for the product or service if it also provides an authentic and convivial experience. The customer will return to repeat the experience if they feel that the transaction is genuine rather than staged.

Experiential marketing underscored Serota's 'New Displays', which were presented in the newly redecorated Tate Gallery by means of a thematic hang, so that the visitor could experience the collection more easily. The Tate Gallery also recognised that, in order to provide wider access, it would need to become more welcoming and undertook the decision to rebrand the organisation. Not everyone however, approved of the rebranding tactics that the Tate Gallery employed and these are discussed, somewhat scathingly, by Angus Hyland in *Visual Identity and Branding for the Arts* (2006).<sup>124</sup> Hyland had worked for Pentagram, the design studio which pitched for the contract of the Tate Gallery, but lost the campaign to Wolff Olins. Perhaps with some resentment, Hyland claims that Tate had, along with a number of US and European museums, adopted a market-driven and corporate approach. The criticism levelled at the Tate was

---

<sup>121</sup> Schmitt, B. H. (1999) *Experiential Marketing*, New York: The Free Press, p. xiii.

<sup>122</sup> Gilmore, J. H. & Pine, B. J. (2007) *Authenticity: What Consumers really want*, Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School, p. 1.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>124</sup> Hyland, A. & King, E. (2006) *Visual Identity and Branding for the Arts*, London: Laurence King, p. 9.

that it drew heavily on commerce and was dependent on the ‘lifestyle method’.<sup>125</sup> Hyland believes this approach was at odds with what the museum was meant to represent.

What Hyland objects to was that the museum visit had become more like a shopping trip, with the emphasis on self-gratification and argues that museums should develop their own visual identity, which should be aligned with their cultural agenda, rather than drawing on business practice. This is, in fact, another commercial strategy for museums, which contributes to the burgeoning litany of petitions that they must fulfil. Marie Lind, Director of Tensta Konsthall, proposes that what is required from modern art museums is multifaceted as they are required to provide social as well as educational functions and are increasingly associated with nation-building ‘intertwined with the neo-liberal economy and the creative industries’.<sup>126</sup> My thesis follows a similar trajectory and looks at how Tate Modern endeavoured to fulfil these aims.

## **Chapter Synopsis**

The Literature Review and primary source material have identified the core themes which affected the development of the Tate Gallery. These themes have shaped the research questions, which are designed to understand the conditions which led to the establishment of Tate Modern. As noted, the research questions are paired together, so that the first question examines the broader political and cultural framework, while the second question discusses how this impacted on the Tate Gallery, and the National Modern Foreign Collection.

Chapter 2, Creating the Tate begins by examining why did the Conservative Government, in the late nineteenth century, adopt a laissez-faire position towards the public funding of museums and galleries? The chapter explores how this affected the establishment of the National Gallery of British Art, and how international affairs later impacted on it when it was given the dual responsibility of hosting the National Modern Foreign Collection. It also identifies how gaps were created in the collection, and why no acquisition policy was undertaken by the organisation from 1897 to 1964.

---

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>126</sup> Lind, M. (2011) ‘Restaging the Institution.’ In Hansen, T. (ed.) *(Re) Staging the Art Museum*, p. 19.



Chapter 3, *Towards Tate Modern* discusses how modernity impacted on the Labour Government from 1964, which changed the political vision of culture. The chapter assesses how the Labour Prime Minister's programme of modernisation affected the practices of the Tate Gallery. A further turning point for the organisation developed when culture became a Conservative Government concern and ascended the urban agenda. This chapter, therefore, evaluates the implications of Conservative urban policy which led to the establishment of Tate Liverpool.

Chapter 4, *Vision and Concept* examines how the Government continued to communicate change and how this shaped cultural vision and patronage. The chapter discusses how Nicholas Serota, as the Director of the Tate Gallery, created a sea-change in the development of the organisation. The chapter looks at how the Tate Gallery undertook a new commercial strategy with the creation of its Development Office. After this point, it was able to shift to the role of patron, as it considered various site options to house the National Modern Foreign Collection. This chapter considers the reasons which led to the selection of Bankside Power Station.

Chapter 5, *Patronage and Funding* assesses how government policy, from 1990, continued to impact on the cultural vision and patronage of the Tate Gallery. It examines how the Tate Gallery approached the funding strategy, and how it undertook the negotiations to purchase the Bankside Power Station. The chapter discusses why the financial services of Hambros Bank were undertaken, and how funding was secured from the Millennium Commission, English Partnerships, and other public, as well as private, bodies. The chapter also explains how the branding process became part of the funding strategy, and how this led to the Tate Gallery of Modern Art becoming Tate Modern.

Chapter 6, *Competition and Building* discusses how culture ascended the urban agenda and impacted on the Tate Gallery. The outcome was that new visions of culture were possible, which led to Tate Modern being established as part of a London riverside strategy. The chapter considers the thinking behind hosting the architecture competition, the selection of the architectural practice and how the Tate Gallery managed the building process. It also discusses how the Tate Gallery ensured that, despite the complexity of the project, it was delivered on time and on budget.



Chapter 7, The Conclusion analyses how the Tate created something beyond a national exhibition space for the former National Modern Foreign Collection which became the re-configured within the Tate Collection. What the Tate also demonstrated was that the mandate for the museum of modern art had changed. It also created a distinct model from other museums of modern art, because Tate Modern had to offer an experiential visit, which is why it was created in the particular way that it was. The conclusion analyses how the Tate adapted new visions of culture in creating a new cultural institution and one that was relevant for the new millennium.

## **Chapter 2. Creating the Tate**

This chapter examines the question, why did Lord Salisbury's Conservative Government adopt a laissez-faire position towards the public funding of museums and galleries? One reason was that, as the Conservative administration straddled the turn of the nineteenth century, it put the Empire at the fore of the political agenda. The Empire demanded greater focus on foreign policy and spending, which fostered a stronger sense of nationalism. Domestic matters related to public projects were, increasingly, left for the private sector to step into the breach left by the government. One impact was that the National Gallery of British Art was established through the private patronage of the sugar magnate Henry Tate.

Following the establishment of the National Gallery of British Art, the opening decades of the twentieth century saw the impact of international affairs when it was given the dual function of hosting the national modern foreign collection. It was renamed the National Gallery Millbank to accommodate its new role, before being officially named after its benefactor the Tate Gallery. This chapter discusses these changes, and examines why gaps were created in the modern foreign collection. Finally, this chapter identifies how and why the laissez-faire position taken by the government at the turn of the century turned to one of interventionism after World War II.

### **The Museums Act**

Sir Robert Peel's Conservative Government oversaw The Museums Act (1845) which decreed that any town with a population of over 10,000 inhabitants would be permitted to build a museum of science and arts, funded out of local public money.<sup>127</sup> The statute specified that as museums had a universal appeal as places for edification and education they were the responsibility of government and were, therefore, perceived as performing a service for the greater good of the public.<sup>128</sup> The role of the museum as a site of national identity was also discussed during a House of Commons debate in 1850, which identified that London and other major British cities could not compete with their

---

<sup>127</sup> The Museums Act (1845) 8 & 9, Vict. c. 43.

<sup>128</sup> House of Commons (14 February 1850) *Mr Ewart and Mr Brotherton Debate*, Hansard, Vol. 108, cc. 759–763.

European manufacturing counterparts for museum amenities. On this basis, the government agreed to provide funds for museums. A government bill was introduced to include the same provision for libraries, but was opposed by Conservative party members, who viewed them as charitable amenities which lacked universal appeal as they were for the lower classes.<sup>129</sup> The Conservative position was that the State was not responsible for the provision of recreational facilities, but was concerned with the moral welfare and education of the nation which was, in part, to be fulfilled by the museum.<sup>130</sup>

Funded by government money, the Museum of Manufactures opened in 1852. Originally housed at Marlborough House, the Museum of Manufactures transferred to Somerset House, before moving to its present location, where it became the South Kensington Museum in 1855. The public money came from revenue generated at the Great Exhibition and by private donation. There was, however, no policy on how the funding would be maintained. Opened officially by Queen Victoria in 1857, it was the first museum to host public refreshment rooms selling tea, cakes and sandwiches. The South Kensington Museum was administered by the Department of Education and Science, which appointed Henry Cole as the first Director. Under Cole the decorative arts and design collections were used as an educational tool to aid the understanding of industry. Cole introduced late-night opening hours in order that working people could attend, which was made possible by the new technology of gas lighting.

The South Kensington Museum, later renamed the Victoria and Albert Museum (V&A), was dependent on public subsidy and on money from private benefactors, many of whom came from the business sector. Increasingly, these patrons replaced the government for funding future cultural public programmes. The parliamentary historian, Ewen Green, in *An Age of Transition: British Politics 1880–1914* (1997) stated that underpinning the government's laissez-faire position was the 'minimal state', which had been constructed in the 1830s.<sup>131</sup> The shift from the public to the private sector had begun when free trade, the introduction of the gold standard and balanced budgets formed the basis for a restricted role of the State. Economic restructuring saw the reintroduction of

---

<sup>129</sup> Public Libraries Act (1859) 13 & 14 Vict. c. 65.

<sup>130</sup> Pearson, N. (1982) *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

<sup>131</sup> Green, E. H. H. (1997) 'An Age of Transition.' In Green, E. H. H. (ed.) *An Age of Transition: British Politics 1880–1914*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, p. 3.

income tax, the reduction of indirect taxation and the stabilisation of the banking and currency system. Sir Robert Peel's first Conservative administration, from 1841 to 1846, engineered the financial reforms, which were introduced in response to the economic recession. The decline was a result of a slump in world trade and a £2.5 million deficit, which escalated during Lord Melbourne's Whig administration, from 1835 to 1841.

The outcome of Peel's economic reforms was to move towards the laissez-faire state, which promoted free trade to aid commerce. Another impact saw the reduced role of state funding by the government. What resulted was that some of the private beneficiaries of the free-market economy chose to apportion their wealth to fund public projects. The benefactors included the Leeds cloth manufacturer John Sheepshanks, who donated 233 paintings and a similar number of drawings of British genre and landscape to the South Kensington Museum, in 1857. One of the conditions of the donation was that a National Gallery of British Art would be established to house his bequest, but it was never fulfilled.<sup>132</sup> While the private benefactor's stipulation was ignored, the government instead focused on developing the educational role of the South Kensington Museum which was given greater momentum by The Education Act (1870).

William Gladstone's Liberal Government introduced The Education Act, with the intention of increasing the school-leaving age to ten, in 1876.<sup>133</sup> Secondary education and the curriculum of Board Schools were broadened to include music and art, but no guidance as to how these subjects would be taught was provided. It became the role of the museum to fulfil the latter function.<sup>134</sup> At the same point, from the 1870s, public art galleries and museums throughout Britain's cities were being funded increasingly by the private sector. The Liverpool brewer Andrew Barclay Walker provided £20,000 for the building of the Walker Gallery, which opened in 1877, to commemorate his term in office as Mayor of Liverpool.<sup>135</sup> The Local Council provided the sum of £1,200 for the purchase of art works. Walker spent a further £11,500 funding a new extension. (The

---

<sup>132</sup> Saint, A. (2005 [2000]) 'Cities, Architecture and Art.' In Collin, M. (ed.) *The Nineteenth Century*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 284.

<sup>133</sup> The school-leaving age increased to eleven in 1893, and twelve in 1899.

<sup>134</sup> Ford, B. (ed.) (1989) *The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain: The Later Victorian Age*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 35.

<sup>135</sup> Sharples, J. (2004) *Liverpool*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, p. 63.

Walker Collection was later expanded, with paintings bought from the Liverpool lawyer, William Roscoe's Collection.)

The jewellers, John Newton Mappin and Sir Frederick Mappin, funded the Sheffield City Museum and Mappin Art Gallery, which opened in 1887. The following decade, in London, the philanthropist William Henry Alexander provided £80,000 for the building of the National Portrait Gallery, with £2,000 provided from public money. The Government provided the site at St Martin's Place. A further London collection opened in Hertford House, after the death of Sir Richard Wallace and his wife. The Wallace Collection had been amassed by his father's aristocratic family, and contained seventeenth-century Dutch and eighteenth-century French paintings. The art works in the Wallace Collection reflected the aristocratic taste of the eighteenth century, which veered towards the classical and allegorical. As aristocratic patronage waned, this changed the kind of collections which were amassed. The middle-class patrons preferred to collect British and morally edifying subject matter.

The situation of the aristocracy's decline as patrons was mainly a result of the situation concerning hereditary landownership and the failure of British agriculture in the late 1870s. The Settled Land Act (1882) was introduced to provide aid, which set aside legal restrictions on the sale of family heirlooms and saw the demise of major aristocratic collections, including Sir Philip Miles's Collection at Leigh Court and the Duke of Marlborough's Collection at Blenheim Palace.<sup>136</sup> Estate Duty was introduced in 1889 which began the disintegration of more aristocratic collections. The impact was that a financially depleted aristocracy was unable to sustain patronage. The new private patrons, mainly from trade, stepped into the breach left by the aristocracy and the government. The historian, Dianne Sachko Macleod, claims that the business patrons did so from a desire to create their own cultural identity within their industrial cities, and that London attracted much patronage as the cultural dominance of the capital rose after 1880, with the tide of imperialism.<sup>137</sup>

Furthermore, a change in emphasis from civic to national patronage was given greater momentum when Robert Gascoyne-Cecil, 3rd Marquess of Salisbury's

---

<sup>136</sup> Farr, D. (1984) *Op. cit.*, pp. 327f.

<sup>137</sup> Sachko Macleod, D. (1998 [1996]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 1f.

Conservative Party was voted into government office.<sup>138</sup> Salisbury headed the Conservative Party and served as Prime Minister for three terms: 1885–1886; 1886–1892; and 1895–1902. Whereas Prime Ministers before and since served as the First Lord of the Treasury, Salisbury chose instead to serve as Foreign Secretary.<sup>139</sup> Salisbury's vision was to expand the Empire, which resulted in government funding being directed to advance its objectives. With public money diverted to international interests, this resulted in a lack of funding for public projects on the home front.

With the focus on Empire, a greater sense of nationalism ensued, which resulted in public buildings and monuments being realised and devoted to national interests. One impact was the creation of the National Gallery of British Art, funded by Henry Tate, whose enterprise was given momentum by the political climate. Despite Salisbury's fear that Conservative politics might give way to the dispossession of upper-class interests, he recognised the importance of cultivating middle-class votes. Salisbury supported the idea of 'Villa Toryism', which upheld the interests of the suburban and middle-class electorate.<sup>140</sup> On this basis, Salisbury recommended the award of peerages to brewers, industrialists and merchants. Under Salisbury, the Government took an increasingly laissez-faire position to state intervention, which engendered a greater sense of civic responsibility. This resulted in the independent sector, consisting of Christian charities, mutual-aid societies and private benefactors, becoming responsible for the welfare of the less well-off.

### **Henry Tate's Enterprise**

Henry Tate was one such private benefactor who, as a successful businessman, had established a sugar-refining business in Liverpool. Tate increased his wealth by embracing new technologies, developing a better sugar refinery process when he became a joint-licensee with David Martineau and Sons of the Langen Cube process. Patented by Eugen Langen, in Cologne, the template provided the method for cutting sugar into dice-sized cubes. This was a major modern development compared to the more laborious task

---

<sup>138</sup> Saint, A. (2005 [2000]) '*Cities, Architecture and Art*', pp. 255f.

<sup>139</sup> Salisbury relinquished the post of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in 1900.

<sup>140</sup> Bentley, M. (2001) *Lord Salisbury's World Conservative Environments in Late Victorian Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3 & 104.

of using sugar nips (similar to pliers) for cutting into the conical-shaped sugar loaves. The sugar-cube technology brought substantial financial rewards. The wealth that Tate amassed from his enterprise was put into philanthropic undertakings.

Tate made benefactions to the Hahnemann Hospital and the Liverpool Infirmary. Tate made his single largest donation when he gave £42,000 to University College London, in 1881. Five years later, at the age of sixty-seven, Tate left Liverpool and moved to the London suburb of Park Hill, Streatham.<sup>141</sup> Exhibition rooms to display Tate's paintings were added to his Park Hill home, and were opened to the public on Sunday afternoons. Park Hill was frequented by members of the Royal Academy of Arts and its President, John Everett Millais, was supportive of Tate's new proposal to establish a British Gallery of Modern Art.<sup>142</sup> The National Gallery, the South Kensington Museum and the Treasury, which Tate independently approached when he decided to leave his modern British art collection of sixty paintings to the nation, were less supportive.

Tate wrote to the National Gallery Board of Trustees (23 October 1889) and attached three conditions to his offer:

that a room or rooms should be devoted exclusively to the reception of the pictures; that such rooms should be provided or erected within two, or at most three years from the date of the acceptance of the gift; and that such pictures [...] should be called the Tate collection.<sup>143</sup>

Consequently, in return for Tate's benefaction, it was the intention to create an exhibition space for the collection that memorialised in name, its patron. The proposal was rejected by the National Gallery.

Tate rethought his position and, in a letter printed in *The Times* (21 June 1890), he asked George Goschen, Chancellor of the Exchequer, for public support. Tate's proposal had become more ambitious, demanding that a National Gallery of British Art be established. Tate stipulated that 'a national gallery exclusively confined to works by

---

<sup>141</sup> Jones, T. (1960 [1952]) *Henry Tate 1819–1899*, London: Tate & Lyle, p. 26.

<sup>142</sup> Robertson, I. (ed.) (2005) 'Art, religion, history, money'. In Robertson, I. (ed.) *Understanding International Art Markets and Management*, London & New York: Routledge, p. 50.

<sup>143</sup> The National Gallery (7 January 1890) *National Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1.

British artists [should be created] whether the work is to be effected by Government or by private action and enterprise, or by a judicious combination of both [...]<sup>144</sup> The combination of public and private funding, however, was not judicious, as a complex arrangement was established between the private benefactor and the government. The main issue was that the Conservative Government decreed that the new National Gallery of British Art should come under the governance of the National Gallery's Board of Trustees in Trafalgar Square.

Tate agreed to the condition, as he instead focused on the objectives of his new National Gallery of British Art project. Tate stipulated that it was 'to be established on lines similar to those of the Luxembourg Gallery Paris which is devoted exclusively to modern works of French artists'.<sup>145</sup> The *Musée du Luxembourg* was the first French museum opened, in 1750, to the public. It was built for Marie de Medici and exhibited paintings by Peter Paul Rubens and works from the Royal Collection. The paintings were transferred to the *Musée du Louvre*. The *Musée du Luxembourg* was later designated as a museum to display works by living French artists. Similarly, Tate wanted his new gallery to only display works by contemporary British artists. The clause was breached within twenty years of the opening of the National Gallery of British Art.

### **Creating the National Gallery of British Art**

The Treasury responded to Tate, and offered the East and West End Galleries of the South Kensington Museum (27 June 1890). An objection was made and a government petition was registered on the 28 April 1891, by 'men of science'.<sup>146</sup> Another government offer was made by William Harcourt, the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 29 November 1892, proposing the former Millbank Penitentiary site, the scale of which offered the potential to create a new building, which could be extended later. Tate agreed to the Millbank site.

Tate's earlier philanthropic project in London was the red-brick South Lambeth Library designed by Sidney R. J. Smith, which opened in 1893. The civic building

---

<sup>144</sup> Henry Tate (21 June 1890) letter to George Goschen, printed in *The Times*, p. 12.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>146</sup> Woodson-Boulton, A. (November 2003) 'The Art of Compromise: the founding of the national gallery of British Art, 1890–1892.' In *Museum and Society*, Vol. 1. No. 3, Leicester: University of Leicester, p. 151.



equipped Tate with the necessary skills to create another public undertaking and he again appointed Smith, with the instruction to visit European art galleries, to study the architecture and research the new technology of electric lighting. Modern lighting was paramount to Tate, who stated: 'I want London to have the best lighted Gallery in Europe and I cannot be a party to building a Gallery which would not have top light'.<sup>147</sup> The modern innovation of electric top lighting was a priority. Tate's chosen architectural style, however, remained rooted in the past, owing to the current taste in civic architecture, which had reverted back to classicism after the rise of gothic from Victoria's Golden Jubilee in 1887.<sup>148</sup>

The problem was that the design proposed for the National Gallery of British Art resembled something more akin to a baroque cathedral, which included a central dome flanked by two smaller domes, supported by the external walls finished in heavy cyclopean rusticated blocks. The artist Edward Burne-Jones complained that the architectural design would detract from the art: 'Who wants his architectural features — damn his staircase — we want to see the pictures'.<sup>149</sup> Neither an artist, nor an architect, nor a benefactor had the final say. Instead, the politician William Harcourt, the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer, requested that Smith draw up a new plan.<sup>150</sup> Undeterred, Smith was confident that the revised National Gallery of British Art in Millbank would still provide a better space than the National Gallery in Trafalgar Square.

The National Gallery, designed by William Wilkins, was built from 1832 to 1838. The design resulted in a Greek Corinthian portico flanking the entire northern section of Trafalgar Square. A problem arose over the dimensions of the building, in that the building did not extend as far back as was expected after viewing the wide portico. Wilkins was limited by the depth of the site, which was occupied formerly by the King's Mews. The area of Trafalgar Square, in front of the building, had been the King's horses' exercise yard, and provided a better volume in terms of space, but served to amplify the issues of scale concerning the National Gallery building.

---

<sup>147</sup> Hamlyn, R. & Booth, J. (1997) *Henry Tate's Gift: A Centenary Celebration*, London: Tate Publishing, unpaginated.

<sup>148</sup> Saint, A. (2005 [2000]) 'Cities, architecture and art', p. 264.

<sup>149</sup> Lago, M. (ed.) (1895) *Burne-Jones Talking. His conversations preserved by his studio assistant Thomas Rooke*, pp.101f. In Waterfield, G. (1991) *Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain 1790–1990*, London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, pp. 113f.

<sup>150</sup> Stratham, H. H. (ed.) (January–June, 1892) *The Builder*, Vol. 62, London: The Builder Offices.

The National Gallery of British Art did not have the same limitations. The final design, however, did result in a heavy classical temple style front, flanked by rusticated, recessed arms and a projecting end pavilion. Nikolaus Pevsner later described the architectural style as being in the ‘Late Victorian grand manner, somewhere between English littleness and Edwardian Swagger’.<sup>151</sup> ‘English littleness’ referred to the lack of gesture, which did not quite fulfil its grand ambitions, and, rather than being substantial, it remained somehow lacking in its outward appearance.

During the construction of the building, Tate had maintained a strong vision that it would provide a new public benefit, which was indicated in a letter he wrote to *The Times* in 1897:

I learnt that a great want was felt [...] if I could succeed in obtaining from the government a plot of land I would build a permanent gallery for British art. [...] The government has promised to maintain the gallery and the Trustees of the National Gallery have undertaken the management of it. I beg to offer to your Royal Highness the deeds conveying my gift to the nation.<sup>152</sup>

The gift to the nation may have been motivated by Tate’s Unitarianism. The Unitarian Society published *A Course of Simultaneous Lectures on Sunday Evenings* (1895): ‘Salvation, and deliverance from sin, could be achieved by everything that heals and helps man towards goodness and God’.<sup>153</sup> According to Unitarian doctrine, salvation and deliverance could be achieved by providing welfare for others. Welfare acts included funding projects for the public good, and this may have been a guiding principle for Tate’s patronage of the National Gallery of British Art.

---

<sup>151</sup> Bradley, K. S. & Pevsner, N. (2003) *London 6: Westminster, the Buildings of England*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, p. 687.

<sup>152</sup> Henry Tate (1897) letter, *The Times*, p. 7.

<sup>153</sup> British and Foreign Unitarian Association (10, 17 & 24 February, and 3 & 10 March, 1895) *A Course of Simultaneous Lectures on Sunday Evenings: The Forward Movement in Religious Thought as interpreted by Unitarians*. London: British & Foreign Unitarian Association, unpaginated.

### A Nineteenth-Century Model of Partnership

Tate's private enterprise became a public spectacle in 1897, when the National Gallery of British Art's opening ceremony was attended by the Prince of Wales and government officials. Harcourt, as the Liberal Leader of the Opposition, offered his thanks to Tate, and added that it would never have been realised by the Government. Tate offered a few words, but the inscription on a plaque left in the central hall indicated his motivation for funding the project: 'This gallery and sixty-five pictures were presented to the nation by Henry Tate for the encouragement and development of British art and as a thank-offering for a business career of sixty years'.<sup>154</sup> Tate's vision in establishing the National Gallery of British Art would not have been realised without government support. The finance had come from Tate and the land had been provided by the Liberal Government.

What the National Gallery of British Art demonstrated was an early model of partnership; a public national gallery created through private initiative, which had been enabled by the government. When the building opened it was seen certainly, by those at the officiating ceremony, as a new model of enterprise, and place of improvement. The Prince of Wales declared: 'I am glad to think that in its place we have this beautiful temple of art instead of a building where unfortunate criminals were undergoing punishment'.<sup>155</sup> Millbank Penitentiary had opened less than eighty years earlier, with great expectations as a new model prison. The vision for the scheme and initial funding came from Jeremy Bentham, the social reformer, who like Tate, was a Unitarian and proposed a new style and a more humane, penal complex, which was intended to provide better lit spaces to replace the existing dark cells of existing prisons.

Millbank Penitentiary was designed by Robert Smirke, and was a modified version of plans by Thomas Hardwick, but neither architect had experience in designing a prison.<sup>156</sup> The vast penitentiary, occupying an eighteen-acre site, began construction in 1816. The complex design pioneered mass-concrete foundations, and the intricate layout created construction problems. The buildings were not completed until 1821.<sup>157</sup> The prison building was built along similar lines to those prescribed in *Panopticon; or, the*

---

<sup>154</sup> Spalding, F. (1998) *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>156</sup> Bradley, S. & Pevsner, N. (2003) *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*

*Inspection House* (1791). Bentham proposed one enclosed space with an internal central viewing platform for the Prison Governor to see into the inmates' cells. Millbank Penitentiary's design was a deviation from Bentham's plan, in that it had a tower containing the Governor's house, surrounded by six separate pentagon-shaped buildings, each with their own watch tower, radiating from a central axis.

The principle of the panopticon design was to provide a clear view into the cells containing the inmates, who could not see who was viewing them.<sup>158</sup> The idea of the panopticon derived from the Greek *Panoptos*, meaning 'seen by all', which in the prison meant being visible to the Governor and prison warders. Bentham's proposition provided the principle for the modern concept of surveillance, as expounded in Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977).<sup>159</sup> Bentham's own surveillance experiment, however, failed and Millbank Penitentiary was closed on 6 November 1890. Millbank Penitentiary had been established by civil agency as was the National Gallery of British Art. The prison and the art gallery were created by Bentham and Tate, who shared a vision for an improved civic society.

### **Building the Urban Vision**

The late Victorian State had fostered an increasing sense of private responsibility, which Tate had mobilised into action to create an initiative which would serve a social purpose.<sup>160</sup> Throughout, Harcourt had been especially supportive of Tate in redeveloping the Millbank site, which was situated in the less salubrious part of the city. Harcourt, when the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1892 to 1895, had already wanted to develop London's urban environment by creating a new city council, and endorsed the proposal for 'a single central authority for the government of the whole Metropolis'.<sup>161</sup> The Liberal Party was removed from government office at the General Election in 1895, and was replaced by a Conservative administration headed by Lord Salisbury. The election indicated a shift towards urban Conservatism, as their votes increased from ten to

---

<sup>158</sup> Walford, E. (1878) *Old and New London*, Vol. 4, Old and New London: London, p. 6.

<sup>159</sup> Foucault, M. (1991 [1977]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 170–177 & 195–228. Foucault explores the impact the panoptic paradigm has produced, claiming that 'hierarchical observation' provides the model for systematic observation and social control.

<sup>160</sup> Green, E. H. H. (ed.) (1997) *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>161</sup> Young, K. & Garside, P. L. (1982) *Metropolitan London: Politics and Urban Change 1837–1981*, London: Edward Arnold, p. 40.

twenty-seven urban seats.<sup>162</sup> Salisbury had approved earlier of county reforms and had overseen The Local Government Act (1888), which established county councils, county borough councils and the County of London. London became a Conservative stronghold. The Conservatives supported establishing a new London Government.

The London County Council (LCC) was established in 1889, as an appointed body responsible for overseeing the city's infrastructure. The LCC took over from the Metropolitan Board of Works (MBW) and assumed greater responsibilities, which extended to education, social housing and city planning. The LCC earmarked the area around Millbank Prison for redevelopment. Additionally Vauxhall Bridge, designed by Sir Alexander Binnie, was under construction from 1895 to 1906, and replaced an earlier bridge designed by John Rennie, which joined Vauxhall Bridge Road. Constructed between 1812 and 1816, the road provided a vital link with the rest of London, going north up to Hyde Park and south to Vauxhall. The LCC oversaw also the development of the Millbank Estate. Situated behind the National Gallery of British Art, construction began on the Millbank Estate in 1897 and was completed in 1902. It followed a symmetrical plan aligned on the axis of the National Gallery of British Art and the angled outer boundaries marked those of the Millbank Penitentiary site.

The red-brick blocks of flats referenced the Arts and Crafts movement, which was rooted in the past. The newly created street names also referenced a bygone era: John Islip Street was named after the sixteenth-century Abbot of Westminster; Herrick Street was named after Robert Herrick, the seventeenth-century English poet and resident of Westminster. The etymology of other street names also referenced a past which had never existed in that part of Westminster. The Millbank Estate otherwise provided a modern vision of social housing, and became a 'show piece for London' providing homes for 4,430 working people.<sup>163</sup> Creating the first large-scale housing by the LCC was visionary, but the estate stood disconnected from the National Gallery of British Art. When the housing project opened, the National Gallery of British Art did not see its role to facilitate educational outreach work to attract the new Millbank Estate residents. This was because it did not share the same educational premise as a national museum.

---

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>163</sup> Bradley, S. & Pevsner, N. (1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 709.

The year the National Gallery of British Art opened, the Whitechapel Art Gallery began construction, with the aim of staging temporary exhibitions, and focusing on educational and outreach work for the local community. The Whitechapel Art Gallery was designed by Charles Harrison Townsend. With its asymmetrical porch with passages of blank brick walling, as well as ornaments, it proposed a hybrid fusion of Art Nouveau and Arts and Crafts.<sup>164</sup> The Whitechapel Art Gallery became one of the outstanding landmark buildings in the East End.<sup>165</sup> During the Whitechapel's construction, Tate funded a second phase of building in 1899, which added nine additional galleries and doubled the exhibition space. Sidney R. J. Smith was again chosen for the extension, but his architectural scheme did not contribute to a landmark building.<sup>166</sup> The design was criticised for being uninspired, but the heavy classical style, did reflect the growing imperial aspirations of the capital at the heart of an empire.<sup>167</sup>

### **Developing the Organisation**

The National Gallery (Trafalgar Square) Board of Trustees oversaw Smith's extension work, as they continued to hold responsibility for the National Gallery of British Art which did not have its own governance. It did have in-house operational staff headed by a Keeper. Charles Holroyd, a former Slade School of Fine Art graduate and working artist, had been appointed as the Keeper to oversee the day-to-day operations of the National Gallery of British Art. Holroyd's role was as an administrator, and was directly accountable to the governing body of the National Gallery Board of Trustees and its Director, Sir Edward Poynter. The fact that the National Gallery of British Art did not have its own Director or Board of Trustees indicated the subordinate position it was to take in relation to the governing body of the National Gallery Board of Trustees.

The National Gallery Trustees created the stipulation that British artists born after 1790 were to be exhibited at the National Gallery of British Art. The outcome of this decision was that key British artists including William Hogarth, Thomas Gainsborough,

---

<sup>164</sup> Pevsner, N. (1991 [1960]) *Pioneers of Modern Design: From William Morris to Walter Gropius*, London: Penguin Books, pp. 164f. Pevsner claims Townsend may have been influenced by H. H. Richardson's Brattle Square Church, Boston, constructed between 1870 and 1872.

<sup>165</sup> Farr, D. (1984) *Op. cit.*, p. x.

<sup>166</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>167</sup> Nead, L. (2005 [2000]) *Victorian Babylon*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, p. 3.

John Constable and Joseph Mallord William Turner remained at the National Gallery.<sup>168</sup> The former Liberal Politician, George Howard, 9th Earl of Carlisle and a National Gallery Trustee, requested that a few works by Constable be exhibited temporarily at the National Gallery of British Art to help strengthen the display. A further issue was that the National Gallery of British Art was not appointed its own direct funding. Instead, it was allocated funds from the National Gallery Board of Trustees, which received its own grant-in-aid from the Treasury and also received funds from private benefaction.

From the inception of the National Gallery of British Art it was, therefore, treated by the National Gallery Trustees as an extension of it, rather than as a public organisation in its own right. Another complex relationship emerged between the National Gallery of British Art and the Royal Academy of Arts owing to the Chantrey Bequest. The sculptor Sir Francis Chantrey left a gift of money to the nation for the purchase of British painting and sculpture, which came into effect after the death of his widow in 1876. The Chantrey Bequest was intended to encourage the establishment of a national collection of British art, and was appointed to the Royal Academy of Arts Trustees to administer. The issue was that the Royal Academy of Arts Trustees used the Chantrey fund to purchase its own members' art works, which were then sent to the National Gallery of British Art. Further issues ensued when the National Gallery Trustees also selected the best British art works for its own collection and transferred the remainder to the National Gallery of British Art. Evidently, the National Gallery and the Royal Academy of Art were 'colluding' in using the National Gallery of British Art 'as a dumping ground for inferior works, and that demotion rather than promotion had become the presiding principle of transfer'.<sup>169</sup>

Despite the situation, notable art works were acquired for the National Gallery of British Art through the independent agencies of private benefactors and charities. The art works included James Abbott McNeill Whistler's *Nocturne: Blue and Gold-Old Battersea Bridge* (c. 1872–1875), which was the first modern painting to be acquisitioned in 1905. American-born Whistler had made his home in London, where he produced work, and on this basis, qualified for entry into the National Gallery of British Art. The painting was presented by the National Art Funds Collection (NACF), later named the

---

<sup>168</sup> Spalding, F. (1998) *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>169</sup> Smith, A. (2000) 'A 'State' Gallery? The Management of British Art during the Early Years of the Tate.' In Barlow, E. & Trodd, C. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 196.



Art Fund (AF). The charity was established in 1903, to purchase works for the nation's collections, and was created in response to the lack of government funding for new acquisitions. One of NACF's founders, Dugald Sutherland MacColl, succeeded Holroyd as Keeper in 1906, and was part of the modern London art scene.

MacColl was the National Gallery of British Art's most outspoken Keeper, through his opposition to the Royal Academy of Arts and its administration of the Chantrey Bequest. MacColl had published earlier two articles in the *Saturday Review*: 'The Maladministration of the Chantrey Bequest' (1903) and 'Parliament and the Chantrey Bequest' (1903). The latter article derided the government for its lack of intervention, indicating its perceived role in having responsibility for the gallery.<sup>170</sup> MacColl took up his new post shortly before Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Liberal administration was voted into office. The Liberal Government focused on social policy, but made no provisions to increase revenue for municipal amenities, which included public museums and galleries. Undeterred by the limited funds, MacColl undertook an imaginative programme of works, which included exhibiting many unseen paintings by Joseph Mallord William Turner. The Turner Bequest was bequeathed on the death of the artist in 1851, on the condition that a gallery would be built to house his art works. The Turner Bequest of over 30,000 works on paper and oil paintings was put in storage in the National Gallery and the British Museum.

The permanent display of Turner's work was only made possible by the private benefaction of Joseph Joel Duveen who offered to fund a new wing to house the paintings.<sup>171</sup> Duveen, a Dutch Jewish immigrant, had established a successful art business exporting art works from Europe to America, and used his fortune for major bequests. Duveen's offer was met with resistance by the National Gallery's Trustees owing to his stipulation that he wished to appoint his own architect, William Henry Romaine-Walker. The offer was finally accepted. The outcome was that Romaine-Walker proposed a cleaner design than Sidney R. J. Smith's earlier scheme. Duveen, however, died before the plan was realised, and his son Joseph took over funding the remainder of the project. The Turner Wing opened in 1910, and provided five rooms on the main floor and a

---

<sup>170</sup> MacColl, D. S. (25 April & 6 June 1903) 'The Maladministration of the Chantrey Bequest' & 'Parliament and the Chantrey Bequest' in *Saturday Review*. Quoted in Farr, D. (1984) *Op. cit.*, p. 344.

<sup>171</sup> Spalding, F. (1998) *Op. cit.*, p. 33.



staircase to the lower floor, with two additional rooms in the basement. It became the third building phase of the original design and created an asymmetrical floor plan by forming a new north-west quadrant, which discarded the former symmetry of the classical building.

The creation of the Turner Wing met with public approval. *The Morning Post* (19 July 1910) declared that Romaine Walker ‘has managed cleverly to make the addition harmonise with the existing hideous edifice [...]. For this we cannot be too grateful’.<sup>172</sup> MacColl praised the design for providing a lighter display space. The extension was installed with electric lighting and provided a modern gallery experience. What was also new was that the visitors could remain in the National Gallery of British Art until the evening in the artificially lit spaces. Tate’s original rooms, however, remained unlit by electric lighting. The modern world was, therefore, only gradually taking effect at the National Gallery of British Art. The modern world would impact when Britain entered war with Germany on 14 August 1914. The following year, the sinking of the commercial British ocean liner, *The Lusitania*, torpedoed on 7 May 1915, had direct implications for the National Gallery of British Art.

### **The Hugh Lane Bequest**

The sinking of *The Lusitania*, a civilian ship, became a symbolic moment in modern warfare. Internationally, it was politically catastrophic as one hundred and sixty-eight Americans were killed. The USA had not entered the war. With worldwide media attention focused on it and the further sinking of American merchant ships, President Woodrow Wilson was finally forced to enter the USA into World War I in 1917.<sup>173</sup> A further outcome of the sinking of *The Lusitania* was that Hugh Lane, the Irish art collector and Director of the National Gallery, Dublin, had drowned in the attack, along with the other American and British passengers. Lane had been involved in negotiations with the Corporation of Dublin and the National Gallery in London, over his intended

---

<sup>172</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Op. cit.*, pp. 38f.

<sup>173</sup> Duncan, R. & Goddard, G. (2005 [2003]) *Contemporary America*, Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 25.

bequest of thirty-nine modern French paintings and his death saw a complicated legal dispute ensue between Dublin and London.<sup>174</sup>

Lane had offered the Corporation of Dublin his modern collection in 1911, on condition that it would build a permanent modern art museum.<sup>175</sup> The Corporation of Dublin accepted and a proposal was forwarded to appoint Sir Edwin Lutyens to create a spectacular 'Venetian Gallery' on a bridge over the River Liffey.<sup>176</sup> The Corporation of Dublin later vetoed the proposal owing to opposition from Lord Ardilaun, an active philanthropist, who opposed the building of a modern foreign art gallery on the basis that it had no public support. Lane's aunt, the dramatist Lady Augusta Gregory, and the writer W. B. Yeats lobbied on behalf of building the modern foreign gallery. Yeats wrote to *The Irish Times* in March 1913, asking for public support, and attached the poem 'To a wealthy Man who promised a second Subscription to the Dublin Municipal Gallery if it were proved the People wanted Pictures'.<sup>177</sup> The wealthy man in the poem referred to Lord Ardilaun and the rest of the verse criticised the Corporation of Dublin for listening to him and decreeing that the funding should be raised out of 'Paudeen's pence', meaning Dubliners' tax money. Furthermore, Dublin's citizens would have to want to pay for the new gallery of modern art, which they did not want to; clearly the poem was, an attack on the Irish system of patronage.<sup>178</sup>

Unhappy about the Corporation of Dublin's decision, Lane offered his paintings to the National Gallery in London in 1913, with the proviso that they be displayed together as a collection.<sup>179</sup> The National Gallery Board of Trustees agreed to the terms, but, when the paintings arrived, they reneged on the condition, and wrote to Lane stating they might display only some of them. Enraged, Lane responded by adding a codicil to

---

<sup>174</sup> Cullen, F. (2008) 'The Lane Bequest: Giving Art to Dublin.' In *Field Day Review*, Dublin: Field Day Review, Vol. 4, pp. 186-201.

<sup>175</sup> His Britannic Majesty's Government (17 November 1919) *Secret Conference No. 6*, London: 10 Downing Street.

<sup>176</sup> Marcus, P. L. (June 1979) 'Artificers of the Great Moment: An Essay on Yeats and National Literature', p. 84.

<sup>177</sup> Yeats, W. B. (1913) 'To a wealthy Man who promised a second Subscription to the Dublin Municipal Gallery if it were proved the People wanted Pictures.' In Jeffares, A. N. (ed.) (1966) *W B Yeats Selected Poetry*, London: Macmillan, pp. 54f.

<sup>178</sup> Marcus, P. L. (June 1979) 'Artificers of the Great Moment: An Essay on Yeats and National Literature', *Colby Quarterly*, Vol. 15, p. 84. <http://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq>, The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress).

<sup>179</sup> Cappock, M. (ed.) (2006) *Dublin City Gallery: The Hugh Lane*, London & New York: Merrell, p. 9.

his Will, in which he bequeathed his paintings to Dublin. The codicil was never witnessed legally. After Lane's death, both Dublin and London wanted the modern foreign collection and a legal dispute began. The Lane conflict paralleled political tensions as Ireland attempted to gain independence from Britain, which erupted into the Home Rule Crisis of 1912–1914.

Further issues emerged when the National Gallery Board of Trustees assigned Lane's paintings to the National Gallery of British Art. In doing so, the National Gallery Trustees breached Tate's original stipulation, which requested that his gallery was to only display British art. The reason the National Gallery Trustees were able to do this was because of an earlier initiative which they had orchestrated in 1911. The National Gallery Trustees requested Herbert Henry Asquith's Liberal Government to review the national and provincial art collections. Lord Curzon was appointed to chair a committee consisting of National Gallery Trustees, to investigate and make recommendations on the nation's collections. The research was published in *The Report of the Committee of Trustees of the National Gallery appointed by the Trustees to inquire into the Retention of Important Pictures in this Country and Other Matters connected with the National Art Collection* (1915). *The Curzon Report* had its publication date delayed until 1917, owing to the outbreak of war. Although *The Curzon Report* was a National Gallery directive, it was published by His Majesty's Stationer's Office.

*The Curzon Report* provisions stipulated that a national modern foreign art collection be created as a result of:

... the inferiority of our present resources and opportunities [...] Donors and Testators are deferred from contributing them to the national collections owing to there being no suitable place in which they can be shown. [...] until a suitable gallery is provided the Collection is not likely to grow, and that a suitable gallery is not likely to be provided until there is an important collection to be housed.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>180</sup> Earl Curzon of Kedleston, Sir Edgar Vincent, Robert H. Benson and Sir Charles Holroyd (1915) *Report of the Committee of Trustees of the National Gallery appointed by the Trustees to inquire into the Retention of Important Pictures in this Country and Other Matters connected with the National Art Collection*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, pp. 25f.

*The Curzon Report* provided no directive as to how the modern collection was to be acquired. The reason for establishing a modern foreign collection was on the basis that the nation did not have one. Furthermore, the Hugh Lane Collection was noted and commended for being the focus of ‘envy’ of other European cities, which made it an attractive prize.<sup>181</sup> However, at the same point, other European cities were developing their own modernism. The *Deutscher Werkbund* opened in Munich in 1907, which marked a pivotal point in the development of modern architecture and industry. The Weimar Republic saw an upsurge in radical arts experimentation and created the framework for the establishment of the Bauhaus school in 1919, which was at the vanguard of modernism.<sup>182</sup> The *Alte Nationalgalerie, Berlin*, also established a modern foreign art collection, and had a new wing designed for it in 1919. This illustrated that the politics of the modern foreign art collection had shifted into the international arena, as European countries shifted away from a national perspective. Hosting a national modern foreign art collection also became a mark of progress. Britain, by not holding such a national collection, was starting to reflect an island-like mentality towards modernism.<sup>183</sup>

### **Trustees and Funding**

MacColl was succeeded by Charles Aitken as Keeper. Aitken had worked for ten years as the Director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery, where he gained experience in curating work by amateur and professional artists. Owing to the provisions made in *The Curzon Report*, Aitken was reappointed as Director and a new Board of Trustees was also created.<sup>184</sup> The appointments were recommended by the Board of the National Gallery Trustees who required that the Directors of the National Gallery and National Gallery of British Art were included as ex-officio members and that three Trustees of the National Gallery were made members of the Board. The new National Gallery of British Art Trustees met on the 3 April 1917, with Lord D’Abernon appointed as the Chairman. The Trustees included

---

<sup>181</sup> Sharp, N. (2003) ‘The Wrong twigs for an eagle’s nest? Architecture, nationalism and Sir Hugh Lane’s scheme for a Gallery of Modern Art, Dublin, 1904–1913.’ In Giebelhausen, M. (ed.) *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

<sup>182</sup> Droste, M. (2006) *The Bauhaus 1919–1933*, Cologne: Taschen, p. 15.

<sup>183</sup> National Gallery Trustees (1915) ‘Minutes of Evidence of the Committee of Trustees of the National Gallery Trustees’. Quoted in Taylor, B. (1999) *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

<sup>184</sup> Her Majesty’s Stationery Office (24 March 1917) *Treasury Minute*, London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office. Tenure was to be held for seven years, and the new governance was to supervise the management of the organisation.

Sir Robert Clermont Witt. As a solicitor, Witt was useful in the legal negotiations and with the other Trustees questioned the legal validity of the Royal Academy of Arts' administration of the Chantrey Bequest, and the purchase of unauthorised works by its own academicians which were sent to the National Gallery of British Art.

The Royal Academy of Arts remained resolute in its position as guardian of the Chantrey Bequest, which compromised the overall quality of the National Gallery of British Art's Collection. The Royal Academy of Arts, in doing so, also robbed the National Gallery of British Art of the opportunity for using the Chantrey Bequest to aid its limited funding. The National Gallery of British Art continued to remain in receipt of a small government grant-in-aid, but had most of its financial support appointed by the National Gallery Board which included income from the Clarke Fund. The residuary estate of Mr Francis Clarke had originally been bequeathed in 1856, for the purchase of art works for the National Gallery. The Clarke fund was made available to the National Gallery of British Art Trustees from 1918, which amounted to less than £600 a year and lasted until 1939.<sup>185</sup> The Clarke Fund was exchanged for the Knapping Fund, which was almost double the amount.<sup>186</sup>

Private benefaction and additional charitable gifts of art works also continued to support the National Gallery of British Art's financial situation. Notable modern foreign acquisitions were accessioned during this period, including Paul Gauguin's *Tahitiens* (c. 1891), which was purchased by the Contemporary Art Society (CAS) in 1917. The CAS was founded in 1910, as a charity to develop public collections of contemporary art for the nation. The CAS purchase of *Tahitiens* provided the National Gallery of British Art's collection with an outstanding example of Post-Impressionism. Gauguin's *Whence come we? What are we? Whither go we?* (1897–1898) and *Nevermore* (1898) were offered the following year for sale.<sup>187</sup> An offer of financial aid came from the private sector to purchase one of the art works. Duveen offered £2,000 to buy *Nevermore*, but owing to resistance from the National Gallery of British Art's Board, the paintings were not

---

<sup>185</sup> The Tate Gallery (1954) *The Tate Gallery Report 1953–1954, Review 1938–1953*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 9.

<sup>186</sup> The Tate Gallery (1955) *The Tate Gallery Handbook for the use of Trustees*, London: Tate Gallery Publishing, p. 27.

<sup>187</sup> See Appendix A (18 February 1918).

purchased.<sup>188</sup> *Whence come we? What are we? Whither go we?* is now in the Boston Museum of Fine Art, and *Nevermore* is in the Courtauld Gallery collection. A further major lost opportunity emerged when government aid was offered.

Lord Curzon secured a grant from the Treasury of £3,000 on behalf of the National Gallery of British Art to purchase Edgar Degas's *La famille Bellelli* (1858–1867), *Mademoiselle Fierce in the Ballet* (1866–1868), *[Repetition] Au Foyer* (c. 1874) and *Portrait of M. Duranty* (1879) at a Paris sale.<sup>189</sup> However, not one of the four paintings was acquired. This was owing to resistance from the National Gallery of British Art's governance in being unable to agree to bid for any of the art works. What Curzon's offer identified was that even when the National Gallery of British Art had finance offered it continued to resist acquiring modern foreign art works. The National Gallery of British Art's Board established a precedent for creating major gaps in the modern foreign collection and, in doing so, reflected a wider official position. By 1905, no London-based national museum or gallery possessed a single modern French painting. Frank Rutter, a modern art curator, organised a public fund to buy Eugène Boudin's *The Entrance to Trouville Harbour* (c. 1890s) which 'a still reluctant National Gallery took much persuading to accept'. The painting was presented by the NACF in 1910.<sup>190</sup>

### National Gallery Millbank

The National Gallery of British Art was renamed the National Gallery Millbank in 1920, by means of a Treasury Minute. The change in title was to accommodate its dual function as the National Gallery of Modern Foreign Art.<sup>191</sup> The name change was also a contravention of Henry Tate's original wish, which had been to create a National Gallery of British Art. The Treasury Minute changed the provision and also stipulated that three members of the Trustees Board should be artists. The arrival of the National Gallery Millbank Trustees appeared to have a desire to address the problems within the modern foreign collection. When the new Trustees convened they acknowledged that gaps had

---

<sup>188</sup> National Gallery of British Art (27 November 1917) *National Gallery of British Art Board Meeting*, p. 3 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>189</sup> See Appendix A (16 July 1918).

<sup>190</sup> Taylor, B. (1999) *Op. cit.*, p. 134.

<sup>191</sup> Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1920) *Treasury Minute*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

been created and proposed to loan art works to fill in the gaps, which were also seen as an opportunity for judging whether those works might be suitable for future purchase.<sup>192</sup>

Gaps continued to be created as Paul Cézanne's *Portrait of Madame Cézanne* (undated) and Vincent Van Gogh's *Garden Court Arles* (undated) were offered for purchase, but were declined by the National Gallery Millbank's Trustees.<sup>193</sup> The situation worsened due to a lack of funding and the political climate, which resulted in two general elections being held in 1924. The Conservative Government, headed by Stanley Baldwin, was replaced by a hung parliament in January 1924. The minority Labour Government, under Ramsay MacDonald, was reliant on Liberal support, which was not forthcoming and a further election was called in November 1924. Baldwin's Conservative Party was restored to government office, with a mandate to stabilise the economy by curbing government spending. With limited public funding available, the National Gallery Millbank looked to the private sector for support.

### **The Modern Foreign Art Galleries**

Financial aid was offered by Samuel Courtauld, the textile manufacturer, who provided a major donation of £50,000 for the purchase of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist works for the National Gallery Millbank.<sup>194</sup> Duveen also offered to fund three rooms, which were designated as the Modern Foreign Art Galleries, with a further room for the display of the work of John Singer Sargent. Five rooms on the lower floor were also part of the new building works. Duveen again appointed William Henry Romaine-Walker, who was joined by Charles Holden. Duveen met with resistance in appointing his own architect, and presented Paul Gauguin's *Faa Iheihe* (1898) as a gift to improve negotiations with the Trustees. The main feature of the design was that it incorporated overhead glazed openings to provide new, lighter exhibition spaces. The Modern Foreign Art Galleries opened in 1926, the year of the General Strike, and had only been made possible because of Duveen's patronage.

---

<sup>192</sup> National Gallery of British Art (16 November 1920) *National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting*, pp. 2f. (Archive TG 1/3). See also Appendix A (19 October 1920).

<sup>193</sup> See Appendix A (20 June 1922 & 16 November 1922).

<sup>194</sup> National Gallery Millbank (27 February 1924) *National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting*, p. 2. (Archive: TG 1/3).



What was demonstrated in the negotiations for the Modern Foreign Galleries and the early funding initiative of the Turner Wing was the level of power the private patron exercised in directing the architectural process. The Modern Foreign Art Galleries offered an enviable modern exhibition space to national and international visitors, who included the young American art historian Alfred H. Barr, Jr. Visiting in 1927, Barr was impressed by the level of private benefaction which had gone into creating the modern exhibition space and was concerned that the USA was lagging behind and neglecting modern art, notably on the east coast.<sup>195</sup> The young American academic proposed that New York should have a modern foreign art collection to rival London, Paris and Berlin. However, the enviable situation of the National Gallery Millbank was terminated in January 1928, when the walls of the River Thames were breached and the building was flooded. The repairs impeded the financial situation and the National Gallery Millbank became a less impressive space than when Barr had visited.

The following year things shifted in the field of modern art in New York, when Barr was appointed as the first Director of MoMA whose earlier comments indicated that, for a short period at least, that the National Gallery Millbank reflected a model of modernity. The enviable position of the National Gallery Millbank had been, entirely due to the private patronage of Duveen and other benefactors including Courtauld. Despite the private benefactions, which also included the Dutch collector C. Frank Stoop's gift of Georges Braque's *Guitare et Pichet* (1927) in 1928, the overall quality of the collection suffered.<sup>196</sup> The Royal Academy of Arts continued to purchase its own artists' works out of the Chantrey Bequest, as a further number of works were deposited in the National Gallery Millbank in June 1928. With the exception of George Clausen's *A Dancer* (undated), the rest of the paintings were by second-rate artists.

### **Rejecting Matisse, Rejecting Modernism**

The most notable rejection occurred in February 1929. Henri Matisse's *Woman at a Table* (undated) was presented by the CAS as a free gift, but was rejected by the National

---

<sup>195</sup> Barr, A. H. (October 1928) 'Modern Art in London Museums.' In *Arts*, New York: Arts, No. 14, p. 187.

<sup>196</sup> National Gallery Millbank (27 June 1928) *National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3).



Gallery Millbank Trustees.<sup>197</sup> Another Matisse, *Woman Kneeling* (undated), was offered for sale and along with Pablo Picasso's *Flowerpiece* (undated) was also rejected.<sup>198</sup> The paintings were offered during an economic downturn and refusing the free gift of *Woman at a Table* indicated the extent to which the National Gallery Millbank Trustees were unwilling to engage with the modern foreign collection. The financial situation worsened as Baldwin's Government was forced to make further spending cuts, which included limiting the grant-in-aid to galleries and museums. The reason for the economic collapse was a result of the US Stock Market Crash in 1929. The outcome was that Ramsey MacDonald's second Labour Ministry saw British exports falling and unemployment rising to over three million.

At the National Gallery Millbank changes of a different kind were underway when Aitken resigned in 1930 and James B. Manson was appointed as the new Keeper. Manson had previously worked as an artist, and was appointed as the Assistant Keeper at the National Gallery Millbank. At the time of Manson's appointment it was still possible to acquire relatively inexpensive, modern foreign art works on the international market. Manson, however, pursued a most retrogressive policy by vetoing representative modern foreign acquisitions, which are listed in Appendix A. During this period, Manson oversaw the National Gallery Millbank, officially renamed the Tate Gallery in 1932. The name change did not affect a shift in the organisation regarding the position taken towards the modern foreign collection. Pablo Picasso's *La Belle Hollandaise* (1905) was offered for sale by the French Gallery, but was declined by Manson, who asked the NACF to purchase it.<sup>199</sup> NACF refused and the decision was passed back to Manson, who referred it again back to NACF. The painting was never acquired. *La Belle Hollandaise* was later accessioned into the Queensland Art Gallery's Collection in Australia. The issue of modernism was being more positively addressed in the field of architecture.

---

<sup>197</sup> See Appendix A (25 February 1929). There is no exact match for the title *Woman at a Table*.

<sup>198</sup> See Appendix A (21 October 1929). The undated painting maybe in a private collection or destroyed. There are a number of *Flowerpiece* paintings by Pablo Picasso, therefore, the location of the rejected work is not possible to ascertain.

<sup>199</sup> See Appendix A (20 March 1933).

## **Traditionalism and Modernism**

Giles Gilbert Scott, at his inaugural speech as President of RIBA, claimed: ‘the old fight of my grandfather’s time between gothic and classic and the present fight between traditionalism and modernism seem to me issues not worth spilling ink over [...]’,<sup>200</sup>

George Gilbert Scott was Giles Gilbert Scott’s grandfather and the architect responsible for designing the Midland Grand Hotel next to St Pancras station, which opened in 1873. The massive red-brick gothic edifice stood along the same road as Philip Hardwick’s classical Doric façade of Euston station, which opened in 1837. Scott’s reference to ‘the old fight’ referred to the debate between nineteenth-century gothic and classical architecture. The debate later shifted to traditionalism versus modernism, as the weighty edifice of Edwardian Baroque architecture was to give way to a cleaner modern style.

The new architectural style was not embraced as easily by other European countries. Modernism, characterised by asymmetrical compositions, unrelieved cubic general shapes and an absence of moulding and use of impersonal materials, was viewed by Scott with trepidation. Scott stated: ‘Use modern materials’ is the correct slogan, I believe, but ‘Use common sense is better’.<sup>201</sup> He was referencing the need to embrace modernism. Fourteen years after his RIBA lecture, Scott embraced his own vision of the style when he designed Bankside Power Station; a fusion of modernism and classicism with its perfunctory massive brick walls in a classically proportioned structure. The same year as Scott’s lecture, modernism was facing greater challenges at the Tate Gallery.

Frank C. Stoop offered his private modern foreign collection as a bequest to the Tate Gallery, but it was met with some hesitation from Manson, although it was finally acquired in 1933.<sup>202</sup> The following year, Vincent Van Gogh’s *The Postman Joseph Roulin* (1888) was offered for purchase. Manson requested that the NACF purchase it for the Tate Gallery.<sup>203</sup> The NACF was unable to and the painting was declined. The Tate Gallery Trustees, instead, recommended that efforts should be made to acquire works by selected modern artists, to include André Derain.<sup>204</sup> When paintings by the French artist

---

<sup>200</sup> Giles Gilbert Scott (November 1933) *President’s Inaugural Speech*, London: RIBA, p. 83.

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>202</sup> The Tate Gallery (11 December 1933) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>203</sup> *The Postman Joseph Roulin* was later accessioned into MoMA’s Collection. See Appendix A (30 January 1934).

<sup>204</sup> The Tate Gallery (30 January 1934) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

were offered, including *Castel Gandolfo* (undated), they were rejected.<sup>205</sup> Public funding also continued to be precarious as it arrived in arbitrary amounts as the government curbed spending. Ramsay MacDonald's National Government cut benefits of insured workers and supported the rising unemployed by increased taxation.

During the unfolding economic crisis, John Maynard Keynes published his magnum opus *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (1936). This advocated that demand and not supply was the key variable in governing the level of economic activity. Keynes proposed government intervention through a planned economy and public spending. MacDonald attempted to control the economy and funding remained limited. Despite the economic stringency, a cultural shift towards embracing foreign modernism had begun to be seen in commercial galleries.<sup>206</sup> Modernism otherwise remained an exotic commodity at the Tate Gallery. The organisation also had little communication with British artists, and was not investing in modern art. The Tate Gallery was instead buying more dated Impressionist works by Pierre Bonnard and Lucien Pissarro.<sup>207</sup> The retrogressive position was in contrast to the private art galleries in New York, which were purchasing much more cutting-edge contemporary art.

The Tate Gallery in London was also, in reality, unable to compete with New York because it did not have continuous benefaction from the private sector. The private funding the Tate Gallery did receive at this point was a boost to its resources. Mrs A. H. Benson donated £2,000 in 1932, with a Deed of Bond also being made which stated that, within six months of her death, £14,000 would be released.<sup>208</sup> Miss Helen Margaret Knapping also made a significant bequest in 1935, to the Trustees of the National Gallery (Trafalgar Square). The money was for the purchase of paintings or sculpture by living artists, or those within twenty-five years of their death, and of any nationality. The fund's income was made available to the Tate Gallery Trustees in 1939. The Knapping donation

---

<sup>205</sup> The work was either the painting now known as *Woods near Castel Gandolfo* (1921) in the Albright Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York, or *The Capuchin Convent close to Castel Gandolfo* (1921) in the *Bern Kunstmuseum*, in Switzerland. See Appendix A (20 March 1934).

<sup>206</sup> Spalding, F. (1986) *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

<sup>207</sup> Harrison, C. (1995) 'England's Climate.' In Allen, B. (ed.) *Towards a Modern Art World*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, p. 211.

<sup>208</sup> The Deed was subject to the condition that the Trustees would exhibit, whenever possible, two watercolours painted by her husband, Abraham Benson: *Newlands Corner* (1928) & *Anemones* (1929).

amounted to approximately £1,170 a year.<sup>209</sup> Private funding also continued to come from major patrons when Duveen made his final major bequest in 1937, to fund a new Sculpture Hall and for the refurbishment of more than half of the basement area. Duveen again appointed his own architect, John Russell Pope.

The Tate Gallery's new Sculpture Hall provided a large grand axis, running from the central entrance to the back of the building. Within the classical frame, a clean open space was created which pre-empted Pope's design for the Duveen Gallery in the British Museum. Opening in 1939, the Duveen Gallery benefitted from the large range of the sculptural pieces from the British Museum's Collection. The Tate Gallery did not have the same range or scale of works to display in its new exhibition space. Otherwise, the volume of the space offered the Tate Gallery the potential to expand its existing collection.<sup>210</sup> Despite Duveen and other private patrons' contributions, the Tate Gallery suffered from public funding cuts, but also from mismanagement by its own governance. Manson's erratic behaviour at Board meetings led him to make increasingly impaired decisions, which impacted both inside and outside the Tate Gallery.

As the Director of the Tate Gallery, Manson was asked by Customs Officials to inspect the art work by Constantin Brancusi *Sculpture for the Blind* (c. 1920) who were unclear if it was an art work or a foreign stone which was being imported illegally into the country. The marble sculpture was designated for an exhibition at Peggy Guggenheim's Cork Street gallery. Manson was asked to identify if it were a modern art work or not and declared that it was not. The consequence was that the object was rejected for admission into the country. A public furore ensued between Guggenheim and Manson. Guggenheim went to court and Manson's decision was overturned. Guggenheim's subsequent comments reflected her attitude to the Tate Gallery Director: 'Mr Manson not only lost his case, but pretty soon his job as well. I thus rendered a great service to foreign artists and to England'.<sup>211</sup> Manson's erratic behaviour inside and outside of the Tate Gallery had become unacceptable and he was asked to resign.

---

<sup>209</sup> The Tate Gallery (1954) *Op cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>210</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

<sup>211</sup> Guggenheim, P. (1995 [1979]) *Out of this Century: Confessions of an Art Addict*, London: André Deutsch, pp. 173f.

Manson's final period as Director reflected his continued resistance to modern foreign art works, as works by the Russian avant-garde artist Marc Chagall and French Expressionist painter Chaïm Soutine were rejected.<sup>212</sup> Manson was replaced, in May 1938, by John Rothenstein. A former Oxford graduate, journalist and academic, Rothenstein, however, like Manson, was not about making changes. After Rothenstein's appointment he oversaw the rejection of sixty-eight paintings by Italian artists.<sup>213</sup> Paintings by Maurice Utrillo were declined the following month.<sup>214</sup> Additionally, a gift of four paintings by Wassily Kandinsky was also rejected initially.<sup>215</sup> Kandinsky's *Cosques* (1910–1911) was finally accepted as a gift, on the basis that there was no guarantee of ever exhibiting it.<sup>216</sup> The painting was presented by Mrs Hazel McKinley, the sister of Peggy Guggenheim, and demonstrated owing to the tenacity of the private international collectors, in this case, American the National Modern Foreign Collection was able to develop albeit, in an ad-hoc way.

### London and New York

The following year, in September 1939, the Conservative Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, announced Britain was at war. The decision was taken to evacuate the Tate Gallery's collection to safer premises, owing to the building's central London location. As the paintings were being removed Rothenstein left London to commence a lecture tour of the USA. Rothenstein created four lectures to give on his international trip. They began with Lecture One, *A Thousand Years of British Painting*, which was described by Rothenstein as 'a popular survey designed for less sophisticated audiences'.<sup>217</sup> Lecture Two, *English Medieval Painting AD 1,000–AD 1,500*, was aimed at universities, and was also given at the Metropolitan Museum, New York. Lecture Three, *British Painting since 1900*, was claimed by Rothenstein as 'the most serious painters of the twentieth century' and claimed by him to be his most popular.<sup>218</sup> Lecture Four, *The Tate Gallery in War-*

---

<sup>212</sup> See Appendix A (15 January 1935–20 April 1937) & Appendix A (18 January 1938).

<sup>213</sup> See Appendix A (21 June 1938).

<sup>214</sup> See Appendix A (25 July 1938).

<sup>215</sup> The Tate Gallery (27 October 1938) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>216</sup> The Tate Gallery (22 November 1938) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>217</sup> The Tate Gallery (21 May 1940) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>218</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

*Time*, provided a brief history of the Tate Gallery, a survey of the acquisitions and the evacuation programme for the collection.

What was evident in Rothenstein's lecture series was none of them discussed the modern foreign paintings in the collection. Rothenstein continued his tour and only returned after his father contacted him, as he sensed hostility from the Tate Gallery Trustees as major problems developed. After the building was hit by a bomb, it was made watertight, which helped Rothenstein to ingratiate himself with the Tate Gallery Trustees. What did not improve was his relationship with the modern foreign collection. While the USA visit had exposed Rothenstein to modern foreign art, after his return the modern foreign acquisitions at the Tate Gallery extended to acquiring only more conservative examples of late Impressionist art works.<sup>219</sup> By contrast, the New York galleries were buying more contemporary art works.

Peggy Guggenheim was also acquiring contemporary works and chose London to exhibit her art collection with the opening of 'Guggenheim Jeune' in Cork Street.<sup>220</sup> Next door to Peggy Guggenheim's exhibition, Roland Penrose and E. L. T. Mesens' commercial galleries were also exhibiting contemporary Surrealist art works. As a result of her London exhibition and dealings with other collectors, she proposed to establish a museum of modern art in London, and appointed Herbert Read as the Director. The museum of modern art had been originally planned to open in autumn 1939, but it coincided with military operations as Britain went to war. The plan was put on hold. When the idea was later revived it was rejected by Kenneth Clark, Director of the National Gallery, and Douglas Cooper, a partner at the Freddie Mayor Gallery, who informed Read that the only place for a museum of modern art was at Millbank.<sup>221</sup> Crucially, it had taken the vision of an American to begin the campaign to create a new museum of modern art in London, even though it was not to be realised at that point.

After London Guggenheim opened the exhibition 'Art of this Century' in New York, which displayed works by major Surrealist, as well as Abstract, artists including

---

<sup>219</sup> Pierre Bonnard's *Coffee Le Café* (1915) was presented by Sir Michael Sadler through the Art Fund, it was acquisitioned in 1941. Lucien Pissarro's *Ivy Cottage, Coldharbour: Sun and Snow* (1916) was presented by the Trustees of the Chantrey Bequest, it was acquisitioned in 1943.

<sup>220</sup> Guggenheim Jeune was open from 1938 to 1939.

<sup>221</sup> Spalding, F. (1998) *Op. cit.*, p. 78.

Pablo Picasso, Jackson Pollock and Max Ernst.<sup>222</sup> The Peggy Guggenheim Collection competed with MoMA, which had been founded with the financial aid of the Rockefeller family and other wealthy patrons. Since MoMA's foundation, the Rockefellers had dominated the museum and were also instrumental in US business and political life.<sup>223</sup> Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, along with her friends Lillie P. Bliss and Mrs Cornelius J. Sullivan, were the founders of the museum in 1929.

MoMA opened in rented premises in Manhattan, initially hosting loan shows. Within two years, the nucleus of MoMA's Collection was established with the bequest of Lillie P. Bliss in 1931. Abby Rockefeller persuaded her husband John D. Rockefeller Jr. to donate \$5 million and the land for a permanent museum building. From the planning process, the creation of MoMA was paid for with private aid. Philip L. Goodwin and Edward D. Stone were appointed to design the new museum. Goodwin was on the board of MoMA's Trustees and was an architect who practised in the Beaux-Arts style. Stone was a modernist and what was created was driven by him; a radical design for a museum. The MoMA building provided a six-storey structure with a glass wall base, two levels of galleries, and upper level offices with horizontal strip windows within a translucent glazed and marble box. The new MoMA building which opened in 1939 more closely resembled a modern department store than a museum of modern art.<sup>224</sup> With its flat stone and glass façade set flush to the street front, the modern art museum building rejected drawing on classical designs. The building formed a striking contrast to the neighbouring properties on Fifty-Third Street. The architect's design had its roots in European international modernism and heralded the fact that New York, rather than Paris, was the new epicentre for modernism.

MoMA was created through the agencies of modernism, private patronage and politics, as the public identity of the organisation continued its association with the Rockefeller family.<sup>225</sup> Nelson Rockefeller was appointed the first President of MoMA from 1939 to 1941, which was followed by his public appointment as Co-ordinator of the Office of Inter-American Affairs in 1941. MoMA functioned as a beacon of modernity,

---

<sup>222</sup> The Tate Gallery (1965) *The Tate Report 1964–1965*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 17.

<sup>223</sup> Buck, L. & Dodd, P. (1991) *Relative Values*, London: BBC Books, pp. 115f.

<sup>224</sup> Grunenberg, C. (1999) 'The Modern Art Museum.' In Barker, E. (ed.) *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

<sup>225</sup> Grunenberg, C. (1999) 'The Modern Art Museum', p. 32.



both inside and outside of the building. The interior spaces were intentionally uncluttered, which enabled Barr, the Director, to rethink hanging the collection. Discarding ‘the mid-nineteenth century principle of hanging by school’, Barr assembled the collection by movement.<sup>226</sup> The museum accommodated a new multi-art department, which included photography, film, industrial design and architecture.

Abstract Expressionism was also championed by Barr and, in doing so, he positioned MoMA in the middle of a progressive international art scene in New York. Even the Metropolitan Museum of Art had developed a small select, impressive modern art collection. The modern art works had been acquired as a result of George A. Hearn, a Trustee of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, who created a fund in 1906 for the purchase of works by notable living US artists.<sup>227</sup> New York was a far cry from London in terms of its museums and galleries certainly during and after the inter-war years. London had been subject to Blitz attacks, had fewer financial resources, and had been less regulated in terms of planning than New York.

The LCC requested that Sir Leslie Patrick Abercrombie and John Henry Forshaw draw up the *County of London Plan* (1943), to make recommendations for the development and reconstruction of London. The plan focused on finding solutions to ongoing issues relating to poor planning, including depressed housing, urban sprawl, traffic congestion and open spaces. There were no provisions for developing museums and galleries, so it fell to their own governances to maintain their buildings and collections. Due to the war resources remained limited for all museums and galleries. The Tate Gallery was only acquiring a few examples of early modern French art, which was partly a result of fewer foreign works entering the country owing to restrictions imposed by war-time conditions. Otherwise, works by Paul Gauguin and Salvador Dali were declined, even though the Board claimed they were addressing the gaps in the modern foreign collection.<sup>228</sup> A further indication of the regressive position towards modernism was reflected in the Tate Gallery Trustees’ statement: ‘in view of the

---

<sup>226</sup> Serota, N. (1996) *Op. cit.*, p. 10. Serota cites Sandler, I. and Newman, A. (eds) (1986) *Defining Modern Art: Selected Writings of Alfred Barr*, New York: Abrams.

<sup>227</sup> The Department of Twentieth-Century Art was established formally in 1967.

<sup>228</sup> See Appendix A (18 March 1943).



continuing vitality of so-called abstract art [...] it would be proper that a small room at the Tate should be devoted to its representation'.<sup>229</sup>

While the Tate Gallery proposed to put Abstract Art into 'a small room', Guggenheim's earlier efforts for a London museum of modern art resurfaced.<sup>230</sup> The museum of modern art's meeting in January 1946, however, was not attended by any representatives from the Tate Gallery. In their absence, Herbert Read proposed that the new museum of modern art should be international, interdisciplinary and not concerned with recognised artists.<sup>231</sup> Along with Guggenheim's proposal, two other schemes were discussed. The Ben Nicholson Group proposed to provide a museum of living art on abstract lines dedicated to work by living artists. The Belgian artist, Edouard Léon Théodore Mesens, and the English artist and collector, Roland Penrose, suggested that an exhibition space could be created in rooms offered by Helena Rubinstein (Princess Gourielli). Efforts to combine her offer with Guggenheim's scheme became an option, but the consensus was that a museum of modern art could not be realised owing to a lack of resources. Instead, a documentary library was to be formed by approaching MoMA for help rather than the Tate Gallery. The outcome was that the Institute of the Contemporary Arts was created. The plan to establish a new museum of modern art in London had, therefore, failed owing to an absence of an official body to undertake the responsibility.

### **Arts Council of Great Britain**

Major changes were underway in realigning state responsibility for the arts by the government to a new body. The Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA), created to promote the arts as a way of providing a range of entertainments on the home front during the war, was disbanded. Attlee's Labour Government oversaw CEMA reassemble into the more professional body of the ACGB in 1946, under the direction of its first Chairman, John Maynard Keynes. The ACGB reconfigured the arts as a new public service which was part of the 'social and moral' economy.<sup>232</sup> The ACGB

---

<sup>229</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 February 1945) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>230</sup> Taylor, B. (1999) *Op. cit.*, pp. 167–202.

<sup>231</sup> ICA Archive (30 January 1946) *Museum of Modern Art Scheme* (Archive: TGA 955.1.1.1).

<sup>232</sup> Harvey, D. (2007) *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

was intended as a temporary measure to fund the arts at arm's-length, but demonstrated that the government believed it was responsible for the arts.

The ACGB was to oversee the funding of grants for theatre, opera, ballet and certain museums. The ACGB began to fund and organise temporary art exhibitions at the Tate Gallery. The Tate Gallery however, remained in receipt of grant-in-aid from the Treasury, which enabled it to continue to operate without implementing a formal purchasing policy. Consequently, Pablo Picasso's *La Mandoliste* (1910) was offered by the London Gallery, but was declined. The seller, Roland Penrose, was asked if he would instead sell Picasso's *La Jeune Fille à la Mandoline* (1910). Neither painting was ever acquired. *La Jeune Fille à la Mandoline* was later accessioned by MoMA.<sup>233</sup>

The Venice Biennale opened the following year, in 1948, which was the first after a six-year break owing to the war. At the Venice Biennale there was greater focus on exhibiting modern art, with France and the USA having the highest profile. In the British Pavilion, the Tate Gallery provided two exhibitions representing the work of J. W. M. Turner and Henry Moore. No examples were provided from the modern foreign art collection. Rothenstein noted that the British Pavilion was the first to be visited by the Italian President, Luigi Einaudi and claimed that both exhibitions had been an outstanding success, but this was not reflected in the allocation of prizes.<sup>234</sup> The French Pavilion displayed collections by Georges Braque and Marc Chagall. Braque was awarded the *Grand Prix de Peinture* and the Russian-born Chagall, who had become a permanent resident in France from 1948, was awarded the Venice Biennale's *Grand Prix de Gravure*.

The US Pavilion displayed contemporary US artists and included objects from Peggy Guggenheim's collection including work by Jackson Pollock. Peggy Guggenheim's collection was important because it represented Abstract Expressionist, as well as Cubist and Surrealist art works, from a US perspective. While a number of Western European countries and the USA benefitted from the Biennale, Britain did not, as it trailed its international counterparts. Britain's post-war lacklustre resonated across the board, and is why Clement Attlee's Labour Government began to plan for the Festival

---

<sup>233</sup> See Appendix A (19 June 1947).

<sup>234</sup> The Tate Gallery (24 June 1948) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

of Britain from 1948. At the same time, on Rothenstein's return from Venice works by the French Expressionist painter Chaïm Soutine and Laszlo Moholy-Nagy were declined.<sup>235</sup> The key issue was that there was no formal purchasing acquisitions policy in place. The situation was identified by the Trustee artist, Graham Sutherland, in June 1949. Sutherland requested that a list of one hundred important acquisitions be drawn up, which could strengthen the collection, and included works by Pablo Picasso, Georges Braque and Henri Matisse.<sup>236</sup> Information about forthcoming public and private sales was also requested for the Trustees.<sup>237</sup>

Rothenstein and Douglas Cooper, a commercial modern art dealer, undertook a trip to Paris with the aim of identifying key foreign art works, but no works were secured.<sup>238</sup> Major works were, instead, acquired through the London commercial galleries including Pablo Picasso's *Femme Nue Assise* (1910).<sup>239</sup> The Mayor Gallery provided the contact, and it was purchased from Galerie Pierre with money from the Courtauld Fund in 1949. The London commercial galleries were, therefore, crucial resources in providing the Tate Gallery with the vision for some of its major modern acquisitions. Yet as the commercial galleries were offering key modern art works, the Tate Gallery was also continuing to reject them, as works by Alberto Giacometti and Jean Gris were declined.<sup>240</sup> The situation continued and was not alleviated when a list of notable art works was drawn up, but no formal purchasing policy was formulated.<sup>241</sup>

The Tate Gallery Trustees instead focused on a different strategy, which was to use loaned works from established collectors and collections, including that of Gustav and Elly Kahnweiler. The Kahnweilers later bequeathed their collection to the Tate Gallery, which bolstered its Cubist acquisitions. However, organisational issues had developed. The Tate Gallery Trustee artists including Henry Moore, John Piper and Graham Sutherland were disappointed by the price paid by Rothenstein for Edgar

---

<sup>235</sup> Soutine's *Le Boeuf Écorché* (1924) was a series of paintings. It is unclear which one was presented to the Tate Gallery, as no details are included in the records. See Appendix A (16 September 1948 & 21 October 1948).

<sup>236</sup> The Tate Gallery (23 June 1949) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 4 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>238</sup> Hermann, F. (1999) *The English as Collectors*, New Castle Delaware: Oak Knolle Press, pp. 409f.

<sup>239</sup> The Tate Gallery (18 August 1949) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>240</sup> See Appendix A (18 August 1949).

<sup>241</sup> See Appendix A (17 January 1952).

Degas's *The Little Dancer* [aged Fourteen] (1880–1881; cast c. 1922), which was purchased with assistance from the Art Fund.<sup>242</sup> The episode indicated a growing concern regarding Rothenstein's inability to negotiate professionally in an increasingly competitive art market.<sup>243</sup> Sutherland remained frustrated with the Director, as he had requested that a purchasing policy be implemented in 1949, and would be still requesting it four years later.<sup>244</sup>

### **The Festival of Britain**

A further issue for the Tate Gallery was that its grant-in-aid was capped during the planning period for the Festival of Britain. Attlee's Government proposed the Festival of Britain as a way to raise the morale of the war-torn nation, and to signal that Britain was modernising its practices in science, technology, industrial design, architecture and the arts. The bombed Queen's Hall in Langham Place, W1, was to be rebuilt on the same site, but instead the Royal Festival Hall was built on the blitzed South Bank site in SE1. The aim was to revitalise the area and leave a lasting cultural legacy. The young architects Leslie Martin, Peter Moro and Robert Matthew were appointed on behalf of LCC to design the modern concert space. The objective of the design was to embrace the idea of the new. However, as the Festival of Britain opened on the centenary of the Great Exhibition of 1851, as London was beginning its ascendancy as a world city, this continued a connection with the nation's historical past.<sup>245</sup> The Great Exhibition had been as much about spectacle as it was about international trade.<sup>246</sup> A century later The Royal Festival Hall also created a new spectacle.

The Royal Festival Hall was built on the River Thames, close to the London County Hall building, which was under construction from 1905, as administrative offices for the LCC. County Hall was located to the side of Westminster Bridge and diagonally opposite the Houses of Parliament. The County Hall building had given the site a new civic identity with its Edwardian Baroque façade which stood in contrast to the industrial

---

<sup>242</sup> The Tate Gallery (4 September 1952) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 4 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>243</sup> The Tate Gallery (8 October 1952) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 5 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>244</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 March 1953) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 4 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>245</sup> Ursprung, P. (ed.) (2005 [2002]) *Herzog and De Meuron Natural History*, Montréal: Lars Müller, pp. 26f.

<sup>246</sup> Stamp, G. (2001) 'The South Bank Site.' In Harwood, E. & Powers, A. (eds) *Festival of Britain*, London: The Twentieth Century Society, p. 3.

trade and storage buildings surrounding it. The Royal Festival Hall was intended to create a modern vision of Britain and of London. The objective was to open up a corridor from the south bank in the northern section of Lambeth to the rest of the city.

With public resources channelled into the Royal Festival Hall and the accompanying exhibition site this resulted in the grant-in-aid to the Tate Gallery, from 1949 to 1953, being capped at £2,000. Attlee's Labour Government was replaced by the Conservative Party led by Winston Churchill, which increased the grant-in aid substantially, from 1953 to 1954, to £6,250.<sup>247</sup> The public funding provided a significant boost because the Knapping Fund administered by the National Gallery had been the only revenue source, which yielded £1,170 per year. The increased grant-in-aid was significant, but did not increase confidence in purchasing modern foreign acquisitions. The rejections of paintings by Otto Dix and Le Corbusier caused some concern by some of the Tate Gallery Trustees who proposed that a new list of artists to be collected was drawn up.<sup>248</sup>

Priority (A) 'General Artists' included Constantin Brancusi, but the first Brancusi sculpture, *Danaïde* (1918), did not enter the collection until six years later, arriving as a gift. Priority (B) 'Inadequately Represented General Artists' listed Antoine Bourdelle, however, while one earlier Bourdelle sculpture, *Sir James George Frazer* (1922), had been acquisitioned in 1925, no further work by the artist was ever acquired. Priority (C) 'Unrepresented General Artists' included Ernesto de Fiori. Again, no work was acquired by the Italian sculptor. Priority (A) 'Foreign Artists' included Odilon Redon, whose first work to be accessioned was not until 1989.<sup>249</sup> Priority (B) 'Inadequately Represented Foreign Artists', included James Ensor. While one work was already in the collection no further work by the Belgian artist was ever acquisitioned.<sup>250</sup> Similarly, the Cuban artist, Wilfredo Lam, was also listed but was never accessioned. The last category, Priority (C) 'Unrepresented Foreign Artists', included the Belgian, Edgard Tytgat and Frenchman, Pierre Laprade, but neither artist's work was ever acquisitioned.<sup>251</sup>

---

<sup>247</sup> The Tate Gallery (1954) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>248</sup> *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting* (21 May 1953) p. 4 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>249</sup> Odilon Redon *Profile of a Woman with a Vase of Flowers* (c. 1895–1905).

<sup>250</sup> James Ensor *Le Coup de Lumière* (1935).

<sup>251</sup> See Appendix A (17 September 1953).

What the Tate Gallery Trustees created was not a purchasing policy but, in fact, another list which was not adhered to. Furthermore, following the effort to improve the modern foreign collection, a major, internal conflict emerged concerning the management of the organisation. ‘The Tate Affair’ spanned the years 1952 to 1954, and revolved around a disagreement between Rothenstein and Le Roux Smith Le Roux, the Tate Gallery’s Assistant Keeper. Smith Le Roux leaked accusations to the press that Rothenstein had misappropriated funds, purchased pictures at inflated prices and maltreated staff. Sutherland and Cooper also aired concerns about the misuse of funds when an allegation was made that Mrs A. H. Benson’s Deed of Bond had been used to finance the development of the Publications Department. The funds were returned for the original purpose to purchase art works.<sup>252</sup>

The outcome of the conflict was that Sutherland resigned, but Cooper and Smith Le Roux remained critical of Rothenstein’s support of British art to the detriment of potential modern foreign acquisitions, and began a campaign to have him dismissed. Smith Le Roux resigned following a Treasury investigation which vindicated Rothenstein. As a civil servant Rothenstein was not allowed to respond to the claims made. The situation, however, escalated again when Rothenstein attended a private view of a Sergei Diaghilev exhibition at Forbes House. Cooper was also in attendance. He began to taunt Rothenstein, which resulted in Rothenstein punching Cooper, which was reported in the press. Rothenstein continued in his public role as the Director, but the event did not reflect well on the professionalism of the Tate Gallery.

### **The National Gallery and Tate Gallery Act**

The National Gallery and Tate Gallery Act was passed in 1954. This resulted in the Tate Gallery becoming independent of the National Gallery, with its own body of elected Trustees. The provisions decreed that the Tate Gallery Trustees should consist of a maximum of ten members, including four practising artists for a term of seven years, with representation of National Gallery Trustees on the Board, and with any retiring Trustees being ineligible for immediate reappointment.<sup>253</sup> The Act apportioned responsibility to

---

<sup>252</sup> The Tate Gallery (1955) *The Tate Gallery Report 1955*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 28.

<sup>253</sup> The Tate Gallery (1955) ‘Treasury Minute 5 February 1955’. In *The Tate Gallery Handbook*, Note 2.

the Tate Gallery Trustees for administration, acquisitions and funding.<sup>254</sup> The Tate Gallery was appointed as a 'non-departmental institution', whose business was conducted by an independent body of Trustees appointed by the Prime Minister. The Officials of the Treasury were available for consultation on all matters of civil service procedure and finance.<sup>255</sup> The instruction indicated the level at which the government continued to be involved in the Tate Gallery's affairs.

Despite the government involvement the result was that the Tate Gallery gained independence from the National Gallery and it was further agreed to consult each other only regarding potential purchases which would be made as part of a common policy, but that joint purchases were not an option.<sup>256</sup> The Tate Gallery was, however, in a weaker state concerning its modern foreign collection after the settlement, because the Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings, which had formed the strongest part of the modern foreign collection, were moved to the National Gallery. The National Gallery became responsible for modern paintings up to 1900, which robbed the Tate Gallery of a number of its most valuable assets, including the Hugh Lane Bequest and ones bought from the Courtauld Fund. The Tate Gallery otherwise benefitted in receiving British art works from the National Gallery, by artists born before 1750.

A positive marker of the Tate's Gallery new-found independence was witnessed internationally, when it decided to curate its own contemporary British art display at the Venice Biennale in 1954. The Venice Biennale became the international centre for contemporary art after the war. Politics continued to underscore the proceedings as governments were keen to forge better diplomatic relations during the continuing reconstruction of Europe.<sup>257</sup> The Tate Gallery exhibited works by its own modern British and Irish artists, including Francis Bacon, Lucien Freud and Ben Nicholson. However, as

---

<sup>254</sup> The Knapping Fund income was divided, with two-thirds awarded to the Tate Gallery, two-ninths going to the National Galleries of Scotland, and one-ninth going to the National Museum of Wales. The Cleve Fund was designated for the purchase of art works by British artists.

<sup>255</sup> The Tate Gallery (1955) *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>256</sup> The Tate Gallery (21 November 1957) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 3 (Archive TG 1/3).

<sup>257</sup> Garlake, M. (1998) *New Art New World: British Art in Postwar Society*, The Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, p. 17.



with other European competitors, the Tate Gallery was unable to compete with the MoMA display, which benefitted by being funded by Nelson Rockefeller.<sup>258</sup>

The USA, as well as the European marquees, exhibited a diverse range of contemporary art made by their own artists. The Tate Gallery was lacking in representation of its own emerging artists which included the Independent Group which part of a new wave of British art. The Independent Group was a collection of artists and arts-related individuals who clustered around the ICA, where they had their first meeting in 1952. The original members of the Independent Group consisted of the artists Richard Hamilton and Eduardo Paolozzi, the critic Lawrence Alloway, and the architectural historian, Peter Reyner Banham. Modern themes were incorporated into their work, which connected with the impact of contemporary technology and popular media.

The outcome was the photographic exhibition 'Parallel of Life and Art, which was staged at the ICA in 1953. The title marked the rejection of formal art theory and practice.<sup>259</sup> The next meeting of the Independent Group, in 1954, saw new members join, including the architects Alison and Peter Smithson. The Independent Group staged a further exhibition 'This is Tomorrow', which was held at the Whitechapel Gallery in August 1956. The Whitechapel Gallery and the ICA, as modern London arts venues, were representing cutting-edge, contemporary art in place of the Tate Gallery. Bryan Robertson was the visionary Director of the Whitechapel Gallery from 1952 to 1968, and was responsible for curating these programmes.

A progressive force, Robertson transformed the gallery from a Victorian philanthropic educational resource for an East End community into a leading centre for contemporary art. Robertson's tenure culminated with the promotion of the 'New Generation' exhibition, which represented uncompromisingly abstract paintings and coloured sculptures in steel and fibreglass. A number of the sculptures were owned by Lord McAlpine, who later donated them to the Tate Gallery. The modern temporary exhibitions at the Whitechapel Gallery were made possible by corporate benefaction;

---

<sup>258</sup> Grenfell, M. & Hardy, C. (2007) *Art Rules: Pierre Bourdieu and the Visual Arts*, Oxford & New York: Berg, p. 103.

<sup>259</sup> Compton, S. (ed.) (1987) *British Art in the Twentieth Century*, Royal Academy of Arts, London: Prestel, p. 26.



notably through the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation which Robertson pioneered.<sup>260</sup> At the same point, different funding streams were being pursued at the Tate Gallery.

### **The State and the Arts**

The Friends of the Tate Gallery was established in 1956, and became operational in 1958, to create self-generating revenue it was born out of necessity, as the organisation was subjected to precarious state funding arrangements. This culminated in the Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer, Derick Heathcoat Amory, informing the Trustees that there was a need to curb spending owing to the costly Suez Crisis.<sup>261</sup> The Suez Crisis changed that vision when the US President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, vetoed the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt. Britain lost its dominant position in international affairs. The Suez Canal trade route no longer provided raw goods to Britain including oil, which had the potential of generating considerable revenue. Public spending was cut and the crisis impacted on grant-in-aid to museums and galleries.

Lord Bridges, Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission reacted to the situation by outlining the case for a separate government department to oversee arts funding. The role of the Treasury being responsible for grant-in-aid to arts organisations was questioned by Bridges: 'Are we content to continue the arrangement whereby nearly all the art organisations look to the Chancellor of the Exchequer as their responsible Minister?'<sup>262</sup> While the Government did not respond, the Tate Gallery Trustees were concerned by the political instability and met to establish a Special Purchasing Policy Sub-Committee in 1959. The Committee drew up lists of contemporary artists and sculptors to be acquired.

List A was for modern foreign art works that were to be sought. List B was for considering modern foreign art works by living artists. List C was for modern foreign art works that were for the collection's future development, and were to be 'watched out for'.<sup>263</sup> List D was titled 'senior', meaning older modern artist's works to be collected. While lists were drawn up, a purchasing policy was not established and examples of foreign modern art continued to be acquired randomly, including Lucio Fontana's

---

<sup>260</sup> Garlake, M. (1998) *Op. cit.*, pp. 14f.

<sup>261</sup> The Tate Gallery (20 February 1958) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>262</sup> The Right Hon. Lord Bridges (3 June 1958) 'The State and the Arts', The Romanes Lecture, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 5 & 18.

<sup>263</sup> See Appendix A (11 February 1959).

*Concetto spaziale* (1958). Other modern works representing Surrealism and Modernism were declined.<sup>264</sup> However, a major Abstract Expressionist acquisition entered the collection as a private donation when Jackson Pollock's *Number 23* (1948) was presented in 1960 by the Friends of the Tate Gallery, who purchased it out of funds provided by the USA food magnates, Mr and Mrs H. J. Heinz II, and H. J. Heinz Co. Ltd.

### **The Modern Museum of Art as Spectacle**

During this period, New York triumphed as the epicentre of modernism, following the opening of the Guggenheim Museum in 1959. This was during Dwight D. Eisenhower's Republican administration, which authorised the massive Interstate Highway System in 1956 and launched the Space Race in 1957. The Frank Lloyd Wright-designed building reflected the Cold War rhetoric of the supremacy of a nation that, along with the Soviet Union, emerged after World War II as a world superpower.<sup>265</sup> The USA was producing over half the manufactured goods in the international market. The wealth of families such as the Guggenheims and Rockefellers increased rapidly. Individual members chose to invest their money in the art market and patronage, and their benefaction extended beyond the USA. Peggy Guggenheim had been one of a number of American donors who offered her financial support outside the US. The international aspect of the benefaction added to the personal prestige of the donor.

Benefactors such as Peggy Guggenheim's uncle made their benefactions to the city where they had made their money which, in his case, was New York. Solomon R. Guggenheim's museum proposed a distinctly modern building on the New York skyline, and alerted spectators to new ways of experiencing modern art. The contemporary design, featuring an entry atrium, provided central orientation and access. Once through the ticketing and information areas the visitor was taken up the escalator straight to the top of the building. The alternative was to walk up the open curved stairwell. The modern architectural design, however, created viewing problems. The curved walls did not lend themselves to the display of large works and, coupled with the beam of daylight radiating down into the foyer, created difficult viewing conditions. At the cost of exhibiting the art,

---

<sup>264</sup> See Appendix A (19 February, 16 April and 17 December 1959).

<sup>265</sup> McClellan, A. (2008) *Op. cit.*, pp. 40f.

the architectural design of the Guggenheim became the main attraction. The cream-coloured exterior with its nautilus-layered shell stood out like a beacon on Fifth Avenue.

Consequently, the Guggenheim building became the more widely recognisable museum of modern art in New York, rather than MoMA, even though the latter housed a world-class art collection. Both buildings have been extended subsequently by internationally acclaimed architects, reflecting the continuing growth in public interest. The Guggenheim established a precedent in spectacular museum architecture, which began to play an increasing international role after the post-war period, as a declaration of national legitimacy.<sup>266</sup> The spectacular modern architectural design became representative of a dominant mode of production and power relations in the West.<sup>267</sup> While the spectacle of the modern art museum came to the fore in the USA, England, as represented by the Tate Gallery, was still coming to terms with the spectacle of foreign modernism. One of the most iconic modern works to enter the Tate Gallery Collection was Henri Matisse's *The Snail* (1953), which could have functioned emblematically for the Tate Gallery Trustees' implementation of a purchasing policy, since the ongoing issue of public funding remained in the balance.

The Conservative Party's *Government and the Arts* (1962) assessed the mechanism of funding. It criticised the ACGB for not alleviating the complex situation which had arisen between public and private funding initiatives, and outlined the need to develop a better working model.<sup>268</sup> Confidence waned, as illustrated when the Chairman, Sir Colin Anderson, stated that the Tate Gallery was poorly treated by the new Conservative Government because of the funding restraints from the Treasury.<sup>269</sup> Anderson did not identify that the Tate Gallery had been complicit in creating governance which had not speculated for the future. The Tate Gallery petitioned the Government to increase funding. The Conservative Treasury Minister, Sir Ronald Harris, responded that public funding was being considered for important purchases.<sup>270</sup>

---

<sup>266</sup> Greub, S. and Greub, T. (2008 [2006]) *Museums in the 21st Century*, Munich, Berlin, London and New York: Prestel, p. 9.

<sup>267</sup> Debord, G. (2008 [1967]) trans. by Donald Nicholson-Smith, *The Society of the Spectacle*, New York: Zone Books, p. 13.

<sup>268</sup> The Conservative Political Centre (1962) *Government and the Arts*, London: The Conservative Political Centre, p. 5.

<sup>269</sup> The Tate Gallery (21 November 1963) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, pp. 2f (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>270</sup> The Tate Gallery (16 January 1964) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3).

While the Tate Gallery waited it deliberated over the question of a purchasing policy. The issue of acquisitions was discussed and the names of underrepresented artists in the Collection included Paul Klee, Max Beckmann and Joan Miró. However, no action was taken to acquire works by them.<sup>271</sup> At this point Rothenstein announced his retirement as Director, as he did Georges Braque's *Port Miou* was offered by the Galerie Beyeler, Basel, but was declined, even though the artist had been identified as a Priority A plus artist to purchase. What this demonstrated was the Tate Gallery was not observing its 'Special Artists lists'; and it illustrated the continuing resistance to developing a representative modern foreign collection.<sup>272</sup> Evidently, little had changed during Rothenstein's tenure as Director. This was not only due to Rothenstein: he had come to an organisation whose institutionalised resistance to change was firmly entrenched before his arrival. The inability to adapt to new ways of thinking, however, by him and his predecessor Manson, left an organisation set in aspic. As Rothenstein stepped down, an opportunity opened up to allow new ways of imagining the Tate Gallery.

---

<sup>271</sup> The Tate Gallery (20 February 1964) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>272</sup> See Appendix A (May 1964).

### Chapter 3. Towards Tate Modern

This chapter discusses the question, how did modernity impact on the Labour Government and change the political vision of culture? The main outcome was that the Tate Gallery was propelled into a new set of debates concerning its public role, as mixed-models of funding became a necessity. The chapter assesses the changing political landscape and its impact on the Tate Gallery, and focuses sequentially on the question, how had culture become a government concern and ascended onto the urban agenda?

The first indication that the political climate had changed began after the General Election in 1959. Under Hugh Gaitskell, the Labour Party lost the General Election. The Labour Party failed to recognise that the post-war electorate had changed.<sup>273</sup> As claimed by Steven Fielding: ‘The new working class on the eve of the election was richer than ever before’.<sup>274</sup> The Labour Manifesto *Britain Belongs to You: The Labour Party’s Policy for Consideration by the British People* (1959), however, focused on the economic inequality of the working class. The Labour Party reformed under their new leader Harold Wilson, in February 1963. Wilson recognised that both the Labour Party and Britain needed to modernise. The Labour Manifesto *Let’s go with Labour for the New Britain* (1964), underlined that Britain was no longer at the heart of an empire, and that it was necessary to let go of old-world ideas.<sup>275</sup>

Modernisation was at the heart of Wilson’s new administration. Pre-election, however, introducing a new arts initiative was not deemed a vote-winner by the Labour Party. *Let’s go with Labour for the New Britain* under ‘Leisure Services’ allocated only one sentence to Labour’s cultural agenda, stating that it would support the arts.<sup>276</sup> The Manifesto did not indicate the level of maintenance that the Labour Party would provide to the arts if it won the election. Positioned after ‘Planning the New Britain’ and before ‘A New Role for Britain’ it appeared as if the cultural imperative had been concealed within the document. The position changed when the Labour Party was voted into government office. Wilson created the first Ministry of Arts, with Jennie Lee appointed

---

<sup>273</sup> Fielding, S. (2003) *Op. cit.*, p. 61.

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>275</sup> The Labour Party (1964) *Let’s go with Labour for the New Britain*, Labour Party Manifesto, London: Labour Party, p. 3.

<sup>276</sup> *Ibid.*

as its Minister. Lee had been in the public eye since the death of her husband Nye Bevan, the Deputy Leader of the Labour Party, in 1960. Lee was not an arts specialist and appointing an amateur as head of the new Ministry of Arts was in ‘sharp contrast with the professional orientation of André Malraux’, the French Minister of Cultural Affairs from 1959–1969. Malraux was a published writer and an established senior politician.<sup>277</sup> Lee did not have Malraux’s credentials and her sole commendation was that she was a passionate supporter of the arts. Despite Lee’s lack of experience, she recognised the urgent need to create a framework for cultural policy.

The first issue concerning the new Ministry of the Arts was where to put it. Initially, it was situated within the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works, which was created in 1962, which replaced the Ministry of Works created in 1943 to requisition property for wartime use. The Arts Minister was appointed as the Parliamentary Secretary at the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works from 1964 to 1965, which indicated that the role was perceived as to be aligned to an urban agenda. The Ministry of Arts was then transferred to the Department of Education and Science from 1965 to 1967, with Lee’s role redefined as Under-Secretary.<sup>278</sup> The reason for the transfer was that the Government decided that the Ministry of Arts should fulfil an educational function. Despite the creation of the Ministry of the Arts, the Treasury continued to retain direct responsibility for funding through grant-in-aid to many national museums and galleries, including the Tate Gallery. Otherwise, the Science Museum and the V&A were funded from the Arts, Intelligence and External Relations Branch of the Department of Education and Science. Other museums continued to be financed through the ACGB, which was overseen by the Department of Education and Science. What this indicated was the Labour Government’s desire to position the arts on the wider political agenda.

### **New Government, New Tate Gallery**

Shortly after the Labour Government had been voted into office, Norman Reid took up his post as Director of the Tate Gallery, in October 1964. London-born Reid had attended Edinburgh College of Art and the University of Edinburgh. During the war, he served as

---

<sup>277</sup> Harris, J. S. (1970) *Op. cit.*, p. 63.

<sup>278</sup> The National Archives (2008) *Research Guide*, Online version: The Arts, Broadcasting and Film, p. 1.

a Major with the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders. After leaving the army in 1946, Reid joined the Tate Gallery staff. Reid became Deputy Director in 1954, and was appointed Keeper in 1959. Reid developed a good professional relationship with the businessman Sir Colin Anderson, who had been appointed as the Chairman of the Trustees in 1960 and remained in the position until he resigned in 1967. Aware of the issues concerning the organisation and the modern foreign art collection, the response from Reid with Anderson's support was to modernise the Tate Gallery and its practices.

Reid drew on Anderson's expertise in decision-making, which was different from previous directors, whose style of management had been more autocratic. Anderson was, like Reid, keen to develop the organisation and introduced a commercial edge to the Tate's Gallery's governance. Both men steered the Tate Gallery onto a more secure financial basis, which was aided by generous Labour Government grants. The Tate Gallery's resources were strengthened with the increased annual grant-in-aid of £60,000 for 1964 to 1965.<sup>279</sup> The Government was aware of the state of the Tate Gallery's collection, and Lee orchestrated a funding initiative which awarded a special grant-in-aid of £50,000 for the following five years, to repair the gaps created in the modern foreign collection for the period 1900 to 1950.<sup>280</sup> Despite the Government's financial support, works by Pablo Picasso, Henri Matisse and Georges Braque had increased substantially in value, and were beyond the Tate Gallery's financial resources.

While modern foreign art works were acquired, the entrenched anti-modern position taken by the Tate Gallery Trustees continued, as works by Piet Mondrian and Francis Bacon were declined. Certain Trustees were notable in their opposition. Barbara Hepworth was the first woman Trustee appointed to the Tate Gallery Board in 1965, which was at the same time as the appointment of the Trustee, Herbert Read. Hepworth and Read had been proponents of modernism in their own fields. Hepworth's work as a sculptor demonstrated her own form of modernism in her departure from formal modes of representation. Read had also supported the role of modern foreign art in England, and

---

<sup>279</sup> The Tate Gallery (1966) *The Tate Gallery Report 1965–1966* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, p. vi.

<sup>280</sup> The Tate Gallery (1964) *The Tate Gallery Report 1963–1964*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, p. 1. The balance carried over was £1,168 5s 5d, and the amount from the Knapping Fund was £1,670 3s 5d.

of English artists engaging with it. Regardless of their credentials, they both attempted to block Roy Lichtenstein's *Whaam!* (1963) from entering the collection.

What the event reflected was that the culture of the Tate Gallery was so entrenched against developing new kinds of modern foreign art that some Trustees continued to take this position. Modernisation of the Tate Gallery's governance was gradual, unlike the Government which saw much more rapid changes being implemented. Modernisation remained at the root of the Labour Party's agenda when the role of the arts was redefined in *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps* (1965). The Ministry of Arts White Paper stated: 'if a high level of artistic achievement is to be sustained and the best in the arts made more widely available, more generous and discriminating help is urgently needed locally, regionally and nationally'.<sup>281</sup> What this meant was that the Government was prepared to support the arts financially, and felt legitimised in criticising arts organisations that it deemed old-fashioned and exclusive: 'Museums, art galleries and concert halls that have failed to move with the times, retaining a cheerless unwelcoming air that alienates all but the specialist and the dedicated' were rebuked.<sup>282</sup> The arts had to become accountable to the government purse by widening access.

*A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps* discussed 'Housing the Arts', which proposed redeveloping historic buildings for cultural use.<sup>283</sup> The Round House in Chalk Farm, which had been a railway shed and was converted into a new cultural venue, was commended for its re-adaptive use. The overall assessment was that there remained, however, a lack of good arts buildings because of the devastation of World War II and the fact that the following governments had prioritised building housing and factories. The Arts Minister added that the problem was that the younger post-war generation had no access to the arts and that: 'People who had never known what they were missing did not press for galleries, theatres and concert halls. Certain sections of the press, by constantly sniping at cultural expenditure, made philistinism appear patriotic'.<sup>284</sup> Undeterred by the negative press, Lee recognised that the arts were seen as a contentious issue concerning funding as they were perceived as non-essential and the preserve of the

---

<sup>281</sup> Her Majesty's Government (1965) *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>282</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>283</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>284</sup> Her Majesty's Government (1965) *Op. cit.*, p. 12.



elite and that this view had to be changed.<sup>285</sup> *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps*, provided a defining moment in government thinking as it signposted that the arts had much wider and social implications than had been previously understood.

The White Paper did not indicate the extent to which the Labour Government would intervene in demanding greater accountability for public funding.<sup>286</sup> Furthermore, while arts audiences did grow there was no indication as to whether people from poorer educational backgrounds were part of the increasing audience figures, or if regular visitors were attending with greater frequency.<sup>287</sup> The White Paper provided a new vision of culture and echoed similar directives to Labour's urban programme. The Labour Manifesto earlier stated that it wished to modernise the nation through a programme of urban renewal. What was created was a new vision for Britain, which saw the building of modern residential developments, public buildings and arts centres. The urban renewal programme also oversaw the major demolition and reconstruction of parts of towns and cities. 'Building the New Britain' was later criticised for the wide-scale and unnecessary demolition of older buildings which, in many cases, were replaced by poorly designed, concrete structures. Unwittingly, what the Labour Government had begun to create was an uninspiring and drab public realm.

Another immediate issue was that, after two years in office, Wilson was forced to hold another election as his Government had an unworkably small majority of only four MPs. The Labour Manifesto *Time for Decision* (1966) again focused on modernisation and also more explicitly discussed the arts and stated that there would be improved social benefits which included better access to the cultural sector. The paper outlined that: 'Access for all to the best of Britain's cultural heritage is a wider part of our educational and social purpose [...]'.<sup>288</sup> The Manifesto provided the verification for the Labour Party that culture was a government concern and, as such, was to be funded through the mechanism of the State. However, the Labour Government was not about solely funding everything through the State, and actively sought a mixed model economy with the private sector making some contributions. This was, however, to be undertaken within

---

<sup>285</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>286</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>287</sup> Munza, M. (ed.) (2006) *Culture Vultures*, London: Policy Exchange, p. 114.

<sup>288</sup> The Labour Party (1966) *Time for Decision: Labour Party Election Manifesto 1966*, London: The Labour Party, p. 3.

the framework of the (nationalised) state. Consequently, alternative methods of funding were sought from the corporate and industrial sector as potential patrons.

### **Patron: Industry Supports the Arts**

Lee and Reid collaborated on *Patron: Industry Supports the Arts* (1966), which assessed international models of corporate patronage as a possible template to consider. They included how, in the USA, the International Business Machines (IBM) Corporation had funded buildings using internationally acclaimed architects. IBM also sponsored independent art exhibitions. IBM was in the process of revising the scope of its patronage as it had not evaluated the level of its success in reflecting the aims of the organisation. European examples included a study of a group of West German industrialists who decided to contribute to the reconstruction of city projects. The issue was that many more German industrialists opted out of providing any contributions.

Sweden provided a case study of a post-war country which had become increasingly urbanised. Swedish private patronage declined owing to increased taxation. Consequently, it became the responsibility of the State to fund arts projects, which it was reluctant to continue. Concerning the British model, Lee proposed that the Government intended to make the arts a 'higher priority than in the past', but with the aid of private sector support.<sup>289</sup> Reid added that there would be additional benefits for independent benefactors in that the cultural prestige of the event or object would enhance the prestige of the donor by attracting a more targeted demographic. Reid concurred that cultural events bearing the donor's name would also act as 'a permanent reminder of public spirited acts long after costly publicity activities have been forgotten'.<sup>290</sup>

The Labour Government's intention to stimulate alternative funding streams was further demonstrated at the Royal Academy of Arts banquet in 1967. Wilson announced that the Government would donate £200,000 to the Tate Gallery, towards a building to display the sculpture of Henry Moore. The offer was on the conditional basis that the Tate Gallery would raise equivalent funds from the private sector. Wilson's challenge pre-empted Thatcher's partnership model; for public money to be matched with private

---

<sup>289</sup> Lee, J. (1966) 'Preface.' In Osborne, A. (ed.) *Patron, Industry Supports the Arts*, London: The Connoisseur, p. 5.

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

sector finance. Anthony Lousada, the Chairman of the Tate Gallery Trustees, accepted the offer, but it was never realised because Moore's former assistant Anthony Caro sent a letter to *The Times* (26 May 1967) objecting to a new building on the basis that it would house works exclusively by one artist. While the Henry Moore rooms were never built, the idea of financing an extension for modern art, albeit a British one, was planted.

The year of Wilson's offer, the ACGB was granted a new charter with the aim of improving knowledge and increasing accessibility to the public. The charter outlined that the ACGB was to advise and cooperate with government departments, local authorities and related bodies. The charter advocated the development of new arts institutions, which saw the South Bank site surrounding the Royal Festival Hall continuing to be developed. The stretch of northern Lambeth along the River Thames had, from the eighteenth century, developed into a housing and industrial site for manual workers and was a maze of streets. Access to the site was improved by the construction of Westminster Bridge in 1750, and Blackfriars Bridge in 1769. Westminster Bridge was rebuilt in 1862, to accommodate the growing traffic. Owing to the area's function and proximity to Parliament it became a target for wartime bombing and was damaged during the 1940s' Blitz, leaving much of it derelict.

Under the ACGB directive, the South Bank site was selected for redevelopment into a cultural hub. The National Film Theatre (now the British Film Institute) was constructed from 1956 to 1958.<sup>291</sup> It was later followed by the Hayward Gallery, the Queen Elizabeth Hall and the Purcell Room which were completed in 1968.<sup>292</sup> The South Bank development reverberated with government vision for the revitalisation of declining inner urban areas and with *A Policy for the Arts*, which directed that, if it was not possible for historic buildings to be reused for the arts, then new buildings would have to be constructed.<sup>293</sup> During the developmental phase of South Bank, Wilson was forced to devalue sterling in November 1967.

Alexander Douglas-Home's earlier Conservative Government's fiscal policy resulted in a large deficit on the balance of trade, which impacted on the incoming

---

<sup>291</sup> Cherry, B. & Pevsner, N. (2002) *London 2: South*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, p. 349

<sup>292</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 350. The National Theatre was designed independently by Denys Lasdun and opened in 1976.

<sup>293</sup> Vickery, J. (2007) *The Emergence of Culture-Led Regeneration: A Policy Concept and its Discontents*, University of Warwick: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, Warwick: University of Warwick, p. 28.

Labour administration. What also affected the shortfall was Wilson's public spending in response to devaluing the pound, Wilson reshuffled his cabinet and Lee was promoted to Minister of State at the Department of Education and Science. Despite public funding being reduced, Lee maintained substantial grants on behalf of the Tate Gallery. Additionally, further external aid came when notable examples of Surrealism and Futurism were acquired, including Salvador Dali's *Forgotten Horizon* (1936) bequeathed by the Hon. Mrs A. E. Pleydell-Bouverie, and Gino Severini's *Suburban Train arriving in Paris* (1915) purchased with assistance from the AF.

### ***Neue Nationalgalerie, Berlin***

While the Tate Gallery was starting to embrace modernism, the concept was more fully taking effect further afield in central Europe. The *Neue Nationalgalerie* in Berlin opened in 1968 on the bomb-damaged site of the Tiergarten, which was developed into a Kulturforum. The creation of a new cultural centre was the result of the City of Berlin's government's directive.<sup>294</sup> The original *Nationalgalerie*, situated on the eastern section of the city, had come under Soviet jurisdiction when the Berlin Wall was built, making it inaccessible to the West.<sup>295</sup> A new national gallery was proposed to replace it which was to be built in the western section of the city. The chosen site, Kemperplatz, between Potsdamer Strasse and the Tiergarten area, had been at the hub of Berlin life before being reduced to wasteland by wartime bombing.

The architectural programme for the *Neue Nationalgalerie* began in 1962, when Ludwig Mies van der Rohe was appointed to design the building. The City of Berlin's Council directed that: 'an urban museum rather than a suburban villa' was to be created which was to be open plan and flexible.<sup>296</sup> A new kind of museum building was needed to reflect a modern vision of Berlin. The *Neue Nationalgalerie* became the first of the buildings to be constructed on the Tiergarten site. The *Neue Nationalgalerie* was part of a wider cultural renewal programme conceived as a Federal Government of the Republic's initiative during the Presidency of Heinrich Lübke, leader of the Christian Democratic

---

<sup>294</sup> Marz, R. & Schneider, A. (eds) (1997) *Neue Nationalgalerie Berlin*, Munich & New York: Prestel, p. 4.

<sup>295</sup> The *Nationalgalerie's* collection had earlier suffered from the 1940s' air raid attacks and as part of the Nazi Campaign, when much of the modern art was deemed as degenerate and was removed.

<sup>296</sup> McClellan, A. (2008) *Op. cit.*, p. 82.

Union. While the modernist design of the *Neue Nationalgalerie* within a tinted glass curtain wall envelope proposed a new kind of museum for a new Germany it was not without its problems. The ground-floor transparent walling overpowered the art works, as natural light streamed in and created difficult viewing conditions. William Rubin, Barr's successor at MoMA, at the inaugural exhibition quipped scathingly that the building's functional design made the Mondrian art works look like 'linoleum samples'.<sup>297</sup>

The *Neue Nationalgalerie*'s viewing problems were addressed when the ground floor gallery was converted into an entrance hall and the basement was reappointed as the main exhibition area. The ground floor has since been reinstated as a gallery space by introducing false walls. The building also became more famous for its architect than for its art twentieth-century art collection and nineteenth-century art collection from the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation and is popularly known as the 'Mies van der Rohe Pavilion' indicating the reverence to the architect. The dialogue between the museum and the city was also paramount, as the *Neue Nationalgalerie* established itself as a modern landmark in a city which needed to redefine its identity. Despite its modernity, the *Neue Nationalgalerie*, similar to the Guggenheim and MoMA, was conceived as a traditional museum, housing one cultural form in the same building.<sup>298</sup>

A different model developed in Paris: while the *Neue Nationalgalerie* opened in 1968, riots by students and workers erupted in Paris. The riots had a major impact on the future President Pompidou, who in response proposed a new vision for the French nation. As will be discussed, a consequence would see the creation of the *Centre Pompidou*, a major new style, multi-department cultural organisation which would provide space for *La Musée National d'Art Moderne* Collection. Earlier in London, the Hayward Gallery had already opened as a temporary exhibition space for modern art, which shifted the focus away from the Whitechapel Gallery as a centre for contemporary art exhibitions. The Hayward Gallery also replaced the Tate Gallery for hosting ACGB exhibitions, and became responsible for the ACGB collection.

Consequently, Reid was able to focus on developing the permanent collection, and concentrated on securing gifts from private collectors and artists. Reid visited Peggy

---

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>298</sup> Russell, J. S. (1999) 'Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, New National Gallery Berlin, 1962–8'. In Russell, J. S. (ed.) *Twentieth-Century Museums I*, London: Phaidon, unpaginated.

Guggenheim in Venice. After the Venice Biennale in 1948, Peggy Guggenheim had purchased the Palazzo Venier dei Leoni on the Grand Canal and had transferred her collection to her new residence. The Peggy Guggenheim holding had become one of the most important collections of early twentieth-century American and European art in Italy. Guggenheim claimed she was dissatisfied with the municipality of Venice, that there was no point in establishing a second Guggenheim Foundation in New York, and intimated that London might be the recipient of her collection.<sup>299</sup>

Unbeknown to Reid, a Peggy Guggenheim Foundation was already being formed by a group of Trustees.<sup>300</sup> What the failed Guggenheim initiative demonstrated was that the Director was actively canvassing to develop the Tate Gallery's modern foreign collection. Following the Guggenheim negotiations Reid made other requests to potential donors and negotiated more successfully with the artist Mark Rothko. The outcome was that Rothko agreed to leave his series of paintings, *Black on Maroon* (1959) and *Red on Maroon* (1959) to the Tate Gallery.<sup>301</sup> The paintings had been originally produced as a commission for the Four Seasons restaurant in the Seagram Building, New York. Communications broke down and Rothko cancelled the contract. The paintings were later presented to the Tate Gallery through the American Federation of the Arts.

While the Tate Gallery secured major gifts from Naum Gabo, and from the British artists Henry Moore and Ben Nicholson, modern foreign art works continued to be rejected as paintings by Francis Picabia and Leon Kossoff, which would have provided valuable examples of Dadaism and Expressionism, were declined.<sup>302</sup> As the Tate Gallery continued to operate an arbitrary acquisitions policy, support came from the Government. Wilson offered the Tate Gallery the land site adjacent to its Millbank site, which had been occupied by Queen Alexandra's Military Hospital. The Government also granted permission for the modification of the existing building.<sup>303</sup> The scheme was financed by public funds which were originally intended for the Henry Moore extension. The funds

---

<sup>299</sup> The Tate Gallery (21 December 1961) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 3 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>300</sup> The Tate Gallery (18 July 1968) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 5 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>301</sup> The Tate Gallery (16 November 1967) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>302</sup> The Tate Gallery (21 March 1968) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3). See also Appendix A (20 June 1968).

<sup>303</sup> The Tate Gallery (1970) *The Tate Gallery Report 1968-70*, London: Tate Gallery Publications, p. 3.

had increased from £200,000 to £250,000, which were matched by private sector support from the Gulbenkian Foundation.

Despite the pound having been devalued, the Government made ample public contributions to the Tate Gallery. The grant-in-aid for 1 April 1968–31 March 1969 was £60,000. The last £50,000 of Special Grants for foreign pictures was made from 1969–1970, with a single grant-in-aid of £75,000 also provided.<sup>304</sup> The funding helped the Tate Gallery to gain a number of quality bequests. The Tate Gallery, however, continued to operate a random selection process regarding acquisitions, which included the rejection of work by the American Abstract Expressionist artist, Robert Rauschenberg.<sup>305</sup> In spite of this, Reid embarked on a programme of internal modernisation within the organisation, and created the Exhibition and Education Department in 1970. It was established to better engage visitors and to ease the pressure on the Curatorial Department by providing catalogues and managing related work.

The Exhibition and Education Department oversaw an imaginative new programme of temporary exhibitions, which displayed works by modern British artists, increasing Richard Hamilton. The following year, an Andy Warhol exhibition played ‘to packed houses’.<sup>306</sup> The educational section of the department was to provide scheduled programming of related events. As its workload increased it became a separate department from exhibitions. Media and other methods were also introduced to attract audiences from a broad educational base. The work of the Education Department was aided by the creation of a twentieth-century British art archive, funded by the Charitable Fund of Robert and Lisa Sainsbury.<sup>307</sup> Reid also stipulated that the educational specialist events had to become more accessible rather than being geared to the traditional visitor.

Students from The Open University (OU) were also targeted. (The OU had been established by Lee to widen access for non-traditional students to university education). An in-house arts education programme and training scheme for staff was also established. Additionally, the Tate Gallery’s Conservation Department opened, replacing the Restoration Department, which admitted postgraduate students onto a four-year training

---

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>305</sup> See Appendix A (15 May 1969).

<sup>306</sup> Maurice Leitch (April 1971) ‘Warhol at the Tate’. In *Forthnight*, No. 14, p. 21.

<sup>307</sup> The Tate Gallery (1970) *The Tate Gallery Report 1968–1970*, London: Tate Gallery Publications, p. 53.



programme. A series of lectures and talks for privately arranged parties was organised, with a public lecture programme for schools and college groups.<sup>308</sup> A Schools' Service was established with the aim to understand the needs of the children. Their teachers were provided with a questionnaire, to identify the size of class visiting, the children's ages and their interests.

Separate premises were rented in Chenies Street Art Gallery, where objects from the Alistair MacAlpine gift were exhibited to primary school children. The unconventional materials of steel, fibreglass, aluminium, perspex, glass and use of bright colours were intended to better engage the children. The workshops led to 'Kidsplay', where children were presented with disposable art works, so that they could interact with them rather than the actual art works. The role of the Education Department was an important development because it initiated the public interface between the Tate Gallery and its younger audiences. The Tate Gallery was actively shifting towards a more accessible, as well as publically accountable, institution.

The Tate Gallery was beginning to respond to government changes and this was an especially important time as the incoming Conservative Government demanded greater accountability for public funds when Labour lost the General Election in 1970. The Conservative Party headed by Edward Heath changed certain government offices to include the Ministry of the Arts, which was replaced by the Office of the Arts and Libraries. Under the new Arts Minister, Viscount David Eccles, his office published: *A Policy for the Arts* (1970) which refocused the role of culture towards the economic agenda, and criticised the ACGB for its poor administration of public funds. The White Paper declared that the ACGB was in crisis and its forthcoming grant of £12.8 million was reduced to £11.84 million, for the financial year 1971 to 1972.<sup>309</sup>

The Tate Gallery, however, continued to receive its public funding directly through the Treasury's grant-in-aid system. Eccles outlined that public money was to be used to stimulate private sector investment, in order to reduce government expenditure. *A Policy for the Arts* demanded, therefore, that it was up to the individual or organisations to take responsibility for cultural initiative and not the government. In response, the Tate

---

<sup>308</sup> The Tate Gallery (1974) *The Tate Gallery Report 1972–74*, London: Tate Gallery Publications, p. 38.

<sup>309</sup> The Conservative Party (1970) *A Policy for the Arts*, London: Her Majesty's Government, p. 2.



Gallery evaluated its position concerning implementing a purchasing policy. Sir Robert Sainsbury, the Tate Gallery Chairman (and former Chairman of Sainsbury's plc.), warned against drawing up rules which, he claimed, could be restrictive for future Trustees. The decision was based on the fact that Sainsbury believed the Tate Gallery would need flexibility which may be impeded by regulations.

At this point, a further issue emerged among the Trustees. Stewart Mason demanded that more artists should be represented in the collection, whereas John Piper and Ted Power felt that major artists or art movements could, instead, be represented by a single work of quality. The Director interjected: 'that collections were often more memorable for the imbalance of their representation than for having an all-inclusive quality'.<sup>310</sup> If not an anomalous claim, it was certainly strategic, as it let the Tate Gallery off the hook for not having a broadly representative collection. Despite Reid's programme of modernisation, he displayed reticence about acquiring certain modern art acquisitions. For example, concerning Conceptual Art, he outlined the curatorial problems which might arise from the possible use and deterioration of organic materials of the art work. Although Reid had misgivings about this type of modern art, he did not use it as a reason to veto it, since examples of Conceptual, Mixed Media and Pop Art including work by Jean Dubuffet and Claes Oldenburg entered the collection in 1972.

As the Tate Gallery was endeavouring to modernise the modern foreign collection, the Government made a radical move when Heath negotiated Britain joining the European Economic Community (commonly known as the 'Common Market') in 1973. The initiative for Britain to enter the international arena secured the Conservative Government's downfall in the following General Election. The following year, the Labour Party was returned to office. The Labour Manifesto *Let us work together: Labour's Way out of the Crisis* (1974) focused on the rising and record level of unemployment under the Conservative administration. The new Labour Government's concern was that it was faced again with a large deficit and was unable to provide the same kind of funding that it had undertaken previously from 1964 to 1970.

Faced with the ongoing economic downturn, the Tate Gallery was forced into making considered decisions about by purchasing modern foreign art works. Conceptual

---

<sup>310</sup> The Tate Gallery (19 October 1972) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 4 (Archive: TG 1/3).

art again became a discussion point for Reid and the Tate Gallery Trustees. The fact that its focus was on the concept which took over precedence in place of traditional aesthetics and material concerns was challenging for the Tate Gallery's governance. As issues of curation were raised, four major conceptual pieces by Joseph Beuys were rejected.<sup>311</sup> However, this was at a point when the economy was in dire straits and speculating for the future was not an option. By the autumn, the Labour Government encountered a crisis only six months after the February election when a parliamentary majority rejected its economic policy, and it was forced to call another election.

The Labour Manifesto: *Britain will win with Labour* (October 1974) addressed inflation, unemployment and the oil crisis. The Labour Party had successfully judged the mood of the electorate, and was re-elected back into office. It also renewed its commitment to support the arts. The Minister for the Arts, Hugh Jenkins, oversaw *The Arts: A Discussion Document for the Labour Movement* (1975), which reiterated the government's belief that the arts had a social function: 'As socialists we believe that the arts have a particular importance, for they are more than material achievement and express the vitality and meaning of community'.<sup>312</sup> The Green Paper criticised the ACGB for subsidising classical music concerts and theatre performances, on the basis that these were more elite cultural forms which did not appeal to wider audiences.

The Government's aim was to create a new enlarged Ministry for Arts, Communication and Entertainment with increased responsibility for the film industry, publishing and broadcasting. The objective was that the new ministry should encompass a wider range of popular cultural forms. The Government indicated, however, it would no longer be able to sustain the same level of arts support, and a recommendation was made to move to a decentralised system of arts funding.<sup>313</sup> The report claimed that the decentralisation would help to attract new audiences which would also be better served by local planning and funding of facilities and projects. The decentralisation process proposed that sponsorship from the commercial sector should also contribute to funding arts initiatives. The Labour Government's intention to move away from providing major

---

<sup>311</sup> See Appendix A (18 July 1974). The second work, *Fat Battery* (1963) was acquisitioned later, when it was presented by the Trustee E. J. (Ted) Power through the Friends of the Tate Gallery in 1984.

<sup>312</sup> The Labour Party (1975) *The Arts: A Discussion Document for the Labour Movement*, London: The Labour Party, p. 7.

<sup>313</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

state responsibility for the arts was motivated by the economic crisis, owing to rising inflation and high unemployment. As the Labour Government became increasingly concerned about public spending, so did those in receipt of government funding.

### **‘The Bricks’**

*The Arts: A discussion document for the Labour Movement* was published the same year that Carl Andre’s sculpture *Equivalent VIII* known as ‘The Bricks’ went on display at the Tate Gallery. Early the following year, Colin Simpson, a journalist, visited the Tate Gallery. ‘The Tate drops a costly Brick’ by Simpson was published in *The Sunday Times* (15 February 1976). The article attacked the Tate Gallery for spending public money irresponsibly on an art work constructed out of bricks. The commentary ignited a major press and media storm.<sup>314</sup> The Tate Gallery became seen as an irresponsible national institution for using public funds to buy ‘rubbish’. The *Daily Mirror* headline read: ‘What a load of Rubbish’.<sup>315</sup> The *Daily Mail* headline declared: ‘Brick-a-brac Art: The Tate paid £4,000 for it, but *The Mail* proves you can do it cheaper’.<sup>316</sup>

‘The Bricks’ had been purchased for \$8,000 (approximately £3,075) in 1972 from the John Weber Gallery. The Tate Gallery Trustees agreed to purchase Carl Andre’s art work as an example of Minimalism, on the basis that it would develop the breadth of the modern foreign art collection. Despite the fact that the art work had been in the Tate Gallery’s Collection for nearly four years and had gone on display a number of times, it was *The Sunday Times* article that sparked the outrage. To alleviate the hostility, Reid suggested that ‘The Bricks’ be displayed with twelve other works in a Minimalist exhibition. The exhibition was to be accompanied by a booklet to support an article written by the Tate Gallery curator Richard Morphet in the *Burlington Magazine* (1976) which was in response to a critical editorial published earlier in the same magazine.<sup>317</sup>

Drafts of the booklet were provided for the Tate Gallery Trustees to alleviate their anxieties regarding the negative public onslaught. Concern was, however, expressed about the inclusion of cartoons, as well as hostile comments which had appeared in the

---

<sup>314</sup> Colin Simpson (15 February 1976) *The Sunday Times*, Business News Section.

<sup>315</sup> *The Daily Mirror* (16 February 1976).

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>317</sup> Morphet, R. (1976) ‘Carl Andre’s Bricks’. In *The Burlington Magazine*, CXVIII, pp. 762–767.

press.<sup>318</sup> Amassing anti-Tate Gallery material was agreed by the Trustees to have an adverse effect in provoking further antagonism and the publication was abandoned. What it demonstrated was the Tate Gallery's attempt to engage in a dialogue with its audience. 'The Bricks' marked a significant cultural turn in the Tate Gallery's history as it became the organisation's first professional engagement in public communications.

Unwillingly, the Tate Gallery was forced to engage with the press, media and the general public, who queued to see the infamous art work. This happened at the beginning of a critical economic period. James Callaghan replaced Wilson, who resigned as Prime Minister in 1976. Callaghan took over an administration which saw high unemployment, 16% inflation and a record budget deficit. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Dennis Healey, negotiated a loan with the IMF for the Labour Government. Healey asked for £2.3 billion (\$3.9 billion) to offset a run on the pound and to service debts; it was the largest amount ever asked of the IMF. The IMF finally consented to the loan with the stipulation that major public spending cuts be implemented.<sup>319</sup>

The IMF's intervention marked the turning point in Britain's economic history and heralded a global shift towards neo-liberalism, which supported 'rapacious free-trade agreements to expand Western financial and commercial interests ...'<sup>320</sup> The IMF with the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation promoted these interests by implementing heavy handed policies on their clients to meet these aims. The IMF demands saw the demise of the Labour Government as all areas of spending were affected which created hostility from the Trade Unions. The Tate Gallery Trustees were forced to consider alternative funding strategies as the position was to worsen. A very different picture emerged across the Channel in terms of arts funding.

### ***Centre National D'Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou, Paris***

*Centre National d'Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou* in Paris was opened by President Valéry Giscard D'Estaing in January 1977. The cultural initiative began in response to the student protests, sparked by grievances against the universities' and lycées'

---

<sup>318</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 February 1977) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>319</sup> Gray, C. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>320</sup> Giroux, H. A. (Winter 2005) *The Terror of Neo-Liberalism: Rethinking the Significance of Cultural Politics*, West Chester: West Chester University, Vol. 38, No. 1, p. 6.

authoritarian and archaic academic administrative practices. The dramatic vision of the rioting students, joined by workers, confronted by armed police, and highlighted by the Sorbonne student occupation, sent shock waves around France. The repercussions of the Paris riots became more powerful than the event itself, as they served as a catalyst to question society, value and order. Georges Pompidou, who was appointed as the new President in 1969, witnessed the events and proposed a modernisation programme which was realised in building projects throughout France. The Beaubourg area of the fourth *arrondissement* became the selected Paris site; formally a thriving area, which had become derelict between the two world wars.

The *Union des Démocrates pour la République's* Government hosted an international architectural competition to find a design practice to create a new multi-functional arts building in Paris. Out of approximately 700 entries, Richard Rogers, Renzo Piano and Gianfranco Franchini were appointed the competition winners. Construction began in 1972, and the building was completed in 1977. The Centre Beaubourg project was renamed *Centre Pompidou* after the President's death in 1974. *Centre Pompidou* became immediately recognisable by its modern façade, set within the surrounding nineteenth-century streets of Georges-Eugène Haussmann. A new eclectic architectural style was created, with its open glass exterior walls, external escalators and colour-coded ducts. The blue ducts were for air flow, the green for fluids, the yellow for electricity cables and the red for movement and flow. Locating the ducts and services outside of the building was designed to free up the internal space, to maximise legibility and flow, and to enable the interdisciplinary nature of the space.

The building was divided into various departments, including a library, an industrial design centre and an institute for the development and promotion of avant-garde music. The largest of the departments, the *Musée National d'Art Moderne*, had been previously located in the rooms of the Palais de Tokyo. From its inception in 1947 until 1969, the *Musée National d'Art Moderne's* collection received limited state funding. Pompidou's incoming government increased the budget for the collection. As a consequence of the state funding, ambitious purchases were made, which enlarged and strengthened the collection. In 1975, the *Musée National d'Art Moderne* was awarded its own independently managed state budget. The implications of this initiative enabled

successive Directors of the *Musée National d'Art Moderne*'s collection to focus on a targeted purchasing policy.<sup>321</sup> What developed was a world-class modern foreign art collection, presented within an imaginative new building in the heart of Paris.

### **A GLC Lottery**

There was no comparable building initiative in London or the UK to President Pompidou's urban programme. The Labour Government was unable to provide the same kind of support owing to rising inflation, and was impeded by the IMF's stipulations on public spending. Consequently, the Tate Gallery struggled as a result of the limits on its grant-in-aid, and considered other funding strategies. The Tate Gallery Trustees entertained the idea of a GLC Lottery, which would be run by Littlewoods Pools. The objective was to operate lotteries every three weeks, which were estimated at generating an annual income of £65,000. The Tate Gallery would be a beneficiary, which involved situating a lottery booth inside the building, but some of the Tate Gallery Trustees were concerned that this might impinge on the aesthetics of the art works.

Commerce conspicuously coming into the spaces of the Tate Gallery was therefore, unwelcome, but Peter Palumbo, a businessman who had recently joined the Board of Trustees, endorsed the proposal. Palumbo stated that the commercial potential of the Tate Gallery had to be explored.<sup>322</sup> The GLC Lottery did not go ahead, but the idea indicated a shift in thinking towards a more commercially minded organisation. The issue of a purchasing policy was also raised, with new lists of artists being proposed. Reid's own chosen artists had been born in the nineteenth century and were either elderly or dead, and so were not broadly representative of modern art.<sup>323</sup> The opportunity of also acquiring an unidentified Edward Hopper painting was proposed, with the aim of finding an American benefactor to purchase it. The painting was never bought and, to date, there is no work by Hopper in the Tate Collection.

---

<sup>321</sup> Lageira, J. (2000) *Musée National d'Art Moderne*, Paris: Scala, p. 6.

<sup>322</sup> The Tate Gallery (16 November 1978) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>323</sup> The Tate Gallery (20 April 1978) *Special Board Meeting of the Trustees of the Tate Gallery*, unpaginated (Archive: TG 1/3).

### **The Arts: the Way Forward**

While the Tate Gallery deliberated over modern foreign purchases, wider political issues were being proposed, which would impact later on the organisation. The Conservative Party discussed a new funding strategy, which included reducing the arts budget. Norman St John-Stevas, the Opposition Spokesman for Education, Science and the Arts, in the White Paper, *The Arts: The Way forward?* (1978) posed the question: Who should fund the arts? The Conservative aim was to move away from a state-reliant system of public funding, and they advocated that private patronage should be stimulated by reduced taxation to free individuals and corporations to patronise the arts, if they wished.<sup>324</sup> Company law was to be changed to enable companies to make contributions to charities, which would be deductible for corporation tax purposes. Gifts by individuals, made out of their income to charities, were also to be made tax deductible. A National Heritage Fund for the establishment of arts and historic buildings was to be established. Reforming the ACGB's objectives and funding was also proposed.

The Conservative's art's strategy was published on the eve of the 'Winter of Discontent' in 1978. The cold winter was the backdrop to widespread national strikes led by trade unions demanding that pay caps be removed, which paved the way for the Conservative Party's win at the General Election in 1979. The Conservative victory had been supported by Saatchi and Saatchi's marketing campaign. They had created the strap-line for the marketing poster — 'Labour isn't working' — which was accompanied by the image of a spiralling dole queue. As noted earlier, the provocative campaign reverberated with the new style of Conservative Government. Following the election, at the Tate Gallery things also began to change, as a purchasing policy and priority purchasing of contemporary works was proposed as a key area to collect. The Tate Gallery Trustees agreed to acquire works made within the last fifteen years, with £125,000 being reserved for the purchase of future works for the next fifteen years.<sup>325</sup> Importantly, the provision for money to be allocated to invest for the future provided the basis for a purchasing policy.

---

<sup>324</sup> The Conservative Party (1978) *The Arts: The Way forward?* London: The Conservative Political Centre, p. 6.

<sup>325</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 May 1979) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 4 (Archive: TG 1/3).



Further government changes were implemented when legislation was put in place to pass the future National Heritage Act (1980), which established guidelines for The National Heritage Memorial Fund. The aim of the National Heritage Memorial Fund was to create the framework for partnership funding for the revitalisation of historic buildings that were at risk of being destroyed. The Conservative Government did not legislate how new arts buildings, extensions or spaces should be created. The responsibility for creating new arts spaces was undertaken instead by non-government bodies, including the Tate Gallery. Following the General Election, the Queen had opened the new Llewelyn-Davies North-East Quadrant extension at the Tate Gallery. The project began in 1963, when the architect Richard Llewelyn-Davies was invited by the Minister of Public Buildings to prepare a feasibility study on extending the Tate Gallery.

Llewelyn-Davies was asked to produce two proposals to find the best approach to increase the interior by fifty per cent. New facilities were required, to include a lecture theatre and a conservation studio. A new visitor restaurant with river views was also to be created. Llewelyn-Davies submitted proposals: Project A and Project B. Project A proved the more radical and involved building across the front façade, removing the front steps and portico. The plan left the north-east corner free for a car park. The design proposed a 'featureless box on stilts' and received support from the Ministry of Public Works and the Tate Gallery Trustees.<sup>326</sup> The design was not popular with the public and provoked much debate in the press. Twenty thousand visitors came to see the plans and the model of the proposed extension, which were exhibited at the Tate Gallery in January 1969. With public opinion and GLC support overwhelmingly against Project A, it was rejected because it involved removing the building's existing classical façade with the statue of Britannia which was seen as a landmark.<sup>327</sup>

Project B proposed instead to create a north-east quadrant to the building, and was agreed as the new extension. Project B however, took over fifteen years to realise owing to issues of funding, and because the building work went over budget. Llewelyn-Davies was joined by Forestier-Walker and Bor Architects, who created the final design for the extension, which opened in 1979. The modernist design was praised by the Department

---

<sup>326</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Op. cit.*, p. 46.

<sup>327</sup> Editorial (February 1969) 'The Tate Gallery Extension.' In *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 111, No. 791, p. 59.

of the Environment for ‘providing a calm, non-assertive background at which the works are the focus of attention’.<sup>328</sup> The statement indicated the level of state involvement at the Tate Gallery since it was the Ministry of Public Buildings that originally requested the feasibility study, and the Department of the Environment that assessed the final extension. However, the following year, the Government took action to reduce the level of state intervention within the arts.

The OAL published *The Arts are your Business* (1980), which was directed at the business sector, and asked that it become more responsible to funding the arts. The White Paper proposed repositioning the level of state intervention of the arts by encouraging industry and commerce in sponsorship, in return for tax incentives.<sup>329</sup> The emphasis was that culture and commerce could be mutually beneficial. The potential sponsors were informed that through their business association with an art object or event it would add to their commercial prestige and bring further economic rewards. The Government document added that this advertising would be cheaper than a television commercial and more productive in targeting the right demographic. Reid had made the same point earlier in *Patron: Industry supports the Arts*. *The Arts are your Business* reiterated the Government’s position on funding, and announced it was introducing ‘measures to stimulate private sector support’.<sup>330</sup> It was published the year Reid retired and Alan Bowness was appointed as the fifth Director of the Tate Gallery.

Bowness was an established art historian, who had his own ideas on how to develop the Tate Gallery, and was a supporter of state funding. Bowness was keen to promote the British Collection, but was less speculative about the modern foreign collection. He proposed creating a Tate in the North for the modern foreign collection, and claimed it would have a distinct identity, adding that a new audience could be enticed by establishing an active education programme. The five largest cities in the North of England: Leeds, Manchester, Sheffield, Newcastle and Liverpool were visited by Bowness to talk with local museum workers, politicians and academics about the proposal. The idea was met with some consternation from the Tate Gallery Trustees, who

---

<sup>328</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

<sup>329</sup> Office of Arts & Libraries (1980) *The Arts are your Business*, London: OAL, unpaginated.

<sup>330</sup> Office of Arts and Libraries (1980) *The Arts are your Business*, London: Office of Arts and Libraries, unpaginated.

were concerned about moving the modern collection out of London. The Tate Gallery Trustees were also concerned about the ongoing problem of funding.

Palumbo, as one of the more commercially minded Trustees, was concerned over long-term planning owing to the Government's proposals to continue to reduce arts funding. He pointed out that the grant-in-aid was to be reduced by 5% and, with 12% inflation, amounted to a shortfall of £40,000, which would have to be found elsewhere.<sup>331</sup> Palumbo recommended that the Tate Gallery Trustees instead investigate the US model of fundraising and consider hosting commercial events, such as evening parties and concerts, and asking for voluntary admission contributions. Not all of the Trustees were keen on the commercial proposal. Rita Donagh, a Trustee artist, was concerned that if money became a priority the 'artistic and spiritual values' of the Tate Gallery might be jeopardised.<sup>332</sup> Bowness agreed and rejected Palumbo's proposal and added that the Government's grants were some of the largest in the world and that by balancing the books the Tate Gallery could manage. Unconvinced, Lord Hutchinson QC, the Tate Gallery Chairman, underlined the pressing need to undertake alternative fundraising strategies as a result of the ongoing deep cuts.

The ferocity of the art cuts were not even supported by all of the members of the Conservative Cabinet, including the Arts Ministers. Norman St John-Stevas's tenure as Minister of Arts lasted from 5 May 1979 to 4 June 1981. Thatcher dismissed him on account of being a 'Tory Wet', because of his unwillingness to make deep and expedient cuts. St John-Stevas was replaced by Paul Channon, from 5 June 1981 to 12 June 1983. Channon was followed by Earl Gowrie, from 13 June 1983 to 1 September 1985. The impact of the government cuts forced some organisations to close down and others to create their own funding strategies. Certain arts organisations chose to charge an admission fee. The V&A introduced voluntary charges in 1984, which became compulsory in 1988. The Natural History Museum, the Science Museum and the National Maritime Museum also charged compulsory entrance admissions. Otherwise, the British Museum, the National Gallery and the Tate Gallery rejected introducing charged entry and, instead, pursued other funding strategies to support the shortfall. The new strategies

---

<sup>331</sup> The Tate Gallery (16 July 1981) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 3 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>332</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

required taking a more commercial approach and, in the case of the Tate Gallery, some of there came from government directives as was the case with funding Tate Liverpool.

### **Action for Cities: The Tate Gallery Liverpool**

The Tate Gallery gained fundraising expertise when it undertook the development of the Tate Gallery Liverpool (later named 'Tate Liverpool'), as part of the Conservative urban programme. *Action for Cities* (1987), co-published by the Department of Environment and the Department of Education, discussed the urban programme and stated how the Conservative Government had become increasingly involved in urban planning. *Action for Cities* stated that change was essential for British cities to develop, and could only be realised successfully by public and private partnership.<sup>333</sup> *Action for Cities* identified that, with the decline of industry and manufacturing, a major shift of population and jobs had begun a move away from urban areas. The government response was to provide a framework for rebuilding skills, while encouraging enterprise.<sup>334</sup>

Two government initiatives were outlined; one was the Urban Development Grant, which was supported by a 75% Government Grant; the other was the Urban Regeneration Grant, which was a grant for developers for the ongoing development of the Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) which were overseen by Michael Heseltine, as Secretary of State for the Environment.<sup>335</sup> The London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC) and the Merseyside Development Corporation (MDC) were the two initial UDCs to be established. The MDC was created in March 1981, with the aim of regenerating the Liverpool Docklands. When the Toxteth riots erupted on 3 July 1981, it gave the MDC proposal greater momentum. Reported as race riots, they broke out in inner-city areas, due to increasing urban degradation and poverty. The Conservative Government's economic reforms exacerbated the situation through increased local council taxation and indirect taxation. Thatcher's method was to make short, sharp cuts which impacted on inner-city areas, including the Merseyside Docks.

---

<sup>333</sup> Central Office of Information (1987) *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2 & 28.

<sup>335</sup> Barker, E. (1999) 'The Museum in the Community: The New Tates.' In Barker, E. (ed.) *Op. cit.*, pp. 182f.

The disused Victorian Docks became earmarked by the Government in 1981 as an area for regeneration. The seven-acre basin had opened in February 1845 as a warehouse and dock complex, consisting of five stacks of warehouse buildings. Within two decades, the entrances had become too small for the new large steamships which were impeded by the shallow basin water.<sup>336</sup> The large warehouses made rebuilding impractical, and Albert Dock became one of the few Liverpool docks to remain intact. Albert Dock went into commercial decline after the 1880s and by 1914 only a few ships came to unload. Until the 1950s the warehouses were used to store bonded tobacco, wines and spirits. Albert Dock closed in 1972 and demolition became a constant threat, as a myriad of development proposals came and went. The Government earmarked the site for redevelopment when the MDC, in partnership with the Arrowcroft Group, embarked on a programme to revitalise the Albert Dock area.<sup>337</sup>

‘Operation Groundwork’ provided the infrastructure to support public funding and private investment, to bring the land back to effective use.<sup>338</sup> The aim was to create an economically sustainable environment which would attract investment, to provide growth within the region by transforming Merseyside’s waterfront. During the Merseyside regeneration programme, the Conservative Party Manifesto, *The New Hope for Britain* (1983) set out its urban agenda: ‘Improving Our Environment: Reviving Britain’s Cities’ which reiterated the Conservative aim, to revitalise inner-city areas, using government funds to stimulate private sector investment.<sup>339</sup> Public money was awarded to the private sector to invest in these new developments. The funding was distributed through the Conservative Small Business schemes and Enterprise Zones.

Business in the Community (BITC) was established in 1982 by the Government as a voluntary organisation to persuade business leaders to contribute to regeneration schemes. Landowners, industry and local authorities were all targeted for investment and consultation. The Tate Gallery was also approached to develop an exhibition space, to

---

<sup>336</sup> Sharples, J. (2004) *Op. cit.*, p. 103.

<sup>337</sup> Liverpool City Council (2000) *Wirral Unitary Development Plan 1*. 63, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.

<sup>338</sup> <http://archive.liverpool.gov.uk> M352 MDC. The designated MDC area was expanded in 1988, to include Birkenhead and New Brighton.

<sup>339</sup> The Conservative Party (1983) *The Conservative Party Manifesto: The New Hope for Britain*, London: Conservative Central Office, p. 38. See also Jones, P. & Evans, J. (2008) *Urban Regeneration in the UK*, London: Sage, p. x.

provide a cultural draw to the area with the Merseyside Maritime Museum, which was important because of Liverpool's seafaring heritage. The city's former wealth had been built on sugar, tobacco, cotton and the slave trade. From the mid seventeenth century, London and Bristol were the first cities to participate in the slave trade and, early in the following century, they were joined by Liverpool. The Slavery Abolition Act (1833), passed during Earl Grey's Whig Government, began with the closing down of slavery colonies throughout the British Empire, which included the East Indies from where sugar cane was exported to England. Liverpool ceased to import sugar from the colonies, but continued to host sugar refineries. In one of these sugar emporiums, Henry Tate became a partner of John Wright and Company Liverpool sugar refinery in 1859.

Tate used his wealth to create the National Gallery of British Art in London therefore, a new Tate Gallery in Liverpool, nearly a century later, was an appropriate gesture. The Tate Gallery was allocated the north-west corner of a seven-storey warehouse in Albert Dock, which had imported sugar, as well as other commodities. The exhibition site was to display a selection of the modern foreign collection, because British art works were already exhibited at the nearby Walker Gallery.<sup>340</sup> The architects James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Associates were appointed to design the redevelopment for the Tate Gallery, and were already working on the Clore Gallery extension. The architects had been appointed mainly because of Bowness's support for them. Additionally, Stirling's home town was also Liverpool and his familiarity with the city was a further benefit in his appointment.

James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Associates transformed the warehouse into a five-storey gallery on Liverpool's waterfront, providing 3,700 sq m, making it the largest exhibition space in the UK outside of London.<sup>341</sup> The Tate Gallery Liverpool became the Tate Gallery's first foray into urban regeneration and major fundraising. The Tate Gallery also acquired a new level of commercial expertise in planning and working in partnership. The project was funded by the MDC providing £4.25 million, which was 50% of the total £9.5 million cost.<sup>342</sup> The Government gave another £0.5 million and a

---

<sup>340</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Op. cit.*, p. 72.

<sup>341</sup> Russell, J. S. (1999) *Twentieth-Century Museums II*, London: Phaidon Press, unpaginated.

<sup>342</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 October 1981) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

further £2 million was secured from the private sector, with additional funds raised from alternative funding streams.

During this point of development, the Tate Gallery was undergoing major internal conflict between Bowness and Palumbo. The situation was exacerbated when Bowness recommended that the yearly purchase budget be split equally between the two collections, even though the British collection was stronger.<sup>343</sup> Palumbo accused Bowness of jeopardising the modern foreign collection owing to his preference for British art. Tensions continued to escalate. The following year, Bowness claimed that as the Director he was accountable to the Government and not to the Trustees.<sup>344</sup> Palumbo informed Bowness that he was also accountable to the Trustees. Bowness continued to press that, after major works were purchased, any remaining funds should be used to buy British art and foreign art post-1950.<sup>345</sup> Palumbo stated the remaining money should not be split between British and modern foreign works, and that a few masterpieces should be acquired instead of buying cheaper second-rate works.

Management issues did not abate, but a more pressing concern was the issue of public funding. The Government announced cuts to the annual grant in 1983. Lord Gowrie, Minister for the Arts, negotiated for the Tate Gallery to reduce the proposed 2% cut to 1%.<sup>346</sup> While Thatcher had proposed that sharp cuts be implemented, Gowrie endeavoured to support the Tate Gallery. The following year, 1984, a key change in the Tate Gallery's governance took place, when Richard Rogers was appointed as the Chairman of the Trustees, replacing Lord Hutchinson. An internationally renowned architect, Rogers provided professional expertise during the construction period of the Tate Gallery Liverpool. At the same time as Rogers' appointment, Bowness oversaw another important initiative at the Tate Gallery. The Patrons of New Art scheme was created in response to the news that the Tate Gallery's annual government grant for the acquisition of arts works was to be frozen at approximately £2 million.<sup>347</sup> The Patrons of New Art was created to generate finance and to advise on art works for the Tate Gallery.

---

<sup>343</sup> The Tate Gallery (19 November 1981) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>344</sup> The Tate Gallery (20 May 1982) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>345</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 February 1983) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>346</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 September 1983) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 6 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>347</sup> Buck, L. (2000) *Moving Targets 2: A User's Guide to British Art Now*, London: Tate Publishing, pp. 231f.



### **Tate Prize, Turner Prize**

The Patrons of New Art consisted of a group of well-connected collectors, including Charles Saatchi, who was also a Trustee of the Whitechapel Gallery of which Nicholas Serota was the Director. The Patrons of New Art decided to establish their own identity by creating an art prize, and proposed that it be named the New Art Prize, the Millbank Prize, the Tate Prize or the Turner Prize.<sup>348</sup> The chosen name of the Turner Prize was owing to the Turner Bequest being held in the Tate Gallery. The Turner Prize was intended to be comparable to the Booker Prize. The Turner Prize, with £10,000 prize money, was to be awarded to the person(s) making the greatest contribution to art in Britain in the preceding twelve months.

The Turner Prize was to demonstrate the Tate Gallery's commitment to contemporary British art, promote public discussion and establish an annual forum for new developments.<sup>349</sup> A short-list was to be compiled by a jury consisting of the Director and the Chairman of the Patrons of New Art, together with three independent members. The Turner Prize required a sponsor whose identity was kept anonymous. This decision attracted media attention as it was speculated that a commercial company with vested interests might manipulate the proceedings. The Turner Prize and the anonymous sponsor ploy was a successful strategy in raising the profile of the Tate Gallery. The creation of the Turner Prize was an enterprising development, but Bowness's approach to the modern foreign art collection, and to alternative funding strategies, continued to cause concern among the Tate Gallery Trustees. Owing to the underlining tension, Bowness announced at a Board Meeting that the Tate Gallery Trustees did not appreciate the work being done by the staff, but indirectly he was referring to himself.<sup>350</sup>

A proposal was made by Bowness to obtain funding for exhibitions instead of for acquisitions; it was ignored and instead the Tate Gallery Trustees asked that the curators be invited to Board Meetings to present the case for purchasing particular acquisitions. They also requested that information about prices of art works for the preceding three-year period be provided, and that acquisitions should be discussed before decisions were made. What the Trustees established were the formal guidelines for a purchasing policy.

---

<sup>348</sup> The Tate Gallery (19 January 1984) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 5 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>349</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>350</sup> The Tate Gallery (21 February 1985) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 1/3).

Palumbo directed that the Chairman should join Bowness in networking with guests at private views and at other important occasions. The proposal put a check on the Director's power and also enlarged the role of the Chairman.

### **Partnership: Making Arts Money Work Harder**

During the negotiations between the Tate Gallery Trustees and the Director a number of major modern works acquisitioned from the collection of the businessman art collector and Trustee, E. J. Power, which included Joseph Beuys's *Fettbatterie*. The art work had been offered for sale earlier and had been rejected, but as a donation from a Trustee it was accepted by the Tate Gallery.<sup>351</sup> Twenty-three art works in total were later acquisitioned, which bolstered the modern foreign collection holdings. The art works came into the Tate Gallery's collection at a significant time concerning public funding. The ACGB published *Partnership: Making Arts Money work harder* (1986), which petitioned the Government to increase its financial support to the arts. 'A renewed commitment to the arts by the Government now would surely be a positive expression of national ambition which others would surely follow.'<sup>352</sup>

Public expenditure to arts funding was capped but, despite the funding situation, the Tate Gallery acquired a number of important major modern acquisitions. The acquisitions were offered as gifts and included paintings from the Mark Rothko Foundation. Further examples of modernism included André Derain's *Nature morte* (c. 1938) which was purchased with support from the commercial sponsor Cognac Courvoisier. As these major works were being acquisitioned, plans were underway to create an annexe to the existing Tate Gallery building. The extension was to house the Turner Bequest. Bowness wanted it to house British art, but was overruled.<sup>353</sup> The project was funded by the Clore Foundation. After the death of Sir Charles Clore, his daughter, Vivien Duffield, assumed the Chair of the Foundation, continuing the responsibility for the funding programme.

---

<sup>351</sup> After E. J. Power's death, six further works were allocated to the Tate Gallery by the Department of National Heritage in lieu of tax. Twenty-three art works in total were acquisitioned from E. J. Power, which bolstered the modern foreign collection considerably.

<sup>352</sup> Arts Council of Great Britain (September 1986) *Partnership: Making Art Money work harder*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain, p. 19.

<sup>353</sup> Searing, H. (2004) *Op. cit.*, p. 50.

The appointed architects were James Stirling and Michael Wilford, who had competed with four other architectural practices to win the brief. Stirling and Wilford linked the new galleries to the existing ones in the main building. The extension was built on the Queen Alexandra Military Hospital site. Under construction from 1982, the Clore Gallery opened in 1987, and added 18,000 sq ft of exhibition space, with additional display areas through to the Duveen Sculpture Hall providing a further 4,000 sq ft. The design incorporated a separate entrance, a double-height entrance hall, a suite of galleries, a lecture hall, a seminar room, a reading room, the Duffield room, reserve galleries, a physical plant room, a paper conservation studio, public amenities, cloakrooms and lavatories. A schools' entrance facilitated the vital role in widening access for younger audiences. Even with the extension, the Tate Gallery lacked exhibition space and remained impeded by a lack of money. The Government increased the Tate Gallery's funding for the following financial year, but the Trustees were disappointed that the award for the next period was limited.<sup>354</sup> A form of compensation came through a major acquisition, which was passed on from the Government. Pablo Picasso's *Weeping Woman: Femme en Pleurs* (1937) was accepted by H. M. Government in lieu of tax, with a grant-in-aid payment made with assistance from The National Heritage Memorial Fund, The Arts Fund and the Friends of the Tate Gallery, and was accessioned in 1987.<sup>355</sup>

### **Grasping the Nettle**

Bowness offered his resignation, and the post for the Director of the Tate Gallery was advertised in autumn 1987 by the Civil Service Commission. The guidelines requested that the applicant should possess a scholarly knowledge of contemporary art, the ability to create major fundraising initiatives, and the ability to oversee a building project. The Civil Service Commission did not envisage the project management of an entire new exhibition site at Bankside, but recognised that the new Director would need the skills to oversee a further building phase at the Tate Gallery if it were to expand. The shortlisted applicants at the final stage included: Dr John Elderfield, Director of the Department of

---

<sup>354</sup> The Tate Gallery (19 November 1987) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 8 (Archive: TG 1/3).

<sup>355</sup> Acceptance in Lieu was created as a Government scheme to allow items of value to be offered to the State in full or part payment of inheritance tax, capital transfer or estate duty. UK museums, galleries and public archival depositories became the beneficiaries of these goods.

Drawings at the Museum of Modern Art, New York; Norman Rosenthal, Exhibitions Secretary at the Royal Academy of Arts; Julian Spalding, Director of Manchester City Art Galleries; and Nicholas Serota, Director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery.

The applicants had to submit a seven-year proposal for the Tate Gallery. Serota's ambitious plan 'Grasping the Nettle' identified the need to modernise the organisation and proposed areas for development, beginning with the collection, accessibility, exhibitions, buildings, fundraising, public affairs and management. Serota's application was supported by his *curriculum vitae*, which read as if he 'had spent his entire adult life in preparation for the post'.<sup>356</sup> He was the son of Stanley Serota, a construction Civil Engineer, and the Labour Peer, Baroness Beatrice Serota. Serota had read Economics at Christ's College, Cambridge, before changing to History of Art. His Bachelor of Arts thesis examined the Euston Road School of Artists. At the Courtauld Institute of Art, Serota's Master of Arts thesis was on Joseph W. M. Turner and his visits to Switzerland. Serota's academic education equipped him with an in-depth knowledge of British art for his future employment, with an understanding of modern foreign art.

Serota's work record began as an Exhibition Organiser for the ACGB from 1970–1973. His next appointment was as the Director of the Museum of Modern Art in Oxford from 1973–1976. At Oxford Art, he gained experience in experimenting with different ways of hanging exhibitions and curated work by Joseph Beuys and Carl Andre. Serota was then appointed as the Director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery from 1976–1988, where he was able to focus on international and local artists, while also engaging with the East End community through an educational programme. At the Whitechapel Gallery, Serota oversaw the building extension in 1984–1985, by the architectural firm Colquhoun and Miller. The project went into deficit. Serota organised a public auction of art works which paid off the debt and secured an endowment for future exhibitions. Consequently, Serota gained considerable experience in curating, fundraising, balancing budgets and developing the role of the gallery in the public realm. Serota's work experience, academic record and vision helped him to secure the post of Director of the Tate Gallery.

Serota began a new chapter in the development of the Tate Gallery whose impact was felt immediately. The Turner Prize became redefined as a showcase for emerging

---

<sup>356</sup> Buck, L. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 156.

contemporary artists. A shortlist of the artists had previously been provided, but Serota withdrew it which sparked media attention.<sup>357</sup> Was Serota already looking at ways of marketing the Tate Gallery by courting press attention with the Turner Prize? Chris Smith later claimed that the Turner Prize had consequently become hugely controversial, but had also stimulated debate.<sup>358</sup> Serota also began experimenting with the permanent collection. The rules of canonical art history were discarded as the Tate Gallery's rooms became dedicated to a theme, instead of a chronological hang. Strategically, Serota was also disguising the gaps in the modern foreign collection. Additionally, the central Duveen Galleries became a test-bed for the future programme of works in the Turbine Hall at Tate Modern, when special commissions were undertaken by artists to produce large-scale, high-impact art works. An ambitious programme of 'Special Exhibitions' opened with 'Late Rothko' in 1988, which was financed by corporate funding as a reciprocal business agreement. A major aid in this work had been the appointment of Sir Dennis Stevenson as Chairman of the Tate Gallery Trustees in the same year.

Stevenson was a member of the media group, Pearson Plc, which owned *The Financial Times* and the *Economist*. Stevenson had worked for Edward Heath and through Peter Mandelson was used by Tony Blair as a gateway between big business and New Labour. Clearly Stevenson in joining forces with Serota created a formidable partnership which was different from earlier Tate Gallery administrations in their level of expertise and political networking and because of these skills they were able to create a new kind of organisation. However, the process of modernisation had begun with Reid who also received professional support from his Chairmen and from the Labour Government. What is important to identify is that the process of modernisation did not skip a generation past Bowness. Although Bowness did not have the same level of in-house support he left a lasting legacy which included the Turner Prize and the creation of Tate Liverpool. The latter was to importantly reposition the Tate Gallery from being a London organisation to one with a greater national presence and one that had demonstrably the skills to oversee another new major cultural initiative.

---

<sup>357</sup> Button, V. (2007 [1997]) *The Turner Prize*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 64.

<sup>358</sup> Smith, C. (1998) *Creative Britain*, London: Faber & Faber, pp. 6f.

## Chapter 4. Vision and Concept

This chapter addresses the questions, how did the government communicate change, and how did this impact on cultural vision and patronage? The impact that saw Thatcher's Conservative administration propose a new kind of political landscape took effect across the board. The Tate Gallery saw a more commercially orientated governance emerge with the appointments of Serota and Stevenson. From these appointments, a new restructuring process began within the organisation, while, more visibly, a major refurbishment of the Millbank building was undertaken from 1989. The immediate visible outcome was that the Tate Gallery exhibition rooms were stripped back and the stone work was cleaned.

The Tate Gallery's false ceilings, claddings and partitions were removed; the floors were cleaned and resealed; the skylights in the North Duveen galleries and the octagon were uncovered; and the marble door surrounds were regilded. A new open-plan bookshop designed by John Miller and Partners was installed. The programme of works became the last major building work within the Tate Gallery, until the new millennium Centenary Development was undertaken by the same architects. The entire refurbishment programme was made possible by funding mainly from the corporate sector. British Petroleum Company plc, The Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, The Rayne Foundation, Westminster City Council and the Waddington Galleries provided most of the finance. Corporate sponsorship was increasingly important to Serota for realising his vision, who concluded his first Director's Report: 'nothing can be achieved without sound planning and imagination, but progress depends on the creation of a partnership between government, the private sector and the Gallery itself'.<sup>359</sup>

The New Displays opened on 24 January 1990, and were attended by the Prime Minister.<sup>360</sup> The title of the first hang — *Past, Present, Future* — was indicative of Serota's intentions to break with formal art historical conventions by mixing up art works from different time periods. Presenting the collection through a thematic hang, rather than following a chronological precedent, followed Serota's aim to 'break the former rigid

---

<sup>359</sup> The Tate Gallery (1990) *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1988–1990*, London: Tate Gallery Publications, p. 28.

<sup>360</sup> Spalding, F. (1998) *Op. cit.*, p. 256.

division between historic and modern art [...],<sup>361</sup> The New Displays received considerable praise from organisations including *The Burlington Magazine* which had not always been favourable about the Tate Gallery's practices.

*The Burlington Magazine* stated:

The comprehensive re-hanging of the Tate Gallery, which was unveiled late in January, has been enthusiastically received by artists, critics and the general public. Even art historians, braced to resist the pruning of the historic British display, have been disarmed. The Director, Nicholas Serota, has, it seems waved his wand and transformed the exhausted, overcrowded and ill-kempt galleries into a spare, elegant unified sequence which tells a single chronology.<sup>362</sup>

The overall aim had been to make the visit more accessible, to entice and include those visitors without any art historical knowledge. The thematic hang was also a useful device to disguise the gaps in the modern foreign collection, which a chronological hang would have made apparent. Loaned art works were also used to conceal the gaps, making the collection appear stronger than it actually was. Some of the works later became donations. Earlier The Tate Gallery had used this kind of strategy with loaned works from Gustav and Elly Kahnweiler's collection, which Serota was no doubt aware of.<sup>363</sup> The modern loans for the New Displays arrived from the Fridart Foundation and the Saatchi Collection, during the period 1 April 1988 to 31 March 1990.<sup>364</sup> Following this, a large number of works by Joseph Beuys were loaned during the period 1 April 1990 to 31 March, 1992, from the Josef W. Froehlich Stuttgart Collection.<sup>365</sup> Within the organisation, Serota also undertook new initiatives.

---

<sup>361</sup> The Tate Gallery (1990) *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>362</sup> Editorial (March 1990) 'The Tate re-hung: more dash than cash' in *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 132, No. 1,044, p. 171.

<sup>363</sup> After the death of Elly Kahnweiler the remaining works from the Gustav and Elly Kahnweiler gift were accessioned in 1994.

<sup>364</sup> The Tate Gallery (1990) *Op. cit.*, pp. 104–106.

<sup>365</sup> The Tate Gallery (1992) *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1990–92*, London: Tate Gallery Publications, pp. 91f.



The Development Office was created in 1990, to raise funds from the private sector for revenue and capital projects. Creating an in-house fundraising department was in accordance with Conservative policy, for public organisations to become more responsible in how they managed their assets. The Development Office was a key agency for how the Tate Gallery managed its public and private partnerships. The Development Office was seen by Serota as a natural extension of the practices of the original organisation. He stated that the public sector played a major role in the Tate Gallery's development, but so had the private sector, which had financed most of the building work and many of the art works.<sup>366</sup> The Development Office later expanded to oversee: Corporate Development; Major Gifts; Operations; Individual Giving; Public Sector Fundraising; and Events. The Development Office was at the forefront of the organisation's restructuring process which saw further internal changes.

The Information Department became the Communications Department in 1992, which was to foster better public relations and promote a wider understanding of the Tate Gallery. Damien Whitmore was appointed as the Head of Communications, and undertook a major review of the Tate Gallery's marketing and information activities. New systems for working with the media were implemented, as was a proactive approach to securing maximum press coverage. Whitmore recognised the limitations of the Tate Gallery's Communications Department and outsourced the work to Bolton and Quinn. The specialist cultural communications consultancy was appointed with the aim 'to increase public awareness, understanding and appreciation of modern art', and to make it more accessible.<sup>367</sup> The Communications Department also ensured that professional relationships continued to be developed with the London Tourist Board and the British Tourist Authority, to promote services and activities for overseas visitors.

Pentagram Design was appointed to create a new corporate identity. The appointment was later followed by a magazine, *Tate ETC*, launched by Wordsearch Publishing. The magazine represented a major development in the Communications Department's strategy, and was aimed at promoting discussion and publicity concerning the Tate Gallery and the collection. The publication was supported by revenue from

---

<sup>366</sup> The Tate Gallery (1990) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>367</sup> Tench, R. and Yeomans, L. (2009 [2006]) *Exploring Public Relations*, Harlow: Prentice Hall, p. 612.

advertising and distributed as a key benefit for Friends and Patrons.<sup>368</sup> The Tate Gallery's next venture was considerably more ambitious.

*The Tate Gallery Preliminary Audit Report* (1991) was requested by Serota as an in-house assessment, to ascertain which areas of the organisation needed attention. The report identified that as a result of the lack of exhibition space the British art and modern foreign art were 'gridlocked' within the building.<sup>369</sup> The conclusion was that the building would need to double its actual size to accommodate the entire collection. The Tate Gallery Trustees agreed that another site would have to be found. The British Art, from 1600 to the present, was to remain at Millbank. The modern foreign art, from 1900 to the present, was to relocate to a new London site. The two galleries were to remain part of a single organisation with one collection, with the headquarters remaining at Millbank. A central storage and service facility was to be created at a converted railway goods depot, the Bricklayers Arms, in Southwark.

Good transport links and accessibility between the Millbank site, the Bricklayers Arms and the new exhibition site were important factors in selecting the site.<sup>370</sup> The new exhibition space also, needed to be large in order to accommodate the growing collection. Initially, the Docklands and King's Cross were suggested as possible areas for development because private developers indicated they would be interested to have the Tate Gallery as a partner. Docklands was considered the preferred option owing to the attractive financial package offered by the Canary Wharf developers. The second site, known as 'the Park' was situated within the King's Cross area, and was recommended for its central London location. The disadvantage with it and the Canary Wharf site was the lack of social development potential.<sup>371</sup> King's Cross was ruled out because of its location and not having cultural cohesion. The Canary Wharf site remained an option owing to the attractive financial package. The site possibilities were proposed by the Tate Gallery Trustees during the roundtable discussions which were ongoing from 1991.

---

<sup>368</sup> The Tate Gallery (1994) *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1992–1994*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 19. The Friends and Patrons were later re-categorised as Members.

<sup>369</sup> Francis, R. (January 1991) *Preliminary Audit Report* (The research was undertaken from October 1990 to December 1990) printed in the *Tate Masterplan* (12 June 1991) p. 25 (Archive: TG 12/1/1/2).

<sup>370</sup> The Tate Gallery (12 June 1991) *Tate Masterplan*, p. 20 (Archive: TG 12/1/1/2).

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

### **The Tate Gallery St Ives**

At the same point, a third Tate Gallery initiative was underway, which had been in development since Bowness's time as Director. Bowness had married Sarah Nicholson, the daughter of the artists Ben Nicholson and Barbara Hepworth. Through the family connection, Bowness worked with Hepworth to create a museum dedicated to her work. The Barbara Hepworth Museum, within her former house and sculpture garden in St Ives, was put under the Trusteeship of the Tate Gallery in 1980. Cornwall County Council wished to develop a connection between the Tate Gallery and the long-standing artistic tradition in the area. Hepworth and other artists had created an artists' colony in St Ives from the early 1930s, although the area's artistic legacy was much older. The roots of the colony began in the nineteenth century when St Ives' train station was opened by the Great Western Railway Company in 1877. The railway carried amateur artists arriving to paint the coastal views in the area. St Ives continued its artistic heritage through local artists and shops selling their work.

The Cornwall County Council and Penwith District Council with South-West Arts established a Steering Group in 1988 to continue the tradition, by campaigning to have the Tate Gallery develop a local exhibition site. The St Ives Tate Action Group (STAG) was established to oversee the building of a new purpose-built gallery, to highlight work by local artists. The derelict Porthmeor Gasworks site was selected as the new site owing to its regeneration potential and scenic location overlooking Porthmeor beach. The Tate Gallery St Ives was to act as a stimulus for regeneration and employment. The Steering Group received local and international funding through the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). The ERDF was set up in 1975, to help stimulate economic development and regeneration in the least prosperous regions of the European Union. St Ives was eligible for the award scheme with its low employment and need for renewal.<sup>372</sup> The ERDF grant covered more than half of the £3.5 million cost of the new building, with STAG securing the remainder through local support.<sup>373</sup>

Five architectural practices submitted a design for the Tate Gallery St Ives. The husband and wife team, David Shalev and Eldred Evans, was appointed the winner in

---

<sup>372</sup> Shalev, D. and Tooby, M. (eds) (1995) *Tate Gallery St Ives: The Building*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 5.

<sup>373</sup> Spalding, F. (1998) *Op. cit.*, p. 264.

1990. Shalev and Evans were awarded the brief on the basis of their modernist design which interacted with the surrounding environment. Their application was supported by the fact that they had designed the award-winning County Court in Truro. The architects were also resident in the area and Evans' father had been a St Ives artist, which provided them with local knowledge of what would be required of a new art space in St Ives.

Shalev and Evans created a bold design, featuring a circular entrance which echoed the shape of the gas holder that was previously on the site. What was created behind the circular walls was approximately 1,600 sq m of exhibition space arranged over four floors. The design mainly met with public approval, and was praised for linking the exterior beachscape within the building's interior spaces, which helped to attract visitors.<sup>374</sup> Sir Richard Carew Pole, Chairman of Cornwall County Council, praised it for providing 'a focus for the local community'.<sup>375</sup> The Tate Gallery St Ives was always envisioned as a local community directive supported by Cornwall County Council, and was a very different kind of initiative from the Tate Gallery Liverpool.

### **Defining the Vision**

The Tate Gallery St Ives did not alleviate the organisation's ongoing problem concerning space, as a further exhibition site for the modern foreign collection remained a necessity. The Tate Gallery Trustees convened to discuss what was needed from the new exhibition site and identified that their priorities were the collection, the audience and that the new site would have to play a role in the cultural life of London. Locating the new site outside of London was not an option and demonstrated that for the Tate Gallery Trustees the relationship between the new gallery and London was paramount. The urban historian, Lewis Mumford, discussed earlier the symbiotic relationship earlier between museum/gallery and the city. According to Mumford, the city facilitated the invention of the museum/gallery as an extension of itself by its citizens.<sup>376</sup> The aim was to conserve, display, educate and edify, but it was also to entertain, mystify, and for revelation.

---

<sup>374</sup> Shalev, D. & Tooby, M. (eds) (1995) *Tate Gallery St Ives: The Building*, p. 11.

<sup>375</sup> Tooby, M. (1993) *An Illustrated Companion to Tate St Ives*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 6.

<sup>376</sup> Mumford, L. (1938) *The Culture of Cities*, New York: Harcourt Brace, pp. 446f.

Transcending the here and now, the museum/gallery became the public space for the sacred and the temporal. Ultimately, the purpose of the museum/gallery was to serve.<sup>377</sup>

The new exhibition space for the Tate Gallery Trustees was also to serve London. *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1994–1996* (1996) identified the changing expectations of their museum/gallery, which was expected to contribute to the cultural and economic strength of the city: ‘The new Tate Gallery of Modern Art will be an exciting new landmark in the centre of London enhancing the city’s position as a world centre, bringing cultural, social and economic benefits to millions of people’.<sup>378</sup> While the roundtable talks were in development, Serota continued to experiment with new ways of exhibiting the collection.

Serota’s objective was:

to generate a condition in which visitors can experience a sense of discovery in looking at particular paintings, sculptures or installations in a particular room at a particular moment, rather than find themselves standing on the conveyor belt of history.<sup>379</sup>

The thematic hang was crucial to realising this objective. Sixty years earlier, Alfred Barr had implemented a thematic hang at MoMA, which was adopted later by certain European museums of modern art. Willem Sandberg at the Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam, and Pontus Hulten at the *Musée d’Art Moderne*, Paris drew on the thematic model. Serota followed their example and began rotating the collection, which was to demonstrate the need for more display space, and was made possible with funding from the British Petroleum Company plc.<sup>380</sup> Experimenting at the Tate Gallery with the thematic hang and rotating the displays were instrumental in working out the objectives of ‘Defining the Vision’ in *Agenda for a Special Meeting of the Trustees of the Tate Gallery* (April 1993). ‘Defining the Vision’ was conceptualised by Sandy Nairne, Director of Tate Regional and Public Services, in a Tate Gallery in-house proposal.

---

<sup>377</sup> Mumford, L. (1961) *The City in History*, p. 562.

<sup>378</sup> The Tate Gallery (1996) *Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1994–1996*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 24.

<sup>379</sup> Serota, N. (1996) *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

<sup>380</sup> The Tate Gallery (1994) *Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1992–94*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 14.

The Tate Gallery of Modern Art was conceptualised by considering ‘a sequence of philosophical and practical choices that would lead to the selection of the site, architect and to the project’s funding’.<sup>381</sup> The aim was to display twentieth-century art and beyond which was principally foreign art, but also with some British art from the same period. Drawing on the model of MoMA, Nairne proposed extending the scope of the Tate Gallery’s Collection. While MoMA became the basis of a template, the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was otherwise envisioned as a distinct London model. Education was a requisite to open up access and was also a driver in attracting money from potential funders who would be more willing to be associated with a cultural facility that offered this public benefit. Facilities were, therefore, to include a Study Centre and a Visitor Services area. Proximity to the existing Tate Gallery and to a new separate Support Centre was also need. The objective was to attract a wide demographic of visitors, which also meant increased income from paid temporary exhibitions and merchandising.<sup>382</sup> A dedicated temporary exhibition space within the new venue became a key requirement.

What emerged from the ‘Defining the Vision’ proposal was that the new exhibition space had to extend beyond the normal parameters of a national gallery or museum, which was to be as financially self-sustaining as possible, and would contribute to the fabric of London. As the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was to play a civic role in London’s identity, the need to set up a dialogue with the art works, the architecture and the people who used the building was essential.<sup>383</sup> The Tate Gallery Trustees asked: ‘What kind of gallery of modern art do we envisage?’ [...] do we wish to build a temple or a forum, a showcase or a laboratory; a sanctuary for scholars or a palace of entertainment and are these incompatible goals?’<sup>384</sup> The questions could only be answered when they knew what they were working with. The Tate Gallery Trustees undertook some preliminary research to find out what was wanted.

The Tate Gallery Trustees, Bill Woodrow and Michael Craig-Martin, were appointed to undertake a survey of European museums, to identify what a model museum of modern art might be from an artist’s viewpoint. The immediate criticism from

---

<sup>381</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 April 1993) ‘Defining the Vision’, in *Agenda for a Special Meeting of the Trustees of The Tate Gallery*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/2/1).

<sup>382</sup> The Tate Gallery (1994) *Op. cit.*, pp. 21 & 29.

<sup>383</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 April 1993) *Op. cit.*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/2/1).

<sup>384</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Woodrow and Craig-Martin was that most newly built museums focused attention on the architecture rather than on creating good exhibition spaces for the art works. Visiting *Kunstmuseum*, Bonn, Woodrow and Craig-Martin declared ‘nice café, pity about the museum’, and found that the ‘ostentatious’ design lost a large amount of exhibition space with its complex layout.<sup>385</sup> A more acceptable model was the *Museum für Moderne Kunst*, Frankfurt am Main, which offered a cultural platform within the city. However, they noted it also suffered from a complicated design, full of dramatic permutations, with ‘popping out holes in walls to the surprise of your friends’.<sup>386</sup>

*Kunsttuileen Maastricht* fared better in its design for its modest use of materials. Another favourable assessment was made of the *De Pont Foundation*, Tilburg, for its sensitive renovation, restructuring and quality of light. The artists found the display aesthetically pleasing because the art collection was prioritised. The most damning assessment was levelled at the *Museum Abteiberg*, Mönchengladbach, which was described as ‘awful’, owing to the overpowering presence of the architect. Overall, what the artists found most offensive was architect-dominated designs.<sup>387</sup> The artists’ conclusions were that the majority of museums were monuments to their architect creators and that none of them provided the possibility to expand a growing collection. While the museums did not provide a working model to refer to, they helped to identify what the Tate Gallery Trustees did *not* want.

From the assessments, what emerged was the need for the organisation to work closely with the appointed architects on the building programme and the necessity of having a professional building consultancy to advise them. The work was outsourced to the development company, Stanhope Properties. Serota had met Stuart Lipton, a Director of Stanhope Properties, at the Whitechapel Gallery, during the building programme prior to his appointment at the Tate Gallery. From Stanhope Properties Lipton seconded Ron German and Peter Rogers, to provide expertise concerning preliminary site proposals, and to supply design and construction knowledge to the Tate Gallery team over the next

---

<sup>385</sup> Woodrow, B. (October 1993) ‘Draft Notes on visit to Museums by Bill Woodrow’, European Museum Trip, undertaken by Michael Craig-Martin and Bill Woodrow, unpaginated (Archive: TG 12/1/14).

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>387</sup> *Ibid.*



six years, on all aspects of the building programme.<sup>388</sup> Peter Rogers had an independent connection with the Tate Gallery as the brother of Richard Rogers, who had previously been the Chairman of the Trustees. Furthermore, the Tate Gallery were considering the former Billingsgate Fish Market in the City of London as their first official site for investigation, which had been converted by his brother's architectural firm.

### **Operation Moby Dick**

Billingsgate Fish Market had been converted by the Richard Rogers Partnership into a new office development for Citibank from 1985–1988. The original building had been designed by Horace Jones in 1876. The fish market operated from Billingsgate until it was relocated to East London in 1982. Prior to its conversion, it had been proposed for demolition. The campaigning group for threatened buildings — Save Britain's Heritage — lobbied with the support of Richard Rogers to have Billingsgate retained, and were successful in their bid. The Richard Rogers Partnership was appointed to adapt the building to its new function as a City trading hall. Externally, Billingsgate was restored to its former appearance and was intended to harmonise the 'modern with old in a single building'.<sup>389</sup> Internally, the main ground floor area was converted into an open space. Owing to the economic downturn, Citibank did not move in and the premises lay vacant.

The design consultant, Anthony Tugnutt, later suggested Billingsgate to the Tate Gallery because of its historic structure, riverside location and proximity to Monument Station.<sup>390</sup> The potential business investment from City investors made Billingsgate an attractive option. 'Operation Moby Dick', as the proposal became known, was only ever intended as a temporary site, as when Tugnutt contacted Serota, in December 1992 there was no funding mechanism to finance a permanent building. The Tate Gallery Trustees commissioned a feasibility study to be undertaken, to investigate Billingsgate's potential. Lower Thames Street was, however, deemed problematic owing to the constant flow of traffic which created a barrier from the rest of the City. As a result of the limited space and inability to develop it for future expansion, and as a challenging location for

---

<sup>388</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Power into Art: The Making of Tate Modern*, London: Penguin, p. 16.

<sup>389</sup> Roger Stirk Harbour and Partners (2011) *Richard Rogers Partnership Billingsgate Fish Market*, London: Richard Rogers Partnership.

<sup>390</sup> Anthony Tugnutt (16 December 1992) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

attracting audiences, it was rejected. What the Tate Gallery gained by the investigation was an understanding of the type of building it was looking for, which could be historic but with the idea of a river location being desirable.

### **Site Proposals**

The Tate Gallery's objectives changed with the news of the National Lottery, which was to apportion receipts to distribution bodies for public projects. The creation of the Millennium Commission offering Capital Award Grants of £50 million made the Tate Gallery reconsider its strategy from finding a temporary site to finding a permanent site. The news of the Tate Gallery's search for a permanent building attracted much interest, as well as numerous suggestions from official bodies and members of the general public. Jane Simpson, a Tate Gallery visitor, recommended the former London County Council Hall building, which had been occupied by the GLC until 1986, for its riverside location and proximity to the South Bank Complex and Westminster Bridge.<sup>391</sup> Serota responded that it was a listed building and could not be altered significantly.<sup>392</sup> However, Serota requested that preliminary inquiries were made about County Hall, but owing to the nature of the layout it was decided that it could not be suitably adapted.<sup>393</sup>

Deborah Stephens from Thames Water, proposed the New River Head Building on Roseberry Avenue in Finsbury EC1.<sup>394</sup> The Thames Water main building opened in 1920, and consisted of five floors and a basement. The second building opened in 1938, had been a water testing laboratory and was Grade II listed. The site offered a potential 287,500 gross sq ft of floor space, but its non-central location and the second building's Grade II listing and related limitations ruled it out as an option. In the meantime Paul Humphries, the Director of Estates of the Royal Brompton National Heart and Lung Hospital in South Kensington, proposed the North Block of the building.<sup>395</sup> Located between Foulis Terrace and Sumner Place, the Victorian premises occupied a site of approximately two and half acres, with a potential 61,500 sq ft. The site was in a

---

<sup>391</sup> Jane M. Simpson (17 December 1992) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>392</sup> Nicholas Serota (19 January 1993) letter to Jane Simpson (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>393</sup> Nicholas Serota (8 June 1993) letter to Richard Young, acting on behalf of an investor interested in purchasing County Hall, but excluding the River block (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>394</sup> Deborah Stephens (18 December 1992) letter to Francis Carnwath, Deputy Director of Tate Gallery (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>395</sup> Paul Humphries (21 December 1992) letter to Dennis Stevenson (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

conservation area and included a Grade II listed chapel. Additionally, as the residential location did not offer the right environment for the Tate Gallery, it was rejected.

Christopher Lucas of the Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce suggested Denys Lasdun's vacated New South Wales Government Office, which he referred to as a potential 'Tate-in-the-Strand'.<sup>396</sup> The limitations of space and possibly the look of the building with its concrete façade saw it rejected. A further government building was nominated, which had been occupied by the Departments of Environment and Transport, at Marsham Street, SW1; it was rejected due to poor transport links.<sup>397</sup> The Harrods Depository near Hammersmith Bridge was also proposed, but was deemed too far west.<sup>398</sup> Brixton Estate Management suggested their sites at Kennington Park, Acton Park Estate, the Westway Estate and other locations within the M25. The sites were all declined on account of being inappropriate and in the wrong areas.<sup>399</sup>

Commercial sites were proposed and rejected, as were industrial sites. Battersea Power Station was suggested by N. C. Guy, a member of the public, who compared its potential to the train station conversion into the *Musée D'Orsay*, Paris. Commending the space for its ability to potentially accommodate the Tate Gallery's collection and other cultural attractions, Guy concluded: 'I am convinced that superb opportunities lie down the river from you [...]'<sup>400</sup> Guy was correct about the River Thames location, but not about the site. The vast scale, poor state of repair, location and Grade II status were the main reasons it was not considered as an option.

Further nominations included Alexandra Palace, the Red Star Depot, Euston and an unspecified site in Victoria, but were all declined. Alexander Fleming House in Elephant and Castle, designed by Erno Goldfinger, was proposed, but rejected owing to its lack of adaptability for a conversion.<sup>401</sup> The Baltic Exchange in the City was also

---

<sup>396</sup> Christopher Lucas (18 December 1992) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>397</sup> Neil C. Thomas (3 January 1993) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>398</sup> Terrence Blair (undated) letter to Nicholas Serota, returned (22 February 1993) letter from Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>399</sup> Brixton Estate Management Ltd (10 February 1993) letter to Tate Gallery, pencilled (3 March 1993) letter 'not suitable' (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>400</sup> N. C. Guy (24 February 1993) letter to the Tate Trustees, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>401</sup> Imry Holdings Ltd (11 August 1993) letter to M. Jones, Drivers Jonas (Commercial Property Consultants) representing the Tate Gallery.

proposed. By this point, the Tate Gallery Trustees had developed a clearer picture of what they wanted and declined it as an option, preferring to pursue a river location.<sup>402</sup>

### **Tate Canary Wharf**

Canary Wharf had been identified earlier as a potential site.<sup>403</sup> The advantage was that the Canary Wharf site was free and would receive financial support. Olympia and York, the international development company, also offered a temporary exhibition site and storage space during the development phase. The benefits of the site were that it offered a riverside location, an adjacent river bus pier and service, few building constraints and the opportunity for future expansion. Additionally, the London Docklands Development Corporation offered financial support. However, logistically, the transport facilities of the Docklands Light Railway appeared limited to the rest of London. The uncertainty concerning the timescale for the Jubilee Line extension, and lack of surrounding related activities, made the site problematic. The East London Docklands location, with only a foot tunnel to and from Greenwich providing access to the south of the Thames, did not alleviate concerns. The Canary Wharf site was rejected as other river locations were considered closer to Millbank, which included Effra by Vauxhall Bridge<sup>404</sup>

### **Tate Vauxhall**

The Effra site occupied 7.25 acres of land bounded by the River Thames, Nine Elms Lane and Vauxhall Bridge.<sup>405</sup> The site was virtually self-contained with the exception of a small area in the south-west corner, which housed a British Rail staff social club. The western section of the land was occupied by a disused meat warehouse, the Nine Elms cold store. The rest of the land was used as a car park leased to National Car Parks. There was also a coach and a lorry park and a Metropolitan Police car pound.<sup>406</sup> Lambeth Council wanted to redevelop the site and appointed Terry Farrell as the Master Planner.

---

<sup>402</sup> Francis Carnwath (10 August 1993) letter to James Buckley, The Baltic Exchange (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>403</sup> The Tate Gallery (26 April 1993) *Masterplan MoMA Tate Notes*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/3/1/1).

<sup>404</sup> The Tate Gallery (7 April 1993) *Museum of Modern Art Notes* (Archive: TG 12/3/3/1).

<sup>405</sup> The Tate Gallery (March 1994) *Tate Museum of Modern Art Project Report on Alternative Sites* (Archive: TG 12/3/1/4).

<sup>406</sup> The land was let on a three-year lease, determinable by the owners at three months' notice.

Farrell submitted a proposal in February 1993, for mixed office, residential, retail and leisure use, to provide 1.2 million sq ft of space.<sup>407</sup>

‘Vision for Vauxhall’, a local action group, lobbied against the proposal, claiming it would lead to a dreary development consisting of 75% of office space. The pressurised market owing to the recession saw the plan withdrawn in the absence of pre-commitments from end-users. Vision for Vauxhall approached the Tate Gallery to redevelop the site, but it was not ideal as the rear section was being converted into 125,000 sq ft of office space and was surrounded by roads.<sup>408</sup> The area was also isolated from other tourist destinations and had a lack of local facilities, such as shops and restaurants. The transport facilities included bus routes going over the river, but fewer into central London. Victoria mainline station was within walking distance but, with the underground station accessed mainly by subway tunnels, the site was deemed difficult to navigate.<sup>409</sup>

Furthermore, British Gas had used the site previously and the land was found to be contaminated.<sup>410</sup> Ove Arup had been appointed to make a report and found chemical contamination with methane and carbon dioxide gases present in the soil.<sup>411</sup> London underground tunnels were also identified under the site.<sup>412</sup> As a solution Ove Arup suggested using pile foundations instead of having a basement floor, which would have added to construction costs and meant losing valuable space by having no basement area. Davis, Langdon and Everest reported that the Effra site was ‘free of many of the technical aesthetic and political constraints that apply on the South Bank’.<sup>413</sup> Ultimately, Effra was ruled out as an option for the Tate Gallery owing to access and other site issues. Vision for Vauxhall again petitioned the Tate Gallery to reconsider its decision.<sup>414</sup> The Tate Gallery responded that it was looking at more suitable developments and ones where it may not have to pay the full market price.

---

<sup>407</sup> Aldous Hogkinson (17 August 1993) Stanhope Memorandum to Richard Rogers (Archive: TG 12/3/3/2).

<sup>408</sup> D. F. Garway-Heath (6 June 1993) letter to Peter Wilson (Archive: TG 12/3/3/1).

<sup>409</sup> Stanhope (September 1993) *The Tate Gallery Site Updates Draft Document* (Archive: TG 12/3/1/2-3).

<sup>410</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>411</sup> Ove Arup and Partners (September 1993) *Effra Site Report*, p. 4, (Archive: TG 12/3/3/2).

<sup>412</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>413</sup> Davis Langdon & Everest (3 September 1993) *Cost Report*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/3/6/16).

<sup>414</sup> Peter Wilson (16 June 1993) letter to D. F. Garway-Heath (Archive: TG 12/3/3/1).

### **Tate South Bank**

Another proposal was to collaborate with the South Bank Centre, to create a cultural forum at Jubilee Gardens. The South Bank site was owned by the ACGB, which held the freehold for both Jubilee Gardens and Hungerford Bridge Car Park. Lambeth Council proposed that the sites be developed together as the hub in the new South Bank Master Plan, which was overseen by Terry Farrell.<sup>415</sup> The South Bank site offered a good location, but the net size of 2.5-2.75 acres allowed only the minimum required dimensions for the Tate Gallery, and no scope for future expansion. Additionally, the cost of replacing the Hungerford Bridge Car Park and redeveloping it as a space to provide 720 car-parking spaces added to the overall cost by £10 million.<sup>416</sup>

While the South Bank Board, the Hayward Gallery and the ACGB were supportive of the proposal, Lambeth Council was less enthusiastic. German (Stanhope Properties) was also concerned that planning consents might be difficult to obtain, given its location diagonally opposite the Houses of Parliament. However, while the South Bank Master Plan was vetoed and Terry Farrell was dismissed, it remained an option for the Tate Gallery, as it had accessibility, a central river location and an existing audience.<sup>417</sup> Otherwise, the dilution of Millennium funding was a concern for the Tate Gallery Trustees, who believed that the South Bank Board might focus attention on its own site. A further issue was that the new Tate Gallery at the South Bank would have a limited life, as there was no space to accommodate the growing collection. Despite these issues, the South Bank remained on the Tate Gallery's site list.

### **Tate Greenwich**

Further sites were offered along the River Thames by Greenwich Council, which was particularly keen to demonstrate to the Tate Gallery that it was a viable London tourist destination. Greenwich Council was already in the process of focusing on a waterfront strategy along a nine-mile stretch of riverfront for regeneration. The Greenwich Waterfront Development Strategy wanted to stimulate development partnerships between

---

<sup>415</sup> Building Design (18 June 1993) *Building Design* (Archive: TG 12/3/5/1).

<sup>416</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 July 1993) *MoMA Project Review* (Archive: TG 12/3/5/1).

<sup>417</sup> The Tate Gallery (March 1994) *Tate Museum of Modern Art Project Report on Alternative Sites* (Archive: TG 12/3/1/4).

landowners, local companies, the local authority, communities, central government and other agencies.<sup>418</sup> Greenwich Council proposed various sites within the borough, which included the Royal Arsenal in Woolwich Town Centre, a seventy-six acre site owned by the Ministry of Defence and Crown Estate. Greenwich Council and the Ministry of Defence outlined the benefit of Royal Arsenal's site as having prime river frontage, a military history and listed buildings.<sup>419</sup> The site was deemed unsuitable by the Tate Gallery Trustees on the basis of being too remote and unsuitable for its audience.

Greenwich Reach was another location to be proposed and was an undeveloped waterfront site on a small peninsula at the mouth of Deptford Creek. The site was proposed by Greenwich Waterfront Development Partnership. Nick Raynsford, the Labour MP for Greenwich, fully backed the project and offered help.<sup>420</sup> The total site area was 12.5 acres, with approximately 3 acres to the east of the creek to be partitioned off for the Tate Gallery.<sup>421</sup> Greenwich Reach Development commissioned W. S. Atkins plc, the engineering and design consultancy, to carry out a site inspection. The report revealed that the site had been used for gas production and as a minerals coating and concrete plant.<sup>422</sup> The main issues were that contamination was found and the river wall which formed three sides of the site was in need of major repairs. The cost of soil remediation and the piling work to be installed owing to the poor ground conditions indicated a negative residual site value.<sup>423</sup>

Access to the Greenwich site was also limited. The transport facilities included a train service from London Bridge to Greenwich. Additionally, the Docklands Light Railway extension to Lewisham was to provide only a north–south link when it opened in 1999. The Jubilee line extension was to commence construction but, as the nearest station was to be located on the Greenwich Peninsula, it was not to benefit the site. Greenwich Reach was disqualified, but the investigation helped the Tate Gallery in identifying that,

---

<sup>418</sup> Colin Roberts (23 December 1992) Chief Executive, London Borough of Greenwich, letter to the Tate Gallery (Archive: TG 12/3/4/1).

<sup>419</sup> The Greenwich Waterfront Development Partnership (15 February 1993) letter to Peter Wilson (Archive: TG 12/3/4/1).

<sup>420</sup> Nick Raynsford MP (8 December 1993) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/4/1).

<sup>421</sup> The Tate Gallery (9 November 1993) *Tate Meeting Agenda* (Archive: TG 12/3/1/4).

<sup>422</sup> W. S. Atkins Consultants Ltd (29–30 September 1992) *Report on Inspection of River Walls in Deptford Creek* (Archive: TG 12/3/4/2).

<sup>423</sup> The Tate Gallery (9 November 1993) *Tate Meeting Agenda* (Archive: TG 12/3/1/4).



along with a river location, a central site was becoming a necessity. This was indicated in a letter declining the offer from Francis Carnwath, Deputy Director at the Tate Gallery: 'we are focusing on two sites on the river in the centre of London that we think will more precisely meet our brief than will Greenwich'.<sup>424</sup>

### **Tate Bankside**

Another site along the River Thames at Bankside became an option. Peter Wilson, Director of Tate Buildings and Gallery Services, suggested Bankside Power Station after seeing it on a boat trip along the River Thames.<sup>425</sup> Owing to the scale of Bankside, the building was initially thought too large. Serota reconsidered Bankside after he visited it independently. Serota understood that it had to meet with the approval of the Tate Gallery Trustees and escorted them to the site, but did not take a direct route. Instead, Serota took the Tate Gallery Trustees to St Paul's Cathedral, a familiar landmark, as an orientation point, in order for them to view Bankside Power Station from the north bank across the river.<sup>426</sup> Serota believed that, from this point, they might better understand its central location and potential, as Southwark, like many post-war inner-city areas, experienced a decline in manufacturing. The once-thriving area had become isolated from the rest of London.<sup>427</sup> Further changes impacted on Bankside when, from 1973, the ongoing oil crisis made financing the oil-powered electricity station no longer viable. The building was de-commissioned between 1978 and 1981, although London Electricity plc maintained an operational switching house and substation in part of the building.<sup>428</sup>

Marcus Binney, on behalf of Save Britain's Heritage, visited Bankside Power Station in May 1980, to assess how the building could be revitalised. The assessment was that the Bankside site had tremendous potential for redevelopment owing to its scale,

---

<sup>424</sup> Francis Carnwath (18 February 1994) letter to L. D. J. Wallis, Greenwich Reach Developments (Archive: TG 12/3/4/1).

<sup>425</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, pp. 4f.

<sup>426</sup> Ron German (20 June 1994) letter to Brian Miles, Chief Planning Office, London Borough of Lambeth (Archive: TG 12/3/5/1).

<sup>427</sup> Joseph Rowntree Foundation (March 1996) *Art of Regeneration*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, p. 1.

<sup>428</sup> The Tate Gallery (February 1994) *Bankside Power Station Planning Brief Draft*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/3/2/4).

historic industrial building and major urban location on the River Thames.<sup>429</sup> The recommendation was that the building could compete with the Pompidou Centre and offered a once-in-a-century opportunity, comparing its capabilities to the Great Exhibition of 1851. The report was made when Thatcher's Government had been in power for one year, and so neither the public funding nor the vision was in place to realise a project of this kind. Owing to fear of demolition, the Twentieth-Century Society, through National Heritage thereafter, petitioned the Conservative Government to list the Bankside building, as it owned the building. The Government would not list it in order to encourage potential developers to be free from constraints. Bankside, however, was not bought by developers and became a desolate hinterland.<sup>430</sup>

Over a decade later, after Tate Gallery Trustees visited Bankside, they agreed that the scale of the structure and the local area offered a potential platform to build on.<sup>431</sup> Bankside Power Station became a site option. The announcement of Bankside's selection received a mixed press reception. *The Evening Standard* (19 July 1993) published the article: 'Playing Power Politics: Eyesore or architectural gem? Sparks could fly over the Bankside Power Station — should it be saved or should it be pulled down?' The newspaper voiced its concern about the viability of converting an existing building, instead of creating a new design opportunity for London. The article noted that Southwark Council had earmarked Bankside as a key regeneration site in the borough.<sup>432</sup> *The Evening Standard* article warned that ministers feared a rerun of the Battersea Power Station saga, by investing in a building which contained a myriad of problems.

The architectural historian Kenneth Powell, writing in *The Sunday Telegraph* (22 August 1993), welcomed Bankside Power Station as a site option under the banner: 'London's culture cathedral: The Tate's plans for a new gallery for its 20th-century collection could involve a disused power station'.<sup>433</sup> Powell also criticised Serota for his outward lack of enthusiasm for Bankside, and for having a 'dry modern' aesthetic in replacing the architects James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Jeremy Dixon with John

---

<sup>429</sup> Binney, M. (1980) *Save Britain's Heritage: Bankside Power Station*, London: SAVE, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/1/7).

<sup>430</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>431</sup> Beat Kuert (Director) (2008) *Architects Herzog and De Meuron: Tate Modern*, Microcinema Documentary Film.

<sup>432</sup> *The Evening Standard* (19 July 1993) p. 52.

<sup>433</sup> Kenneth Powell (22 August 1993) *The Sunday Telegraph* Review, p. 9.

Miller and Partners at the Tate Gallery.<sup>434</sup> He added that the fate of Bankside Power Station was in the balance as it became entangled in the politics of privatisation, and that the Director and Tate Gallery Trustees were cast in the unlikely role of potential saviours.

Opposition to the Bankside redevelopment continued to come from across the board and included Sam Wanamaker, Vice Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of The Shakespeare Globe Centre, who wrote to the Tate Gallery: 'The Shakespeare Globe Trust would strongly oppose the retention of the Power Station [...] on account of it overwhelming the more modest proportions of the theatre building project, which had taken considerable effort to have built on the Bankside site.'<sup>435</sup> The Location of Industry Bureau took a more patronising tone and even offered its management services.

The Location of Industry added that:

it does seem from some of your observations that, with respect, you are not fully aware of the alarming state of disrepair the building is in and this appears to be reinforced by the fact that you have, as yet not employed an architect or an engineer to make a preliminary appraisal.<sup>436</sup>

The Location of Industry Bureau's services were rejected, as was its opinion on the selection of Bankside Power Station. Other organisations were also not convinced by the Bankside re-development.

Lawrence Hansen, Director of The Southwark Environment Trust, wrote to *The Independent* (5 November 1993):

[Bankside] looks like a cenotaph and indeed casts a mighty gloom over its Thames-side site in central London. It presents a vertical acre of the ugliest-ever bricks to the City and to the river [...]. Despite some art deco styling, [...] the building still casts a miasma of depression [...]<sup>437</sup>

---

<sup>434</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>435</sup> Sam Wanamaker (7 October 1993) Vice Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The International Globe Centre, letter to Dennis Stevenson (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>436</sup> Donald du Parc Braham (29 April 1994) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>437</sup> Lawrence Hansen (5 November 1993) letter to *The Independent* (Archive TG 12/3/2/1).

Hansen later contacted Dennis Stevenson and was no less inflammatory: ‘Surely the Tate ought to reflect the very best spirit of our age, instead of perpetuating a mouldy hangover from the past’.<sup>438</sup> The concern was that the development would result in a banal arts centre, only operational during daylight hours, which would create a dull, lifeless area in the evening. A new building was wanted to create a mixed-use setting at different times of the day. Hansen suggested that with British architectural talent, a development could easily be achieved.<sup>439</sup> On both accounts Hansen was to be disappointed as the Tate Gallery Trustees became increasingly interested in Bankside Power Station as an option.

### **Selling Bankside**

‘Spectacular central London riverside site of three and a half acres, opposite St Paul’s [...]’ began Hillier Parker’s marketing brief for Bankside Power Station.<sup>440</sup> The information outlined that the building had been operational for fifteen years and was less subject to wear and tear than other industrial buildings. To suggest Bankside was in better condition than comparable buildings was not strictly true. Most of the building had been unused for over a decade and was in a state of considerable disrepair. What was true was that the building standing on an 8.48 acres site remained unlisted. The building was not subject to restrictive planning regulations and had been granted a Certificate of Immunity from listing by the DNH, to cover the period February 1993 to February 1998.

Hillier Parker was keen to alert potential purchasers to the fact that the building could be demolished. The marketing brief also stressed that Southwark Council was keen to encourage the development of the site, to contribute to the wider regeneration of the borough. The existing transportation links were seen as a benefit. Blackfriars and London Bridge underground stations, approximately ten minutes’ walk away, were identified as useful access points. Furthermore, Southwark Council had funding in place for the construction of a new underground station on the Jubilee Line extension, which was to be built within walking distance of Bankside. The potential for car-parking facilities and a river bus were also identified as further transport assets.

---

<sup>438</sup> Lawrence Hansen (16 November 1993) letter to Dennis Stevenson (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>439</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>440</sup> Hillier Parker (January 1994) Bankside Brochure, Introduction, 1. 0. (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

Overall, the Bankside Power Station site offered the Tate Gallery a central London river location, which had the possibility for future expansion and had local government support. When the Tate Gallery registered its interest in Bankside, Southwark Council, which was keen to encourage culture and tourism in the area, backed the proposal. While Southwark Council was able to provide basic start-up grants, the Tate Gallery recognised that it would otherwise not be able to make significant funding contributions. Furthermore, the Tate Gallery realised that the building was larger than planned and the cost of the conversion per square foot was higher than estimated. Additionally, the modern industrial nature of the building, which had initially been a draw, was also deemed to be potentially problematic in that it would dictate the style of the new scheme. Another concern regarding the Bankside development was that the Jubilee Line was not definite.

The power station's redeeming feature was its size and scope for local regeneration.<sup>441</sup> Bankside was twice the size of Jubilee Gardens at South Bank with a net developable area of five to six acres, which made it a challenge for redevelopment. One major issue hanging over Bankside was the need for a new bridge to be created between it and the other side of the river to link it with the City. The future Millennium Bridge was recognised as an essential development if the Bankside project was to be successfully realised. The necessity of installing a pier was noted, as was public parking with public transport remaining a concern. These issues would all have to be addressed and priced. The comparative site construction costs, including demolition, site clearance and basic building costs were estimated at: for Effra Vauxhall, £46,730,000; Greenwich Reach, £45,890,000; Jubilee Gardens, £47,520,000; and Bankside, £48,980,000.<sup>442</sup>

Although the most expensive development, Bankside with its coverage of approximately 500m x 200m offered almost the same square footage as the Tate Gallery. Additionally, Bankside's River Thames location and possibility for expansion indicated that it had the best potential over the other site options. The building alleviated the issue raised in the *Tate Gallery's Preliminary Audit Report* (1991), which specified that the Millbank site needed to be twice the size if it was to facilitate the expanding collection.

---

<sup>441</sup> The Tate Gallery (March 1994) *Tate Museum of Modern Art Project Report on Alternative Sites* (Archive: TG 12/3/1/4).

<sup>442</sup> Stanhope Properties (9 November 1993) *Tate MoMA Project Meeting No. 4* (Archive: TG 12/3/3/1).

The scale of Bankside, its central river location and backing from Southwark Council resulted in it becoming the selected site for the Tate Gallery of Modern Art.

### **Purchase and Consultation**

A Tate Gallery Press Release (28 April 1994) announced that Bankside Power Station was the chosen site, and added that the revitalised building would lead to the successful regeneration of a long-neglected area.<sup>443</sup> Southwark Council used the Tate Gallery's decision to strengthen its demand to London Transport to build a new Underground station on the site on the corner of Blackfriars Road and The Cut. With the negotiations underway the Tate Gallery Trustees focused on the costs of the new project. The purchase and initial redevelopment of Bankside was estimated at £80 million, plus additional running costs. The Tate Gallery, with the London Borough of Southwark in consultation with the City of London, and the business membership organisation London First, proposed a strategy to secure funding.

The work was undertaken in consultation with English Heritage. Officially the Historic Building and Monument's Commission for England it was created with the aim of managing and maintaining the historic environment. Initial grants were made by English Heritage towards a structural survey, which provided £3,525 of the estimated £7,000 for the report.<sup>444</sup> The Director of London Region of English Heritage, Paul Drury, stated that they were supportive of the Bankside redevelopment on the basis that prior consultation with them was required throughout the demolition and building process.<sup>445</sup> The proposal to create a new link bridge also required consultation. Although Bankside was not a listed building, because of its scale English Heritage noted that any demolition would affect the setting of surrounding listed buildings and of the area as a whole.<sup>446</sup>

The Tate Gallery appointed the Chartered Quantity Surveyors, Davis Langdon and Everest, as Cost Consultants. Davis Langdon and Everest had to cost all of the pre-construction work and liaised with Stanhope Properties, who continued working as Project Advisors. Schal were appointed as Construction Managers to appoint and oversee

---

<sup>443</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 April 1994) *Tate Press Release*, (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>444</sup> Steve Pilcher (28 February 1994) Grants Branch, London Region, English Heritage, letter to Francis Carnwath (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>445</sup> Paul Drury (21 December 1993) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>446</sup> Paul Drury (13 April 1994) letter to Fred Manson (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

the building packages, which had to be agreed with Davis, Langdon and Everest. The Consulting Engineers, Ove Arup and Partners, had already begun making detailed inspections of the building, to see which remedial works needed to be undertaken. Having undertaken a *Feasibility Study* (28 July 1993) Ove Arup investigated the brick skin of the building.<sup>447</sup> Sound tests concerning the noise from the operational transformer were also undertaken, which remained an ongoing issue throughout the redevelopment.<sup>448</sup>

The Tate Gallery contacted Councillor Jeremy Fraser, Leader of Southwark Council, to ask how they would like to see the scheme develop.<sup>449</sup> Fraser was supportive of the plan and as a result German (Stanhope Properties) consulted with Fred Manson, the Director of Regeneration and Environment of Southwark Council. The key question they debated was whether a ribbon development or a cultural quarter with a new link bridge would best serve the area.<sup>450</sup> A cultural quarter and a link bridge were agreed as the most suitable plan for the redevelopment. Another area to consider was whether to appoint an architect or host an architecture competition. The architectural writer Jonathan Glancey wrote to Serota, warning that it was best to appoint an architect directly, rather than ‘trying to please everyone [but] pleasing no one’.<sup>451</sup> An architecture competition became the chosen format to support the Tate Gallery’s Millennium Commission application, and to find the best architectural practice to achieve their aims.

During these planning stages, the organisation came under further criticism for selecting Bankside Power Station. David Mellor, the former Secretary of State at the Department of Heritage, writing in *The Guardian* (13 May 1994) stated he had been supportive of the Tate Gallery finding a cheaper temporary premises. He warned of ‘the gargantuan folly on which the Tate seems determined to embark’, and added that the National Lottery should not be used for ‘dodgy proposals’.<sup>452</sup> Mellor’s objection was on spending a vast sum of money on a sole project. Not everyone shared this view and

---

<sup>447</sup> Ove Arup & Partners (28 July 1993) *Bankside Power Station-Feasibility Study Status Report* (10 March, 1994), letter to Ron German & Stanhope Properties (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>448</sup> Chris Manning (28 July 1993) *Arup Acoustics Report* (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>449</sup> Nicholas Serota (8 March 1993) letter to Councillor Jeremy Fraser, Southwark Council (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>450</sup> Ron German (26 January 1994) *Stanhope FileNote* (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>451</sup> Jonathan Glancey (14 April 1994) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>452</sup> David Mellor (13 May 1994) letter to *The Guardian* (Archive: TG 12/3/2/3).



letters of support congratulated the Tate Gallery for revitalising an existing building.<sup>453</sup> The Tate Gallery continued to apply for Lottery funding, and claimed that, with the creation of Bankside, a broader context for the collection to stimulate debate and attract wider audiences would be created.<sup>454</sup>

### **Creating the Brief, Completing the Vision**

The Bankside redevelopment was to be coordinated with the renovation of the Tate Gallery at Millbank and the opening of the Bricklayers Arms storage site in Southwark. The Bricklayers Arms had been selected after an appraisal of other site options had been undertaken. It became the selected warehouse storage on account of its accessibility, suitable storage facilities and competitive financial terms, to accommodate art works from the stores at Millbank and the off-site location in Acton, in West London. Bankside, Millbank and the Southwark store and the other sites were to form an interconnected whole, reflecting that the Tate Gallery was a single organisation. The entire development required a focused strategy, which was set out in the *TGMA Creating the Brief, Completing the Vision* (1994).

The aims of *TGMA Creating the Brief, Completing the Vision* re-iterated the need to prioritise access and education. A friendly and informative environment was needed to encourage visitors from diverse cultural communities that had not engaged previously with modern and contemporary art in a gallery.<sup>455</sup> Recognising the imposing nature of the building, one concern was how to communicate a welcoming and educational environment, and to facilitate ease of access to all of the spaces for the visitors, disabled users, staff members and artists. The building was to provide public areas for orientation, meeting and congregation, in order to provide a central heart from which various explorations and activities could happen. The building was to offer clear choices which were ‘to delight as much as educate’.<sup>456</sup>

A recommendation was made to tour the art works and to publish them, with the aim of publicising the collection and integrate them into the Tate Gallery’s educational

---

<sup>453</sup> Peter R. Schwemer (2 May 1994) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

<sup>454</sup> The Tate Gallery (1994) *Tate Gallery Biennial Report*, London: Tate Gallery Publications, pp. 9f.

<sup>455</sup> Nairne, S. (14 March 1994) *TGMA Creating the Brief, Completing the Vision* (Archive TG 12/1/2/2).

<sup>456</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 July 1994) *TGMA Defining the Vision*, p. 1 (Archive TG: 12/1/2/2).

work. The need to establish regular contact with London schools inside and outside of the gallery was required. Teachers' programmes were proposed for a wide range of visits by classes of all ages and abilities. The educational possibilities were to extend to collaborations with universities and broadcasters. An Information Centre was to provide videos and interactive displays; and sound-guides linking to the Tate Study Centre based at Millbank were to be implemented. A wide range of educational possibilities were to be offered through material resources, including books, CD-ROMs, slides and videos linked with the National Curriculum and also to the needs of art students.<sup>457</sup> Expanding the publishing programme in all formats, with a range of products to include high-quality exhibition catalogues to postcards, was also required.

The visit was to provide visitors with new levels of information, facilities and services. The special temporary exhibitions were also to be curated with the objective of enticing new audiences who would then want to visit the rest of the gallery. Shops and catering services were, therefore, to be included to provide an enjoyable place in which to spend time and to generate revenue. Longer opening hours were also required. The Tate Gallery of Modern Art was to act as a catalyst, bringing direct and indirect employment to regenerate the local area. With the opening of Shakespeare's Globe Theatre, the new transport links by underground and overground and the renewed river connections were to contribute to making Southwark a desirable London location.

Ultimately, Bankside was envisioned as a new spectacular landmark in London, offering a stimulating space which would facilitate new ways of experiencing art. The Tate Gallery of Modern Art was to furnish a dialogue between the present and the past to allow for the 'dislocation [and] disruption [...] of art in raw spaces'.<sup>458</sup> The Tate Gallery realised it was competing with presentations of new art in more radical urban spaces, such as private houses and disused warehouses, while competing with an ever-increasing number of new international museums and exhibition spaces. The Tate Gallery of Modern Art was intended to express a renewed confidence in the arts, and to help London become one of the foremost art capitals of the world, along with New York and Paris. With MoMA and the Pompidou Centre as a template Bankside was intended to

---

<sup>457</sup> Nairne, S. (14 March 1994) *Op. cit.* (Archive TG: 12/1/2/2).

<sup>458</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 July 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/2/2).

provide a comparable 120,000 sq ft of gallery space in the first phase of building work.

The international modern and contemporary art from the Tate collection was to be displayed in a series of suites of rooms, each approximately 20,000 sq ft in size. The aim was to provide an overview of the whole of the twentieth century, with attention on the post-war period, while also displaying works from the earlier years of modern art. The brief outlined that this could be achieved by an imaginative hang which required loaned works. Importantly, the building had to offer a whole experience rather than one confined to looking at art, so that the visitor was free to create their own personal space, allowing them to make choices in visiting the displays and shopping areas. Why these choices were important was because the Tate Gallery recognised the cultural turn that had taken place thirty years earlier.

The cultural turn was the point when culture had been put onto the wider social and economic agenda by the government, which demanded that arts establishments widen accessibility to the public that they served, and offer better value for money. In this way, the government communicated change and impacted on cultural vision. The repositioning of arts organisations in providing a public service, as well as the debates concerning museums of modern art, were therefore taken into consideration by the Tate Gallery Trustees when defining the new vision for Tate Modern. The fact that they had to consider the collection, the audience and that the site had to contribute culturally and economically to London by regenerating an inner-city area, made the task all the more challenging. As will be discussed, the theoretical concepts had to be underpinned by a strong business vision to turn them into a working and sustainable practical model.

## Chapter 5. Patronage and Funding

This chapter examines the question, how did government policy continue to impact on the cultural vision and patronage of the Tate Gallery? When John Major replaced Margaret Thatcher as Conservative leader, he renewed his predecessor's aim for a laissez-faire state. The Conservative Manifesto *The Best Future for Britain* (1992) continued to prioritise the areas of wealth and ownership, lower taxes and privatisation, and proposed to introduce a National Lottery as a new mechanism of public funding.<sup>459</sup> The impact of the government directive positioned the Tate Gallery as a professional fundraiser when it competed for National Lottery funding for the purchase and redevelopment of Bankside Power Station. The Tate Gallery, therefore, shifted towards becoming a more business-orientated arts organisation, as it pioneered a mixed public and private partnership funding model. This chapter focuses on how commerce began to play a greater role within the culture of the Tate Gallery.

### Funding Strategy

From the official announcement of the new Tate Gallery of Modern Art, the organisation was forced to secure funding outside of government bodies that were unable or unwilling to provide it. Owing to the sink or swim environment that was created, the Tate Gallery looked for alternative funding opportunities, while developing strategies for self-generating income. South Bank University was appointed to provide a comprehensive report of funding strategies on behalf of the Tate Gallery. *Resume of Funding Regimes Public Sector Investments Strategy: Tate Gallery of Modern Art Report* (1994) outlined the areas of public sector finance that could be raised from capital or revenue schemes.<sup>460</sup> Government capital cash injections were identified as being dependent on the value of the project to the area in which the public authority operated. The government investment could be made in land or cash, on a lease or a lease back arrangement. The contributions were dependent on being able to show increased business and employment.

---

<sup>459</sup> The Conservative Party (1992) *The Conservative Manifesto: The Best Future for Britain*, London: Conservative Party, pp. 5–12.

<sup>460</sup> Professor Gerald Bernbaum (21 October 1994) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/9/1/2).

The Single Regeneration budget and the Assisted Area Status scheme were also noted as potential areas of public funding. The Single Regeneration funding was introduced in 1994, to act as a catalyst for economic and social regeneration through partnership funding. The Assisted Area Status scheme came under the remit of European funding.<sup>461</sup> The scheme was aimed primarily at businesses which would be able to stimulate regional development or urban regeneration. Central revenue sources via direct partnership on special interest schemes were examined, as was National Lottery funding. Regeneration developments applying for National Lottery funding, including Gateshead, were also identified. Gateshead had suffered from de-industrialisation. As part of a recovery plan, the Council's Policy and Resources Committee convened in December 1992, to discuss the redevelopment of The Baltic Flour Mill on the River Tyne. A grant application was made through the Arts Council England to the National Lottery, which saw the project being awarded £33.4 million, plus £1.5 million per annum for the first five years for running costs.

The Baltic Centre for Contemporary Art, as a culture-led regeneration project to revitalise the surrounding area with National Lottery funding, shared some of the characteristics of the model that the Tate Gallery was seeking to achieve in London. The difference between the Tate Gallery of Modern Art and the Baltic Centre for Contemporary Art initiative was that the latter was instigated by Gateshead Council. The London initiative was instigated by the Tate Gallery, and was also on a larger scale. Similarly to the Gateshead proposal the Tate Gallery also chose to apply for the largest Millennium Commission award of £50 million and competed to meet the agency's criteria which were: 'to restore the fabric of the nation [and] to help endow our cities'.<sup>462</sup> While the Southbank University listed other potential sources of revenue it was the Millennium Commission with other public bodies that the Tate Gallery targeted for funding. The Tate Gallery began a fundraising campaign that emphasised the regenerative aspect of the new London exhibition site.

---

<sup>461</sup> South Bank University (1994) *Résumé of Funding Regimes Public Sector Investment Strategy Tate Gallery of Modern Art at Bankside*, London: South Bank University, p. 1.

<sup>462</sup> The Conservative Party (1992) *The Conservative Manifesto: The Best Future for Britain*, p. 44.

The Development Office negotiated start-up donations from private donors and endowments from foundations, charitable trusts and individuals.<sup>463</sup> Southwark Council provided a loan of £500,000 in 1994, towards the deposit for the purchase of Bankside. The national regeneration agency English Partnerships offered money on the basis that funds were secured from the Millennium Commission.<sup>464</sup> International funds were also donated from the USA sector, which included an unrestricted grant of \$1 million paid into the American Fund for The Tate Gallery from the Annenberg Foundation. British contributions included: £10,000 from The Richard Attenborough Charitable Trust; £100,000 from the Esmée Fairbairn Charitable Trust; and, as a targeted 'closest supporter', Barings donated £100,000.<sup>465</sup> The fundraising work was overseen during an organisational restructuring process.

Francis Carnwath resigned from his position as Deputy Director in 1994 and two new posts were created which saw the appointment of Sandy Nairne as Director of Public Services and Alex Beard as the Director of Tate Gallery Finance and Administration. These appointments were vital in the restructuring and development of the Tate Gallery. Nairne played a pivotal role in defining the vision for the new Tate Gallery of Modern Art. Beard was a crucial appointment in the professional management of the funding process. A measure of this was when Carnwath had arrived as the Tate Gallery Deputy Director in 1989 he found that one person John Ashfield was responsible for doing all of the Tate Gallery's accounts by hand. One consequence of this practice was that there was no provision to provide the Tate Gallery Trustees with a breakdown of the annual accounts. Consequently, much was to change within the following five years.

As the new Director of Tate Gallery Finance and Administration, Beard was keen to develop strategic relationships and worked closely with Hambros Bank Ltd.<sup>466</sup> Hambros Bank Ltd had worked extensively with other not-for-profit organisations and had wide-ranging expertise on business strategy and management. Hambros Bank Ltd was experienced in working with the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) launched in 1992,

---

<sup>463</sup> The Tate Gallery (January 1993–March 1995) The *Start-up donations* file is closed owing to the Data Protection Act, therefore specific amounts and names are unavailable (Archive: TG 12/9/1/1).

<sup>464</sup> Nicholas Serota (29 July 1994) letter to David Taylor, English Partnerships (Archive: TG 12/1/9/2).

<sup>465</sup> The Baring Foundation (16 December 1994) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/9/1/1).

<sup>466</sup> Stephen Ives (25 October 1994) letter to Alex Beard (Archive: TG 12/9/1/5).

with the aim of increasing capital stock by targeting private sector resources.<sup>467</sup> Although the Tate Gallery did not opt for PFI funding, it did wish to pursue alternative private funding streams. Securing the services of Hambros Bank Ltd was a crucial appointment for the Tate Gallery in assisting it to fundraise professionally through the private sector.

### **Buying Bankside**

As Chairman of the Tate Gallery Trustees, Dennis Stevenson began negotiations to purchase Bankside Power Station from Nuclear Electric. Bankside Power Station remained under government control during the privatisation process, which began with The Electricity Act (1989). The following year, Nuclear Electric took control of Bankside on behalf of the Government. When the Government chose to sell off Bankside it wanted to receive the best market price for the site. Consequently, the later discussions between Nuclear Electric and the Tate Gallery reached deadlock over the proposed price. Stevenson contacted Peter Brooke, Secretary of State for National Heritage, to plead that the Tate Gallery had been forced into agreeing a higher price of £10 million than had been previously estimated to secure the site. The Tate Gallery had only agreed to the price in order to begin plans for the architecture competition.

One of the aims of hosting the architectural competition was to support the Tate Gallery's application for Millennium Commission funding. The Tate Gallery was, therefore, speculating, as it did not have sufficient funds to pay the agreed purchase price. The Tate Gallery entered the agreement to secure the site for the public good, but Nuclear Electric, another public sector body, was not working with this same aim.

Outraged, or appearing to be, Stevenson stated:

I want to put on record the very strong view of the Tate Gallery Trustees that, as two arms of the public sector, it is highly inappropriate for the Tate Gallery to play Peter to Nuclear Electric's Paul [...] I will, in due course, be seeking agreement from Government for this public asset to be

---

<sup>467</sup> Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1995) *Urban Regeneration*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, pp. 21f & p. 59.



transferred between our two bodies, and for appropriate accounting adjustments to be made.<sup>468</sup>

The letter concluded that the creation of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art in London would be a major cultural development, with reverberations into Europe and beyond. Nuclear Electric reviewed the price and stated: ‘Our joint venture with the Tate gives them time to realise their vision and it is a positive pledge of that wholehearted support from Nuclear Electric’.<sup>469</sup> The £10 million was reduced to £8.8 million. The Tate Gallery announced at a press conference (28 April 1994) that the Bankside Power Station site was confirmed, and that cultural and economic regeneration would be the rewards of the initiative, and a new landmark for London would be established.<sup>470</sup> The plans to host an international architecture competition were also announced, but not everyone including some of the Tate Gallery’s own and related personnel, was in agreement. German stated that while competition might be useful ‘to explore potential and to help fundraising’, that it could extend timescale and costs and by potentially appointing an untried architect could result in the project not being delivered.<sup>471</sup>

Despite the concerns raised, the competition proposal went ahead to find an architectural practice. The objective of the architectural competition was to realise the Tate Gallery’s vision and attract National Lottery funding. The Millennium Commission’s guidelines for Capital Funds emphasised that good design was a requisite, and that architecture competitions were one of the ways of achieving this aim. Even before the guidelines were published, a number of architecture competitions were implemented by the Baltic Flour Mills Arts Centre, Gateshead, the Cardiff Bay Opera

---

<sup>468</sup> Dennis Stevenson (26 April 1994) letter to Rt. Hon. Peter Brooke, Secretary of State for National Heritage, Department of National Heritage (Archive: TG 12/3/2/4).

<sup>469</sup> Mark Baker (28 April 1994) Director of Corporate Affairs and Personnel, *Nuclear Electric News* (Archive: TG 12/3/2/3).

<sup>470</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 April 1994) *Tate Gallery of Modern Art Press Information* (Archive: TG 12/3/2/3).

<sup>471</sup> Stuart Lipton (27 June 1994) *Stanhope Properties File Notes* (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).

House and the Manchester City Art Gallery.<sup>472</sup> Competition, as well as partnership funding, were the guiding principles promoted by the Millennium Commission.<sup>473</sup>

### **Quantifiable Evidence**

To achieve the competitive edge, McKinsey & Company provided the quantifiable evidence that the Tate Gallery needed to support the validity for their proposal. McKinsey & Company's *Assessing the Economic Impact of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art at Bankside* (1994) drew a variety of resources, including a MORI report. The assessment by McKinsey & Company outlined the economic benefits the new gallery would bring by providing a catalyst attraction at Bankside which would draw high visitor figures and generate related revenue. The report estimated that 1.5 million people would visit in the first year, creating between 430 and 1,000 jobs, which would attract further investment through businesses and residents. The outcome would generate between £5 million and £20 million, with between 140 and 530 new local jobs being created.<sup>474</sup>

The economic rewards and employment would be a result of the revitalisation of Bankside, as well as related tourist activities south of the river, which would develop the necessary critical mass of attractions within walking distance of each other. McKinsey & Company estimated the impact of increased investment would provide an additional benefit of between £16 million and £35 million to the wider economy. They also stated that the Tate Gallery of Modern Art would also attract international, as well as national, visitor numbers through blockbuster temporary exhibitions.<sup>475</sup> McKinsey & Company's conclusion was that the new development would provide a world-class modern foreign art gallery which would positively impact on the economy, and contribute to London's prestige and enhance its internal position.

Following the McKinsey & Company report, Southwark Council and the Central Government Office for London appointed the urban regeneration consultants, Martin Caldwell Associates, in December 1994, to provide their own independent assessment.

---

<sup>472</sup> Strong, J. (1996) *Winning by Design: Architectural Competitions*, Oxford: Butterworth Architecture, p. 93.

<sup>473</sup> The Millennium Commission (1995) *The Millennium Commission Report 1993/94*, London: The Millennium Commission, pp. 6f.

<sup>474</sup> McKinsey & Company (14 October 1994) *Assessing the Economic Impact of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art*, p. 3 (Archive: TG 12/1/3/7).

<sup>475</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Martin Caldwell Associates' *Bankside Economic Study* (1995) was based on site visits, data on visitor attractions, consulting agencies, reports and UDPs. Interviews were also conducted with people working in the office, hotel, residential and industrial sectors. The aim was to survey trends in tourism and visitor sectors, to investigate how economic resources might be achieved by the Bankside development. Martin Caldwell Associates' research identified the viability potential of Bankside in having the ability to facilitate a new mixed, cultural, residential and employment development.

Martin Caldwell Associates proposed that a Tate-led initiative could revitalise the former industrial site, and that employment opportunities could be created within the Bankside viaduct network, which would provide further evening leisure attractions for city workers. Unlike the McKinsey & Company's report, Martin Caldwell Associates identified that other tourist draws, apart from the Tate Gallery, would play a vital role in the area's regeneration, including the future Shakespeare Globe Theatre, the 'Old London' developments around Southwark Cathedral and cross-river attractions.<sup>476</sup> Bankside was otherwise identified as having the scope to create a new cultural quarter near the centre of London, and relieving visitor capacity constraints in the West End. The limited opportunity for social housing, given the overall 70 acres of the site, including the land for infill housing, was also noted.

Overall, Martin Caldwell Associates supported the proposal for the broader regeneration of the area and for re-visioning the River Thames. Martin Caldwell Associates stated, as had McKinsey & Company, that a link bridge was crucial to open up the Thames between Southwark and the City of London, to offer visitors a new river experience and a variety of sights. The bridge was also necessary to provide a geographical link between the north and south banks. The transformation of Bankside was recommended as having the potential to provide an anchor attraction for other sights. Martin Caldwell Associates proposed that it could become one of the great buildings of Europe and could attract many first-time visitors.<sup>477</sup> The research concluded that, while stimulating investment and regeneration, the focus on tourism would reinforce London's position as a world city. Conclusively, Martin Caldwell Associates and McKinsey &

---

<sup>476</sup> Martin Caldwell Associates (1995) *Bankside Economic Study*, p. 2.

<sup>477</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6f.

Company provided the quantifiable evidence of the validity of the proposal and assisted the Tate Gallery in its application for National Lottery funding.

### **The National Lottery**

The National Lottery, launched in November 1994, heralded the largest publically funded arts and sports building programme in the UK since the post-war period. The creation of the National Lottery saw the ACGB divided into the Arts Council England, the Arts Council of Northern Ireland and the Arts Council of Wales. The National Lottery funded the new Arts Councils in place of the Treasury, which had previously funded the ACGB. This marked a fundamental shift away from the government funding the arts. The National Lottery distributed further funds to: Awards for All; Heritage Lottery Fund; Millennium Commission; Olympic Lottery Distributor; Scottish Arts Council; Scottish Screen; Sport England; Sports Council for Northern Ireland; Sports Council for Wales; Sportscotland; UK Film Council; and UK Sport.

Twenty per cent of the National Lottery proceeds were awarded to the Millennium Commission to support projects marking the year 2000 and the beginning of the third millennium.<sup>478</sup> The creation of the Millennium Commission was partly to do with Peter Palumbo who, after his time as a Tate Gallery Trustee, served as the Chairman of the Arts Council of Great Britain from 1988 to 1994. In this capacity, he put forward ideas to Thatcher concerning the revitalisation of Britain's former important buildings. By the time of the creation of the Millennium Commission, this shifted towards the regeneration of rundown areas rather than for the benefit of restoring specific buildings. Millennium Commission funded projects were to enjoy public support and make a contribution to the life of the community which they served.

Virginia Bottomley, Secretary of State for the Department of National Heritage, was also the Chairman of the Millennium Commission. Bottomley commended the competitive edge of the Millennium Commission, which had encouraged 1,378 projects to submit applications for the funding awards.<sup>479</sup> The Millennium Commission created four funding awards. Awards were allocated as Capital Projects to support local or

---

<sup>478</sup> The Millennium Commission (1994) *The Millennium Commission First Report, 1993–1994*, London: Millennium Commission, p. 7.

<sup>479</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

regional initiatives, and one-off-capital applications to cover groups of schemes with a common theme. The Millennium Exhibition and Festival Awards were to support a national Millennium Exhibition in 2000. The smaller Millennium Awards were to fund individual projects for the new millennium.<sup>480</sup>

The largest, Landmark Capital Projects, offered up to £50 million to support projects which would establish major landmarks in the UK for the twenty-first century.<sup>481</sup> The Millennium Commission directed that the projects applying for Landmark Capital Projects should reflect partnership funding, be demonstrably financially viable, and have longevity. The proposals which showed high architectural design and environmental quality were given special precedence.<sup>482</sup> The objective was to regenerate urban areas that had fallen into decline and to create self-sustaining projects. According to Munira Mirza, writing for Policy Exchange, the Millennium Commission Landmark Projects opened up ‘a new level of capital for the arts to revive inner cities.’<sup>483</sup>

The regeneration of Bankside in the inner-city area of north Southwark had made the Tate Gallery’s proposal a viable contender in applying for the maximum award of £50 million. Serota asked for a further £15 million making the maximum amount £65 million, and claimed that it was to cover 50% of the total estimated project’s out-turn costs of £130 million. The argument was for parity, as larger sums were being offered to comparable projects by other Lottery distributors. The second reason was that by attracting greater audience numbers the Tate Gallery would generate a higher return.<sup>484</sup> The additional £15 million was not awarded. Undeterred, Serota contacted Chris Smith, Secretary of State for the DCMS: ‘[The Millennium Commission] have hitherto been reluctant to manifest that spirit of partnership by providing further support [...]’<sup>485</sup> Serota added that, in line with government policy, the project would present excellent value for money and would have a long-lasting regenerative impact on the inner-city area.

The demand for increased funding was motivated by the rising cost of the project.

---

<sup>480</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>481</sup> The Millennium Commission (1995) *The Millennium Commission Report, 1994–1995*, p. 7.

<sup>482</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>483</sup> Mirza, M. (ed.) (2006) *Culture Vultures: Is UK Arts Policy Damaging the Arts?* London: Policy Exchange, p. 119.

<sup>484</sup> Nicholas Serota (21 January 1997) letter to Hayden Phillips, Permanent Secretary, Department of National Heritage (Archive: TG 12/5/2/5).

<sup>485</sup> Nicholas Serota (6 May 1997) letter to Chris Smith (Archive: TG 12/5/2/5).

Davis Langdon and Everest estimated the project's costs: for the acquisition of the Bankside Power Station site at £8.8 million; construction and fitting out at £57.4 million; construction contingency £2.2 million; project and design team work £11.4 million; mock-ups and other project expenses £1.5 million; client contingency £5.7 million; other costs at £9.4 million; and VAT estimated at £9.8 million. The Cost Consultants estimated that the total had been estimated at £106.2 million in April 1995, but by June 1995, it had risen to £120 million, owing to design adjustments and inflation.<sup>486</sup> During the rising costs, the Tate Gallery's fundraising campaign gained confidence when in October 1995 the Millennium Commission announced that its bid had been successful.<sup>487</sup>

The Tate Gallery became one of the first recipients to receive a Millennium Commission Capital Award of £50 million. According to the Millennium Commission this was on account of the Tate Gallery making 'a significant contribution to the regeneration of Southwark' with its landmark architecture.<sup>488</sup> The Millennium Commission award to the Tate Gallery was not viewed favourably by everyone. The North-East based newspaper *The Sunday Sun* (29 October 1995) ran the headline: 'Don't Dish Our Dosh To The Posh' and began the article: 'The Tate Gallery is famous for displaying a pile of bricks as modern art.'<sup>489</sup> What this indicated was that the Tate Gallery's Bricks affair had become part of the national consciousness concerning the position taken to modern art. As importantly what the newspaper piece also outlined was that the arts were seen for the 'posh.' The Tate Gallery, rather than repudiate these claims, instead took the position that it needed to attract a wide visitor demographic.

### **English Partnerships**

The Millennium Commission funding generated greater interest in the project as a number of pledges and donations were offered subsequently to the Tate Gallery's Development Office. A further major award was secured from English Partnerships.<sup>490</sup>

---

<sup>486</sup> Davis Langdon and Everest (13 June 1995) *Chartered Quantity Surveyors Report* (Archive: TG 12/6/3/2).

<sup>487</sup> The Millennium Commission (1995) *The Millennium Commission Annual Report and Accounts 1994/95*, London: The Millennium Commission, p. 12.

<sup>488</sup> The Millennium Commission (1996) *The Millennium Commission Report 1995–1996*, p. 11.

<sup>489</sup> Gareth Walsh (29 October 1995) *The Sunday Sun*, p. 1.

<sup>490</sup> The Tate Gallery (1996) *The Tate Report 1994–1996*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 24.

Launched by the Government as a national agency in November 1993, English Partnerships was created to promote regeneration through the development of vacant, derelict and contaminated land. Working in partnership with the public, private and voluntary sectors, its key objectives were to stimulate local enterprise, create job opportunities and improve the environment. English Partnerships initiated the PFI which took over the work of English Estates and the Derelict Land Grant and City Grant programmes. The budget was made up with receipts from its own activities, grant-in-aid from the Department of the Environment and finance from the European Regional Development Fund. The regeneration of Bankside was in accordance with the guidelines for funding awards from English Partnerships.

The Chief Executive of Southwark Council, Anna Whyatt, contacted English Partnerships in support of the Tate Gallery's redevelopment plan for Bankside. At the same time Serota contacted David Taylor, Chief Executive of English Partnerships, and outlined the benefits of a gallery-led regeneration development in Southwark.

Bankside could act as a powerful catalyst to the redevelopment of the whole of the area between Blackfriars and London Bridge and Elephant and Castle. I hope that English Partnerships might wish to play a role in the development of this major section of London.<sup>491</sup>

Stevenson also played a pivotal role for the Tate Gallery in these negotiations as he had been a non-executive Director for English Partnerships from 1993. The professional relationship strengthened the communications between the Tate Gallery and English Partnerships. The Tate Gallery was successful in its bid, which saw £12 million being offered to them by English Partnerships in May 1996.

The funding enabled the Tate Gallery to formulate a design for Bankside, which included a viewing platform at the top of the chimney as a visitor attraction to increase the project's appeal to the Millennium Commission. What this indicated was that, from an early point in the redevelopment and prior to the architect's appointment, the building

---

<sup>491</sup> Nicholas Serota (22 March 1994) letter to David Taylor, Chief Executive English Partnerships (Archive: TG 12/3/2/1).



was conceived to be looked out from as much as providing internal spaces to look into. However, owing to the rising expenditure, the viewing platform did not go ahead, but the revisions in removing it from the design cost time and money.<sup>492</sup>

Furthermore, in summer 1994, Nuclear Electric's fee for deplanting was approximately £2 million, but by January 1995, had risen to £5.8 million.<sup>493</sup> What contributed to the increased costs was the discovery of contaminated ground. After negotiations with German and Stevenson, the Nuclear Electric price was reduced to £3,174,785. However, Nuclear Electric identified further decommissioning works, and the price increased again to £3,204,426, with final costs, including VAT, reaching £3,406,972.<sup>494</sup>

Another costly obstacle was that the deplanting contractors, Brown and Mason, were instructed by National Heritage to stop cutting through the walls of the building to remove plant equipment. The National Heritage stipulation also caused further delays.<sup>495</sup> Furthermore, a fatality occurred when an employee of Brown and Mason died from a fall on 16 April 1996. Clearing Bankside Power Station was becoming hazardous, difficult and expensive. In the same year, Magnox Electric plc took over the assets of Nuclear Electric as a result of the Government's further reorganisation of the Electricity Industry. Magnox Electric plc oversaw the next phase of plant removal and related work. After the contractors removed most of the former power station's machinery, Magnox Electric formally handed over responsibility to the Tate Gallery in September 1996.

With energies diverted towards construction work at Bankside Power Station, the Tate Gallery at Millbank was also requiring updating. The Tate Gallery hoped to secure further National Lottery funding for the refurbishment of the Millbank site, but was unable to secure it. The private sector offered financial support and the Clore Gallery underwent an extensive programme of refurbishment, funded by the Clore Foundation through Mrs Vivian Duffield.<sup>496</sup> Further private funding was secured for the first phase of the collection's store at the Bricklayers Arms site. As the Tate Gallery negotiated a long lease on the second phase of development of industrial units to provide a secure landing

---

<sup>492</sup> The Tate Gallery (June 1995) *Estimated Costs for the TGMA* (Archive: TG 12/3/6/3/10).

<sup>493</sup> Aldous Hodgkinson (10 January 1995) Stanhope letter to Alex Beard with summary notes attached re Deplanting Costs, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/8/4/2).

<sup>494</sup> G. B. Moutrey (25 September 1995) letter to Ron German & P. M. Lee (Magnox) (31 October 1996) letter to Dawn Austwick (Archive: TG 12/8/4/2 and TG 12/4/8/3).

<sup>495</sup> Ron German (29 June 1995) letter to Bernard Angus, Nuclear Electric (Archive: TG 12/8/4/2).

<sup>496</sup> The refurbishment was modified to designs by Michael Wilford and Partners.

and transit space, a preparation area and stores for paintings and sculpture, the work also needed to be funded.<sup>497</sup>

Virginia Bottomley, as the Secretary of State for National Heritage, was contacted by Stevenson for further public funding. The government response was based on whether the Tate Gallery would be successful in its new enterprise. Bottomley stated that if Bankside became a reality, the Tate Gallery as a public organisation would change significantly because a further new national cultural institution would be established.<sup>498</sup> The response was that if the Tate Gallery rigorously sought funding from other resources, the Government would be responsive and asked the Trustees to do everything in their power to eliminate the annual running cost deficit by exploring alternative funding strategies. Another challenge was put to the Tate Gallery Trustees by the Government, which was to consider charging an admission fee. This was a policy which the Tate Gallery always rejected, but which other national museums and galleries, including the V&A, had implemented under the Thatcher Government. With this kind of response, the onus was on the Tate Gallery to stimulate other funding revenues, as charging an admission fee was something that it wished to avoid. To attract further funding Serota believed increasing the profile of the Bankside area would help the Tate Gallery.

### **Southwark Station**

Serota contacted London Transport and proposed that the intended Southwark station on the Jubilee Line extension be named 'Bankside'. Peter Ford, the Chairman of London Transport, responded that it was not possible.<sup>499</sup> Serota petitioned Ford again, informing him that the Tate Gallery had been awarded Millennium Commission funding, and that the plan was progressing well. Serota added that a Bankside Development Officer had been appointed, and that Southwark Council also had a number of initiatives underway to support the proposal. Serota's proposition was that as Bankside developed its own

---

<sup>497</sup> The Tate Gallery (1996) *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1994–1996*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 45.

<sup>498</sup> Virginia Bottomley (14 May 1996) Secretary of State, letter to Dennis Stevenson (Archive: TG 12/7/1/2).

<sup>499</sup> Peter Ford (14 November 1995) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/7/3/1).

distinct identity as a London destination: 'it would be marvellous to mark this with such a significant intervention as its own name on the underground station that serves it'.<sup>500</sup>

London Transport responded to Serota and to Councillor Jeremy Fraser, Leader of Southwark Council, by outlining its decision *not* to name the station Bankside, on the basis that there would be confusion with Bank Station. London Transport added that it would incur additional costs in changing the associated signage and that, as Blackfriars was a closer walk, it would be odd to name a station 'Bankside' that was a further distance away. London Transport also proposed a more unusual reason for not renaming it Bankside, claiming that Bankside might become colloquially known as 'Backside'.<sup>501</sup>

Serota was not dissuaded and responded:

Given the arguments advanced in the letter, I wonder how can it be that London Transport continues to maintain Queensway on Bayswater Road and Bayswater Station on Queensway and to retain such names as Bank and Cockfosters. Are these not equally names which are capable of geographical confusion, transformation or double entendre, bringing the great name of London Transport into disrepute?<sup>502</sup>

London Transport was not dissuaded and Southwark station, designed by MacCormac Jamieson Prichard, opened in November 1999.

The insistence on the Bankside name was to aid with the marketing of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art for funding. In the meantime, the Development Department continued to focus on cash contributions from the private sector. Significant gifts of art works were also made to the Tate Gallery. Janet Wolfson de Botton, who had been a Tate Gallery Trustee from 1992, made a gift of sixty contemporary art works by British and American artists in 1996. The art works were estimated at a market value of

---

<sup>500</sup> Nicholas Serota (3 April 1996) letter to Peter Ford (Archive: TG 12/7/3/1).

<sup>501</sup> Gary Joynes (5 November 1996) London Transport Developmental Manager letter to Councillor Jeremy Fraser, Leader of Southwark Council (Archive: TG 12/7/3/1).

<sup>502</sup> Nicholas Serota (22 November 1996) letter to Peter Ford (Archive: TG 12/7/3/1).

approximately £2.3 million, and were a major gesture of support to the new Tate Gallery of Modern Art from the private sector.<sup>503</sup>

Financial aid continued to come into the Development Committee and was overseen by the Chairman, the American businessman, Mr John Botts. The financial breakdown in June 1997 consisted of start-up and other donations of £15.4 million, pledges at £6.2–£10.5 million with further lease benefits forecast at between £2.6 million and £10 million. VAT recovery was to be recouped from the total £130 million, at £12.25 million. The Development Committee estimated that it had achieved £98.5 million at the lower end and £110.2 million at the upper end, but needed a further £20 to £32 million over the development period, to raise the full £130 million cost. A special meeting on 18 June 1997 was held to discuss funding as it was estimated that the £130 million project cost would not be raised by the funding target date of 23 June 1997.<sup>504</sup>

Onsite problems resulted in further escalating construction costs being reported by Davis Langdon in July 1997.<sup>505</sup> The construction cost of £2,230,000 was reported back on target by October 1997.<sup>506</sup> A further £19.8 million to £31.5 million was required over the next development period. ‘Bridging the Gap’ was achieved by funding from the private sector.<sup>507</sup> Two donors offered £10 million, with a number of other donors offering funds of £1 million and above, with additional funding coming from trusts. The corporate sector raised in excess of £5 million through an initiative led by Anthony Salz and a group of other leading businessmen.<sup>508</sup> Expenditure for the project, from 1997 to June 1998, was estimated at £130 million, but with an increase in construction costs the budget rose to £134.5 million.<sup>509</sup> The funding strategy relied increasingly on offers, rather than cash on the table, and required a coordinated strategy to raise the additional finance.

---

<sup>503</sup> Buck, L. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 261.

<sup>504</sup> The Tate Gallery (18 June 1997) *Confidential Agenda for Special Meeting of the Trustees of the Tate Gallery*, unpaginated (Archive: TG 12/5/8/10).

<sup>505</sup> Ian Fraser (17 July 1997) letter and memorandum. Job No. 06313 to Harry Gugger, Tim Marriott, Ian Blake & Ron German (Archive: TG 12/6/3/25).

<sup>506</sup> Steve Watts (Senior Project Surveyor, Davis Langdon & Everest) (1 October 1997) letter to Harry Gugger, Tim Marriott, Ian Blake & Ron German (Archive: TG 12/6/3/36).

<sup>507</sup> The Tate Gallery (18 June 1997) *Confidential Agenda for a Special Meeting of The Trustees of the Tate Gallery to be held Wednesday in the Boardroom Millbank*, 4. 2, p. 7 (Archive: TG 12/6/2/5).

<sup>508</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>509</sup> The Tate Gallery (February 1999) *Tate Gallery of Art Monthly Report*.

## **Branding Tate**

Branding the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was the next stage in the process to promote the funding initiative, and had been spurred on by the lack of signage at Bankside. As late as March 1998, a Buildings and Services memorandum stated:

At present there is no signing anywhere, even of an architectural nature.  
[...] the landscape will be 'dumb' to any signing requirements in design terms unless we choose a generic signpost frame system in which to house the new signs.<sup>510</sup>

The memorandum outlined there were no graphically designed signs in place to accompany the development of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art.

The Tate Gallery of Modern Art needed new graphics for its marketing. The decision was taken to outsource the work, which was overseen by the Communications Department. Wolff Olins, Watermark and Pentagram were all asked to pitch. Wolff Olins was appointed because of its track record, as well as its expediency, collaborative approach, value for money and understanding of the project.<sup>511</sup> Wolff Olin's strategist Brian Boylan was appointed to oversee the Tate Gallery branding process. Boylan observed the organisational practices of the Tate Gallery through workshops in which the staff participated to identify the needs of the organisation. The research provided Wolff Olins with the knowledge to formulate a new branding framework for the Tate Gallery.

Wolff Olins proposed a focused strategy: 'The Ten Principles of Interpretation for TGMA' and identified the following areas:

1. The collection contains many histories and not a single twentieth-century chronology;
2. TGMA is to inspire its visitors to be confident about their feelings towards modern and contemporary art;
3. Experience, expectation and response is to be validated;

---

<sup>510</sup> The Tate Gallery (3 March 1998) *Buildings and Gallery Services Memorandum* (Archive: TG 12/7/5/4).

<sup>511</sup> The Tate Gallery (16 June 1998) *Communications Department Memorandum* (Archive: TG 12/7/5/4).

4. Interpretation is to include education and information;
5. Interpretation is to make an intellectual contribution;
6. Exhibitions and related activities are to be established for a wide range of visitors;
7. The possibility for multiple readings of the art works is to enable visitors to engage with the art in a personal way;
8. To accommodate a wide spectrum of voices from inside and outside the institution;
9. Interpretation and communications are to work in an integrated way; and
10. To provide innovation, experimentation and evaluation.<sup>512</sup>

‘The Ten Principles of Interpretation’ were based on commercial marketing practice. The strategy worked on the premise that the Tate Gallery needed to identify its visitors, keep its existing visitors, and develop new visitors.<sup>513</sup> Wolff Olins was able to develop this kind of marketing strategy because the Tate Gallery had already been engaging with its visitors. Twenty years earlier, Reid had created the Education Department, which had opened up access, and had overseen the press, media and public communications which had ensued around ‘The Bricks’ episode. The Turner Prize had continued a further dialogue with the media and the public over the legitimacy of modern art. The Tate Gallery had, therefore, actively engaged with, and developed, an audience by making modern art a public event. The outcome was that the public had an official voice on whether it liked or disliked modern art.

What was crucial was that a communication was established between the Tate Gallery and its audience, which had been identified earlier in ‘Defining the Vision’ which proposed that the Tate Gallery of Modern Art should provide a variety of activities to engage its visitors. The reason the Tate Gallery was able to meet these aims for the visitors to meet, eat, drink and shop was because the role of the modern art gallery had changed. According to Olins, the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was about concepts and experiences rather than pictures, and as such was able to provide a unique service for

---

<sup>512</sup> The Tate Gallery (19 March 1998) *The Ten Principles of Interpretation for TGMA* (Archive: TG 12/7/5/4).

<sup>513</sup> Kotler, P. Armstrong, A. Wong, V. & Saunders, J. (2008 [1996]) *Principles of Marketing*, Harlow: Pearson Education, p. xxii.

public money.<sup>514</sup> Furthermore, the Tate Gallery was in a position to cater to the ‘needs and wants’ of the audience because it had created them.<sup>515</sup>

### **The Tate Gallery of Modern Art Becomes Tate Modern**

‘The Ten Principles of Interpretation’ were created as a tool to aid the branding process. Wolff Olins proposed that the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was not to be a generic modern art gallery, but was to offer the Tate experience. From this trajectory, Tate ‘the brand’ was launched. Since the post-war period, the Tate Gallery had been known popularly as ‘the Tate’. Wolff Olins removed ‘gallery’ and the definite article to create the brand name ‘Tate’. The branding graphic was presented through four different variations — standard, blurred, faded and halftone — in a choice of bright colours. The branding process was intended to unify the organisation. All services and products became part of the Tate brand. The outcome was that the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was re-configured as Tate Modern (Museum of Modern Art). Tate Modern had become a museum rather than a gallery, following the US precedent.

The Tate Gallery became Tate Britain, reverting to the original role of the founding organisation to represent British art. The Tate Gallery Liverpool became Tate Liverpool which was to display British and international modern and contemporary art. The Tate Gallery St Ives became Tate St Ives which was to continue exhibiting work by modern British artists. The branding concept was sanctioned in spring 1998 but, owing to delays in the building schedule, the changes did not officially take effect until summer 1999. The Olins branding permeated the culture of the Tate for the visitors, emphasising the idea that the experience replaced the more conventional modes of art spectatorship: ‘With Tate, Wolf Olins provided a distinctive worldwide brand which broadened the museum’s appeal and conveyed its forward thinking approach to experiencing art’.<sup>516</sup> The Tate had become a brand-led rather than a gallery-led organisation; it was able to facilitate this fundamental change because it had already started to expand its scope.

*The Tate Report 1992–1994* (1994) identified its aims as curating, documenting, researching, publishing, storing and caring for the art works, as well as borrowing, loans,

---

<sup>514</sup> Olins, W. (2003) *Tate Case Study*, London: Wolff Olins, p. 3.

<sup>515</sup> Kotler, P. Armstrong, A. Wong, V. & Saunders, J. (2008 [1996]) pp. 8f.

<sup>516</sup> Olins, W. (2003) *Tate Case Study*, p. 1.



and interpreting and promoting the collection.<sup>517</sup> Four years later, *The Tate Report 1996–1998* (1998) rephrased ‘aims’ to ‘aims and values’, which began to read as a government exercise in commercial marketing: ‘The Tate Gallery aspires to international excellence and wishes: to combine quality and accessibility [...] to invest in high quality architecture and promote good design [...] and to be accountable to the public [...]’.<sup>518</sup> The Tate Gallery was creating an identity in line with Labour’s vision.

Replacing the Department of National Heritage (DNH) with the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), the new Labour Government department laid out its own aims in *A New Cultural Framework* (1998): ‘to ensure the delivery of appropriate outputs and benefits to the public; to streamline the way we deliver our policies and programmes; and to raise standards of efficiency and management across all our sectors’.<sup>519</sup> *A New Cultural Framework* did not appear so new in its emphasis on delivery of outputs, which echoed earlier DNH policy. What was new was that, from July 1998, the Labour Government provided a direct cash injection to the cultural sector of £290 million, for a period of over three years.

The financial allocations were awarded on the basis of providing access, innovation and education. A portion of the funding was awarded for the use of the arts, of which the Tate Gallery was a beneficiary and in response it continued to respond to New Labour’s Government directive for creating private sector stimulus, which is why it formed a new Business Development Unit in 1999. The business strategy focused on maximising marketing and revenue opportunities out of public programmes and licensing images. The Tate Gallery in doing so was demonstrating that culture and commerce inhabited the same space. Subsequently, the Tate Gallery was commended by the Government in a public report, *Efficiency and Effectiveness of Government-sponsored Museums and Galleries - Measurement and Improvement: Private Initiative Incentive Excellence Study (PFI)* (1999).

---

<sup>517</sup> The Tate Gallery (1994) *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1992–1994*, London: Tate Publishing, pp. 6f.

<sup>518</sup> The Tate Gallery (1998) *The Tate Gallery Biennial Report 1996–1998*, p. 6.

<sup>519</sup> Department of Culture, Media & Sport (14 December 1998) *A New Cultural Framework*, London: Department of Culture, Media & Sport, p. 1.

The DCMS-sponsored report was produced by Deloitte & Touche to evaluate innovative practice in securing private sector partnership benefits within the museum and gallery sector.

The questions included:

- What was the use of the private sector in the delivery of goods and services within the field of the museum and gallery?
- What were the constraints on museums and galleries?
- What private sector skills were applicable and exploited? and
- What was the economic scope through joint procurement of services and collaborative partnerships?<sup>520</sup>

The assessment commended the Tate Gallery for successfully managing these expectations. It noted that PFI was discounted at the planning stage because the Tate Gallery believed sufficient funding could be raised by independent fundraising and because it wanted autonomy from the regulations governing the legislation. The Tate Gallery was commended for managing the funding strategy, the construction process and the marketing and rebranding strategy. Additionally, the pragmatic approach to challenges, which were driven by in-house capabilities, was also praised. The report was published before Tate Modern opened, but already hailed it as an exemplary model of museum practice and innovation. The commendation was because the Tate had demonstrated an ability to work within a tripod economy of public, private and earned income revenues. It also identified that the Tate performed consistently at a professional level and maximised value for money. The report noted that the construction process had been subject to change, but that the Tate kept to its funding target in adopting a 'what works' philosophy in utilising the economies of scale.<sup>521</sup>

Recognising that the organisation was selling a whole experience and wished to maintain control over the entire process, the DCMS continued to allow the Tate

---

<sup>520</sup> Deloitte & Touche (1999) *Efficiency and Effectiveness of Government-sponsored Museums and Galleries - Measurement and Improvement, Private Initiative (PFI) Excellence Study*, London: Department of Culture, Media & Sport, p. 10.

<sup>521</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 29.

autonomy in the Bankside development. The report concluded that the Tate's ability to fundraise and deliver on a considerable scale was owing to the in-house expertise of the management steered by Serota and Stevenson which had been underpinned by a unified strategy and an understanding of the need to create a business vision. Consequently, the Business Development Unit was established to increase the 'value of the Tate Brand', as well as to explore the organisation's underused assets.<sup>522</sup> The Business Development Unit's team played a catalytic role in working with different departments to initiate projects as part of the strategy.

The Development Department incorporated Tate's business strategy to include Campaigns, Corporate Fundraising, Membership, Special Events, Trusts and Public Sector Fundraising and the Tate American Fund.<sup>523</sup> The donations received, from 1 April 1998 to 31 March 2000, indicated that the business strategy was successful in attracting corporate, as well as private sector, funding. The private benefactors included long-term patrons such as the Clore Foundation. The list of independent donors was published in *Tate Facts* (2000) with a number of donors wishing to remain anonymous.<sup>524</sup> Many of the donors who were public in their contributions came directly from the City of London and from the corporate sector. Significant contributions were made by The Carpenters' Company, The Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths, The Worshipful Company of Grocers, The Leathersellers' Company Charitable Fund and The Worshipful Company of Tallow Chandlers. The founding corporate partners included AMP, BNP Paribas, CGNU plc, Clifford Chance, Energis Communications, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer, Goldman Sachs, Lazard, London Electricity plc - EDF Group, Pearson plc, Prudential plc, Railtrack plc, Reuters, Rolls-Royce plc, Schroders, UBS Warburg, Wasserstein Perella and Co. Inc., and Whitehead Mann GKR.

### **The Change Management Programme**

Stevenson stepped down and was replaced by the successful investment banker, David Verey, who acted as Tate Chairman from 1998 to 2000. Verey continued to play a strategic role in overseeing the final costs governing the construction process and

---

<sup>522</sup> The Tate Gallery (2000) *The Tate Gallery Report 1998–2000*, London: Tate Gallery Publishing, p. 38.

<sup>523</sup> Wilson, S. (ed.) (2000) *Tate Facts 2000*, London: Tate Gallery Publishing, p. 50.

<sup>524</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

negotiations for the opening of Tate Modern. Verey was also able to oversee the organisation undergoing major organisational changes.<sup>525</sup> The major new areas to be developed in its restructuring included the creation of Directors and Management Teams for Tate Britain and Tate Modern. The Change Management Programme oversaw this work which introduced collaborative ways of working within and outside the organisation. A new practice was established in creating career opportunities for individual members of staff.

New technology was a key area of development, which impacted throughout the organisation and was introduced throughout the Tate's buildings. A new finance system, a collections management system and an image management system were also created. The conversion of the Tate library and archive data to a digital system, as well as a new box office system, and a telecommunications system, with the creation of an intranet, turned the organisation into a modern commercial organisation. Retail also played a major role in the redevelopment with the expansion of Tate's subsidiary companies of Tate Publishing and Tate restaurants. The Tate restaurants outsourced services at Tate Britain, with new cafés and a restaurant being created at Tate Modern. The Tate shops, publishing activities, licensing, picture library and online services achieved a turnover of £7 million, contributing £2 million to the organisation's revenues from 1998–1999. New products and editions were created to generate further revenue streams.

Internationally, the American Fund for the Tate Gallery had been created in 1988, and with an additional \$6.5 million endowment from the American Patrons of Tate Gallery established in 1999, made substantial contributions to the fund.<sup>526</sup> Overall what had been achieved from the combined national and international funding strategies was £50 million from the Millennium Commission. English Partnerships provided £12 million. The Arts Council, England gave £6.2 million.<sup>527</sup> The DCMS awarded £5 million. The Clore Gallery Foundation and associated Vivien Duffield Foundation donated £2.5 million. Unilever offered £1.25 million sponsorship money, for a commissioned artist to produce work designed specifically for the Turbine Hall. The rest of the funding came

---

<sup>525</sup> The Tate Gallery (2000) *The Tate Report 1998–2000*, London: Tate: Publishing, p. 7.

<sup>526</sup> The Tate Gallery (2000) *Philanthropy, The Role of Benefactors, Opportunities for Giving and Tax-effective Ways of Giving*, London: Tate Pamphlet, unpaginated.

<sup>527</sup> Deloitte & Touche (1999) *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

from private UK and international donors. The funding initiative succeeded because it had been backed by a robust campaign, which had involved outsourcing services to the branding consultancy Wolf Olins.

The Development Office's work ran alongside a highly co-ordinated operational strategy, which was mobilised into action by Bankside Operations. Their programming work entailed organising employment opportunities for local residents for the staffing positions and was a key factor in the funding process as it was necessary for funders to see that the Tate was fulfilling its aims in providing local employment.<sup>528</sup> The work ran in tandem with the Publicity Department and Communications Department which oversaw the press and media. Open days, events and publications, the visitor centre and the opening ceremony were part of the marketing and communications strategy.<sup>529</sup> The Publicity Department worked closely with Bolton and Quinn, the Public Relations team which focused on increasing public awareness and expanding Tate Modern's appeal. Media interest was further boosted through press releases while other more novel methods of advertising were also being utilised.

A special preview for 20,000 taxi cab drivers in London was used to increase word-of-mouth coverage to passengers. *Time Out* (2000) provided a guide for the local area of Bankside and *The Sunday Times Magazine* covered the launch party. High-profile celebrities attended including Mick Jagger, Claudia Schiffer, Kylie Minogue, and Madonna. Channel 4 was also screening Karl Sabbagh's television documentary 'Power into Art: The Battle for the New Tate Gallery.' BBC 2 provided updates in news related items and when the building opened it was covered live on BBC 1. Public relations agencies in France and New York also assisted with international coverage of the event. The aim of the national and international hype was to raise the profile of Tate Modern; the objective was to continue to attract funding. The funding for the project totalled £134.5 million and was achieved on target by 31 May 2000. Funded by a 60% public and 40% private split, Tate Modern reflected government vision by almost matching public sector money with private sector finance. How far had the government effected change,

---

<sup>528</sup> Tate Bankside Operations (Archive: TG 12/12).

<sup>529</sup> Tate Publicity (Archive: TG 12/10).

and how had this impacted on the Tate Gallery? This was demonstrated when the Tate Gallery competed for public and private sector funding to create Tate Modern and got it.

## Chapter 6. Competition and Building

This chapter discusses the question, how had culture ascended the urban agenda and impacted on the Tate Gallery? It considers how the architectural competition was used by the Tate Gallery in developing the most appropriate building to display the collection, attract visitors, contribute to the regeneration of the area and become a landmark for London. It assesses the extent to which the Tate Gallery became a highly competent architectural patron and building client, ensuring that, despite the complexity of the conversion, it was delivered on time and on budget. Meticulous planning was therefore, required by a design practice which was to be found by hosting an architectural competition to realise the Tate Gallery's vision.

The last external building development of Tate St Ives had been created by hosting an architectural competition. Tate Liverpool, however, had been created by a direct appointment as Richard Rogers, the Chairman of the Tate Gallery Trustees, had been unable to persuade Alan Bowness, who wished to continue using the architects Stirling, Wilford and Partners who had designed the Clore Gallery. Rogers promoted the idea of the architecture competition in place of direct procurement and later claimed that it was the solution to poor urban design in the UK as 'a way to improve the public realm'.<sup>530</sup> Developing the urban environment meant improving the quality of architectural design.

Rogers's concern was that UK architects lacked the competitive edge compared to their European counterparts and used as an example of how, under President Mitterand during the 1980s, a different picture emerged in France, where architecture competitions were promoted to find good architects. The impact saw the *Grands Projets* created, and a new generation of French architects.<sup>531</sup> Similarly, Germany, the Netherlands and Japan had increasingly hosted architectural competitions, whereas the UK and the US remained less speculative in this sphere. As an independent voice for the UK, Rogers supported the architecture competition as the best method for raising the quality of architectural design.

---

<sup>530</sup> Collyer, G. S. (2004) *Competing Globally in Architecture Competitions*, Chichester: Wiley-Academy, p. 21.

<sup>531</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.



The year before the National Lottery was proposed, Rogers stated: ‘The greatest contribution to improving the design of public buildings in Britain would be the establishment of a nationwide system of architecture competitions’.<sup>532</sup> The proposal was given substance when the Millennium Commission identified that a preference would be given to the applicants that hosted architecture competitions.

### Researching the Process

The programming of architectural competitions had been regulated by RIBA. Pursuing policies of deregulation, the government requested that RIBA abandon its fee scale for architectural competition guidelines in 1992.<sup>533</sup> RIBA attempted to reintroduce a fee guidance document in 1994, but was questioned by the Office of Fair Trading. RIBA waived the fee and lost its monopoly on official jurisdiction over architectural competitions in England.<sup>534</sup> Owing to the change in regulations, the Tate Gallery opted out of RIBA’s guidelines and undertook European Union (EU) tendering rules.<sup>535</sup> The EU guidelines enabled the Tate Gallery to develop its own format, and they had already begun researching the architecture competition brief.<sup>536</sup>

The Tate Gallery sent *A Questionnaire to Modern Foreign Museums* (17 November 1993) to major European and North American museums to inquire about their recent building projects. The questions asked about the owner, patron and architect responsible for the museum’s development, as well as the management of the project, the building process, the planning period and the funding mechanism. Specific inquiries were made concerning: What were the costs for preparation and development? How much was the construction of the building? Were any special problems incurred, e.g. proximity of river or other obstacles that contributed to costs? How was the building procured, in a direct, limited or open national or international competition? Who drafted the brief for the

---

<sup>532</sup> Rogers, A. (1992) *A New London*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, p. xxxvi.

<sup>533</sup> Strong, J. (1996) *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

<sup>534</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>535</sup> Stanhope (16 December 1993) *Tate-MoMA Project Meeting No. 6* (Archive: TG 12/3/3/1).

<sup>536</sup> Ron German (23 December 1993) letter, notes & table of architectural competition formats to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12 /4/2/1).

competition: an in-house team or an outside consultant? Who was made a member of the jury? Was the building completed on budget? Was the building completed on time?<sup>537</sup>

Certain museum responses were less helpful than others. Germain Viatte, Director of the *Musée National d'Art Moderne*, Pompidou Centre, did not respond. After being sent a follow-up letter, photocopied press cuttings were returned, without the questionnaire. Other museums were more forthcoming. The Director, Dr Klaus Schenk, of the *Kunstmuseum*, in Bonn, along with the questionnaire provided additional detailed information, including costs, floor plans and public leaflets. The US museums were particularly helpful about their building programmes. The Art Institute of Chicago's Vice-President of Operations, Calvert W. Audrain included a file of plans. Richard Koshalek, Director of the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, also provided building plans, and stated that their architectural competition had used a committee of Trustees, including artists and an architect, who selected a list of six candidates. Similarly, the Tate Gallery chose to run their competition with six selected candidates for its final shortlist and with a jury of a similar composition. Koshalek was also invited to be one of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art jury assessors.

The Director of MoMA, James S. Snyder warned about the level of bureaucracy concerning legislation which, unexpectedly, made the pre-development for the west wing construction complicated and the costs 'disproportionately high'.<sup>538</sup> The Guggenheim, New York, provided one of the more direct responses to the question about whether there were any special problems relating to the project. The Guggenheim responded: 'Failure to set program, budget, and schedule early in the project led to recurring conflict'.<sup>539</sup> The Guggenheim, Soho, was equally honest about the pitfalls of their project. The new building had been planned from 1982 and was under construction from 1988 to 1992. The Director stated: 'Constructing and operating a museum within an existing multi-tenant building adds complexity and cost to both the construction and maintenance costs'.<sup>540</sup> What was indicated overall was that working to the set budget, within time constraints, as well as liaising with local people, was difficult.

---

<sup>537</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 November 1993) *Questionnaire to Foreign Museums* (Archive: TG 12/4/1/3).

<sup>538</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>539</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>540</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 November 1993) *Questionnaire to Foreign Museums* (Archive: TG 12/4/1/3).

Further research was undertaken by the Tate Gallery concerning the aesthetic considerations of artists. Selected artists were contacted on the basis that their work would be shown in Tate Modern.<sup>541</sup> Responding to the question: which are your favourite museums and galleries for exhibiting your work, or for viewing the work of others? Rachel Whiteread responded: 'No favourites, but always favour serene architecture both internally and externally'.<sup>542</sup> Good natural lighting such as that in the Serpentine Gallery was Whiteread's preference, and echoed a similar response from Damien Hirst for liking galleries which were well-lit and not architecturally overwhelming. The Whitechapel Gallery was championed by Julian Opie for its uncomplicated architecture. David Tremlett liked the *Stedelijk* Amsterdam, for its clean, uncluttered open space with no architectural eccentricities.<sup>543</sup>

Michael Craig-Martin favoured many traditional museums, but preferred conversions for being more sympathetic spaces for the display of art works, as did most of the other artists questioned. The Louvre Museum and the Tate Gallery were also recommended by Gerhard Richter for their proportions. Paulo Rego favoured the Prado in Madrid for its exciting collection, easy access and for having large, as well as intimate, rooms. Howard Hodgkin did not share the same view as the other artists, and praised Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim building as an architectural work of art in its own right, and for its urban location. Hodgkin found newly built museums too busy. Overall, urban locations were identified as the preferred sites for museums of modern art, with MoMA receiving the most praise for its innovative, but not overwhelming, design. The *Centre Pompidou* was also commended as an ideal exhibition venue with its open floors, adaptability to new uses, and also for being set within its urban environment.

Additionally, the artists liked day-lit spaces and converted spaces from existing buildings, where architectural intervention was minimal. The *Hallen für Neue Kunst*, Schaffhausen, the Saatchi Collection and the late nineteenth-century Beaux-Arts style museums including the *Kunsthalle*, Bern and the *Stedelijk* Museum, Amsterdam, were also recommended by a number of the artists questioned. While metropolitan sites were

---

<sup>541</sup> Nicholas Serota (5 January 1994) letter to Artists (Archive: TG 12/4/1/6).

<sup>542</sup> The Tate Gallery (January 1994) *Questionnaire to Artists* (Archive: TG 12 /4/1/6).

<sup>543</sup> *Ibid.*

desirable, many artists liked the Louisiana Museum of Modern Art, *Humblebaek*, Denmark and the *Kröller-Müller*, Otterlo, for being rural and naturally lit.<sup>544</sup>

Antony Gormley responded to the question whether he preferred traditional museums, newly built, or conversions, and opted for the latter. Gormley's favourites included the Saatchi Gallery at Boundary Road, St John's Wood, the former Tilbury Riverside Station converted into an Arts Activity Centre, and the Reina Sofia in Madrid, because of the large and various exhibition spaces on one level. What Gormley and the artists generally thought of as common mistakes in museum design, were low ceilings, small exhibition spaces, public spaces that were too large and curved walls. Overall, what emerged from the artists' questionnaires was their universal dislike of the architects' presence in dominating the museum space. This concern would be addressed by the Tate Gallery in the architectural competition, by specifying that the architectural practice would need to prioritise the collection and the visitor.

### **Architectural Competition Reception**

The Tate Gallery's architecture competition was published electronically in the *European Architecture Journal* (July 1994). The accompanying information identified that the contest was to be hosted as an open international architectural competition rather than as a national one, which turned it into a global event.<sup>545</sup> The announcement was also a strategic piece of self-promotion to generate public interest. The news of the Tate Gallery's architecture competition, and the other ones which were being undertaken to meet the Millennium Commission funding directive, received a mixed response. Adrian Ellis wrote in *The Independent* (May 1994): 'Thanks to the National Lottery, architecture competitions are set to become a major force in England ... [and]... will feature prominently in the selection of architects'.<sup>546</sup> Not all responses were positive. Hugh Pearman, the architectural correspondent for *The Sunday Times* (October 1994) claimed:

---

<sup>544</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>545</sup> Stanhope (16 December 1993) *Tate-MoMA Project Meeting No. 6* (Archive: TG 12/3/3/1).

<sup>546</sup> Ellis, A. (25 May 1994) 'Competitions who really wins?' In *The Independent*.

‘Nobody wins’, and stated that competitions were unsatisfactory, a waste of time and money and did not benefit the client.<sup>547</sup>

Richard Rogers and Mark Girouard in *The Sunday Times* (December 1994), responded: ‘Everybody Wins’.<sup>548</sup> Rogers and Girouard stated that where architecture competitions had been supported, particularly by national governments, a culture of strong architectural design had been fostered. They proposed that this resulted in a better urban landscape being created. This chimed with the aims of the Tate Gallery which envisaged that their new redevelopment would be fully integrated within the environment and would provide a holistic solution to the revitalisation of Bankside Power Station. What was essential was that the Tate Gallery’s vision would be translated into a working model and that the architect’s design would not dominate. The fact that the design was to convert an existing building, rather than build from new, made the development all the more challenging. The building also had to extend beyond the normal parameters of a gallery and was to form part of the fabric of London.

The aim was that the gallery should play an important civic role which would set up a dialogue between the art works, the architecture and the visitors.<sup>549</sup> The urban context was vital, as were the building and the display spaces. The architecture competition brief outlined that the new London site: ‘will have national and international significance on a scale similar as the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris’.<sup>550</sup> Given the high bar, it was essential that the Tate Gallery team, headed by Peter Wilson, Director of Gallery and Building Services, and Dawn Austwick, Project Director, liaised with Ron German (Stanhope Properties). Working as a team they had to ensure that the aims in ‘Defining the Vision’, which stated that the project envisaged as ‘a sequence of philosophical and practical choices that would lead to the selection of the site, architect and to the project’s funding’, were delivered.<sup>551</sup>

---

<sup>547</sup> Pearman, H. (October 1994) ‘Nobody Wins.’ In *The Sunday Times*. Quoted in Strong, J. (1996) *Op. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>548</sup> Rogers, R. and Girouard, M. (December 1994) ‘Everybody Wins.’ *The Sunday Times*. Quoted in Strong, J. (1996) *Op. cit.*, p. 1.

<sup>549</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 April 1993) *Agenda for a Special Meeting of the Trustees of The Tate Gallery*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/2/1).

<sup>550</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>551</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 April 1993) ‘Defining the Vision’ in *Agenda for a Special Meeting of the Trustees of The Tate Gallery*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/2/1).

The 'Defining the Vision' ideas had to be translated into a tangible framework for the Architecture Competition brief and for the appointed architects, who were required to turn the theoretical proposition into a practical application. The Architecture Competition brief specified that six suites of gallery spaces, consisting of five for the display of the collection and one for the major temporary exhibitions, were needed.<sup>552</sup> The suites were to include different sized rooms, with introductory information, complementary activity spaces and natural light wherever possible. Project spaces for temporary installations and special displays which did not require daylight were also required. Well-proportioned and varied galleries making use of natural light, complemented by a clearly organised arrangement of public spaces, were to be created. The intention was to have the collection shown in arrangements at regular intervals, with many of the most important works and groups to be on permanent display.

Key art works were identified from the collection and were to be taken into consideration by the architects when designing the gallery spaces. Henri Matisse's *L'Escargot* (1953) and Pablo Picasso's *Three Dancers* (1925) were identified for display, as were other major artists, including Mark Rothko and Joseph Beuys. Significant groups of works covering Surrealism, German Expressionism, Abstract Expressionism, Post-War European Art, Arte Povera, and Minimal Art were also outlined as major areas of the collection. All of the art works were to be displayed sensitively, with the public spaces acting as natural extensions to the galleries, offering further display possibilities. Resources for information, as well as formal and informal learning and study were also requisites.<sup>553</sup> Impressive and memorable eating spaces for formal, corporate hire and casual eating were also highlighted. These directives were codified in the Design Brief which specified that three areas had to be developed:

- 1) The Urban Context and the Site required that the building was set within its urban environment, with public access and possibilities to use the space for the display of sculpture. A grand public space was to be created on the Bankside riverbank, to

---

<sup>552</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 25 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>553</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 July 1994) *TGMA Defining the Vision*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/2/2).

- provide links and respond to the new Millennium footbridge across the Thames, and to establish a space to regenerate the area into a lively, mixed-use quarter.<sup>554</sup>
- 2) The Building required that a design be provided which could demonstrate how the various functions of the new internal spaces would be integrated within the building. It also had to show how the building would relate to its entrance, approach and surrounding area. Clarity, legibility and orientation of the space emanating from a 'central heart' were fundamental to the building approach.<sup>555</sup>
  - 3) The Display Spaces required that natural daylight be used in an imaginative way on several levels, and that a set of display suites be created. These spaces were to be varied, as well as having the ability to blend with each other in their relationship to the interior and exterior of the building.<sup>556</sup>

The objective was to create an exciting daytime and evening venue in London. The objective was to entice visitors. Once inside the museum, they would be eased through the rooms by the creation of accessible spaces, to enable them to form their own personal space within the public building. The eating areas, aided by late-night openings, were to provide further opportunities for making the museum a more interesting destination. The brief concluded that it was essential to link the interior and exterior spaces between the museum and the outside world, to give it life and vitality.<sup>557</sup>

### **The Tate Gallery of Modern Art Assessors**

The architectural submissions were judged by a jury panel of ten assessors, who were supported by seven expert advisors. The panel was drawn from a wide cross-section of expertise. Sir Simon Hornby was appointed Chairman of the Tate Gallery Assessors who had been Chairman of the Design Council and was the Chairman of WH Smith. Ricky Burdett, Professor of Urban Studies, LSE, and the founding Director of the Architecture Foundation, was appointed on the basis of his architectural expertise. The assessors included the Tate Gallery Trustees, Michael Craig-Martin and Caryl Hubbard; the arts

---

<sup>554</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 10 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>555</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>556</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 9 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>557</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.



broadcaster Joan Bakewell; Richard Koshalek, the Director of the Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles; and Sir Philip Powell of Arup Associates. The Austrian architect Hans Hollein was also appointed, having worked as a juror on the National Scottish Museum competition.<sup>558</sup> Hollein noted that the jury's recommendation was not binding because the Trustees could veto the decision.<sup>559</sup> Serota, also an assessor, responded that the Trustees would follow the jury's recommendation, but some leeway was needed should a decision be totally unacceptable.<sup>560</sup>

What this indicated was the extent to which the Tate Gallery was controlling the project and this was further demonstrated in the clause that, should an assessor or advisory panel member be unable to continue to act, the Tate Gallery Trustees, rather than the jury, would appoint a replacement.<sup>561</sup> After the jury made its selection, the appointed architect was required to develop a detailed design for the Tate Gallery of Modern Art. Overseeing this process was Ricky Burdett who was also appointed as Chairman of the expert advisors, to provide special advice to the jury on the technical and operational aspects of the submissions. The expert advisors were: Mike Carver from The SVM Partnership regarding engineering services; Paul Morrell from Davis Langdon and Everest, the Cost Consultants; Peter Rogers from Stanhope Properties for construction advice; Sir Jack Zunz from Ove Arup and Partners concerning the structural engineering. From the Tate Gallery, to offer in-house advice, were: Jeremy Lewison, the Deputy Keeper of the Modern Collection; Sandy Nairne, the Director of Public and Regional Services; and Peter Wilson, the Head of Buildings and Gallery Services.

### **Architecture Competition**

Architectural practices raced to meet the application deadline: 26 August 1994. Frank Gehry, the architect who designed the Guggenheim, Bilbao, was contacted to inquire if he wished to participate. Gehry declined the offer.<sup>562</sup> Certain architectural practices had specific questions. The competition fee was questioned by Jacques Herzog. A return fax

---

<sup>558</sup> Ron German (12 April 1994) *Stanhope Memorandum: Tate Competition Jury* (Archive: TG 12/4/3/1).

<sup>559</sup> Hans Hollein (18 August 1994) letter to Nicholas Serota (Archive: TG 12/4/4/1).

<sup>560</sup> Nicholas Serota (18 August 1994) letter to Hans Hollein (Archive: TG 12/4/4/1).

<sup>561</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 4 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>562</sup> Frank Gehry and Associates (2 August 1994) letter to Catherine Graham-Harrison, Project Director, The Tate Gallery (Archive: TG 12/4/5/1).

from the Tate Gallery responded: 'Rules regarding entry to the competition must be applied equally to all competitors. Therefore we cannot waive the fee for any competitor. We require a sterling cheque for £50 [...]'<sup>563</sup> Herzog sent the fee.

The formal assessment process required that for the submission the architects submit documents, images and text on previous work or on a relevant project.<sup>564</sup> Evidence of innovative ideas and successful approaches to problem-solving and quality of design in previous work was required. Additionally, a statement describing the priorities to be addressed in creating a gallery of modern art at Bankside was a criterion for entering Stage One of the competition. Out of the one hundred and forty-eight applications submitted, Burdett and Powell were required to each draw up a list of thirty-six architects. They combined results and narrowed the list down to thirty-six applicants. The assessments were made on the quality of the written statements, the commitment to the project, and the nature of the architect's previous design work.<sup>565</sup>

The thirteen contestants selected for Stage One were announced in a Tate Gallery Press Release (26 September 1994; see Appendix B). The Stage One candidates received an honorarium of £3,000 and travel expenses up to £1,500, and were invited to attend a briefing session with Serota, Lipton and Craig-Martin.<sup>566</sup> The candidates were asked to make a short presentation to the assessors. The format was disliked by some of the architectural practices.<sup>567</sup> The prestige, however, of designing the new Tate Gallery of Modern Art meant that winning the design would enhance the architect's reputation more than for almost any other type of building. This made the Tate Gallery's competition process more palatable.<sup>568</sup>

### **Shortlisted Designs**

From the thirteen architectural practices, the number was reduced to six, who were invited to enter the second round. A Tate Gallery Press Release (21 November 1994)

---

<sup>563</sup> Cheryl Pereira (12 August 1994) fax to Jacques Herzog (Archive: TG 12/4/5/1).

<sup>564</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 5 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>565</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

<sup>566</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 6 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>567</sup> The Tate Gallery (14 & 15 November 1994) *Minutes from Assessors' Meeting*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/4/6/1).

<sup>568</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

announced that the architectural practices were David Chipperfield Architects (UK); Herzog and de Meuron (Switzerland); Office for Metropolitan Architecture (Netherlands); Rafael Moneo (Spain); Renzo Piano Building Workshop (Italy); and Tadao Ando Architect and Associates (Japan). The Stage Two architects were awarded an honorarium of £15,000 and travel expenses of up to £750. For Stage Two, information was required on 'management and resources of your team, as were details on how the design would be realised'.<sup>569</sup> The Stage Two designs were assessed on whether they demonstrated boldness and imagination were innovative and sympathetic to a museum of modern art, and were able to communicate ideas. The architectural practice's ability to provide management and resources for the scale of the project and to have experience of the adaptive reuse of large buildings was also a key factor.<sup>570</sup> The State Two architects were invited to the Tate Gallery in January 1995 to present their proposals.<sup>571</sup>

Out of the final contestants, David Chipperfield Architects was the only British applicant and there was some public opinion which favoured the design practice over a foreign applicant. David Chipperfield Architects' design involved removing the central chimney and building a wide, glazed tower in its place, and contravened the guidelines, which specified that the architect should work with the original building, rather than alter it significantly. The assessor's evaluation was that David Chipperfield Architect's design had potential, but that the spaces were insufficiently articulated, that there was not a single terrace or balcony, and that the proposed courtyards needed developing. The consensus was that Chipperfield himself had made a thoughtful presentation, but that he evidently disliked Bankside Power Station as a building. The assessors agreed that, with the chimney removed, albeit for good reasons, Chipperfield had failed to understand the ethos of the brief.<sup>572</sup> Chipperfield was voted out of the competition.

Following Chipperfield's rejection, there was speculation that the winner might be Asian. The Osaka-born Tadao Ando proposed two glass structures containing gallery spaces which protruded onto the riverside. The jury, however, felt Ando failed to engage

---

<sup>569</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Minutes from Assessors' Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/4/6/1).

<sup>570</sup> The Tate Gallery (December 1994) *The Tate Gallery of Modern Art Competition to Select an Architect Stage 2*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/4/7/1).

<sup>571</sup> Ricky Burdett (9 January 1995) *TGMA Advisors Meeting* (Archive: TG 12/4/4/2).

<sup>572</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 January 1995) *Minutes of Assessors' Discussions of Stage Two Submissions*, p. 34 (Archive: TG 12/4/7/9).

with the brief, and did not address the building's relationship with the local area. Additionally, while the assessors agreed that Ando had provided a highly imaginative concept, they were unconvinced about the general circulation routes throughout the building. Ando was voted out of the competition.<sup>573</sup> According to the jury, Ando, like Chipperfield, was not sympathetic to the existing structure. Equally, the Spanish architect Rafael Moneo also experimented with the external façade. Moneo's design pushed out the north face of the building, with three extensions fanning out at angles. Moneo also proposed filling in the Turbine Hall with galleries which was considered as disappointing. A further issue was his limited interest in art and general dislike of Bankside Power Station, as indicated by his desire to hide the industrial nature of the building. Moneo was ruled out of the competition.

Rem Koolhaas proposed one of the most striking designs. The design incorporated setting the entrance down a sloping ramp to a cross-circulation area. Koolhaas also identified new 'found space' in the vast underground oil tank areas.<sup>574</sup> The jury agreed that the plan showed ingenuity and helped them to rethink what was required. Overall, however, the proposal was considered too ambitious and costly. Despite the fact that Koolhaas's imaginative use of the space was praised, his design was declined. Another favoured contender was Renzo Piano, whose design involved creating two pavilions extending from the north and south sides, which again altered the appearance of the external façade. Furthermore, the design's earlier issues of the interior galleries and circulation flow had not been resolved. The assessors were also concerned about the architect's reliance on white as a way of alleviating design issues and would see a museum which would be too similar, to ones that had already been built. Piano lost the competition and Herzog and de Meuron were appointed the winners by the jury.

### **Architect's Vision**

The main commendation was that Herzog and de Meuron proposed the least dramatic changes to the appearance of Bankside and, rather than hide or eliminate the qualities of

---

<sup>573</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 January 1995) *Assessors' Final Discussion of Stage Two Proposals*, p. 37 (Archive: TG 12/4/7/9).

<sup>574</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38 (Archive: TG 12/4/7/9).

the building, they enhanced and worked creatively with them.<sup>575</sup> The architect's design was praised for being simple, flexible and robust, as well as for initiative in using the building to its maximum advantage. Herzog and de Meuron's proposal for the Turbine Hall also received unanimous support, which transformed it into a large, open space, which emphasised its monumental proportions. The Turbine Hall was to be accessed by a dramatic ramp running down from the entrance, which was seen as a winning feature.<sup>576</sup> The boiler house was to be converted into a seven-storey structure. Surmounting the entire building was a glazed structure referred to as the 'Light Beam', which was commended for allowing natural light into the building and acting as a beacon at night.<sup>577</sup>

To oversee the building process Harry Gugger was appointed as Contract Manager, working on behalf of Herzog and de Meuron. Gugger took over from Christine Binswanger, who had been the liaison person from the practice. Initially, there was consternation by the Tate Gallery that the accommodating Binswanger was being taken off the project to be replaced by the more challenging Gugger. True to form, when Gugger began his appointment he objected immediately to Herzog and de Meuron having to work with an associate London practice to provide them with technical and regulatory advice. Gugger was overruled. The appointment of the UK architectural practice was made by a small selection process by the Tate Gallery Trustees. A Tate Gallery Press Release (28 July 1995) announced that Sheppard Robson Architects had been appointed as the associate London practice for the Tate Gallery of Modern Art project.

While the appointment of the architects had been ongoing, site work at Bankside had already begun. German and Lipton (Stanhope Properties) oversaw site investigations to evaluate what remedial work needed to be undertaken. They were crucial in the building process, as the Tate Gallery had opted out of the traditional practice of employing a construction contractor to appoint subcontractors. As Project Managers, Stanhope oversaw the work of Schal, who as Construction Managers were responsible for the competitive tendering of the building packages and for the delivery of the project. Schal appointed and managed the trade contractors, oversaw the fit-outs, and all external

---

<sup>575</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 January 1995) *Minutes of Assessors' Discussions of Stage Two Submissions*, p. 32 (Archive: TG 12/4/7/9).

<sup>576</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 January 1995) *Assessors' Final Discussion of Stage Two Proposals*, p. 42 (Archive: TG 12/4/7/9).

<sup>577</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 49.

and remedial works. Schal also liaised with related services, including Alexi Marmot Associates which provided research and technical writing on space management, programming and planning, design briefing, utilisation and satisfaction surveys, furniture selection and change management.

Schal also had to work with the architects from Lumsden Design Partnership, which was appointed independently of Herzog and de Meuron to design the bookshop. Originally, Herzog and de Meuron were to design the bookshop. Serota wanted a large shop to sell merchandise to generate maximum revenue, but Gugger objected, arguing that it would detract from the integrity of the building as an art museum. As the issue over the size of the shop could not be resolved, Herzog and de Meuron were taken off that part of the design project. Instead, Lumsden Design Partnership was appointed to design what became the largest art museum bookshop in the world. Along with working with Herzog and de Meuron and Lumsden Design Partnership, Schal had to ensure that the work was carried out. Stanhope had, however, overall responsibility for overseeing that the project was properly delivered. Stanhope, therefore, worked closely with Schal to oversee the design process and to read the architectural plans.

Before the design process even began, Stanhope had to evaluate the engineer's reports to identify what works had to be undertaken to make the building operable. Stanhope had to work closely with Ove Arup, the structural engineers, who were responsible for the mechanical, electrical and fire engineering, as well as air-conditioning, acoustics and specialist lighting. Ove Arup provided detailed site reports to ascertain the scale of works from: an *Existing Building Report* (December 1993); a *Preliminary Report on Supplementary Inspection of External Façade Report* (March 1994); a *Ground Contamination Report* (April 1994); and a *Fabric Inspection Report* (May 1994). Ove Arup's work included reducing noise generated from Switch House, which was the only remaining operational unit of the station within the building.

The major problem faced on-site was the deplanting and removal of several peripheral structures which involved extensive negotiations with Nuclear Electric before the process could begin.<sup>578</sup> Works included the repair of the brickwork skin; the inspection and repair of the steel frame; the refurbishment and replacement of the

---

<sup>578</sup> Miss C. Blythe (27 September 1994) Nuclear Electric letter to Ron German (Archive: TG 12/4/8/1).

windows; the addition of new roof coverings; drainage refurbishment; and interventions to the façade to form new window and door openings. What the Tate Gallery team had not anticipated was ‘how difficult it was going to be to build a new frame inside an old frame’.<sup>579</sup> Additionally Nuclear Electric’s fee of approximately £2 million for deplanting, in summer 1994, rose to £5.8 million in January 1995.<sup>580</sup> What had contributed to the rising costs was that contaminated ground had been identified, which was found to contain asbestos. Nuclear Electric was to hand over the building, but more asbestos was found in the corners of the chimney and in the roof, which created further delays.<sup>581</sup>

Brown and Mason, the deplanting contractors, experienced considerable problems with their work at Bankside, and major setbacks when they were informed by English Heritage that they were no longer permitted to cut through the permanent fabric of the building to remove plant equipment.<sup>582</sup> The additional work incurred delays. Other issues arose that impacted further on the planning schedule. This was not helped by the building budget, which increased from £4 million to £5.5 million, owing to the level of Herzog and de Meuron’s design changes.<sup>583</sup> More major problems ensued with a personal disaster through the death of a construction worker on 16 April 1996. The Health and Safety Executive Inspector was called in to review work practices and safety standards.

While the Tate Gallery was dealing with on-site issues they were in consultation with various groups for the work to progress, including the City of London Corporation, Lambeth Council and Westminster Council. What this indicated was the level of impact that the new development was expected to have on the urban environment. The consultation process involved working with statutory bodies, as well as residents and tenants associations. For the Tate Gallery it was important to demonstrate that they were willing to liaise with all concerned parties.<sup>584</sup> In addition, social engagement was essential for the project to work as an effective regeneration project, as major noise and pollution impacted on the area. Site presentations were, therefore, made to the Bankside

---

<sup>579</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

<sup>580</sup> Aldous Hodgkinson (10 January 1995) Stanhope Properties, letter to Alex Beard + summary notes attached with de-planting costs, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/8/4/2).

<sup>581</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>582</sup> Ron German (29 June 1995) letter to Bernard Angus, Nuclear Electric (Archive: TG 12/8/4/2).

<sup>583</sup> Nicholas Serota (18 September 1995) letter to Jacques Herzog (Archive: TG 12/8/5/1).

<sup>584</sup> The Tate Gallery (2000) *The Tate Report 1998–2000*, London: Tate Publishing, p. 22.



Residents Forum, which had been set up to share information about the changes which were being made.

George Cochrane was appointed by the Tate Gallery as the Bankside Development Officer in April 1996 to work with the local community. Cochrane's experience was in development, regeneration and community organisations. He was an important mediator for the residents when the Tate Gallery, as a major organisation and its employees, could appear overwhelming to the local community. The Tate Gallery was keen to represent itself as a welcoming catalyst for change, and also recognised that it required consensus through consultation for the project to work. The outcome was that the Tate Gallery organised a fete 'to reinforce community spirit in the Bankside area and enhance the process of consultation'.<sup>585</sup>

The local community raised their own questions about the development which included: How was the building going to be constructed? How was it going to affect the residents? What were the key issues in the building work? And what would the programming issues involve? Cochrane responded that a pre-opening programme of artists' interventions and events would run in the local area, with linked educational work, involving local schools, colleges and community organisations. The residents were also given the opportunity to exploit the Tate Gallery's own uncertainty and achieve improvements in an area that many of them knew better than the architects. The residents had their greatest input concerning the landscape surrounding the building. This was an important public area as it was to help set the building within a landscaped park and its wider urban context.

Laurie Olins, the original landscape consultant, was replaced by the Herzog and de Meuron's landscape architects, Kienast Vogt and Partners. Incorporating the residents' wishes, Kienast Vogt and Partners created a soft landscape with paved areas of hard landscaping. Birch trees were planted up from the River Thames towards the building. Planted zones were created to continue the layered structure of the building surface, and to translate it into the outside area.<sup>586</sup> The surrounding ground was resurfaced in various states of aggregate. The landscaping was to take into account the other external work,

---

<sup>585</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 157.

<sup>586</sup> Mack, G. (2005) *Herzog and de Meuron 1992–1996*, Basel, Boston & Berlin: Birkhäuser, p. 97.

which involved the creation of a café terrace, a service yard with fencing and security, and a coach and taxi drop-off point, with a disabled parking area. Cochrane liaised with the residents at every stage of the construction process.

During the residents' discussions and wider consultation process, planning permission was granted on 30 September 1996 for the change of use of the building and for the external changes to include the landscaping. The specifications allowed for seven levels to be constructed.<sup>587</sup> Level One was appointed as the lowest level for the location of the Turbine Hall. Retail shops were also to be created on Levels One and Two, with restaurant and café facilities on Levels Two and Seven. The permanent collection was appointed for Levels Three and Five. Level Four was appointed for use for temporary exhibitions. Level Six had planning permission granted, but would not be fitted out until after the opening owing to budget restrictions, when it would be converted into a Members Room with catering facilities. The erection of a roof-level extension was also granted along with elevational alterations to the exterior façades.

Permission was also granted for the use of the chimney as an observation tower, which had been part of the original vision to make the museum a visitor attraction not only to view the exhibits inside but also from which to view the rest of the city. The viewing tower was, however, never realised, but the idea to have the building serve as a platform to view the rest of the city remained. Access formed part of the planning consent and provision was granted for vehicle and pedestrian access, as well as parking and servicing facilities. The news of the planning consent was positively received, but other events made tensions escalate, when Herzog and de Meuron applied to MoMA's architecture competition for the extension of their building.

Serota declared:

The Tate and the Museum of Modern Art are two of the four great museums in the world. It is important for us, and no doubt for them, that we should appear different to our audiences. For this reason I do not think that it would be sensible to share audiences.<sup>588</sup>

---

<sup>587</sup> Southwark Council (30 September 1996) Planning Permission, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/8/1/3).

<sup>588</sup> Nicholas Serota (14 January 1997) letter to Jacques Herzog (Archive: TG 12/8/5/1).

Herzog and de Meuron continued their application, but were unsuccessful. Had they won, it would have been challenging for the Tate Gallery to compete with the world's most famous museum of modern art while creating its own one. What was also indicated from Serota's response was his unerring confidence, believing that the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was in the same league as MoMA.

Crucial to the Tate Gallery of Modern Art being successfully realised was that the exterior and interior should interact seamlessly in creating optimum viewing conditions for the collection. Frances Morris and Iwona Blazwick were appointed as the curators to design the permanent collection's opening hang. A thematic hang was proposed to be represented as four displays, which were given a three-word title. The first word referred to the subject matter, the other two words reflected the ways in which the subject-matter had transformed in the twentieth-century.<sup>589</sup> The four display themes — Nude/Action/Body; Landscape/ Matter/Environment; History/Memory/Society and Still Life/Object/Real Life — were created as a device to help visitors to access the collection more easily. The aim was to establish a dialogue with its audience, and create a connection between the past and the present and was to make the experience more interactive.<sup>590</sup>

The hang of the permanent collection was important to Serota who visited other museums of modern art to see how they chose to display their art works. Consequently, Serota visited the Guggenheim Bilbao in October 1997 and assessed the building and how the collection was displayed. However, the Guggenheim Bilbao was from a very different initiative compared to Tate Modern. The main difference was that the Guggenheim Bilbao was driven by the Basque Government which was to stimulate the failing economy as part of a culture-led regeneration programme. Public investment was provided for the new museum building, and a major renewal programme of the city which included revitalising the Old Quarter, modernising the transport infrastructure and constructing new buildings. The aim was to stimulate cultural tourism, as well as the service sector, to attract businesses to the city.<sup>591</sup>

---

<sup>589</sup> Tate (2000) *Tate Report 2000*, London: Tate Gallery Publishing, p. 23.

<sup>590</sup> The Tate Gallery (15 July 1994) *TGMA Defining the Vision*, p. 1.

<sup>591</sup> Vicario, L. & Monje, P. M. M. (2003) *Another Guggenheim Effect? The Generation of a potentially Gentrifiable Neighbourhood in Bilbao*, London: Urban Studies, Vol. 40, No.12, pp. 2383–2400.

Under the Directorship of Thomas Krens, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation stated that the architect was to be Frank Gehry and demonstrated that this was not a project delivered by local civic vision and lacked the kind of autonomy that the Tate Gallery was able to wield with Tate Modern. This included all areas, as Serota was prompted to consider more specific design details after visiting the Guggenheim Bilbao, such as would the signage within the exhibition spaces be fit for purpose? Serota deliberated further whether there would be enough lavatories, and would the café be the right size. Practical considerations as well as aesthetics were paramount.

Despite the meticulous planning process, design flaws emerged and proved to be the most challenging and costly areas of the redevelopment. The architects realised the staircase on Level Two would be in the way of a lift-machine room.<sup>592</sup> Heated discussions ensued between Gugger and Serota, who refused to pay to move the staircase. A compromise was reached when, with revised drawings, the protrusion was reduced in size.<sup>593</sup> Further on-site problems, including a fire, saw construction costs rise. Ian Fraser, from Davis Langdon, the Cost Consultants, became agitated at the rising cost of the expenditure in July 1997.

Fraser sent a memorandum to the Design Team declaring:

TGMA — Early (!) Warning (!!)

1) This should be on a pink [not white] piece of paper, it's an early warning to all [...] If we are all to retain our sanity, sense of humour, enthusiasm and remain friends, do justice to ourselves and serve the client well, we must never repeat the dry lining fiasco [...] I can't ever remember such a debacle. I hope this is a 'one off' — please tell me it is. The number of changes, the timing of the changes has made a mockery of cost planning, pretender estimates, sign offs, cost checking IRS's and the entire tender process. Thank God we had some packages that appeared to go well.<sup>594</sup>

---

<sup>592</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, p. 190.

<sup>593</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 197.

<sup>594</sup> Ian Fraser (17 July 1997) Davis Langdon & Everest letter and memo, Job No. 06313 to Harry Gugger, Tim Marriott, Ian Blake, Ron German (Archive: TG 12/6/3/25).

The crisis resolved in the autumn when the cost for external works for the total construction was reported to be back on target and a positive visual marker of progress was the addition of the 'Light Beam' box constructed on top of the roof.<sup>595</sup> The Light Beam functioned as an architectural signal of the change of use from power station to art gallery. On-site construction continued regardless of the obstacles which then turned to issues of aesthetics rather than design. The question of the colour scheme selection was raised after Serota visited the Getty Museum in Los Angeles, in November 1998. In contrast to the Getty's light interiors, Serota's concern for London was that the tonal range of black would be unwelcoming and overwhelming.<sup>596</sup> Guggen responded that the art works would not be overwhelmed and that black was a neutral colour. Ultimately, the blacks became dark colours which lightened the overall tone.<sup>597</sup>

Serota turned his attention to the construction schedule: 'The building is not yet watertight, which will prevent us moving forward with floors and other finishes, and the general state of the site remains untidy and disorganised [...]'<sup>598</sup> The situation resolved over the next twelve months when Schal reported that the Turbine Hall was almost complete, apart from works to the entrance doors at the west ramp.<sup>599</sup> Level Eight's roof was also complete, and was offered to the architects for their approval.<sup>600</sup> The Turbine Hall reached completion as the balconies had permanent lighting installed. The new east lancet windows had their secondary glazing works completed. The construction of the west ramp was put on hold while pending approval from Southwark Council.<sup>601</sup> Work to Level Four was estimated at 85% complete. The base build works were completed by September 1999, but the snagging was ongoing.

Unconvinced by the schedule, Rogers noted the ongoing work and was concerned was that the District Surveyor would only certify the building for occupation when all the

---

<sup>595</sup> Steve Watts (1 October 1997) Davis Langdon & Everest, letter (Archive: TG 12/6/3/36).

<sup>596</sup> Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Op. cit.*, pp. 250–253.

<sup>597</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 173.

<sup>598</sup> Nicholas Serota (1 March 1999) letter to Andy Butler (Archive: TG 12/5/8/11).

<sup>599</sup> Schal (June 1999) *Tate Gallery of Modern Art Building Project Monthly Report No. 39*, Section 1.0 (Archive: TG 12/8/6/39).

<sup>600</sup> Schal (July 1999) *TGMA Building Project Monthly Report No. 41*, Section 1.0 (Archive: TG 12/8/6/40).

<sup>601</sup> Schal (August 1999) *TGMA Building Project Monthly Report No. 40*, Section 1.0 (Archive: TG 12/8/6/41).

works were complete, which was projected for December 1999.<sup>602</sup> The initial completion date had been set for 31 March 1999, which was moved to May 1999, then July 1999, followed by September 1999. The last major works, which was to have the Level Five galleries clear storey glazing sand-blasted, was put back to December and was followed by the completion of the external final snags. A revised handling programme was proposed to the construction programme which directed that semi-permanent walls be erected to compensate for the delays.<sup>603</sup> The trade contractors and the project team worked over the Christmas period to ensure the gallery and art handling and loading areas were operational. The first art objects were moved into the building on 6 January 2000, after a loading bay was built specially to receive them. The bulk of the remaining areas were certified as being practically complete on 21 January 2000, when Schal officially handed over half the building to the Tate.<sup>604</sup> The rest of the building work focused on clearing snags, which was carried out in parallel with the Tate moving art objects into the exhibition areas.<sup>605</sup>

### **Millennium Bridge**

While work had been ongoing at Bankside Power Station construction began on Millennium Bridge. The new bridge was essential for the Bankside project to work, as the site was stranded across the river from the rest of London with no direct pedestrian access to it. Southwark Borough Council was responsible for overseeing the project, as the bridge was to form an arterial link between it and the City of London. The existing adjacent road bridges did not provide good access to the site. Southwark Bridge crossed over the east section of Bankside and to the south-west of Mansion House station. The nearest junction road into Southwark Bridge was by the Approach Road via Sumner Street, but it did not provide a logical route to Bankside. Blackfriars Bridge crossed the

---

<sup>602</sup> Schal (September 1999) *TGMA Building Project Monthly Report No. 42*, Section 1.0 (Archive: TG 12/8/6/42).

<sup>603</sup> Schal (December 1999) *TGMA Building Project Monthly Report No. 45*, Section 1.0 (Archive: TG 12/8/6/45).

<sup>604</sup> Schal (January 2000) *TGMA Building Project Monthly Report No. 47*, Section 1.0 71.1 (Archive: TG 12/8/6/47).

<sup>605</sup> Schal (February 2000) *TGMA Building Project Monthly Report No. 48*, Section 1.0 71.1 (Archive: TG 12/8/6/48).

River Thames from Southwark Street to Blackfriars Station, but involved weaving around a combination of local roads. Consequently a new bridge at Bankside became a necessity.

Southwark Council, with *The Financial Times* and RIBA, organised a two-stage international competition launched in July 1996, to design a new footbridge across the River Thames. The architectural brief outlined that a pedestrian bridge was to be created, to aid the revitalisation of Bankside and to connect the city as a whole. The competition received over 200 worldwide entries at stage one. A jury assessed the designs anonymously and selected six schemes to proceed to the second stage of the competition. The jury concurred that the scheme by the team of Norman Foster and Partners, the artist Anthony Caro and the structural engineers Ove Arup and Partners showed a creative collaboration between architecture, art and engineering, and it won the competition.

The new design for Millennium Bridge was to provide ‘a ribbon of steel by day, a blade of light by night’.<sup>606</sup> After the design was approved, however, the positioning of Millennium Bridge proposed design issues. Foster wanted the bridge to align with a main north side, riverside entrance linking directly into the Bankside building. Herzog and de Meuron designed the main entrance to the west side leading into the Turbine Hall. Foster asked that the position of the main entrance into Bankside be altered, but Herzog and de Meuron were unwilling to make the change. Construction began on the Millennium Bridge in 1998, which saw it offset from the main building’s main entrance. Structurally an ambitious project, the suspension bridge spanned 320 m, and was designed with a thin profile to form a slender arc across the water. The Millennium Bridge opened in June 2000, and a technical problem emerged when it exhibited lateral movement as 100,000 people walked across. The movement was caused by synchronised pedestrian footfall; the solution was to fit dampers beneath the deck to mitigate movement.<sup>607</sup>

On reopening, the Millennium Bridge provided an important connection for Southwark with the City and the rest of London. The Millennium Bridge was crucial to the Tate’s vision being realised in opening up access. The Millennium Bridge was also important to the architect’s vision, as it integrated the museum with the city and would lead visitors around its riverside entrance and into Turbine Hall which was imagined as

---

<sup>606</sup> Powell, K. (2004) *City Reborn: Architecture and Regeneration in London, from Bankside to Dulwich*, London & New York: Merrell, p. 78.

<sup>607</sup> The research undertaken by Ove Arup resulted in changes to the codes for bridge-building worldwide.



an internal street, accessed by a long ramp which linked the inside with the outside of the building.<sup>608</sup> From that internal hub, the integrated areas of the restaurants, bookstores and exhibition areas were intended to invite visitors to explore them further. The rest of the building was also to create connections with the rest of the city. The chimney, rising up ninety-nine metres, crowned by the two-storey high horizontal Light Beam, was to act as a visual point parallel to the dome of St Paul's Cathedral across the river. The old line of windows was doubled on the east façade. Floor-to-ceiling window cut-outs provided a further viewing platform, to create panoramic vistas of the city.

Logistically, the building, set on the 3.43 hectare (8.48 acre) site, provided a total floor area of 34,500 sq m (371,350 sq ft) arranged over seven levels. The gallery suites for display and exhibitions were appointed 7,827 sq m (84,250 sq ft) of space, with an additional 3,300 sq m (35,520 sq ft) provided in the Turbine Hall. An education area of 390 sq m (4,200 sq ft), a member's room of 150 sq m (1,615 sq ft) and a support services and art handling area of 1,500 sq m (16,145 sq ft) were also appointed. Office areas covering a floor area of 1,350 sq m (14,530 sq ft) were located at the east end of the building. A special exhibition suite, a 240-seat auditorium and two cafés were also installed, as was the public restaurant on Level Seven. Levels One, Two and Four were equipped with operational trading retail units to sell Tate merchandising. Additionally, nine passenger lifts, with four allocated for public use with a capacity for sixteen people each, were installed. Additional methods of mechanised circulation were catered for by the six large escalators and the internal staircase.

The completion of the building signalled that the project's objective had been achieved. The Cost Consultants, Davis, Langdon and Everest, which managed the budgeting schedule, had worked closely with the construction team. Serota was especially grateful to them, and thanked them for their accuracy, and for responding to all of the financial challenges. Crucially, what the Cost Consultants maintained throughout the entire process was contingency money. Consequently, Tate Modern, opening as Serota stated: 'on time and on budget' for the new millennium, reflected a highly professional organisation. What this meant was that the Tate had delivered.<sup>609</sup>

---

<sup>608</sup> Mack, G. (2005) *Herzog and de Meuron 1992–1996*, Basel, Boston & Berlin: Birkhäuser, p. 97.

<sup>609</sup> Nicholas Serota (25 May 2000) letter to Paul Morrell (Archive: TG 12/6/3/29).

## **Chapter 7. Conclusion**

Tate Modern opened to the public on 12 May 2000. The aim to exhibit the Tate's international modern and contemporary art in a permanent site and to regenerate Bankside as a new riverside attraction had been realised. In doing so, the Tate demonstrated that the scope of the museum of modern art had widened. This conclusion assesses how the Tate facilitated these changes and adopted new visions of culture, by creating a distinct museum of modern art for London and one that was relevant for the new millennium. The chapter begins by assessing how, after a long exchange of processes, the organisation moved to the role of patron when it created Tate Modern.

The reason the organisation was able to shift to this position was due to its unique nature having been shaped by its own defining moments in having to constantly adapt to change. From the organisation's inception, it had to position and reposition, albeit by a matter of degrees, between the public and the private sectors. As nationalist and international agendas converged, the founding organisation found itself having to undertake a further role in dually curating the National Modern Foreign Collection with the British Art Collection. Modernisation and modernity further affected the organisation, forcing it to develop new ways of thinking about the collection and its audience. The consistent feature to impact on the organisation was the relationship between culture and commerce, which moved in the balance, depending on shifting political agendas.

### **The Final Analysis**

Despite the many upheavals that the organisation underwent, what is surprising in the final analysis is that there were features of Tate Modern which it shared with the founding organisation of the National Gallery of British Art. The principle characteristic was that the National Gallery of British Art and Tate Modern had both been established through a model of public and private partnership. The combination of Henry Tate's money and government land created a union which endured throughout the organisation's development. Tate Modern was also created through a public and private partnership funding model. Furthermore, the National Gallery of British Art was created during the 1890s, when Lord Salisbury's Conservative Government supported the laissez-faire state

which resulted in a reduction of public money on spending, and saw a free-market economy flourish.<sup>610</sup> Similarly, the Tate Gallery of Modern Art was proposed during John Major's 1990s Conservative Government, which supported the laissez-faire state and witnessed a deregulated market boom.

Additionally, Salisbury's Government saw economic liberalism flourish which allowed for greater financial freedoms and enabled individuals to profit unimpeded. Some of the beneficiaries, including Henry Tate, used their new wealth to finance public projects. Correspondingly John Major's Conservative Government promoted monetarism and economic neo-liberal measures (put in place by his predecessor, Margaret Thatcher) which stimulated private and independent enterprise. The impact on the Tate Gallery was that it created Tate Modern. Another comparative factor is that both projects were created as civic initiatives, and were not born from government directives as part of official top-down policy. These comparisons, however, have arisen in this concluding analysis, and are not the reasons why this Ph.D. investigated the origins of the founding institution.

The preliminary research had earlier suggested that this Ph.D. would begin with an assessment of the Conservative Government from 1979, to discuss its economic and cultural impact on national museums and galleries. The next stage was to provide an analysis of alternative funding mechanisms. However, the reading for the Literature Review in Chapter 1, Introduction, revealed that major gaps had been created historically in the Tate Gallery's modern foreign collection. Further investigation of the primary sources revealed that the gaps were largely due to the Tate Gallery's own governance. The fact that Henri Matisse's *Woman at a Table* (undated) was presented as a free gift and was rejected by the National Gallery Millbank Trustees became a relevant factor. Why? This was because, as no reason was put forward, during, before, or after the Board Meeting, the collective silence could only be interpreted as hostility.

What the position demonstrated was that the organisation operated in an amateur way, unclear of its objective, which was to maintain and develop the National Modern Foreign Collection, along with the National British Art Collection. Furthermore, the modern foreign rejections became a defining feature of this thesis, when it became evident that this practice was systemic, as other works were offered by private collectors,

---

<sup>610</sup> Gray, C. (2006) *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

dealers and commercial galleries at favourable prices, with some even offered as gifts, but were also declined. Consequently, the organisation created a paradigm for rejecting modern foreign art works which became an important feature to investigate, as it shaped the journey of the collection which eventually, led to the creation of Tate Modern. The reading also identified that the later thematic hang, implemented by Serota, was to camouflage the historic gaps. Serota was, therefore, actively addressing the entire history of the rejections of the National Modern Foreign Collection which he re-configured as the international modern and contemporary art working within the single Tate Collection.

Consequently, to examine this wide ranging topic this Ph.D. research was re-cast as an interdisciplinary, longitudinal case study, to assess the collection and the Tate's founding organisation. This was because the case study offered the most comprehensible and critical method to assess and present the research findings. Additionally, assessing the primary and secondary material through a qualitative method enabled the investigation to examine the why and how of decision-making; to produce an analysis of the key events. Another factor in determining the scope of the research was due to the published primary sources, which indicated that there was no comparative existing scholarship in the field within which to situate this thesis. The lack of relevant literature led to thinking about how other national museums and galleries had been established.

Furthermore, from the Tate's inception, a dynamic was established with the government which made it the main reason for investigating related literature in this area. The Literature Review reading was, therefore, extended to include government and related publications. Due to an absence of literature concerning government funding and policy for museums and galleries (outside of ACGB funding) in Chapter 1, Introduction, a preliminary map of relevant cultural policy and parliamentary acts was included. The difficulty, however, in drawing up a framework of cultural policy relating to museums and galleries is that it does not have a clear path and may be the reason why there is no specific scholarly research in this field. An ideal publication would have been titled 'Cultural Policy in the UK: Museums and Galleries: The History, Development and Impact' and this would make a useful topic for future research.

A further issue arose in that other government directives also impacted on cultural initiative, including Conservative urban policy. Consequently, public cultural initiatives

could not always be traced back to cultural policy directives. Why was this important? This was relevant because precise political boundaries concerning cultural vision were difficult to identify, and have been obscured concerning who led the directives, and what were the intended outcomes of cultural policy. This led to the first of the research questions: What determined successive governments in adopting a laissez-faire or interventionist position towards funding public museums and galleries. How did this affect the Tate Gallery? The questions were addressed in Chapter 2, Creating the Tate, which assessed how the government funded the National Gallery but, after the economic recession in the 1840s, it did not repeat this type of public funding initiative. As discussed, while there was no formal legislation assigned to creating public galleries, The Museums Act (1845) directed that these initiatives were to be funded by local rather than national government. Much of the funding, however, came from the business sector which was increasingly keen to promote its own interests, as well as those of their cities.

By the end of the century, the idea of Empire had bolstered a stronger sense of nationalism, which saw public projects being dedicated to national interests. One outcome was that the privately funded National Gallery of British Art was established. As it was built on the less than salubrious prison site it was intended to provide a new vision of Millbank. The LCC's subsequent creation of the Millbank Housing Estate, however, remained detached from the National Gallery of British Art. This is one key area where the Tate Gallery was to change most as later education and social engagement played a major role in the organisation's development. The National Gallery of British Art, however, was never envisaged as a holistic solution for the wider integration of the local community and in this way was very different from Tate Modern. The National Gallery of British Art was instead to provide a lasting legacy to Tate, and his vision of Britain. Furthermore, by stipulating that the organisation was created exclusively for the display of British art, Henry Tate created a culture which could not be easily changed.

The directives in *The Curzon Report* resulted in the Hugh Lane Bequest becoming the nucleus collection for the National Modern Foreign Collection and being given to the National Gallery of British Art. Consequently, the organisation was put into a difficult position, which it could not adapt to. One reason for this was that the new collection was a direct breach of Tate's stipulation and contradicted what the institution was intended to

be. The other reason may be to do with it taking a national position to things which were modern and foreign (and might be viewed suspiciously), as other official bodies, including the National Gallery, were also resistant to accepting modern foreign art. This position was, however, not reflected across the board, as private collectors, commercial galleries and independent dealers were buying modern foreign art works some of which were offered to the National Gallery of British Art. Whatever the reason, the anti-modern foreign position became entrenched within the culture of the organisation from the onset and resulted in its subsequent irresponsibility in the way that it hosted the National Modern Foreign Collection.

Consequently, when Lord Curzon secured Treasury money to acquire works by Edgar Degas in 1918, not one of the paintings was purchased. *La Famille Bellelli* (1858–1867) is in the *Musée D’Orsay’s* Collection; *Mademoiselle Fioyce in the Ballet* (1866–1868) is in the Brooklyn Museum Collection; *[Repetition] Au Foyer* (c. 1874) is in the Shelburne Museum, Vermont’s Collection; and *Portrait of M. Duranty* (1879) is in the Glasgow Art Gallery and Museum Collection. While other public collections benefitted, the National Modern Foreign Collection did not. What the situation demonstrated was that, even when public money was offered, resistance persisted. This shaped the journey of the organisation and its inability to adapt to new practices. The organisation was also restricted in what it could do by the National Gallery Board of Trustees (Trafalgar Square) which administered its funding and was in a further difficult position with the Royal Academy of Arts, owing to its administration of the Chantrey Bequest.

### **Communicating Change**

The renamed National Gallery Millbank and its new governance did *not* create change. What did create change was the private sector which began to take increasing responsibility for the modern foreign collection. One reason may have been that a number of the private benefactors were non-nationals, and were without vested interests in an idea of a British art. The other benefactors, however, were nationals, but also faced similar resistance from the organisation’s governance towards the modern foreign collection. While the private patrons propped up the modern foreign collection, so did the independent and commercial dealers, who continued to offer art works at competitive

prices, as listed in Appendix A. The private sector had, therefore, been mobilised into action in taking responsibility the National Modern Foreign Collection.

Apart from the early Keeper D. S. MacColl who was sympathetic to the modern foreign collection, there was a resistance to adopt new practices and new art at the Tate Gallery by James B. Manson and John Rothenstein. Even after the creation of the ACGB which made the arts part of the social and moral economy, the Tate Gallery did not change. The following decade the situation worsened with The National Gallery and Tate Gallery Act as, although the organisation gained independence from the National Gallery, it did so in the full awareness that this would be at the cost of losing substantial modern foreign holdings. Crucially, the Tate Gallery did not seek to rectify the losses and afterwards it was not in a position to do so as it suffered from major funding issues due to the Suez Crisis, when Britain lost its dominion and London declined as a world city.

### **Defining Moments**

The first time organisational change affected the Tate Gallery was with the appointment of the new Director, Norman Reid, and the Labour Government, led by Harold Wilson. This led to the research question(s): How did modernity become a government concern and change the political vision of culture? How did this impact on the development of the Tate Gallery? Chapter 3, Towards Tate Modern, therefore, discussed how the Labour Government changed political vision across the board. The new Ministry of Arts in publishing *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps* (1965) provided a defining moment in the Labour Government's vision of the arts and had direct implications for the Tate Gallery. The White Paper identified the government's belief that culture had the ability to function as a social driver and legitimised its interventionist position, in demanding that arts establishments widen their accessibility as they were accountable to the public purse.

The Tate Gallery received an unprecedented level of financial support through the Arts Minister. The outcome was that the Tate Gallery was forced to engage in a new set of debates concerning its public role. A number of modernising measures were introduced at the Tate Gallery which lead to the establishment of the Conservation Department, the Exhibition Department and Education Department. As these new



initiatives were in development the Government's unsustainable 'Golden Age' ended. A mixed partnership model was proposed to sustain funding with local government and private patrons targeted to make contributions. It was also the first time that a Tate Gallery Director publically supported the Government by collaborating with the Arts Minister, Jennie Lee, on *Patron: Industry Supports the Arts* which was an appropriate gesture as it was a sugar industrialist, after all, who had created the original Tate Gallery.

The economic challenges continued under the Conservative Government and were overseen by the Tate Gallery's Chairmen from Colin Anderson to Robert Sainsbury who enabled the Director to make forward thinking decisions concerning pursuing alternative funding strategies and developing the collection. One outcome, and defining moment in the Tate Gallery's history, was that the decision was taken to broaden the breadth of the modern foreign collection, which resulted in the acquisition of Carl Andre's 'The Bricks'. The unintended furore which ensued reflected the increasing power of the media in provoking public opinion and sparked a public debate about the value and perceived lack of value concerning modern art.

The timing of this event was also a key factor in the controversy as it coincided with the Government's escalating financial crisis and subsequent loan application to the IMF. The excessive IMF loan, however, provided an inflated money supply and contributed to high interest rates and soaring inflation. The incoming Conservative administration responded by introducing a new monetary system as it meted out immediate and deep cuts.<sup>611</sup> To survive the economic climate, publically funded institutions had to rethink their financial basis. The Tate Gallery Trustees focused on the collection, and made priority purchasing of contemporary works a key area, with money being reserved for the purchase of future works.<sup>612</sup> What this meant was that after decades of procrastination, with the arrival of the new Conservative government, the Tate Gallery formulated a purchasing policy and was now speculating for the future.

---

<sup>611</sup> Gray, C. (2000) *Op cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>612</sup> The Tate Gallery (17 May 1979) *The Tate Gallery Board Meeting*, p. 4 (Archive: TG 1/3).

### **Testing the Public Realm, Testing the Market**

What was less forward thinking was the costly Tate Gallery's North-East Quadrant which became the kind of initiative that the Conservatives vehemently objected to through their demands for value for public money and economic sustainability. This is why Tate Liverpool was a very different development for the Tate Gallery. Guided by government vision, this began the Tate Gallery's first foray into urban regeneration. The Tate Gallery was able to gain experience in procuring finance from the private sector and thus became equipped with the skills to realise a major funding campaign and was instilled with confidence in testing new ways of interacting with the public realm. Importantly Tate Liverpool demonstrated the viability of attracting a new audience outside of the Millbank site, and gave it a greater national presence. This meant that the Tate Gallery was able to test the market in identifying that its identity and collection was a moveable commodity.

During the discussions for Tate Liverpool, Lord Hutchinson, Chairman of the Tate Gallery Trustees, used his professional diplomacy when disputes emerged between Bowness and the more commercially minded Trustee, Peter Palumbo. Despite the hostilities paradoxically what resulted was that the Tate Gallery's governance left a lasting legacy, as from 1980 this became one of the most productive periods in the development of the organisation. This phase saw the Patrons of New Art, the Turner Prize and Tate Liverpool being created. While Tate Liverpool raised the national profile of the organisation, the Turner Prize raised the international profile of the Tate Gallery, which had now also become the patron of a highly prestigious art prize.

The Chairmen continued to ensure the smooth delivery of the Tate Gallery's objectives. Richard Rogers oversaw the completion of Tate Liverpool and the preliminary planning proposals for Tate St Ives. As importantly, Rogers understood what was required from the government. Chapter 4, Vision and Concept, therefore, examined the question: How did the government policy communicate change, and how did this impact on cultural vision and patronage of the Tate Gallery? What resulted was a greater shift to the enterprise model developed from the Thatcher Government. The impact of the Conservative's Party's third term in Government office saw many changes in the field of modern visual arts. As Tate Liverpool opened, Charles Saatchi became the patron of the YBAs, who were at the forefront of London establishing itself as the new hub for modern

artistic innovation. (The role of independent members of the YBA's including Damien Hirst was later given a greater national profile when he won the Turner Prize.)

Nicholas Serota was also appointed as the Director of the Tate Gallery and the businessman Dennis Stevenson was made Chairman. A new phase in the Tate Gallery's development began as special exhibitions were curated, and were followed by a major refurbishment of the building. The main turning point was The New Displays which attracted greater audience figures and earned income. The Tate Gallery received public praise for the work the main reason was because the work; was paid for by private contributions. *The Burlington Magazine*, however, warned that the Tate Gallery remained limited by its space and added: 'Presumably we shall not, under this bold but pragmatic Director, see a campaign for a separate Museum of Modern Art'.<sup>613</sup> The article not only underestimated Serota, but also the impact of Thatcher, as organisations including the Tate Gallery were willing to take greater risks.

The Tate Gallery was already responding to Conservative directives which in *London World City* (1991) demanded that museums and galleries had to change the public's perception of them.<sup>614</sup> Correspondingly, the Tate Gallery understood that it *had* to change the public's perception of it. Serota responded immediately by making the Tate a laboratory for experimenting with the collection and chose to discard the rules of a chronological art history. The objective of the thematic hang was to make the Tate Gallery and the collection more accessible, and also to disguise the gaps. At the same time the central Duveen Galleries were used as a testing ground for future programme of works in the Turbine Hall, when special commissions for artists were undertaken to produce large-scale, high-impact art works.

The period of experimentation was part of a long-term strategy, and led to *The Tate Gallery Preliminary Audit* (1991) which identified key areas for development within the organisation.<sup>615</sup> The directive indicated the way that the Tate Gallery was becoming a more professionally minded body, which recognised that it needed to develop its assets. The outcome was the search to find a new exhibition space for the modern foreign

---

<sup>613</sup> Editorial (March 1990) 'The Tate re-hung: more dash than cash' in *The Burlington Magazine*, Vol. 132, No. 1044, p. 172.

<sup>614</sup> Kennedy, R. (1991) *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

<sup>615</sup> Francis, R. (January 1991) *Tate Gallery Preliminary Audit Report* (Studies undertaken October 1990–December 1990) printed in *The Tate Masterplan* (12 June 1991), p. 25 (Archive: TG 12/1/1/2).

collection which came with the proviso that its creation would help to improve the city's image as an attractive visitor destination. What this meant was that the Tate Gallery saw itself as responsible for this kind of undertaking and had shifted its aims, as a place for the display and curation of art works with an educational basis to that of a civic patron.

The decision was announced in the aftermath of Black Wednesday. The Government responded to the economic collapse by tightening public funding. The Tate Gallery responded by announcing it was going to create Tate Modern. The economic climate provided the context for the Tate Gallery to move towards a more business style arts organisation and had earlier created the Development Department. Chapter Five, Patronage and Funding, therefore examined the question: How did government directives continue to impact on the cultural vision and patronage of the Tate Gallery? The key government initiative was the National Lottery which created a competitive edge to the Tate Gallery (and all of the organisations competing for its funding). The Millennium Commission Capital Landmark Award gave the Tate Gallery an increased appetite to find a permanent site and the chance to re-think the scale of the project.

Incentivised by the funding, the Tate Gallery armed with the McKinsey & Company Report pursued Bankside as an exhibition space for the international modern and contemporary art, and as a site for urban regeneration.<sup>616</sup> The Tate Gallery felt legitimised in pursuing National Lottery funding and became one of the first recipients, on account of making a contribution to the regeneration of Southwark through its landmark architecture.<sup>617</sup> Achieving this funding was not without criticism, as complaints were made in the media about using the funding for a museum of modern art. The Tate Gallery, rather than repudiate these claims, instead took the position that it needed to attract a wider visitor demographic by offering a new kind of accessible museum and public space. This meant changing its public image.

### **The Museum in the Market Place**

The Tate Gallery recognised the power of reinvention, which had been successfully demonstrated by the Labour Party in 1997. The following year the Tate Gallery procured

---

<sup>616</sup> Martin Caldwell Associates (1995) *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

<sup>617</sup> The Millennium Commission (1996) *The Millennium Commission Report 1995–1996*, p. 11.

the services of Wolff Olins, which created the brand identity of 'Tate'. Wolff Olins had claimed that the brand value was now in the Tate name signature, rather than in the collection and buildings. What the rebranding process in fact created was the opportunity to allow the organisation far greater flexibility to exploit the physical assets of the collection and buildings. As a point when the Tate Gallery first announced it was going to create a new gallery beyond the Millbank site – it stressed that this was for the modern foreign collection; however, modern British artists became included – this also indicated that the impact on the global world meant that artists such as Hirst had moved from being young 'British' artists to middle aged international ones. What this also meant for the Tate was that, after the decades of debate over the modern foreign collection which, at points, felt like it was battling with the British art both had become subsumed into the one collection – under the brand name Tate.<sup>618</sup>

Furthermore, the Tate was created as a quality brand in providing high cultural value, innovation, and by pioneering new museum practices.<sup>619</sup> A significant shift in thinking had taken place, about what it was and what it had become.<sup>620</sup> Recognising that the expectations of the museum had changed, the Tate met these needs by providing exhibition areas, user-friendly spaces, with shopping areas and coffee destinations. The Tate made the transition into a commercial style arts organisation which could cater to its visitor/consumer needs and wants, because it had created them.<sup>621</sup> In other words, the Tate had shaped the public's perception of what they could expect from the museum. Making Tate consumable was part of a strategic business vision which was to appeal to a wide demographic attracted by the modern colourful graphics, and by the publicity communications. The in-house advertising emphasised the experiential and commercial aspect over the aesthetic and cultural considerations, and continues to do so by inviting the visitor to: 'Be a part of Tate - Shop, eat and drink - Enjoy your visit'.<sup>622</sup>

---

<sup>618</sup> Rosenbaum-Elliott, R. Percy, L. & Pervan, S. (2011 [2007]) *Strategic Brand Management*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 88f.

<sup>619</sup> Rentschler, R. & Hede, A. (2007) *Museum Marketing: Competing in the Global Market Place*, Oxford & Burlington: Butterworth-Heinemann, p. 188.

<sup>620</sup> Olins, B. (2003) *On Brand*, London: Thames & Hudson, p. 23.

<sup>621</sup> Kotler, P. Armstrong, A. Wong, V. & Saunders, J. (2008 [1996]) *Principles of Marketing*, Essex: Pearson Education, pp. 8f.

<sup>622</sup> Tate (2012) *Tate Publicity Hand-Out*, London: Tate.

The reason the Tate changed its aims was also because it had created an identity in line with an enterprise culture which began under Margaret Thatcher and continued with Tony Blair. Ultimately, it was New Labour which had played a role in shaping how Tate Modern would finally define itself. The Labour Party's political aims were not simply revised by Blair; they were changed when he re-defined the meaning of Clause 4 which moved from supporting nationalisation to privatisation under the veil of creating a greater meritocracy in providing more opportunity. These aims reverberated with neo-liberal values rather than those of old Labour. Some former socialist objectives remained within Labour Party politics, including the Government funding free admission to national museums and galleries. However, this Labour Government benefit was given on the basis that a delivery of outputs and benefits was expected. What this meant was that organisations in receipt of public funding had to become more economically viable.

Consequently, the Tate's Business Development Unit was created to respond to Labour Government directives by focusing on maximising marketing and revenue opportunities through commercial enterprise. The Tate Gallery Chairman, Stevenson, was strategic in creating the Business Development Unit, who realised the urgency in providing alternative funding streams. David Verey, his successor, ensured that, through a targeted strategy, this contributed to the realisation of the tripod funding model being realised. The Government recognised the strengths of the funding initiative even before Tate Modern opened, and praised the organisation as an exemplary economic model of a professionally managed arts project.<sup>623</sup>

### **Shifting Public Geographies**

Government proposals continued to communicate change, which is why Chapter 6, Competition and Building, discussed the question how did culture impact on the urban agenda and affect the Tate Gallery? The initial response by the Tate Gallery in an increasingly competitive market was to host an architectural competition to find the best architect and to raise the public profile of Bankside. The Tate Gallery, therefore, recognised that the building of Tate Modern needed to attract attention to itself, but also

---

<sup>623</sup> Deloitte & Touche (1999) *Efficiency and Effectiveness of Government-Sponsored Museums and Galleries-Measurement and Improvement, Private Initiative (PFI) Excellence Study*, p. 29.

to the Bankside site, which had literally become obscured by being fenced off from public view and had become detached from the rest of city life as it stood apart from its surroundings. The aim was to reconfigure the geography of the site, and integrate it with the local environment, and to make it part of the *central* London skyline.<sup>624</sup>

The new development had to become part of the core tourist areas which were mainly clustered on the north bank in and around Westminster including the National Gallery at Trafalgar Square. The new geographic reach had to extend to the south bank area of Southwark. Therefore, the urban context, the site, the building and the display spaces were identified as the key areas to be developed. What this indicated was that the Tate Gallery prioritised the urban and architectural aspects before the collection. The reason was because the building's redesign had to compensate for the gaps in the collection and also had to facilitate an accessible and welcoming visit.

Opening up a connection between the inside and outside of the building was also a key factor in realising the vision. Ove Arup, the structural engineers, added that the redesign successfully created a landmark building for providing new connections with the rest of London and proposed a coherent spatial syntax between the inside and outside of the building.<sup>625</sup> Additionally, the external soft landscaped area was intended to help mediate the space between the building, the outside and the rest of the city. What was vital to establishing the relationship with the outside was the creation of the Millennium Bridge which opened up a vital corridor between Bankside and the City. The Millennium Bridge brought visitors into Southwark who might normally have only visited the major tourist attraction of St Pauls Cathedral, but now were offered another cultural destination.

The Millennium Bridge contributed, therefore, to revitalising the Bankside area, by providing access to Tate Modern which was envisioned to provide a central hub in generating further activities and services along the South Bank and was to revitalise the area into a vibrant, mixed-use cultural quarter and new public space.<sup>626</sup> The Tate chose to create its own public space inside and outside the building with the aim to enable visitors

---

<sup>624</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).

<sup>625</sup> Hirst, J. Marriott, T. & Wainwright, F. (2000) *The Arup Journal*, London: Ove Arup, Vol. 65, No. 3, p. 3.

<sup>626</sup> The Tate Gallery (July 1994) *The Tate Gallery of Modern Art: Competition to Select an Architect*, pp. 2 & 10 (Archive: TG 12/4/2/6).



to make decisions about their visit and to offer a range of choices, which could include meeting people as Tate Modern was to be a place to rendezvous, as well as serving as a destination. Ultimately, the objective was to lead the visitor to using the museum's goods and services from viewing the art works to shopping and, by doing so, Tate Modern is similar to international museums of modern art, yet it remains distinct from them.

### **Rethinking the Museum of Modern Art in the City**

While Tate Modern shares many of the attributes of international museums of modern art, it is different in three ways:

1. Tate Modern was not established by a private patron, or as a political solution reflecting a wider national economic restructuring. Tate Modern was created through the agency of the Tate.
2. The Tate's collection of international modern and contemporary art (although much expanded), does not have the same breadth of art works as MoMA, in New York, and *La Musée National d'Art Moderne*, in Paris.
3. Tate Modern does not propose the same kind of spectacular modern architecture as international models; it instead, offers an urban spectacle on London's skyline.

Regarding this last point, this is because Tate Modern was created from a readapted building within Bankside Power Station and suggests a different narrative in proposing a type of historic preservation in place of contemporary design. Tate Modern was not designed as an icon of modernity; it instead opened up an old industrial building as a new landmark building. Tate Modern has re-cast Bankside Power Station into the public view, and serves as a reminder of London's post-war industrial past. Contrastingly, international museums of modern art have instead played a role in shaping ideas related to modernity about their cities. MoMA emerged as a sleek modernist building on the New York skyline, which broke with conventions of exhibiting art in more traditional buildings. The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum also proposed something even more

ambitious with its spectacular spiral edifice and set a precedent for cutting-edge museum design and has become one of the foremost iconic buildings of the twentieth century.

Post-war Europe also saw its cities promoting new architectural design for their own museums of modern art such as the *Neue Nationalgalerie* in Berlin which was intended as an image of modernity for the divided city. A different kind of public initiative was proposed with the opening of Richard Rogers and Renzo Piano's *Centre National Art et de Cultures George Pompidou* which houses *La Musée National D'Art Moderne* and stands out in contrast against Baron Haussmann's nineteenth century vision of Paris. Further innovative designs were proposed for cultural buildings and specifically museums of modern art in other parts of Europe and beyond which continue to act as symbols of national pride. Recognisable by their modern rhetoric, they offer the same generic urban rituals of shopping, eating and drinking, and contribute to the global economy. As Tone Hansen, Director of the Henie-Onstad Art Centre, claims, the museums are 'increasingly intertwined with the neo-liberal economy [...]'<sup>627</sup> Similarly, Tate Modern contributes to this wider economy and has been highly successful in terms of its impact, compared to what had been previously been forecast.

### Evaluating the Impact

McKinsey & Company's *Assessing the Economic Impact of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art at Bankside* (1994) estimated an initial benefit of £30–£90 million to the economy, of which £13–£35 million was specific to London. In reassessing these figures, McKinsey & Company's *Assessing the Economic Impact of Tate Modern* (2001) estimated that between £75 and £140 million was generated to the wider economy with between £50–£70 million specific to London.<sup>628</sup> McKinsey & Company's original research also estimated that 790–2,440 jobs would be generated in London, of which 400–1,000 jobs would be created in Southwark. The revised figures identified that 2,100–3,900 jobs were created, of which between 1,390 and 1,890 were specific to Southwark. Indirect job creation was also evident. The new employment impacted on Southwark property prices and commercial investment levels, which increased faster than the London average.

---

<sup>627</sup> Hansen, T. (2011) *(Re)Staging the Art Museum*, Berlin: Revolver, p. 19.

<sup>628</sup> McKinsey & Company (10 May 2001) *Assessing the Economic Impact of Tate Modern*, London: McKinsey & Company, p. 2.

The urban impact was also visible in the immediate vicinity of Tate Modern, where commercial activity concentrated as local businesses and investment relocated to meet visitor demands for related retail and accommodation. Although the residential levels increased, they trailed London as a whole, but later rose. New tourist trails south of the river developed, as public perceptions of the area improved. Tate Modern was identified as contributing to the broader regeneration of the South Bank, but noted that its popularity was relative to all London attractions. Otherwise, McKinsey & Company commended the arrival of Tate Modern which had become the anchor attraction on the South Bank, and in doing so had attracted a new public focus in a previously former industrial, underdeveloped and deprived area.

The visitor figures also exceeded the earlier estimated economic and social impact. McKinsey & Company had originally forecast that approximately 2 million people would visit the building in the first year of opening; instead, 5.25 million visited. The visitor figures were also double those of MoMA, which received 2.5 million visitors. The reason for this could be attributed partly to MoMA having an admission charge. Tate Modern's free admission remains a key government-funded benefit. To forecast what Tate Modern's figures would be without this financial advantage is impossible, but it clearly contributed to the success of the museum in attracting visitors. To date Tate Modern remains the most visited museum of modern art in the world. Yet, the view that Tate Modern was a success was not shared by all commentators.

Graeme Evans, Professor of Urban Culture and Design at Brunel University, criticised the Tate for creating a new Bankside cultural quarter which led to increased property rents and 'high value-usage' squeezing out the existing residents.<sup>629</sup> Deyan Sudjic, Director of the Design Museum claimed that subsequent new developments saw land value escalate, but added that Southwark had transformed: 'from a run-down post-industrial wasteland into a reinvigorated urban neighbourhood, studied by city planners all over the world'.<sup>630</sup> Another criticism levelled at the Tate was for using an existing building instead of creating a new design opportunity. Ken Allinson, the architectural

---

<sup>629</sup> Evans, G. (2001) *Op. cit.*, p. 220.

<sup>630</sup> Sudjic, D. (2007) 'Theory, Policy and Practice'. In Burdett & Sudjic (2007) *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

writer, added: 'The English appear to suffer the need to house their new institutions in buildings formerly from the past'.<sup>631</sup>

A commendation came from David Throsby for revitalising the building and area into a new public space for London. As a cultural economist, Throsby praised Tate Modern as an exemplary example of well managed, and economic re-use of an adapted building which allowed more space to be created, and for creating 'an engaging and stimulating place in which to enjoy modern art'.<sup>632</sup> A mixed critique was provided by Kenneth Powell, the architectural historian, who commended Tate Modern for the 'spectacular installations' in the Turbine Hall, which had made it 'one of the most impressive spaces in London'.<sup>633</sup> A key flaw however, was that the galleries were too small and boxy and 'lack flexibility' and that the lifts, escalators and top-floor restaurant are unable to accommodate the vast number of visitors.<sup>634</sup>

Despite the varied reviews, the area of the development which received almost unanimous praise was the Turbine Hall. The space had been created by the long ramp down from ground level and through the entrance doors into the unexpected and massive volume of the Turbine Hall. Additionally, the two storey high glass box known as the Light Beam adds a further dramatic dimension to the building. In the same way that these are distinctive features of Tate Modern, it has itself become a distinctive feature of London.<sup>635</sup> Thierry Greub, Assistant Director of the Art Centre, Basel, added that Tate Modern was a distinctive marketing factor for London, and compared it with the Guggenheim Bilbao.<sup>636</sup> The comparison was on account of the museums of modern art reviving a rundown urban area. While Tate Modern is different from the Guggenheim, Bilbao in how they were established, they are similar in that they have both created a new cultural rendezvous, in areas which were formerly inaccessible.

---

<sup>631</sup> Allinson, K. (2006) *London's Contemporary Architecture* +, Oxford: Architectural Press, p. 143.

<sup>632</sup> Throsby, D. (2010) *The Economics of Cultural Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 142.

<sup>633</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.

<sup>634</sup> Powell, K. (2011) *21st Century London: The New Architecture*, London & New York: Merrell, p.102

<sup>635</sup> Allinson, K. (2006 [1994]) *Op. cit.*, p. 142.

<sup>636</sup> Greub, T. 'Museums at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Speculations'. In Greub, S. & Greub, T. (eds) (2008) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

### **The Cultural Box Office**

Creating a new cultural destination in London had been made possible because the Tate Gallery had been able to capitalise on its increasing autonomy and independent decision-making. What had given it confidence to do so was having the ability to re-think the commercial aspects of the organisation. For the Tate Gallery, culture and commerce had become inextricably linked. The position had been taken because from Thatcher to Blair government increasingly viewed the arts as commodities. The extent of commodification of culture was demonstrated when Blair identified that the creative industries and, notably, Tate Modern, had become a marketable asset.

We have encouraged the cultural sector to go out into the market place to seek private funding, to enter into partnerships across sectors, to test its work at the box office. Across all the many disciplines the response has been vigorous enthusiastic and creative. Our arts leaders are world class entrepreneurs.<sup>637</sup>

These words encapsulated New Labour's vision of entrepreneurship, partnership, incentivisation and the market. Would Blair have used the same rhetoric before being voted into office a decade earlier? Probably not, as the Labour Party did not indicate the extent to which it would continue the Conservative monetary model.

According to Blair, New Labour culture had become 'an engine for regeneration' and he praised the Millennium Commission-funded projects at Salford Quays, Newcastle-Gateshead, Bristol Harbourside, Birmingham Jewellery Quarter and the Ancoats area of Manchester.<sup>638</sup> Tate Modern was hailed as an exemplary model and its success was claimed to be as a result of the Labour Government's investment in allowing visitors free admission.<sup>639</sup> While the Conservatives earlier had suggested that the Tate charge an admission fee, it did not make it a requisite for funding. The position of the Conservative and Labour Governments resulted in the Tate seeking greater institutional

---

<sup>637</sup> Department for Culture, Media & Sport (2007) *Culture and Creativity*, London: Department of Culture, Media and Sport Report, p. 3.

<sup>638</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>639</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

independence. Consequently, the Tate undertook a strategic campaign underpinned by a strong business vision, which was contingent on all areas of the project working as part of a co-ordinated plan which involved marketing Tate Modern.

Communicating that Tate Modern was a new accessible London venue was vital to the Tate Gallery's publicity campaign. The Tate's Communications Department had outsourced the work to the cultural communications consultancy, Bolton and Quinn, with the aim to expand interest in Tate Modern. This included targeting key media personalities and high-profile endorsers to attend the launch party with the aim to make Tate Modern fun, cool and the place to be. The media-hyped event attracted considerable publicity for Tate Modern and was part of a deliberate planned initiative to advertise that Tate Modern was not an elite and exclusive art institution. What this demonstrated was how 'media savvy' and networked Tate Modern had become in Blair's Britain. Competing in a pressurised market, where a high standard of audience needs and services was expected, Tate Modern offered, therefore, more than the founding organisation's exhibition space was ever meant to do and continues to provoke debate.

### **Debating the Tate**

While this thesis has discussed how Tate Modern was established, it has also asked: What is Tate Modern? Responses which reverberate with some of the themes discussed were raised by a group of academics assembled for a roundtable discussion hosted by The MIT Press in 2001. Mignon Nixon from the Courtauld Institute of Art began by asking: What is it that makes Tate Modern different?<sup>640</sup> Julian Stallabrass from The Courtauld Institute of Art claimed that Tate Modern's success was due to key defining moments which it had embraced and had resulted in creating a unique new kind of arts organisation. Stallabrass stated that Tate Modern harked back to Wilson's 1960s' 'white heat of technology' and that an extraordinary phenomenon had occurred in creating it, which had shifted away from the former parochial insularity surrounding modernity in the UK.<sup>641</sup> The argument of this thesis concurs with Stallabrass that Tate Modern cast off the old to embrace the new, although this had in fact be done by the organisation which created it. Alex Potts

---

<sup>640</sup> Nixon, M. Potts, A. Fer, B. Hudek, B. & Stallabrass, J. (Autumn 2001) 'Round Table: Tate Modern'. In *October*, Vol. 98, Cambridge, MA: The Mit Press, p. 3.

<sup>641</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

from the University of Michigan re-iterated the earlier point that Tate Modern's success was owing to its re-engagement with earlier events in the organisation's history, including 'The Bricks', to becoming a big modern institution within the art world.<sup>642</sup> Potts added that Tate Modern had successfully situated itself within the national and international art scene. The Tate was also able to do this because the positions of national and international agendas had changed in an increasingly global world.

Briony Fer, from University College London, approached the topic from a different viewpoint and proposed that Tate Modern was dissimilar from other museums of modern art because it was created to look *from*, rather than looking within.<sup>643</sup> The underlining theme of Fer's thesis is that Tate Modern is a viewing platform. Certainly, the redesign of the building created new viewing opportunities. Logistically, the Tate had doubled the original line of windows on the east façade of the building with further floor-to-ceiling windows created to offer panoramic vistas. Café 2 on Level 2, with its glass walling, provided further views onto the northern landscaped area, and was intended to facilitate an inside–outside connection, but also provided views of other visitors. Additionally, Level 4's two riverside balconies by the Espresso Bar area offer far-reaching vistas to the west and east of London, as well as views of those below entering and leaving the building. Fer's proposition is that, from the spaces of Tate Modern, the city is re-imagined in a way that it was never intended as: 'a city of vistas [and] opens up a whole series of vistas and viewpoints'.<sup>644</sup> Her theory is that Tate Modern created spaces which are about looking at people rather than at the art works within the building and in this sense is also a place for surveillance rather like Bentham's Millbank penitentiary and as such becomes a site for the urban *flâneur*.

On this basis Tate Modern appears to propose many narratives and because of this when it was being developed the Tate Gallery Trustees knew they were creating something beyond an exhibition space.

This is why the Tate Gallery Trustees posed the following question in 1993:

---

<sup>642</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>643</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>644</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.



What kind of gallery of modern art do we envisage? What will it look like [...] do we wish to build a temple or a forum, a showcase or a laboratory; a sanctuary for scholars or a palace of entertainment and are these incompatible goals?<sup>645</sup>

The Tate Gallery Trustees deliberated because they knew that they were dealing with a much more complex phenomenon than had the founding organisation. When the National Gallery of British Art opened it was seen, at least by those at the officiating ceremony, as a new model of enterprise, a place of improvement and as a temple of art. The National Gallery of British Art was not about attracting a wider group of people, nor was it to revitalise the local area, nor play a role in the economic and cultural image of the city, in the way that Tate Modern was intended to do.

The question therefore, persists: what is Tate Modern?

This conclusion asserts that Tate Modern fulfils the function of being the National Museum for the Tate's collection of international modern and contemporary art. Tate Modern is also the revitalised Bankside Power Station building at the hub of a cultural regeneration project led by the Tate, working to a wider government agenda. Tate Modern is also part of the Tate brand. As importantly, Tate Modern is also an experience, as the visitors are attracted by the combination of the architecture, the art, and the urban spectacle on the River Thames. Tate Modern works, therefore, as an integrated whole because it was always envisioned as part of a holistic solution: it was not to be a stand-alone project, as it was intended to contribute to the social and economic fabric of London. Tate Modern will continue to provoke questions about what it is, what it does and what it can be, and provides the basis for further related research.

---

<sup>645</sup> The Tate Gallery (28 April 1993) *Agenda for a Special Meeting of the Trustees of The Tate Gallery*, p. 1 (Archive: TG 12/1/2/1).

### **Signposting for Future Research**

Concerning future research to emerge from this Ph.D. what is apparent is that there is a gap in the scholarly field concerning cultural policy which focuses on national galleries and museums using qualitative research. While there are academic departments working in this field, they tend to focus on the creative industries and use mainly quantitative analysis. (The departments are: The London Centre for Cultural Policy and Management, City University; The School of Culture and Creative Arts: Research Centre for Cultural Policy, University of Glasgow; and the Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, Warwick University). Although not an academic body, the National Museum Directors' Council does provide reports which discuss aspects of cultural policy on museums and galleries.

Future academic research questions leading to more focused study might include: Who directs vision for cultural projects in the UK? And how should cultural projects be funded? And, as importantly: How can cultural value be assessed? And if cultural value is to be evaluated by a delivery of outputs based on visitor figures and income - does the cultural benefit no longer matter? A research title could be 'Establishing Cultural Policy: Museums and Galleries in the UK', to address the questions: Why did the government create cultural policy? Should the government have a cultural policy? What impact does cultural policy have? And does having a cultural policy provide a public benefit?

A further area for research is on the funding of museums and galleries, and could be addressed as: 'Establishing The Cultural Box Office: Museums and Galleries in the UK' to examine the questions: How did culture become a marketable asset? When and why did it happen? And what are the broader implications concerning global agencies and policies? These questions can be applied to public international museums of modern art - given the proposition that they are increasingly associated with nation-building while having to maintain cultural and economic continuity.<sup>646</sup> Economic sustainability is, therefore, also a key factor for the international museum of modern art to survive, but does this compromise its aims? And, specifically building on this Ph.D. research thesis: Will the Tate compromise its own aims in becoming more widely consumable?

As the Tate is part of the wider economy there are increasing customer/audience expectations on it to commoditise its assets. Consequently, the Tate's Development

---

<sup>646</sup> Lind, M. (2011) 'Restaging the Institution'. In Hansen, T. *Op. cit.*, pp. 19 & 31.

Office has become the most established and successful fundraising team across the not-for-profit spectrum in the UK. The Development Office continues to expand to meet the growing needs of the Tate, and to build a sustainable economic future. Crucially, the reason that the Development Office is able to raise this money is because the Tate continues to deliver its aims by demonstrating that it is open to new ideas in art (including beyond the West) and to new audiences, as well as being entrepreneurial, innovative, sustainable, rigorous and enduring. However, all is rhetoric and is dependent on the bigger picture directed by the government and the global forces that influence it.

The question is: if there were a major global restructuring, would the Tate have the ability to respond to new challenges? While the Tate continues to adopt new visions of culture by bridging the gap with politics, it should be able to continue to adapt. The Tate has, however, adopted new visions of culture on the basis that it has a virtual autonomy in its decision-making process; if it had less control over how it manages its resources, it might not be able to function in the same way. Otherwise, for the present, Serota continues to speculate for the future by building on the existing art collection and by further physical expansion. With Tate Modern Phase 2 under construction, the £215 million extension designed by Herzog and de Meuron is planned to open as an annex to the existing building.

A final consideration is: as the Tate continues to develop, will it still be able to maintain a balance between culture and commerce? For the time being, it appears that the Tate is able to maintain a professional relationship between these two areas. Importantly, they have underpinned the entire history of the organisation, with commerce more conspicuously coming to the fore since the Thatcher government. This PhD has, therefore, examined the vision and patronage which led to Tate Modern and what has been the most interesting point to arise, for this researcher, is that the public became willing to visit a museum which displays international modern and contemporary art. This was because the public's perceptions had been changed and, just like the journey of the original modern foreign collection, this took place over a very long period of time.

## Bibliography

- Adorno, T. (2003 [1964]) *The Jargon of Authenticity*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Alicata, M. (2008) *Tate Modern London*, Milan: Mondadori Arte.
- Allen, B. (1995) *Towards a Modern Art World*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Alley, R. (1981) *Catalogue of The Tate Gallery's Collection of Modern Art other than works by British Artists*, London: The Tate Gallery Publications Department & Philip Wilson.
- Arts & Business (2006) *Investing in Culture: Challenges and Opportunities*, London: Arts & Business.
- Arts Council of Great Britain (1993) *A Creative Future: The Way Forward for the Arts, Crafts and Media in England*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Arts Council of Great Britain (September 1986) *Partnership: Making Art Money Work Harder*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain.
- Association of Cultural Economics International (2004) *Economics of Art and Culture: Invited Papers at the 12th International Conference of the Association of Cultural Economics International*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Allinson, K. (2003 [1994]) *London's Contemporary Architecture*, London: Architectural Press.
- Altshuler, B. (2005) *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art*, Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Barker, E. (ed.) (1999) *Contemporary Cultures of Display: Art and its Histories*, Yale: Yale University Press.
- Barlow, P. & Trodd, C. (eds) (2000) *Governing Cultures: Art Institutions in Victorian London*, Hants: Ashgate.
- Beech, M. (2006) *The Political Philosophy of New Labour*, (International Library of Political Studies 6), London & New York: Tauris Academic Studies.
- Bennett, T. (1995) *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*, London & New York: Routledge.

- Bentley, M. (2001) *Lord Salisbury's World: Conservative Environments in Late Victorian Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Binney, M. (1980) *Save Britain's Heritage Report: Bankside Power Station - The Possibility of Alternative Use*, London: SAVE.
- Blaug, M. (ed.) (1976) *The Economics of the Arts*, London: Martin Robertson.
- Boddy, M. & Fudge, C. (1984) *Local Socialism? Labour Councils and New Left Alternatives*, London & Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. & Darbel, A. (1991 [1969]) *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*, trans. Caroline Beattie & Nick Merriman, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bradley, C. H. J. (1998) *Mrs Thatcher's Cultural Policies: A Comparative Study of the Globalized Cultural System*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bradley, S. & Pevsner, N. (2002 [1997]) *London 1: The City of London*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Brenner, N. (2009 [2004]) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brenner, N. & Theodore, N. (2008 [2002]) *Spaces of Neoliberalism: Urban Restructuring in North America and Western Europe*, Malden, Oxford & Victoria: Blackwell.
- Bridges, Right Hon. Lord (1958) 'The State and the Arts'. The Romanes Lecture, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brooke, P. (22 June 1994) *A Strategy for Supporting Millennium Projects*, London: The Millennium Commission.
- Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buck, L. (2000) *Moving Targets 2: A User's Guide to British Art Now*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Buck, L. & Dodd, P. (1991) *Relative Values*, London: BBC Books.
- Burdett, R. (2004) *Museums and Galleries: Creative Engagement*, National Museum Directors' Report, London: National Museum Directors' Conference.
- Burdett, R. & Sudjic, R. (eds) (2007) *The Endless City*, London & New York: Phaidon.
- Burlington Magazine*, The (September 1998) Editorial, 'A Positive Policy for the Arts', vol. CXL (140), No. 1146, London: The Burlington Magazine.

- Button, V. (2007 [1997]) *The Turner Prize*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Caygill, M. (2006 [2003]) *The British Museum: 250 years*, London: The British Museum Press.
- Central Office of Information (1995) *Urban Regeneration*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Central Office of Information (1989) *Urban Regeneration in Britain*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Central Office of Information (1988) *The Promotion of the Arts in Britain*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Central Office of Information (1987) *Action for Cities*, London: Department of Education & Department of Environment.
- Collyer, G. S. (2004) *Competing Globally in Architecture Competitions*, Chichester: Wiley-Academy.
- Compton, S. (ed.) (1986) *British Art in the Twentieth Century: The Modern Movement*, Royal Academy of Arts Exhibition Catalogue, Munich & London: Prestel.
- Conservative Party, The (September 1978) *The Arts: The Way forward?* London: Conservative Political Centre.
- Conservative Party, The (1970) *A Policy for the Arts*, London: Her Majesty's Government.
- Conservative Political Centre, The (1988) *Small Business and the Rebirth of Enterprise in Britain*, London: Conservative Political Centre.
- Conservative Political Centre, The (1962) *Government and the Arts*, London: Conservative Political Centre.
- Cragoe, M. & Taylor, A. (eds) (2005) *London Politics 1760-1914*, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Creswell, J. (2003) *Research Design*, London: Sage.
- Department of Culture Media & Sport (2000) *Centres for Social Change: Museums, Archives and Galleries*, London: Department of Culture, Media & Sport.
- Department of Culture, Media & Sport (2007) *Culture and Creativity*, London: Department of Culture, Media & Sport.

- Department of Culture, Media & Sport (2005) *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life*, London: Department of Culture, Media & Sport.
- Debord, G. (2009) *Society of Spectacle*, Sussex: Soul Bay Press.
- De Haan, H. & Haagsma, I. (1988) *Architects in Competition: International Architectural Competitions of the last 200 years*, London & New York: Thames & Hudson.
- Department of Education & Science (1971) *Museums in Education*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Department of Education & Science (1966) *Report on The Arts: Partnership in Patronage*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Department of Environment (1995 [1994]) *Assessing the Impact of Urban Policy*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Department of Environment (1993) *Evaluation of Urban Development Grant, Urban Regeneration Grant and City Grant*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Duncan, C. (1995) *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Earl Curzon of Kedleston, Sir Edgar Vincent, Robert H. Benson & Sir Charles Holroyd, (1915) *Report of the Committee of Trustees of the National Gallery appointed by the Trustees to inquire into the Retention of Important Pictures in this Country and Other Matters connected with the National Art Collection*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Evans, G. (2001) *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?* London & New York: Routledge.
- Evans, G. & Shaw, P. (2004) *The Contribution of Culture to Regeneration in the UK: A Review of Evidence-A Report to the Department of Culture, Media & Sport*, London: Metropolitan University.
- Falk, J. D. & Dierking, L. D. (1997 [1994]) *The Museum Experience*, Washington: Whalesback Books.
- Farr, D. (1984) *English Art 1870–1940*, Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fielding, S. (2003) *The Labour Governments 1964–1970: Labour and Cultural Change*, Vol. 1, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.



- Foucault, M. (1991 [1977]) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, London: Penguin.
- Fox, C. (2007) *No strings attached! Why Arts Funding should say 'no' to Instrumentalism*, London: Arts & Business.
- Freeland, C. (2001) *But is it Art?*, Oxford & New York, Oxford University Press.
- Frey, S. B. (2000) *Arts and Economics: Analysis and Cultural Policy*, Berlin, Heidelberg & New York: Springer.
- Gamble, A. & Wright, T. (2004) *Restating The State*, The Political Quarterly, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Garber, M. (2008) *Patronizing the Arts*, Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Garlake, M. (1998) *New Art New World: British Art in Postwar Society*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Gayford, M. et al., (2005) *Tate Modern: The First Five Years*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Giebelhausen, M. (ed.) (2003) *The Architecture of the Museum: Symbolic Structures, Urban Contexts*, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Gibbons, J. (2005) *Art and Advertising*, London & New York: I.B. Taurus.
- Gillham, B. (2000) *Case Study Research Methods*, London & New York: Continuum.
- Gilmore, J. H. & Pine II, J. B. (2007) *Authenticity: What Consumers Really Want*, Boston MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Glinowski, P. (2008) *Good Foundations: Trusts and Foundations and the Arts in the United Kingdom*, London: Lawrence King.
- Glinowski, P. (2007) *Trusts and Foundations and the Arts*, London: Arts & Business.
- Goodwin, B. (1994) *How the Leopard changed its Spots: The Evolution of Complexity*, London: Phoenix.
- Gomm, R. Hammersley, M. & Foster, P. (eds) (2000) *Case Study Method*, London: Sage.
- Gray, C. (2000) *The Politics of the Arts in Britain*, London & New York: MacMillan & St Martin's Press.
- Greater London Authority (2004) *The Mayor's Cultural Strategy: London Cultural Capital - Realising the Potential of a World-Class City*, London: Greater London Authority.

- Green, E. H. H. (ed.) (1997) *An Age of Transition: British Politics 1880–1914*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Grenfell, M. & Hardy, C. (2007) *Art Rules: Pierre Bourdieu and the Visual Arts*, Oxford & New York: Berg.
- Greub, S. & Greub T. (eds) (2008 [2006]) *Museums in the 21st Century: Concepts Projects Buildings*, Munich London, New York & Basel: Prestel.
- Guilbaut, S. (trans.) Goldhammer, A. (1983) *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Habermas, J. (trans.) Burger, T. (1999 [1962]) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hall, P. (1998) *Cities in Civilization*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Hall, P. (1986) *Governing the Economy: The Politics of State Intervention in Britain and France*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hamlyn, R. & Booth, J. (1997) *Henry Tate's Gift: A Centenary Celebration*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Hansen, T. (ed.) (2011) *(Re) Staging the Art Museum*, Berlin: Revolver.
- Harris, J. S. (1970) *Government Patronage of the Arts*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Harris, J. & Williams, R. (eds) (2011) *Regenerating Culture and Society, Architecture, Art and Urban Style within the Global Politics of City Branding*, Liverpool: Tate Liverpool & Liverpool University Press.
- Harrison, C. (1994 [1981]) *English Art and Modernism*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Hartley, J. (ed.) (2008 [2005]) *Creative Industries*, Malden & Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Harvey, D. (2012) *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*, London & New York: Verso.
- Harvey, D. (2009 [2005]) *A Brief History of Neo-liberalism*, Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

- Heilbrun, J. & Gray, C. M. (2008 [2001]) *The Economics of Art and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1978) *A National Heritage Fund*, London: Treasury Chambers.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1970) *A Policy for the Arts*, London: Department of Education.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1977) *A Policy for the Inner Cities*, London: Department of Environment.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1993) *The Arts*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1970) *The Promotion of the Arts in Britain*, London: Central Office of Information.
- Her Majesty's Stationery Office (1968) *Town and Country Planning Act*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Her Majesty's Government (1965) *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps*, London: Her Majesty's Office.
- Hermann, F. (1999) *The English as Collectors*, New Castle Delaware: Oak Knolle Press.
- Heywood, A. (2007 [1997]) *Politics*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hibou, B. (ed.) (2004 [1999]) *Privatising the State*, London: Hurst.
- Hillman, J. (1992) *Medicis and the Millennium: Government Patronage and Architecture*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Hooghe, L. (2001) *The European Commission and the Integration of Europe: Images of Governance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2007) *Museums and Education – Purpose, Pedagogy, Performance*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Hourston, L. (2004) *Museum Builders II*, Chichester: Wiley-Academy.
- Hutchinson, R. (1982) *The Politics of the Arts Council*, London: Sinclair Browne.
- Hyland, A. (2006) *Visual Identity and Branding the Arts*, London: Lawrence King.
- Imrie, R. Lees, L. & Raco, M. (eds) (2009) *Regenerating London*, London & New York: Routledge.

- Jarvis, H. Pratt, A. Cheng-Chong Wu, P. (2001) *The Secret Life of Cities: The Social Reproduction of Everyday Life*, Essex: Pearson Education.
- Jenkins, H. (1979) *The Culture Gap: An Experience of Government and The Arts*, London & Boston: Marion Boyars.
- Jones, P. & Evans, J. (2008) *Urban Regeneration in the UK*, London: Sage.
- Jones, T. (1960 [1952]) *Henry Tate 1819–1899*, London: Tate & Lyle Ltd.
- Judge, D. (2003) *The Parliamentary State*, London, California & New Delhi: Sage.
- Karp, I. Kratz, C. A. Szwaja, L. & Ybarra-Frausto, T. (2006) *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Kavanagh, D. (1995 [1987]) *Thatcherism and British Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kawashima, N. (1997) *Museum Management in a Time of Change: Impacts of Cultural Policy on Museums in Britain 1979–1997*, Warwick: University of Warwick.
- Kennedy, R. (1991) *London: World City*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Kliment, S. A. (2001) *Building Type Basics for Museums*, New York: John Wiley.
- Kotler, N. G. Kotler, P. & Kotler, W. I. (eds) (2008) *Museum Marketing and Strategy: Designing Museums, Building Audiences, Generating Revenue and Resources*, San Francisco: John Wiley.
- Krens, T. (1994) *Art of this Century: The Guggenheim Museum and its Collection*, New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Labour Party, The (1977) *Building Britain's Future: Labour's Policy on Construction*, London: The Labour Party.
- Labour Party, The (1957) *Industry and Society: Labour's Policy on Future Public Ownership*, London: The Labour Party.
- Labour Party, The (1972) *Labour's Programme for Britain Annual Conference*, London: The Labour Party.
- Labour Party, The (1957) *Public Enterprise: Labour's Review of the Nationalised Industries*, London: The Labour Party.
- Labour Party, The (1975) *The Arts*, London: The Labour Party.
- Labour Party, The (1977) *The Arts and the People: Labour's Policy towards the Arts*, London: The Labour Party.

- Lageira, J. (2000) *Musée National d'Art Moderne*, Paris: Scala.
- Lechner, F. J. & Boli, J. (2005) *World Culture: Origins and Consequences*, Malden, Oxford & Victoria: Blackwell.
- Ledger, S. & McCracken, S. (eds) (1998 [1995]) *Cultural Politics at the Fin de Siècle*, Cambridge, New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Luke, T. W. (2002) *Museum Politics*, Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Magnano Lampugnani, V. & Sachs, A. (eds) (2001 [1999]) *Museums for a New Millennium Concepts Projects Buildings*, Munich, London, New York & Basel: Prestel.
- Martin Caldwell Associates (1995) *Bankside Economic Study Draft*, London: Martin Caldwell Associates.
- Marz, R. & Schneider, A. (eds) (1997) *Neue Nationalgalerie Berlin*, Munich & New York: Prestel.
- McClellan, A. (2008) *The Art Museum from Boullée to Bilbao*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- McCormick, J. (2007 [2003]) *Contemporary Britain*, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave.
- McGuigan, J. (2004) *Rethinking Cultural Policy*, London: Open University Press.
- McKinsey & Company (2001) *Assessing the Economic Impact of Tate Modern*, McKinsey & Company: London.
- McKinsey & Company (1994) *The Economic Impact of the Tate Gallery of Modern Art at Bankside*, London: McKinsey & Company.
- McKinsey & Company (2005 [1990]) *Valuation: Measuring and Managing the Value of Companies*, New Jersey: Wiley.
- Millennium Commission (1993–2000) *Millennium Commission Reports 1993–2000*, London: Millennium Commission.
- Miller, T. & Yudice, G. (2002) *Cultural Policy*, London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage.
- Mirza, M. (ed.) (2006) *Culture Vultures: Is UK Arts Policy damaging the Arts?* London: Policy Exchange.

- Moore, P. G. (1997) 'The Development of the UK National Lottery'. In *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A Statistics in Society*, Vol. 160, No. 2, London: Blackwell, pp. 169-185.
- Moore, R. & Ryan, R. (2000) *Building Tate Modern: Herzog and De Meuron Transforming Giles Gilbert Scott*, London: Tate Gallery Publishing.
- Morley, D. & Robins, K. (eds) (2001) *British Cultural Studies: Geography, Nationality and Identity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morris, A. E. J. (1979) *A History of Urban Form: Before the Industrial Revolutions*, London: G. Godwin.
- Morris, F. (2006) *Tate Modern: The Handbook*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Morphet, R. (1976) 'Carl Andre's "Bricks"'. In *The Burlington Magazine*, CXVIII, London: The Burlington Magazine.
- Mulholland, N. (2003) *The Cultural Devolution: Art in Britain in the Late Twentieth Century*, Hants: Ashgate.
- Mumford, L. (1961) *The City in History*, New York: MJF Books.
- National Archives, The (2008) *Research Guide: The Arts, Broadcasting and Film*, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk>
- National Museum Directors' Conference (2006) *Values and Vision: Cultural World Unites to Launch Future Vision*, London: National Museum Directors' Conference.
- Nead, L. (2005 [2000]) *Victorian Babylon*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Newhouse, V. (2006 [1998]) *Towards a New Museum*, New York: The Monacelli Press.
- New London Architecture (2005) *Civilizing Spaces: Improving London's Realm*, London: New London Architecture.
- O'Brien, J. (1998) *International Data on Public Spending on the Arts in Eleven Countries*, London: The Arts Council of England.
- O'Doherty, B. (1986 [1976]) *Inside the White Cube: The Ideology of the Gallery Space*, Berkeley, California & London: University of California Press.
- Office of Arts & Libraries (OAL) (1980) *The Arts are Your Business*, London: Central Office of Information.
- Olins, W. (2003) *On Brand*, London: Thames & Hudson.

- Olins, W. (2008) *The Brand Handbook*, London: Thames & Hudson.
- Orbie, J. (ed.) (2009) *Europe's Global Role: External Policies of the European Union*, Surrey & Burlington: Ashgate.
- Osborne, A. (ed.) (1966) *Patron, Industry Supports the Arts*, London: The Connoisseur.
- Paddison, R. & Miles, S. (2007) *Culture-led Urban Regeneration*, Oxford & New York: Routledge.
- Paliwoda, S. (1994) *The Essence of International Marketing*, Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Pearson, N. (1982) *The State and the Visual Arts*, Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.
- Pevsner, N. (1991 [1936]) *Pioneers of Modern Design: From William Morris to Walter Gropius*, London: Penguin Books.
- Pick, J. (1988) *The Arts in a State: A Study of Government Arts Policies from Ancient Greece to the Present*, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Pinder, D. (2005) *Visions of the City*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pine II, J. B. & Gilmore, J. H. (1999) *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre and Every Business a Stage*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pointon, M. (1994) *Art Apart: Art Institutions and Ideology across England and North America*, Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press.
- Pratt, A. C. & Jeffcutt, P. (eds.) (2009) *Creativity, Innovation and the Cultural Economy*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Read, H. (1964 [1951]) *Contemporary British Art*, Harmondsworth: Penguins.
- Rees, G. & Lambert, J. (1985) *Cities in Crisis: The Political Economy of Urban Development in Post-War Britain*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Rentschler, R. & Hede, A. (eds) (2007) *Museum Marketing: Competing in the Global Market Place*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Robertson, I. (ed.) (2005) *Understanding International Art Markets and Management*, Oxford & New York: Routledge.
- Robson, B. Parkinson, M. Boddy, M. & Maclellan, D. (2000) *The State of English Cities*, London: Department of the Environment, Transport & the Regions.
- Rogers, R. (1991[1990]) *Architecture: A Modern View*, London: Thames & Hudson.



- Rogers, R. & Fisher, M. (1992) *A New London*, London: Penguin Books.
- Rosenthal, N. et al. (eds) (1997) *Sensation*, London: Royal Academy of Arts Exhibition Catalogue.
- Rothenstein, J. (1966) *Brave Day, Hideous Night*, London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Rugimbana, R. & Nwankwo, S. (eds) (2003) *Cross Cultural Marketing*, London: Thomson.
- Russell, J. S. (ed.) (1999) *Twentieth-Century Museums I*, London: Phaidon.
- Russell, J. S. (ed.) (1999) *Twentieth Century Museums II*, London: Phaidon.
- Sabbagh, K. (2000) *Power into Art: The Making of Tate Modern*, London: Penguin.
- Sachko Macleod, D. (1996) *Art and the Victorian Middle class: Money and the making of Cultural identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandler, I. & Newman, A. (eds) (1986) *Defining Modern Art: Selected Writings of Alfred Barr*, New York: Abrams.
- Sassatelli, M. (2009) *Becoming Europeans: Cultural Identity and Cultural Policies*, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saunders, A. (1992 [1984]) *The Art and Architecture of London*, London: Phaidon.
- Schmitt, B. H. (1999) *Experiential Marketing*, New York: The Free Press.
- Schubert, K. (2000) *The Curator's Egg*, London: One-Off Press.
- Scott, J. (1990) *A Matter of Record*, London: Polity Press.
- Searing, H. (2004) *Art Spaces: The Architecture of Four Tates*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Selwood, S. (2007) *Public Funding, Private Contributions and Arts & Business*, London Arts & Business.
- Selwood, S. (2002) 'Measuring Culture', <http://www.spikedonline.com>
- Serota, N. (1996) *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art*, Walter Neurath Memorial Lecture (1992) London: Thames & Hudson.
- Shalev, D. & Tooby, M. (eds) (1995) *Tate Gallery St Ives The Building*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Sharrock, L. (2008) *A Guide to Desk Researching Audiences and Visitor Data*, London: ADUK.
- Sharples, J. (2004) *Liverpool*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Smith, C. (1998) *Creative Britain*, London: Faber & Faber.

- Southwark Council (2004) *UDP: The Southwark Plan: The Policies*, Part 2, Policy 1. 13, London: Southwark Council.
- Southwark Council (1995) *UDP*, Section 1.14, London: Southwark Council.
- Spalding, F. (1986) *British Art since 1900*, London: Thames & Hudson.
- Spalding, F. (1998) *The Tate A History*, London: Tate Gallery Publishing.
- Stake, R. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*, California: Sage.
- Stallabrass, J. (2001 [1999]) *High art lite: British Art in the 1990s*, London & New York: Verso.
- Stratham, H. H. (ed.) (January–June 1892) *The Builder*, Vol. 62, London: The Builder Offices.
- Strong, J. (1996) *Winning by Design: Architectural Competitions*, Oxford: Butterworth Architecture.
- Tate Gallery, The (2000) *Philanthropy, The Role of Benefactors, Opportunities for Giving and Tax Effective Ways of Giving*, London: Tate Pamphlet.
- Tate Gallery, The (1955) *The Tate Gallery Handbook for the use of Trustees*, London: Her Majesty's Office.
- The Tate Gallery (1963) *The Tate Gallery Review 1953–1963*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Tate Gallery, The (1954) *The Tate Gallery Reports 1953–54 & Review 1938–53*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Tate Gallery, The (1957–1967) *The Tate Gallery Reports 1957–1967*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Tate Gallery, The (1968–2000) *The Tate Gallery Reports 1968–2000*, London: Tate Gallery Publications.
- Taylor, B. (1999) *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions for the London Public 1747–2001*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Tench, R. & Yeomans, L. (2009 [2006]) 'The Launch of Tate Modern'. In *Exploring Public Relations*, Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Thompson, D. (2008) *The \$12 Million Stuffed Shark: The Curious Economics of Contemporary Art and Auction Houses*, London: Aurum.
- Throsby, D. (2001) *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Throsby, D. (2010) *The Economics of Cultural Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiesdell, S. Oc, T. & Heath, T. (2001 [1996]) *Revitalizing Historic Urban Quarters*, Oxford: Architectural Press.
- Tooby, M. (1993) *An Illustrated Companion to Tate St Ives*, London: Tate Publishing.
- Towse, R. (2010) *A Textbook of Cultural Economics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Travers, T. (2006) *Museums and Galleries in Britain: Economic, Social and Creative Impacts*, London: National Museum Directors' Conference.
- Travers, T. (2004) *The Politics of London*, Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Travers, T. & Glaister, S. (2004) *Valuing Museums*, London: National Museum Directors' Conference.
- Twentieth Century Society, (Summer 1994) 'Industrial Architecture', *The Journal of the Twentieth Century Society*, No. 1, London: The Twentieth Century Society.
- Ursprung, P. (2005 [2002]) *Herzog and De Meuron: Natural History*, Quebec: Lars Muller.
- Vickery, J. (2007) *The Emergence of Culture-led Regeneration: A Policy Concept and its discontents*, Warwick: University of Warwick.
- Von Naredi-Rainer, P. (2004) *A Design Manual: Museum Buildings*, Basel, Berlin & Boston: Birkhäuser.
- Walford, E. (1878) *Old and New London*, Vol. 4, London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin.
- Wallace, M. A. (2006) *Museum Branding: How to create and maintain image, loyalty and support*, Oxford: AltaMira.
- Waterfield, G. (1991) *Palaces of Art: Art Galleries in Britain 1790–1990*, London: Dulwich Picture Gallery.
- Wilson, D. M. (2001 [1989]) *The Collections of the British Museum*, London: The British Museum Press.
- Wolfe, A. (2010) *The Future of Liberalism*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Wu, C-T. (2002) *Privatising Culture: Corporate Art Intervention since the 1980s*, London: Verso.

Yin, R. K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, California, London & New Delhi: Sage.

Young, K. & Garside, P. L. (1982) *Metropolitan London Politics and Urban Changes 1837–1981*, London: Edward Arnold.

Zeiger, M. (2005) *New Museum Architecture*, London: Thames & Hudson.

Zulaika, J. (2002) *Guggenheim Bilbao Museoa: Museums, Architecture, and City Renewal*, Reno: University of Nevada.

## Appendix A: The Modern Foreign Art Rejections

*NB: The medium of oil, gouache etc. is only included in the following list where it has been recorded in the National Gallery of British Art to The Tate Gallery Board Minutes. In most cases, it has not been included in the Minutes, which is why the following information only sometimes notes these details.*

### **February 1918:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Post-Impressionism)

The National Gallery of British Art Board Meeting, 19 February 1918.

Paul Gauguin *Whence come we? What are we? Whither go we?* (1897–1898) was offered for £2,000 by Lady Cunard on behalf of M. Frederic Delius.

Paul Gauguin *Nevermore* (1897) was offered for £2,400 by Michael Sandler.

### **July 1918:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Impressionism)

The National Gallery of British Art Board Meeting, 16 July 1918.

Edgar Degas *La famille Bellelli* (1858–1867) the price unrecorded and was offered in an identified Paris sale.

Edgar Degas *Mademoiselle Fiancee in the Ballet* (1866–1868) the price was unrecorded and was offered in an unidentified Paris sale.

Edgar Degas *[Repetition] Au Foyer* (c. 1874) the price was unrecorded and was offered in an unidentified Paris sale.

Edgar Degas *Portrait of M. Duranty* (1879) the price was unrecorded and was offered in an unidentified Paris sale.

### **October 1920:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Neo-Impressionism)

The National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting, 19 October 1920.

Georges Seurat *La Baignade* (undated) was offered for £175 by Percy Turner from the Independent Gallery.

\* The painting was rejected, but was purchased four years later through the Independent Gallery by the Trustees of the Samuel Courtauld Fund. The painting remained in the Tate Gallery Collection until it was moved to the National Gallery, Trafalgar Square in 1954.

**June 1922:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting, 20 June 1922.

An unspecified Paul Cezanne portrait of *Madame Cezanne* (undated) was offered for £7,000 by Percy Moore Turner.

\* The portrait could have been any of the following paintings:

*Madame Cezanne* (c. 1883–1885) Private Collection.

*Madame Cezanne* (1885–1887) The Barnes Foundation Merion, Pennsylvania.

*Madame Cezanne in the Garden* (1880–1882) Musée de l'Orangerie des Tuileries, Paris.

*Madame Cezanne in a yellow Chair* (1888–1890) Art Institute of Chicago.

*Madame Cezanne in Blue* (c. 1886) Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.

*Madame Cezanne with unbound hair* (1890–1892) Philadelphia Museum of Art.

*Madame Cezanne in a Green hat* (1894–1895) The Barnes Foundation, Pennsylvania.

**November 1922:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Post-Impressionism)

The National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting, 16 November 1922.

Vincent Van Gogh *Garden Court, Arles* (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

**February 1924:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Impressionism – Post-Impressionism)

The National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting, 27 February 1924.

Auguste Renoir *Premiere Sortie* (undated) was offered for £7,500 by Messrs. Knoedler.

Vincent Van Gogh *Landscape with Cypress Trees* (undated) was offered for £3,300 by the Independent Gallery.

Edgar Degas *Jeune Spartiate s'exerçant à la lutte* (undated) was offered for £1,200 by W. Marchant of the Goupil Gallery.

Vincent Van Gogh *Sunflower* (undated) was offered for £1,304 by Theo Van Gogh.

Vincent Van Gogh *The Chair* (undated) was offered for £696 by Theo van Gogh.

**January 1927:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 26 January 1927.

James Mc Neill Whistler *Chelsea in Ice: a Nocturne* (undated) the price was unrecorded and was offered by the Galerie Paffrath.

**February 1929:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting, 25 February 1929.

Henri Matisse *Woman at a Table* (undated) was presented as a gift by the Contemporary Art Society.

**October 1929:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The National Gallery Millbank Board Meeting, 21 October 1929.

Henri Matisse *Woman Kneeling* (undated) was offered for £1,200 by Mr T. D. Barlow.

Pablo Picasso *Flowerpiece* (undated) was offered for £800 by Mr T. D. Barlow.

**November 1932:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 November 1932.

Henri Gaudier-Brzeska [Bust of] *A Monkey* (undated) plaster, the price was unrecorded and was offered by C. G. Bryce.

Henri Gaudier-Brzeska *Bust of Major Macfall* (undated) plaster, the price was unrecorded and was offered by C. G. Boyce.

**March 1933:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 March 1933.

Pablo Picasso *La Belle Hollandaise* (1905) the price was unrecorded and was offered by the French Gallery.

\* The painting is now in the Queensland Art Gallery, Australia.

**January 1934:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Impressionism – Post-Impressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 30 January 1934.

Georges Seurat *La Baignade* (undated) chalk study for a figure, the price was unrecorded and was offered by E. Fairfax Murray.

Vincent Van Gogh *The Postman Joseph Roulin* (1888) was offered for £5,850 by R. Luytens.

\* The painting is now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.



**February 1934:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 February 1934.

Auguste Rodin *Adam* (undated) bronze, was offered for £750, the seller was unrecorded.

Camille Pissarro unidentified landscape (undated) oil, was offered for £1,200 by Sir Evan Charteris.

\* The painting could be one of a number of landscapes by Pissarro including *A Corner of the Meadow at Eragny* (1902) which was later presented to the Tate Gallery by the artist's daughter-in-law in 1951.

**March 1934:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Fauvism – Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 March 1934.

André Derain *Castel Gandolfo* (undated) was offered for £275 by the Mayor Gallery.

André Derain *Landscape* (undated) was offered for £800 by Lady Ottoline Morrell.

André Derain *Blue Sky and Trees* (undated) was offered for £450 by the Tooth Gallery.

André Derain *Rocky Landscape* (undated) was offered for £530 by the Tooth Gallery.

Maurice Utrillo *L'Eglise blanche* (undated) was offered for £660 by the Mayor Gallery.

\* The above painting is now in the National Museum of Modern Art, Paris.

Maurice Utrillo *Tabac* (undated) was offered for £375 by the Mayor Gallery.

Alfred Sisley unidentified landscape (undated) was offered for £472.10.00 by the Leicester Galleries.

**January 1935:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Fauvism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 January 1935.

André Derain *The Boa* (undated) the price was unrecorded and was offered by Madame Paul Guillaume.

\* The only match appears to be *Black Boa Feather Boa* (c. 1935), which is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

**February 1935:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Fauvism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 19 February 1935.

Maurice de Vlaminck *Thatched Roofs* (undated) oil, was offered for £130 by Wildenstein & Co.

Maurice de Vlaminck *The Harvest* (1904) oil, was offered for £85 by Wildenstein & Co.

Maurice de Vlaminck *The White Bouquet* (undated) oil, was offered for £65 by the Leicester Galleries.

Maurice de Vlaminck *Flowers* (undated) oil, was offered for 65 guineas by the Leicester Galleries.

\* The Tate Gallery waited thirty-five years until a Vlaminck was accessioned when *Landscape near Martigues* (1913) was bequeathed by Sir Robert Hart in 1970.

### **July 1935:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 July 1935.

Henri Matisse *Interior with Figure* (undated) was offered for £2,000 by Pierre Matisse.

\* The Grant-in-Aid: £92.11.10; Clarke Fund: £278.4.00; Courtauld Fund: £30.12.00.

A. H. Benson Fund: £522.17.09 & Deposit Account: £1,200. Evidently the painting was beyond the finances of the Tate Gallery Board, but no initiative was taken to purchase it through another method, such as the Contemporary Art Collection Fund.

### **February 1936:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 February 1936.

Marc Chagall *Jewish Interior, Supper time* (undated) gouache, the price was unrecorded and was offered by Lady Clerk.

### **April 1937:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 April 1937.

Chaïm Soutine *La Polonaise* (1922) oil, was offered for 150 guineas by the Leicester Galleries.

Chaïm Soutine *Prêtre en soutane* (undated) oil, was offered for 450 guineas by the Leicester Galleries.

Chaïm Soutine *Le Bain de pied* (undated) oil, was offered for 375 guineas by the Leicester Galleries.

\* The three paintings were agreed to be purchased, but none of them was acquired. *La Polonaise* is in a private collection; the location of the other two paintings is unknown. No work by this artist entered the Tate Gallery Collection until *The Road up on the Hill* (c. 1924) was bequeathed by Miss Helen Drysdale in 1959.

**July 1937:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Fauvism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 July 1937.

André Derain unspecified portrait (undated) oil, was offered for £150, the seller was unrecorded.

**January 1938:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 January 1938.

Edouard Manet *Portrait of Jeanne Demarsy* (undated) oil, was offered for £1,200 by Mrs Terence Harman.

Auguste Rodin *Le Baiser* (undated) marble, was offered for £15,000 by Mrs Irwin.

\* A version of Rodin's *Le Baiser* (1901–1904) marble, was purchased with assistance from the Art Fund and public contributions in 1953. There are three versions: whether the present one in the Tate Collection is the same as the one presented in 1938 is not identifiable from the records.

**June 1938:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Italian Impressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 June 1938.

Sixty-eight unspecified oil paintings by Italian Impressionists were offered at unrecorded prices by Julius Oppenheimer.

**July 1938:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 25 July 1938.

Maurice Utrillo *Villiers le Bel* (undated) oil, was offered for £1,000 by the Mayor Gallery.

Maurice Utrillo *Jardin à Montmagny* (1913) oil, was offered for £500 by Arthur Tooth & Sons Gallery.

H. Dunoyer De Segonzac *Baigneurs* (undated) oil, was offered for £500 by the Mayor Gallery.

Lehmbruch *Torso* (undated) bronze, was offered for £406.10s by Curt Valentin.

**October 1938:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Abstraction)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 27 October 1938.

Wassily Kandinsky *Zwei schwarze Strefen* (undated) oil, the price was unrecorded.

Wassily Kandinsky *Stabil* (undated) oil, the price was unrecorded.

Wassily Kandinsky *Fixiert-Locker* (undated) oil, the price was unrecorded.

Wassily Kandinsky *Ernstpass* (undated) oil, the price was unrecorded.

\* All of the paintings were offered by Mrs King Farlow later Mrs McKinley, *née* Barbara Hazel Guggenheim, the sister of Peggy Guggenheim.

**May 1939:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism)

Yves Tanguy, unspecified painting (undated) the price was unrecorded and was offered by Peggy Guggenheim.

\* The art work was identified by Frances Spalding (1998) in *The Tate: A History* (p. 78), as having been rejected. I was unable to find details of it in The Gallery Board Meeting Records, but include it here for reference.

**May 1942:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Impressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 May 1942.

Camille Pissarro *Bords de Seine* (undated) was offered for £1,800 by the Leicester Galleries.

\* The Tate Gallery Board requested that the National Art Collections fund the purchase, but they refused. The painting is now in a private collection.

**September 1942:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Post-Impressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 September 1942.

Paul Gauguin unspecified painting (undated) was offered for £960 by Messrs Reid & Lefevre.

**March 1943:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 March 1943.

Salvador Dali *Presence Instantée* (undated) was offered for £70 by the Zwemmer Gallery.

\* The Tate Gallery Board stated that Dali should be acquired only if 'an example of sufficient importance became available'. The present location of the painting is unknown.

**February 1945:** List of Modern Foreign Artists to be collected.

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 February 1945.

List One: Representation of Abstract Art in the Gallery: Arp, Bigge, Brancusi, Calder, Gabo, Giacometti, Hepworth, Miro, Mondrian, Moholy-Nagy, Moore, Ben Nicholson, Ozenfant, (early) Piper and Tunnard. List Two: Foreign Artists either inadequately or not at all represented in the Collection Painters: Berard, Bermann, Braque (represented by three examples, Chagall (represented by one example) Chirico, Dali, Denis, Ernst (represented by one example), Feininger, Gris, Guerin, Klee (represented by one example in gouache), Laprade, Leger, Leonide, Lurcat, Marcoussis, Marquet, Matisse (represented by three examples), Masson, Miro, Mondrian, Munch (presented by one example), Nolde, Ozenfant, Picasso (represented by four examples, none of them recent Redon, Roussel, Roy, Rouault (represented by three examples), Rousseau, Daumier (represented by one example), Severini, Tangye, Tchelichew. Sculptors: Arp, Barlach, Bourdello (represented by one example a bust), Brancusi, Calder, De Fiori, Flanagan, Gabo, Gargallo, Giacometti, Kolbe, Laurens, Lehmbruck, Lipshitz and Zadkine.

**October 1946:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 31 October 1946.

Juan Gris *La Socialiste* (undated) was offered for £500 by the Zwemmer Gallery.

**June 1947:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 19 June 1947.

Pablo Picasso *La Mandoliste* (1910) was offered for £3,150 by the London Gallery.

\* The painting was offered on behalf of Roland Penrose who was asked by the Tate Gallery Board if he would instead sell his other painting by Pablo Picasso *La Jeune Fille à la Mandoline* (1910), neither painting was acquired.

**September 1948:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 September 1948.

Chaïm Soutine *Boeuf Écorché* (1924) was offered for £600 by Eardley Knollys.

\* The Tate Gallery Board authorised Rothenstein to inquire about obtaining another painting by Soutine, *Dead Pheasant* (1926), which was offered for sale the following month, in October, but was rejected.

*Boeuf Écorché* is now in a private collection and *Dead Pheasant* is in the Phillips Collection, Washington.

**October 1948:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 October 1948.

Chaïm Soutine *Dead Pheasant* (undated) was offered for £600 by Eardley Knollys.

Three unspecified paintings by Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, with unrecorded prices were offered by Mrs Moholy-Nagy.

**August 1949:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism – Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 August 1949.

Pablo Picasso *Arlequin* (1915) oil, was offered for £3,000, the seller was unrecorded.

Jean Gris *Compotiers et Journal* (1909) oil, was offered for £2,500, the seller was unrecorded.

Jean Gris *La Guitar Jaune* (1925) oil, was offered for £2,500 by the Galerie Lairis.

Raoul Dufy *Les Pêcheurs* (undated) oil, was offered for £350–£425, the seller was unrecorded.

Salvador Dali *Landscape* (undated but stated ‘early’) was offered for £700, the seller was unrecorded.

Georges Braque *Paysage* (1906) oil, was offered for £1,000, the seller was unrecorded.

Fernand Léger *Composition en rouge et noir* (undated but stated 'recent') was offered for £350, the seller was unrecorded.

Fernand Léger *Les disques dans la ville*, (undated but stated 'recent') oil, was offered for £500, the seller was unrecorded.

Maurice de Vlaminck *Landscape* (undated) oil, offered for £650, the seller was unrecorded.

Alberto Giacometti *Still Life* (undated) gouache, was offered for £60–£70, the seller was unrecorded.

Alberto Giacometti *Portrait of Mother* (undated) gouache, was offered for £60–£70, the seller was unrecorded.

Constantin Brancusi *L'Oiseau* (undated) bronze, was offered for £5,000, the seller was unrecorded.

Alberto Giacometti *The Hand* (undated) bronze, was offered for £100, the seller was unrecorded.

Henri Laurens *Matin* (undated but stated 'recent') lead, was offered for £2,100, the seller was unrecorded.

Henri Laurens *Allégorie* (undated but stated 'recent') lead, was offered for £700, the seller was unrecorded.

Henri Laurens *Ondines* (undated but stated 'recent') lead, was offered for £2,600, the seller was unrecorded.

Jacques Lipchitz *Instruments de musique* (1925) bronze, was offered for £370, the seller was unrecorded.

Jacques Lipchitz *Prometheus* (1943) bronze, was offered for £250, the seller was unrecorded.

Antoine Bourdelle *Buste of Anatole France* (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

Charles Despiau *Baccante* (undated) was offered for £2,500, the seller was unrecorded.

Charles Despiau *Torso* (undated) was offered for £1,000, the seller was unrecorded.

Auguste Renoir *Kneeling Figure* (undated) bronze, was offered for £2,000, the seller was unrecorded.

\* A decision was made to defer on this art work, but it was never purchased.



**November 1949:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Synthetic Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 November 1949.

Juan Gris *La Guitare Jaune* (1925) was offered again. It had previously been presented in August 1949, for £2,500 by Galerie Lairis. It was offered at the higher price of £3,000 by M. Kahnweiler.

**December 1949:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 December 1949.

Amedeo Modigliani *Portrait of Zborowsky* (undated) was offered for £3,000 by the Mayor Gallery.

\* There is a portrait of *Leopold Zborowsky* (c. 1916) now in Museum of Fine Arts, Texas, and *Madame Hanka Zborowsky* (1918) now in *Museu de Arte*, Sao Paulo, Brazil. The Tate Gallery Board Minutes do not specify which portrait it is, but is more likely to be *Leopold Zborowsky*.

**March 1950:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Synthetic Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 March 1950.

Juan Gris *Still Life* (undated) was offered for £1,600 by the Mayor Gallery.

**April 1950:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 April 1950.

André Masson unspecified painting (undated) was offered as a gift by the Contemporary Art Society.

**May 1950:** Modern Foreign Catalogue Proposal

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 May 1950.

The Tate Gallery Board considered the proposal of a Catalogue of the Modern Foreign School and decided not to pursue the project temporarily. The Modern Foreign Collection Catalogue was produced in 1979.

**June 1950:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 June 1950.

Yves Tanguy *A l' Oreille des Voyantes* (undated) the price was unrecorded and was offered by the London Gallery.

Odilon Redon *La Chute de Phaeton* (undated) the price was unrecorded and was offered by the Marlborough Fine Art Gallery.

**]October 1950:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 19 October 1950.

Giacomo Manzù *Pas de Danse and Bronze Doors for St Peter's Rome* (undated) the price was unrecorded, see below.

Marino Marini *Horse and Rider and Horse* (undated) and seven unidentified gouaches (undated) were also offered, the prices were unrecorded.

The paintings were offered by Mario Sironi from the Il Milione Gallery, Milan.

**January 1952:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 January 1952.

Artist unrecorded *La Baie* (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

Artist unrecorded *Pierrot* (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

Juan Gris four untitled gouaches (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

André Masson *Nature Morte* (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

Pablo Picasso *Le Gheridon - Le Guéridon?* (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

**April 1952:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Russian Constructivism – Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 April 1952.

Nicholas de Stael *Composition* (undated) was offered for £175 by Matthiesen Ltd.

Joseph Riviere *La Danse* (undated) was offered for 70,000 French francs by the artist.

Antoine Pevsner *Construction in Space* (undated) was offered for £1,500 by the artist.

Paul Rebeyrolle *Dog* (undated) was offered for £105 by the Arcade Gallery.

Jacques Lipchitz *Prométhée* (undated) bronze, was offered for 450,000 French francs by Madame Lipchitz.

**April 1953:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Russian Constructionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 April 1953.

Naum Gabo *Construction in Space* (1952) the price and seller were unrecorded.

\* The Tate Gallery Board acknowledged their interest in obtaining a representative example of Gabo's work. No work was acquired until *Spiral Theme* (1941) and *Linear Construction No. 1* (1942–43) was presented by Miss Madge Pulsford in 1958. The main body of the Gabo's work arrived when he donated part of his own collection in 1977.

**May 1953:** Modern Foreign Rejections (German Expressionism – Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 May 1953.

Otto Dix *Portrait of the poet Usarski* (undated) was offered for 12,000 Swiss francs by Dr Hermann Ganz of Zurich.

André Minaux *Sanglier Mort* (undated) was offered for £500 by the Adams Gallery.

Le Corbusier *La Boetie* (undated) drawing, was offered for £200 by the ICA.

**July 1953:** List of Modern Foreign Artists to be collected.

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, July 1953.

(A) Priority Artists: Brancusi, Despiau, Giacometti & Laurens.

(B) Inadequately Represented Artists: Arp, Bourdell, Degas, Manzu, Marini, Matisse, Pevsner, Picasso, Renoir & Wotruba.

(C) Unrepresented Artists: Barlach, Calder, de Fiori, Flanagan, Gabo, Gargallo, Kolbe, Lehmbruck, Lipchitz, Nimptsch & Zadkine.

Foreign Artists: (A) Priority Artists: Matisse, Mondrian, Redon, Soulages & de Stael.

(B) Inadequately Represented Artists: Braque, Chagall, de Chirico, Derain, Dufy, Ensor, Ernst, Giacometti, Gris, Klee (oil), Lam, Leger, Marcoussis, Masson, Miro, Morandi, Munch, Picasso, Pignon, Rouault, Rousseau & Sironi.

(C) Unrepresented Artists: Berard, Berman, Carra, Dali, Delvaux, Denis, Duchamp, Feininger, de la Fresnaye, Gleizes, Gruber, Guerin, Laprade, Leonide, Lurcat, Marc,

Marquet, Matthieu, Michaux, Moholy-Nagy [Nagy], Nolde, Ozenfant, Rebeyrolle, Roussel, Roy, Severini, da Silva, Soutine, Tanguy, Tchelitchew, Tytgat & Vlamincx.

**September 1953:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Impressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 September 1953.

Mary Cassatt *La Lecture* (1898) was offered for £1,500 by the Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

Mary Cassatt *Tête de Femme au Grand Chapeau Bleu* (undated) was offered for £350 by the Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

**December 1953:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 December 1953.

Pablo Picasso *Le Broc* (undated) was offered for £2,000 by Mr Gustave Kahnweiler.

\* Picasso was earlier listed as a 'B artist' and *Coq* (1932; cast 1952) was instead purchased in 1953.

**May 1955:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Russian Constructivism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 19 May 1955.

Alva *Patriarch* (undated) oil, see below.

Alva *Fleur du Mal* (undated) oil, see below.

Alva *Due Hino* (undated) oil, see below.

Alva *Trio* (undated) oil, see below.

Alva *Torso* (undated) oil, see below.

The above paintings were offered for 160 guineas by the artist.

Laszlo Moholy-Nagy *L.A.I.I* (1936) was offered for 200 guineas by Mrs Lucy Moholy-Nagy.

Laszlo Moholy-Nagy *L.A.I.II* (1936) was offered for 200 guineas by Mrs Lucy Moholy-Nagy.

Laszlo Moholy-Nagy *G.Z.I. Galalith* (1932) was offered for 125 guineas by Mrs Lucy Moholy-Nagy.

**July 1955:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 July 1955.

André Minaux *Dans mon Jardin* (undated) was offered for approx. 400,000 French francs by the artist.

**October 1955:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 October 1955.

Henri Gaudier-Brzeska *Bust of Alfred Wolmark* (undated) was offered for £225 by the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool.

**December 1956:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 December 1956.

Auguste Rodin *Grande Danseuse* (undated) bronze, was offered for £920 by the Musée Rodin through Messrs. Roland, Browse and Delbanco.

**October 1957:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 October 1957.

Jacob Epstein *Jacob and the Angel* (undated) was offered for £15,000 by Louis Tussaud's Waxworks, Blackpool.

Jacob Epstein *Adam* (undated) was offered for £10,000 by Louis Tussaud's Waxworks, Blackpool.

Jacob Epstein *Consumatum Est* (undated) was offered for £5,000 by Louis Tussaud's Waxworks, Liverpool.

The three art works were offered for the combined price of £27,500.

\* *Jacob and the Angel* was purchased in 1996, for £500,000, with assistance from the National Lottery through the Heritage Lottery Fund, the Art Fund and the Henry Moore Foundation.

**October 1958:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 October 1958.

Henri Matisse *La Perruche et la Sirène* (undated) was offered, the price was unrecorded and was offered by M. Pierre Beres.

**February 1959:** List of Modern Artists to be collected

The Tate Gallery Meeting of the Purchasing Policy Sub-Committee on Contemporary Painters and Sculptors, 11 February 1959.

Foreign Painters: List A: Balla (Futurist work), Balthus, Bazaine, Braque (Cubist and from 1935), Chirico (early), Derain, Dubuffet, Ernst, Giacometti, Kandinsky, Klee, Leger, Manessier, Marquet, Matisse (immediately prior to 1917), Mondrian, Munch, Picasso, Pollock, Severini, Soutine, Vlaminck (Fauve). List B: Beckman, Bertholle, Bissiere, Brooke, Burri, Casorati, Corinth, Dali, Delaunay, Dix, Van Dongen, Ensor, Esteve, Feininger, Francis (oil), La Fresnaye, Gleizes, Graves, Guston, Hartung, Herbin, Hopper, Jacques-Villon, Asger Jorn, Kirchner, Kline, Kollwitz (drawing), de Kooning, Macke, Magnelli, Magritte, Man Ray, Dada works (relief or collage), Marc, Matta, Morandi, Motherwell, Nolde, Picabia, Rohlfs, Rothko, Serusier, Shahn, Stael (1948–52), Tamayo, Tanguy, Mark Tobey, Tworkov, Ubac & Wols. Foreign Sculptors List A: Archipenko, Barlach, Boccioni (Futurist), Brancusi, Calder, Despiau, Duchamp-Villon, Giacometti, Gonzales, Laurens, Lehmbruck, Lipchitz and Noguchi. Foreign Sculptors List B: Adam, Callery, Fazzini, Gilioli (marble), Lassaw (Ibram), Lippold, Lipton, Arturo, Martini, Kirko (Basaldalla), Smith & Viani.

**February 1959:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 19 February 1959.

Odilon Redon *Les Saintes Femmes* (undated) pastel, was offered for £3,000 by the Lefevre Gallery.

Otto Dix *The Poet, Ivan von Lucken* (1926) oil, was offered for £2,175 by the artist.

**April 1959:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 April 1959.

List A) Henri Matisse *Grey Nude* (1929) was offered for 25,000 French francs (approx. £18,155) by Madame Duthuit.

\* Matisse was listed as an artist to be collected in February 1959.

**December 1959:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 December 1959.

Max Ernst *Personnages un sans tête* (1935) was offered for £7,500 by the Obelisk Gallery.

\* Ernst was listed as an artist to be collected in February 1959.

**April 1960:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Abstraction – Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 April 1960.

Nicholas de Stael *Painting 1946* (undated) was offered for 8,000,000 French francs (sic) (approx. £5,850) by the Galerie Dubourg, Paris.

Robert Delaunay *Fenêtre* (undated) and *La Tour Eiffel* (undated) were offered for £10,000 by Monsieur Michelson.

Henri Matisse *Fish on a Beach* (1920) was offered for £11,000 by an anonymous seller through Mr Walter Goetz.

**October 1960:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Blaue Reiter)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 October 1960.

Alexei von Jawlensky *Asiatic Woman* (undated) the price and seller were unrecorded.

\* The Tate Gallery Board decided not to purchase the painting, but expressed their continued interest in purchasing works by the Blaue Reiter Group.

**May 1961:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Italian Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 May 1961.

Roberto Matta Echaurren *Les Autres sont le miroir* (undated) was offered for 500 guineas by the Gimpel Fils Gallery.

Roberto Matta Echaurren *Pacification du Sacre* (undated) was offered for 850 guineas by the Gimpel Fils Gallery.



**September 1961:** Modern Foreign Rejections (German Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 September 1961.

Alexei von Jawlensky *Variations* (undated) the price was unrecorded and was offered by the O'Hana Gallery.

**October 1961:** Modern Foreign Art Rejections (Cubism, Realism & Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 19 October 1961.

Jean Metzinger *Portrait of Robert Delaunay* (1905) was offered for \$9,000 (approx. £3,412) by the Silberman Galleries, New York.

Gino Severini *Étude pour Danseuses + Mer = Pot de Fleurs* (1913) pastel and collage, was offered for approx. £3,412 by the New Gallery, New York.

Marchel Duchamp, unidentified painting (1910) was offered for approx. £8,000 by Arnold Fawcus.

**December 1961:** Modern Foreign Art Rejections (Dutch Modernism & Neo-Plasticism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 December 1961.

Piet Mondrian *Composition, Blue and Yellow* (1936) was offered for \$60,000 (£21,250), the seller was unrecorded.

Piet Mondrian *Composition with Red, Yellow and Blue* (1936–43) was offered for \$60,000 (£21,250), the seller was unrecorded.

Piet Mondrian *Composition, White Red, Yellow* (1938) was offered for \$65,000 (£23,020), the seller was unrecorded.

**March 1962:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 March 1962.

Jean Dubuffet *Femme et bébé* (1956) was offered for £3,500 by the Lord's Gallery.

**September 1963:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Italian Futurism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 19 September 1963.

Gino Severini *Tram* (1913) was offered for £3,500 by the Marlborough Gallery, Rome.

Lucien Freud *Profile of Head* (undated) oil, was offered for £525 by the artist.

**May 1964:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 May 1964.

Georges Braque *Port Miou* (1907) was offered for £25,000 by the Galerie Beyeler, Basel.

Giacomo Balla *Mercurio passa davanti al sole* (1914) was offered for £7,500 by the Galerie Beyeler, Basel.

**June 1964:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism, Expressionism & Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 June 1964.

Jean Dubuffet *Les Dames aux Fenêtres* (1961) was offered for £7,100 by the Robert Fraser Gallery.

Paul Klee *Sonnenuntergang* (1930) was offered for £30,000 less 15% by the Marlborough Fine Art.

**July 1964:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Multimedia – Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 July 1964.

Otto Piene *Black Volume in White Space* (1962) was offered for £200 less 15% by the Group Zero Exhibition at the Mc Roberts & Tunnard Gallery.

Otto Piene *Black Volume in Red Space-rectangle* (1962) was offered for £375 by the Group Zero Exhibition at the McRoberts & Tunnard Gallery.

Pablo Picasso *Buffalo Bill* (1911) was offered for \$75,000 (approx. £26,700) by the E. & A. Silberman Galleries, New York.

Jules Pascin *Seated Girl* (undated) was offered for \$6,500 (approx. £2,310) by the E. & A. Silberman Galleries, New York.

**July 1966:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Neo-Plasticism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 July 1966.

Piet Mondrian *Painting I* (1921) was offered for \$140,000 (approx. £50,230) by the Galerie Beyeler Basel.

**September 1966:** Modern British Rejections (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 22 September 1966.

Francis Bacon *Portrait of George Dyer crouching* (1966) see below.

Francis Bacon *Lying Figure* (1966) see below.

Francis Bacon *Portrait of George Dyer staring at Blind Cord* (1966) see below.

The paintings were offered for the combination price of £6,500 reduced from £10,000 by Marlborough Fine Art.

**October 1966:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 October 1966.

Piet Mondrian *Composition in Grey, Yellow and Blue* (1920) was offered for a special price of £34,000 reduced from £45,000 by the Marlborough-Gerson Gallery, New York.

**June 1968:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Dadaism – Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 June 1968.

Francis Picabia *Collage* (1919) was offered for £2,000 reduced from £2,500 by the Hanover Gallery.

Leon Kossoff *Woman ill in bed surrounded by her family* (1965) was offered for £750 by Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

Leon Kossoff *Head of a Woman* (1965) was offered for £250 by Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

Leon Kossoff *Two seated figures* (1967) was offered for £800 by Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

**May 1969:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Abstract Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 May 1969.

Robert Rauschenberg *Untitled* (1953–1954) the price was unrecorded and was offered by the Galerie Ileana Sonnabend.

**May 1970:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism – Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 May 1970.

Jean Arp *S' Élevant* (1962) was offered for £20,000 by Madame Arp through the Brook Street Gallery.

\* Unidentified works from the Fernand Léger Exhibition at the Waddington Galleries were also declined because Norman Reid had been unable to attend the exhibition to view the paintings. The Tate Gallery Trustees expressed interest in Fernand Léger's *Composition Architecturale* (1952), but Reid opposed the purchase and it was declined.

**April 1971:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Minimalism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 April 1971.

Dan Flavin *Untitled to Annalee fondly* (1971) was offered for \$10,000 by the Dwan Gallery.

**March 1972:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 March 1972.

Leon Kossoff *Demolition of YMCA Building No. 3 Spring* (1921) was offered for £900 by the artist through the Whitechapel Art Gallery.

**May 1973:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 May 1973.

Sylvia Gosse *Le Château, Dieppe* (undated) was offered for £400 by the executors of the late Dr Katherine Lloyd-Williams through Mr Robert M. Wellington.

Arthur Segal *Prismatic Street* (1925) was offered for £1,400 by the artist's estate through Richard Nathanson.

**June 1973:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Avant Garde)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 June 1973.

Francis N. Souza *Black Nude* (undated) the price was unrecorded and was offered by Mr Ivon Hitchens.

**July 1974:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Conceptual Art)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 July 1974.

Joseph Beuys *Eurasia* (1966) stuffed hare, blackboard, poles with butter and beeswax, remnant of a performance, was offered for \$65,000 (approx. £27,500) by the Galleries Rene Block.

Joseph Beuys *Feitbatterie* (undated) fat, tins, and felt in cardboard box, was offered for DM 25,000 (approx. £4,500) by the Wide White Space Gallery, Antwerp.

Joseph Beuys *Das Erdtelefon* (undated) telephone and clod of earth with dead vegetation on a board, was offered for DM 22,000 (approx. £3,500) by the Wide White Space Gallery.

Antwerp & Joseph Beuys *Schlitten* (undated) sledge, blanket and torch, (from an edition of fifty) was offered for DM 5,500 (approx. £1,000) by the Galerie Rene Block.

**March 1976:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Abstraction)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 March 1976.

Wassily Kandinsky *Der Rote Kreis* (1939) the price was unrecorded and was offered by Christies.

**July 1976:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Collage – Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 July 1976.

Jiri Kolar *Map Collage* (1963–64) the price was unrecorded and was offered by the Grosvenor Gallery.

Lillian Lijn *High Nine* (1975) was offered for £1,800 by the artist.

**May 1978:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism – Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 May 1978.

Albert Houthuesen *Night Sea, Autumn* (1968) was offered as a gift by Sir John Rothenstein through the Friends of the Tate Gallery.

Giorgio de Chirico *The Jewish Angel* (1916) was offered for \$310,000 (approx. £170,329) reduced from \$375,000 by Eugene Thaw.

**June 1978:** Modern Foreign Rejection (American Realism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 15 June 1978.

Edward Hopper *Summer in the City* (1950) was offered for \$150,000 (approx. £82,417) by Mr Robert Miller.

**September 1978:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Die Brücke – Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 September 1978.

Emil Nolde *Masks II* (1920) was offered for \$150,000 (approx. £77,700) reduced from \$200,000 by Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

**February 1979:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, February 1979.

Salvador Dali *Impressions of Africa* (1936) was offered for £235,000 &

Salvador Dali *The Great Paranoiac* (1936) was offered for £110,000 by the Edward James Foundation.

**June 1979:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Post-Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 June 1979.

R. B. Kitaj *Sides* (1979) was offered for \$18,000 (approx. £9,000) by the Marlborough Gallery New York.

R. B. Kitaj *Bad Faith, (Warsaw)* (1978) was offered for \$11,000 (approx. £5,500) by the Marlborough Gallery, New York.

**September 1979:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Abstract Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 20 September 1979.

Frank Auerbach *Julia Asleep* (1979) was offered for £4,500 by the Marlborough Fine Art Gallery.

Marcel Maeyer *Yellow Blind* (1976) was offered for 220,000 Belgian francs (approx. £3,543) by the Galerie Jurka, Amsterdam.

**April 1980:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting 17 April 1980.

Cy Twombly *Untitled* (1959) was offered for £52,500 reduced from £60,000 by the Mayor Gallery.

**October 1982:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Surrealism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 October 1982.

Giorgio de Chirico *The Dream of Tobit* (1917) was offered for £250,000 by the Edward James Foundation.

**March 1983:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Les Nabis)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 March 1983.

Edouard Vuillard *The Black Cups* (1919–1924) was offered for £115,000 by J. P. L. Fine Arts.

**November 1983:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Conceptual Art)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 November 1983.

Joseph Beuys's complete set of thirteen vitrines and two blackboards, made between 1949 and 1983, was offered for a special price of £390,000 plus VAT by the Anthony d'Offray Gallery. The Tate Gallery Trustees agreed to buy two to three vitrines from the group and would make the final choice in January 1984. The artist instead presented his own works later in 1984.

**May 1984:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism – Collage)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 17 May 1984.

Kurt Schwitters *Woolly Ball Picture* (1942–1945) was offered for SFS 225,000 (approx. £73,052) by Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

**June 1984:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Cubism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 21 June 1984.

Roy de Maistre *Studio Interior* (c. 1934) was offered for the reduced price of £7,500 from £9,000 by Whitford and Hughes.



**October 1984:** Modern Foreign Rejection (Expressionism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 18 October 1984.

Frank Auerbach *Interior Vincent Terrace* (1982–1984) was offered for £18,000 less 15% plus VAT totaling £17,595 by Marlborough Fine Art Ltd.

**October 1986:** Modern Foreign Rejections (Modernism)

The Tate Gallery Board Meeting, 16 October 1986.

Francis Tailleux *Dieppe: L'Arrivée de Paquebots* (1935) see below.

Francis Gruber *Scène de Rivière* (1941) see below.

André Minaux *Nature Morte avec Poires* (1954) see below.

Edouard Pignon *Paysage* (1957) see below.

Bernard Lorjou *Nature Morte aux Sabots* (c. 1950) see below.

The five paintings were offered as gifts by Ronald Bullock through the Friends of the Tate Gallery.

*NB: Owing to the Freedom of Information Act, when this section was researched this was the last access date to the Tate Gallery Board Minutes.*

## **Appendix B: The Candidates' Designs**

### **Presentation One: Michael Hopkins and Partners.**

The design proposed that the Turbine Hall should be transformed into a public arcade reaching out onto the surrounding streets, with entrances at both ends. Containing a central hub, with a grand glazed window, the design included lifts, stairs and ramps leading to the galleries facing towards St Paul's Cathedral. The display areas were placed within the Boiler House, with access balconies overlooking the Turbine Hall. The chimney tower was stripped back revealing its steel structure.<sup>647</sup> The assessment of the plan was that there was ambiguity over the entrance, and insufficient consideration given to the display areas. The evaluation also noted that a lack of regard for the original building indicated an inability to create a dialogue between the old and new. The assessors' conclusions were that there was insufficient and unsympathetic understanding of the museum's needs and the nature of contemporary art. Additionally, there was an inappropriate treatment of light, and problems as to physical access were also indicated.<sup>648</sup>

### **Presentation Two: Tadao Ando.**

The minimal design proposed creating two glass and concrete shafts containing gallery spaces, cutting through the longitudinal axis of the building. A series of external stepped terraces and walkways linked the building to the river, with a floating gallery and café on the existing pier. The entrance was from two gradually graded circular ramps to the north and south of the building. A series of ramps connected the main display spaces, which were arranged in two wings on either side of the central top-lit atrium. The Turbine Hall was left open for future expansion of the gallery.<sup>649</sup> The assessment was that the plans were complicated, that the visual experience might be more fantasy than reality, and that the waterfront side was unrealistic. Concern was expressed that the long galleries might prove difficult for display. Further consternation was caused by the fact that the

---

<sup>647</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Draft Descriptive Texts* (Archive: TG 12/4/8/1).

<sup>648</sup> The Tate Gallery (14 & 15 November 1994) *Minutes from Assessors' Meeting*, p. 2 (Archive: TG 12/4/6/1).

<sup>649</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Draft Descriptive Texts* (Archive: TG 12/4/8/1).

Southwark area had been overlooked. Otherwise, the minimal, poetic quality of the design, which demonstrated sensitivity to modern art, was praised.

**Presentation Three: Nicholas Grimshaw and Partners Ltd.**

The design retained the original structure. Additional floors were to be installed providing further gallery space. The main entrance was to be located from the north from a new urban square and a car drop-off area, with a free-standing entry pavilion containing shops and cafes. The building was to act as a light beacon at night-time on the riverside. Internally, the circulation was arranged between the new galleries. The northern façade of the building had escalators running parallel to the river.<sup>650</sup> The assessment was that there was anxiety about the landscaping of the building, which demonstrated poor interest in the outside area and approach. Further consternation was around Grimshaw's claim that the South Bank was a good example of cultural renewal, which the assessors considered an appalling example. Reservations about sensitivity to art and artists' needs were also discussed. While there was approval of Grimshaw's consideration of the separation of functions, such as the shops, café, and nightlife of the building, there was no desire to take Grimshaw through to Stage Two.<sup>651</sup>

**Presentation Four: Renzo Piano Building Workshop.**

The design proposed an urban plan in creating an internal street connecting two external pavilions on the south and north side of Bankside. A South Piazza was to cover the entrance, with a wide, slightly raised paved platform for outdoor art installations. A North Piazza was to contain restaurants and cafés overlooking the River Thames. Inside, the Turbine Hall was left intact, with all the galleries and display areas arranged along the northern section of the building. The galleries were set back from the external walls to allow daylight to filter down to the lower levels, with double-height galleries surrounding the central circulation core. A restaurant was located at roof level, while an observatory with a dedicated lift was placed at the top of the chimney tower.<sup>652</sup> The assessment praised Piano for presenting the building on a dramatic scale, and for the flexibility of

---

<sup>650</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>651</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>652</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

gallery spaces. Otherwise, concern was expressed that the galleries required attention, and could end up characterless, and that the circulation needed to be addressed.<sup>653</sup>

#### **Presentation Five: Future Systems.**

The design created a curved glass membrane, supported by steel beams, cast over the masonry mass of Bankside, containing two main levels of galleries and display areas. The entrance was proposed at a raised level from the north, creating a link to and from the potential pedestrian bridge across the River Thames. Cafés, restaurants, shops and sculpture courts were arranged on three different levels underneath the glass canopy, between the building and the river's edge. A specially designed double-skin roof provided top light. Column-free galleries, spanning across the main volume of the building were to be bounded by fixed walls. The chimney was to remain functional, acting as a fresh air intake and exhaust for the environmental control of the building.<sup>654</sup> The assessment appreciated the architect's imagination, but noted that the design added one building to another. Concern was also expressed over the fabric ceilings and the shape of the roof, which appeared too rigid. The assessors felt that to allow Future Systems continue to Stage Two would not see any development of ideas or concepts.<sup>655</sup>

#### **Presentation Six: Rolfe Judd and Claudio Silvestrin.**

The design set the galleries and public spaces within the Boiler House zone, along the northern front of the building, leaving the Turbine Hall free for future expansion. The main entrance was from the north, directly beneath the chimney. Cafés, bookshops and shops were arranged at entry level in the western section of the building. The display areas were to occupy the two upper levels and one basement level, with gallery suites to run parallel to the river. The chimney, with a new skylight, was to be used as a space for art work and light installation, while a restaurant and an upper viewing terrace were to be placed on the roof.<sup>656</sup> New surroundings would be built to accommodate cafés, restaurants and a sculpture court. The assessment was that Bankside existed as a shell and

---

<sup>653</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>654</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

<sup>655</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>656</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

needed to be designed in a way that would awaken people's imagination with the minimal amount of demolition and intervention, which was not achieved by this architect's plans. The assessors concurred that the design was 'hopeless'.<sup>657</sup>

**Presentation Seven: Rick Mather Architects.**

The design proposed using half of the building for the new gallery, leaving the eastern section free for installations and future expansion. Mather proposed surrounding the power station by streets, with new buildings to the south-facing Sumner Street. The entrance was to be from the north, with escalators running through the centre of the building, parallel to the river, linking the different gallery levels. The galleries were arranged at the front and rear of the building, on either side of the circulation bay, which was to be top-lit by a new skylight. The chimney tower was also proposed to be adapted to accommodate up to twenty-two bedroom apartments or studios for artists-in-residence, with a separate entrance and dedicated lift at ground level. The assessment was that the entrance appeared small in scale and treatment, and that the approach to the building was impressive, but that there would be too many cars over the site. While impressed by the clever and sensitive arrangement, the assessors felt that the building was too big for Mather to manage.<sup>658</sup>

**Presentation Eight: David Chipperfield Architects.**

The design had the Bankside shell as an umbrella containing the new facilities of the gallery. The main public entrance was by a raised platform along the north façade, at the base of a five level brick and glass tower that would replace the masonry chimney structure. The entrance was to lead directly to the central circulation hub, connecting to an entry hub from the south. A bank of lifts and stairs were to provide access to the main gallery levels at the western and eastern wings, and to the temporary exhibition spaces at the upper levels of the new tower facing the river.<sup>659</sup> The assessment was that there were problems in the design of the entrance, and concerns were expressed over the circulation. Otherwise, potential was indicated as the architect was the only one to suggest a variety

---

<sup>657</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

<sup>658</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>659</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

of heights to galleries. It was agreed that Chipperfield should be allowed to go to Stage Two.<sup>660</sup>

### **Presentation Nine: Alsop & Störmer.**

The design involved creating a vast open space termed the ‘Great Floor of Art’ to run the full length of the building, from east to west, punctuated by the horizontal shafts creating a varied spatial experience. The main public entrance from the west was to lead directly to the Turbine Hall, which was to act as an internal street, linking the different parts of the building to the gallery, south of the main building, and to the future zones for expansion. A glazed piazza between the building and the river was to lead to the restaurant, café areas and to a top-lit gallery.<sup>661</sup> Overall, the assessment was that the proposal would exceed the budget and there were doubts about the quality of the gallery space. The route around the gallery also appeared restrictive, and the design proposal was unconvincing.<sup>662</sup>

### **Presentation Ten: Arata Isozaki.**

The design set the main entrance coming from a paved piazza to the west of the building into the Turbine Hall, leading to a central circulation zone. The display areas were to vary from full-height top lit spaces to glazed boxes overlooking the river which would occupy the northern zone of the building. Shops and administration were to be placed beneath the Turbine Hall and the galleries. A sloping landscape was to extend northwards, mediating the change in level from the building to the River Thames. A temporary exhibition area with glass ceiling, café and restaurant facilities was to be contained within the covered forecourt to the building, along the river’s edge.<sup>663</sup> The assessment was that the scheme maintained the integrity of the original building, but was insufficiently original. Additionally, there appeared to be a lack of consideration of the river aspect. The

---

<sup>660</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

<sup>661</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

<sup>662</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>663</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

assessors felt it was also undesirable to have two Japanese architects on the shortlist, and agreed that Ando's design was preferred.<sup>664</sup>

### **Presentation Eleven: Herzog & de Meuron.**

The design had the principal entrance to the west developing into a gradual sloping ramp leading to the lowest level of the Turbine Hall, with an additional south entrance. From the main reception area and display space of the Turbine Hall, access to shops, cafés, galleries and other spaces was to be provided. A glazed wall along the northern edge of the Turbine Hall would reveal the galleries and display areas. These were arranged on three levels with a central circulation zone, containing lifts and stairs. The galleries were to be set back from the external walls to allow daylight to filter down. A restaurant was located at roof level, with an observatory platform and a dedicated lift. The uppermost level of the galleries was surmounted by a glazed rectangular structure. A 'Light Beam' glass box was to be built on top of the existing roof structure, to bring natural daylight into the singular upper galleries.

The assessment noted the alternative entrance would avoid creating a front-to-back building with access on all sides, and that the Turbine Hall would function as a public space like a covered street. Serota had visited the architects in Basel and Munich to see them and their work and believed they were coming to the peak of their abilities. Serota considered their buildings to be impressive and saw them as possibly the most exciting architects of the 1990s. Ron German was concerned that the advisors could not read Herzog and de Meuron's drawings and that there was insufficient attention to the gallery spaces. There was general agreement that the scheme was original, intelligent and clear. What was one of the decisive points in Herzog and de Meuron's favour was that they were the only architects to think of converting the Turbine Hall into a gallery space, whereas some of the architects talked about it as a potential shopping area.<sup>665</sup>

---

<sup>664</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>665</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.



**Presentation Twelve: Rem Koolhaas / Office for Metropolitan Architecture.**

The design had the public entrance coming from the north, down a sloping ramp and south through the oil tanks, to lead to a central ‘mixing chamber’ at entry level. A grand staircase, the width of the Turbine Hall, was to lead to the main reception level. From there, stairs, ramps and lifts offered different routes, at different speeds, to other areas of the building. The gallery suites were to be located on five levels. The central section of the building was to offer a wide variety of spatial experiences. An auditorium with a glazed roof was to occupy the western end of the building, while the eastern end was left relatively raw, to accommodate experimental spaces and future galleries.<sup>666</sup> The assessment praised Koolhaas’s design for its dynamic energy, but there was concern that the art appeared to be secondary to the experience of the building, with too little attention paid to the gallery spaces. Koolhaas’s work initiated the greatest debate over the merits and drawbacks of the scheme. It was agreed that his work would require extensive discussions to develop the ideas further.<sup>667</sup>

**Presentation Thirteen: Rafael Moneo.**

The design arranged the display spaces on two levels, to provide a wide range of top-lit and side-lit spaces of substantial internal proportions. The main restaurant and café facilities were placed outside the volume of the building within a new structure that fronted directly onto the Thames. Access to the new Tate was to be from all sides, with a direct link to the planned pedestrian bridge. The vertical circulation was concentrated in the lifts and stairs to the western end of the building. From that point, an internal street was to overlook the Turbine Hall at upper levels, providing access to the individual displays suites which were to function as individual units, or to be interconnected to gallery spaces.<sup>668</sup> The assessment noted that Moneo was sensitive to art and light, and had the ability to listen to the client.<sup>669</sup> Concerns were that Moneo stated that the £40 million budget would be insufficient, and that issues of access and local life had not been fully

---

<sup>666</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

<sup>667</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>668</sup> Ricky Burdett (3 February 1995) *Op. cit.*

<sup>669</sup> The Tate Gallery (14–15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, pp. 9–11

defined. The overall assessment was that Moneo had provided a highly intelligent proposal.<sup>670</sup>

---

<sup>670</sup> The Tate Gallery (14-15 November 1994) *Op. cit.*, pp. 9-10, (Archive: TG 12/4/6/1).