

## **Redefining Culture: The Welsh Arts Council's *Art and Society* Exhibition Series**

**1969-1976**

Huw David Jones

Cardiff School of Creative and Cultural Industries

University of Glamorgan,

The ATRium,

86-88 Adam Street,

Cardiff CF24 2FN,

United Kingdom.

Tel: +44 (0)1443 668524

Email: [hjones6@glam.ac.uk](mailto:hjones6@glam.ac.uk)

Alternative email (for correspondences after 31 July 2013): [huwjones\\_80@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:huwjones_80@yahoo.co.uk)

Word count: 7,542 (excluding abstract, acknowledgements, notes, references and figures)

**Biographical note:** Huw David Jones is a Research Assistant at the Cardiff School of Creative and Cultural Industries, University of Glamorgan. His research focuses on the art, media and culture of Wales and other small nations.

## **Abstract**

Between 1969 and 1976, the Welsh Arts Council organized a groundbreaking exhibition series of called *Art and Society* which explored how particular themes – war, work, worship and sex – had been interpreted across different media. Combining ‘high’ art with ‘popular’ culture, this series attracted international attention for challenging cultural hierarchies with a broader, sociological definition of ‘art’. Yet it was also criticised for rejecting traditional standards and for the subject its final exhibition, *Sex*. This article examines *Art and Society* in its broader historical context. It argues the series illustrates Wales’s overlooked contribution to key cultural debates in post-war Britain.

**Keywords:** Welsh Arts Council; high art; popular culture; cultural policy.

Huw David Jones

## **Redefining Culture: The Welsh Arts Council's *Art and Society* Exhibition Series 1969-1976**

Between 1969 and 1976, the Welsh Arts Council (WAC), a subcommittee of the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB), organised a groundbreaking series of exhibitions called *Art and Society* which explored how particular themes – war, work, worship and sex/marriage – had been interpreted across different media. Through presenting ‘high’ art alongside film stills, photographs, toys, postcards, comics and other aspects of ‘popular’ culture, the series attracted international attention for challenging traditional cultural hierarchies and offering a more inclusive, sociological definition of ‘art’ and ‘culture’.

Since its formation in 1945-6, ACGB had focused on ‘developing a greater knowledge, understanding and practice of the fine arts exclusively’.<sup>1</sup> Although the term ‘fine arts’ was never clearly defined, it was narrowly equated in practice with European high culture.<sup>2</sup> Thus, for the visual arts, the work of professional painters and sculptors was supported, whereas amateurs or more ‘applied’ activities, such as craft or graphic design, were ignored.

This narrow definition of ‘art’ and ‘culture’ rested on the assumption that painting and sculpture – alongside opera, ballet, theatre and classical music – constituted what the Matthew Arnold had called ‘the best that has been thought and said’.<sup>3</sup> Popular culture, by contrast, was viewed as vulgar and degrading.<sup>4</sup> However, from the mid-1950s onwards, artists and intellectuals, particularly on the Left, began to challenge these cultural hierarchies by putting forward a broader understanding of ‘art’ and ‘culture’.<sup>5</sup> They argued that, with the expansion of the mass media and consumerism, European high culture could no longer maintain a monopoly on excellence. Some even suggested it did not matter whether art was good or bad; what mattered was its meaning and function within society.

Through its *Art and Society* series, WAC contributed to this new mindset. Although it was not the first to challenge traditional cultural hierarchies or propose a broader, sociological understanding of art and culture, it was the first major arts institution to base its

policy on these ideas. As such, it showed how the new model of culture worked in practice and also helped to popularise it amongst a wider public.

This article examines the development of the *Art and Society* series, from its origins in the progressive mood of the late 1960s, to its eventual demise against the conservative backlash of the mid-1970s. It pays particular attention to how the series and the themes each exhibition addressed – war, work, worship and sex/marriage – were received by both the arts establishment and the wider gallery-going public.<sup>6</sup>

Despite the extensive coverage it received at the time in both the British and the international press, *Art and Society* has attracted little academic attention to date.<sup>7</sup> This appears characteristic of the tendency within British art history to focus on England and London in particular rather than Britain as a whole. A further aim of this article, then, is to highlight the significance of the *Art and Society* series not only in terms of its role in helping to establish a broader understanding of art and culture, but also as an example of the contribution of the Welsh ‘periphery’ to key cultural debates within post-war Britain.

### **The origins of *Art and Society***

WAC began planning the *Art and Society* series during the late 1960s in an attempt to revive its flagship exhibition programme in response to growing audience dissatisfaction. WAC’s predecessor, the Welsh Committee of the Arts Council of Great Britain, had since 1946 organised a number of highly successful exhibitions, including its annual *Contemporary Welsh Painting and Sculpture* series.<sup>8</sup> However, during the early 1960s, the Welsh Committee encountered increasing public criticism after it began to champion the work of the avant-garde in a bid to raise Wales’ profile within the British and international art world. In 1966, it was strongly attacked by readers of one local newspaper for ‘wasting public money’ on *Structure ’66*, a highly ambitious exhibition of modernist sculpture and constructions, featuring work by some of Britain’s most progressive artists.<sup>9</sup>

Around 1968 architect Gordon Redfern circulated a memorandum to colleagues on WAC’s Art Committee, highlighting the problems facing the Council’s exhibition programme:

Most art exhibitions as we know them, regardless of their quality and content, appeal, by and large, to a very small part of the population. Such exhibitions are considered – often rightly, in my view – by the majority to be esoteric, intellectual and incomprehensible. This may be an unpleasant truth for us to swallow but it is amply proved by fact and should, I feel, be of great concern to us.<sup>10</sup>

Instead of ‘showing the work of one or several artists’, Redfern suggested organising ‘a series of popular mobile exhibitions’, looking at how particular social issues – ‘sex’, ‘food’, ‘money’, ‘the street’ and ‘the house’ were among the topics suggested – had been interpreted across different media.<sup>11</sup> It was thought that, by focusing on subjects and material people were familiar with, the series would appeal to a broader public.<sup>12</sup>

Redfern’s proposal for a series of multimedia thematic exhibitions chimed with the broader cultural policy concerns of the time. Labour’s *Policy for the Arts* (1965) white paper, published three years earlier, had criticised museums for having ‘failed to move with the times, retaining a cheerless unwelcoming air that alienates all but the specialist and the dedicated’,<sup>13</sup> and had also called into question ‘the gap between what have come to be called the “higher” forms of entertainment and the traditional sources – the brass band, the amateur concert party, the entertainer, the music hall and pop group’.<sup>14</sup> Redfern’s proposal also presented the newly established Welsh Arts Council, which the Labour government had created in 1967 to replace the less impressively titled Welsh Committee of the Arts Council as part of its attempt to pacify the growing nationalist tide of the 1960s,<sup>15</sup> with the opportunity to carve out a more distinctive cultural policy for Wales. Since the early 1960s, Wales had followed ACGB’s leadership in London by prioritising the raising of artistic standards over increasing public access to the arts. Yet many within the organisation felt this was out of step with Wales’ own democratic traditions.<sup>16</sup> As Aneurin Thomas, WAC’s Director for Wales, observed: ‘To leave “Spread” to the broadcasting services and the amateur movement and ‘Raise’ to subsidised performing companies is, and probably was two decades ago, too convenient a solution. It is wholly inappropriate to Wales’.<sup>17</sup>

Redfern’s proposal was accepted by the Art Committee, and WAC’s Art Director, Peter Jones, began the task of organising the new exhibition series under the title ‘Art and Society’. Since his appointment in 1964, Jones had already begun to pursue a more populist

arts policy. In 1966 he curated the series *Background*, which aimed to demystify modernist art by showing photographs of artists' working environments alongside examples of their work, and in 1967-8 he organized a widely publicised 'poster print scheme', which sought to free art from the hallowed environs of the museum by presenting silk-screen designs on advertising billboards across Wales. Jones had also tried to broaden the range of artforms WAC supported. In 1968, for example, he organized the first arts council exhibition of work by a living photographer, describing this as 'yet another step towards the inevitable realisation of the indivisibility of all forms of creative expression'.<sup>18</sup>

Jones worked on most of these projects with the freelance designer Ken Baynes. Baynes shared Jones' commitment to democratising the visual arts, both in terms of making it more accessible and inclusive of a broader range of media. While Jones made the practical arrangements for the *Art and Society* series (through securing loans and so on), it was Baynes who developed the intellectual rationale for the project.<sup>19</sup>

Through a series of articles published in the early 1970s, Baynes argued that the 'high' or 'aristocratic' model of culture had become obsolete in the modern age.<sup>20</sup> Not only did it exclude 'the artefacts that actually provided the majority of us with our visual education', including things like photography, cinema and television; it was also rooted in class prejudice towards the forms of culture most people consumed and enjoyed, and therefore had no legitimacy in a society which aimed to be egalitarian.<sup>21</sup>

*Art and Society* sought to replace the old 'aristocratic' model of culture with a more 'democratic' one. The aim was not only encompassed broader range of media, but also made it possible determine the meaning and function of art within society. As the catalogue to the first *Art and Society* exhibition explained:

The material gathered in the world's great museums is only the top of a colossal iceberg, the base of which stretches away below the limited range of attitudes and activities that have become thought of as 'cultural'. In this wider definition, people's response to life, even their actual experience of it, have always been in all manner of ways determined and described by art. To-day, with the development of mass media like magazines, film, television and advertising, the world is more than ever before being understood and perceived through man-made images, sounds and gestures.<sup>22</sup>

The unspoken implication behind this broader, sociological definition of art was that, by making people aware of the meaning and function of art within society, they could begin to think about how art could be used to change that society. *Art and Society* was therefore an inherently political project.

Of course, these ideas were nothing new. Since the Second World War, intellectuals in Western Europe and North America had tentatively begun to challenge traditional cultural hierarchies and work towards a more inclusive understanding of art and culture.<sup>23</sup> For pre-war observers, popular or mass culture had generally been viewed as a problem. Conservatives regarded it as trivial and corrupting, while the Left associated it with the Nazi propaganda of the 1930s or with the advance of American capitalism. High culture, by contrast, was seen as a repository of eternal moral values or a bulwark against authoritarian or market forces. However, with the post-war economic boom and the growth of consumerism and the mass media, attitudes began to change, particularly on the Left. The English literary theorist Richard Hoggart, in his seminal *The Uses of Literacy* (1957), was one of the first to take mass culture seriously, even though he often disapproved of its effects on working-class life.<sup>24</sup> In 1964, he established the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham University as a focus for sociological research on popular culture. Raymond Williams likewise broke new ground with his studies on television and his assertion that 'culture is ordinary', while the Canadian cultural critic Marshall McLuhan became particularly influential amongst the 1960s countercultural movement for his advocacy of a world united through electronic mass communication.<sup>25</sup>

Artists, too, were also working towards a broader understanding of art and culture. Between 1952 and 1955, the Independent Group, a loose collection of painters, designers, architects and critics, met at the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA) in London, to discuss the relationships between art, technology and popular culture. Weary of British Neo-Romanticism and enthusiastic instead for Hollywood movies, Detroit cars and Madison Avenue adverts, they looked to 'develop a new aesthetic that fully belonged to contemporary life', for which they later coined the term 'Pop Art'.<sup>26</sup> In 1953 members of the Independent

Group staged the ICA exhibition *Parallel of Art and Life*, which anticipated the *Art and Society* series by presenting paintings alongside photographs drawn from scientific sources, and in 1956 the group attracted wider attention for its involvement in the Whitechapel Art Gallery exhibition *This is Tomorrow*, which attempted to synthesize painting, sculpture and architecture, though is perhaps best remembered for one exhibit which featured posters of Marlon Brando and Marilyn Monroe, a reproduction of Van Gogh's *Sunflowers*, a working jukebox, and a model of Robby the Robot from the film *Forbidden Planet*. Art critic Laurence Alloway, one of the Independent Group's leading members and advocates, did much to promote the group's ideas. In a 1959 essay entitled 'The Long Front of Culture', he anticipated the argument made by Baynes a decade later that, with the expansion of the mass media, a more inclusive, sociological understanding of culture was needed:

Instead of reserving the word [culture] for the highest artefacts and the noblest thoughts of history's top ten, it needs to be used more widely as the description of "what a society does". Then, unique oil paintings and highly personal poems as well as mass-distributed films and group-aimed magazines can be placed within a continuum rather than frozen in layers in a pyramid.<sup>27</sup>

Baynes cited Hoggart, Williams, McLuhan and Pop Art (though not Alloway or the Independent Group) as key influences on the *Art and Society* series.<sup>28</sup> Yet, while he conceded the broader, sociological definition of art and culture was nothing new, Baynes believed WAC was nevertheless unique in being the first major arts institution to 'deliberately base its policy on these ideas *and* to use them as a basis for popularisation'.<sup>29</sup>

*Art and Society* was the first project to give a real sense of how the new democratic model of culture worked in practice. No other exhibition had really attempted to combine high art and popular culture on such a grand scale before. As such, it gave ordinary people the chance to respond to ideas which until that point had been largely confined to a small circle of artists and intellectuals.

### **The War exhibition**

The first exhibition in the *Art and Society* series, *War*, opened at Swansea's Glynn Vivian Art Gallery on February 7, 1969. While it is not clear why this was chosen as the theme for the



first exhibition in the series, the ready availability of material was probably a key factor. Over 300 items were secured from major collections in Britain, Europe and America, most notably the Imperial War Museum in London, making it WAC's largest exhibition to date.

Anticipation had been building in the weeks leading up to the exhibition's opening after WAC executed a clever, if somewhat controversial, marketing campaign. A series of placards were displayed on newsstands at railway stations across south Wales with the headlines, 'War Scare,' 'War: Crisis Talks' and 'War Immediate', culminating in the final announcement: 'War Declared!' Yet nothing quite prepared audiences for the scene awaiting them through the doors of Swansea's normally sedate municipal gallery (figure 1). Science fiction comics and First World War recruiting posters appeared next to reproductions of work by such historically important artists as Leonardo da Vinci, Goya and Eugene Delacroix. Medals, models and military uniforms hung alongside paintings by official war artists like Paul Nash, Eric Kennington and Graham Sutherland. In one corner of the gallery stood a child's board game from the Boer War; in another, teenagers huddled over a two-penny slot machine, inviting them to 'fire your own missile'. There was even a Nazi swastika flag on display. Meanwhile, a soundtrack featuring Tchaikovsky, African drums, The Beatles and Churchill's wartime speeches, all interspersed with the wail of air-raid sirens and the occasional burst of machinegun fire, played in the background. No attempt was made to distinguish between high art, popular culture and schlock. The effect on audiences was wide-ranging: 'interesting, shocking and even amusing,' as one critic put it.<sup>30</sup>

The archives reveal that WAC received complaints from the public about its 'frightening and distasteful' marketing campaign.<sup>31</sup> Outside the Glynn Vivian Art Gallery, an anarchist group – student politics in Swansea had a strong anarchist element in the late 1960s due to the influence of Ian Bone, later editor of *Class War*, who studied at the local university – staged a protest, claiming the exhibition 'glorified its subject'.<sup>32</sup> With American troops embroiled in bloody combat against Communist forces in Vietnam, and British soldiers about to be deployed onto the streets of Northern Ireland to quell the escalating violence between Protestants and Catholics, sensitivities to the subject of war were certainly

heightened. Nevertheless, despite these concerns – or maybe because of them – the exhibition proved a massive hit, breaking all attendance records at the gallery.

*War* was equally well-received when it visited Cardiff, Newport and Newcastle later in the year. Meanwhile, critics praised WAC for its bold and innovative display. ‘Success is a nebulous term in this context for it is a hackneyed word and cannot adequately suggest the feelings which this exhibition arouses,’ wrote Eric Rowan in *The Times*.<sup>33</sup> ‘Perhaps it is possible to become more detached with subsequent visits – which is either a comment on art or on human sensibilities – but the first encounter is undoubtedly a moving experience.’

A special section of the exhibition devoted to wartime photojournalism, with examples ranging from the American Civil War to the current conflict in Vietnam, attracted particular attention. There were also several items of specific Welsh interest, including photographs of Welsh war memorials and military artefacts from the Welsh battalions and regiments of the British Army. As for ‘glorifying its subject’ – most critics thought, like Rowan, the exhibition underlined ‘the poignancy and pathos and the horror’ of war.<sup>34</sup> ‘This is not an anti-war exhibition as such,’ wrote *The Western Mail*’s Griffith Williams.<sup>35</sup> ‘Yet this demonstration of posters, flags, photographs, models and military insignia, from many different nations, together with paintings and reproductions, all abundantly proclaim the depravity and sin of war.’

Yet the archives also reveal that some within WAC were privately critical of *War* and the *Art and Society* series in general. One member of WAC’s Literature Committee complained about the ‘alarming concentration of kitsch’ and described the exhibition in a memorandum to colleagues as ‘further evidence of the eccentric critical judgement of our colleagues in the visual arts, which I have heard severely censured elsewhere recently’.<sup>36</sup> The Welsh Folk Museum’s Director, Iorwerth Peate, likewise described *War* in a letter to Peter Jones as ‘a deplorable exhibition, not because of the subject, but because of the way in which it was presented’.<sup>37</sup> Meanwhile, ACGB’s Art Director, Gabriel White, told Jones that he thought ‘[WAC] wasn’t dealing in art at all’.<sup>38</sup>

These concerns echoed more prominent voices within the British arts establishment. In his inaugural lecture as Oxford Professor of Poetry, Roy Fuller evoked the views of his Victorian predecessor, Matthew Arnold, by arguing that the blurring of distinction between ‘the high-brow, middle-brow, and kitsch categories of art’ was responsible for a ‘rampant philistinism’ which would, if left unchecked, lead ultimately to anarchy within British society.<sup>39</sup> Likewise, Kenneth Clark, ACGB’s former Secretary-General, concluded his acclaimed television documentary series *Civilisation*, broadcast almost exactly the same time as the *War* exhibition, with a similar warning against undermining confidence in European ‘high’ culture: ‘We can destroy ourselves by cynicism and disillusion, just as effectively as by bombs’.<sup>40</sup> Yet, apocalyptic though these predictions were, they stood against the progressive tide of the late 1960s and failed to deter Baynes and Jones (who had the added support of both the Art Committee and WAC’s Director, Anuerin Thomas) from pursuing their commitment to a more democratic understanding of art and culture.

### ***Work and Worship***

After the success of *War*, the next two exhibitions in the *Art and Society* series followed the same format of presenting high art alongside popular culture. *Work* opened at the National Museum of Wales, Cardiff, in October 1970, and then travelled to Swansea, Liverpool and Sheffield (figure 2), while *Worship* followed at the same venue in November 1971, before visiting Bolton and Hull. Both exhibitions included a series of associated events and performances – an attempt by the organisers to redress the museum’s ‘cheerless unwelcoming air’ and make the space more inviting to audiences. *Work*, for example, opened with a concert by a local colliery band and included daily performances by the folk singers Meic Stevens and Peter Bellany (figure 3). *Worship*, meanwhile, featured recitals by local choirs, hand-bell ringers and lunchtime sermons performed by actors in the guise of famous Welsh preachers.

*Work* and *Worship* both dealt with issues that were highly pertinent to the changing character of Welsh society in the 1970s. *Work* considered the ‘impact of industrialisation in

people's life, and their moral, political and cultural reactions to the situation' at a time when heavy industry, and in particular the coal industry which had been so central to Welsh life for the past century, was in decline and the post-war consensus between workers, government and capital was beginning to unravel.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, *Worship* explored 'the role of art in religious thought, ritual and teaching' when another key feature of Welsh life, Christianity and specifically Nonconformist chapel-based worship, was also on the wane.<sup>42</sup> Yet, while both exhibitions included a high proportion of Welsh artefacts through which such issues could potentially be explored, the organisers chose to frame and interpret this material within a universal context rather than one culturally specific to Wales.

It is important to note that issues to do with Welsh culture and identity were becoming increasingly politicised during this period. Welsh nationalism was on the rise in response to the erosion of the 'traditional' Welsh way of life and the decline of the Welsh language in particular.<sup>43</sup> Plaid Cymru won their first parliamentary seat in 1966 and gained two more MPs in the 1970 general election, while Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg (the Welsh Language Society), established in 1962, led a high profile campaign of civil disobedience in support of Welsh language rights. Paramilitary-style groups like the slightly comic Free Wales Army also appeared on the scene, and there was even a small bombing campaign by Welsh republicans in the lead up to the Investiture of the Prince of Wales in July 1969.

While only a minority supported the nationalist cause, there was a growing consensus that Welsh culture and identity deserved greater recognition, even if there was little agreement over what exactly these actually meant.<sup>44</sup> The decision to frame the *Art and Society* exhibitions in a universal context rather than one culturally specific to Wales was therefore somewhat out of step with the Welsh cultural and political climate at the time.

Part of the reason was that Baynes, who was responsible for writing the catalogue for each exhibition, lived in England and had little specific knowledge of Welsh culture and society. He also relied on a Marxist perspective to interpret the material on show. While this was not necessarily insensitive to the specificity of Welsh culture – it was during this period, for instance, that the Marxist cultural theorist Raymond Williams began to grapple with his

own Welsh experience<sup>45</sup> – the more traditional Marxist analysis offered by Baynes was one which saw national and cultural difference as largely irrelevant compared to common class interests. As he made clear in an article for *Planet: The Welsh Internationalist*:

Outside the special question of language, it must be negative to insist that all Welsh resources be expended on an examination of ‘Welshness’. Although it is obviously true, for example, that the experience of industrial Wales since 1800 is not exactly the same as that of, say, Durham in England or Alsace in France, there is also a tremendous degree of continuity. And the continuity must be well understood in Welsh culture otherwise it is going to be literally impossible to grasp why there should be any Welsh problem at all.<sup>46</sup>

Baynes’s Marxist class-based analysis was particularly evident in the *Work* exhibition. One section, entitled ‘Identity’, focused not on the issue of Welshness but rather on the role of art in defining the identities of certain occupations. Another section, entitled ‘Struggle’, was subdivided into the categories ‘Injustice’, ‘Unions’ and ‘Revolution’, implying a natural, dialectical progression from industrial conflict to the overthrowal of capitalism. Amongst the items on show were socialist banners and posters. As the Marxist art critic Peter Fuller noted in *Arts Review*: ‘From the “Smash Capitalism” poster, supplied by “Black Dwarf”, the revolutionary newspaper, to the mocking caricatures of bloated business men, the exhibition gives clear and honest endorsement to proletariat militancy’.<sup>47</sup>

*Worship* was far less politicised than *Work*. Yet, like its predecessor, national and cultural particularities were downplayed in favour of universal commonalities. Thus Welsh language Bibles appeared next to Sikh charms and African tribal masks, implying that there was a fundamental human need for worship which transcended cultural boundaries.

For some, like the art historian Peter Lord, the decision to frame *Art and Society* within a universal context rather than one specific to Wales meant that the series ‘estranged itself from the particular society it was attempting to enlighten’.<sup>48</sup> Be that as it may, it did little to dampen its popularity amongst Welsh audiences. Over 43,000 saw the *Work* exhibition when it opened at the National Museum of Wales – a record for a WAC show.<sup>49</sup> Meanwhile, an audience survey of the *Worship* exhibition found that 91 per cent liked the show, although some did criticise its ‘poor and confusing layout’.<sup>50</sup>

The framing of *Art and Society* within a universal context also boosted its appeal outside Wales. *Work* was particularly well-received when it toured the north of England, attracting record audiences in Sheffield in particular. *The Daily Post*'s Roderick Bisson, who saw the exhibition at Liverpool's Walker Art Gallery, wrote: 'I have not been so absorbed by an exhibition for a long time'.<sup>51</sup> Meanwhile, Peter Fuller, writing in *The Connoisseur*, dubbed it 'a clarion call to the Northern cities in which it is shown'.<sup>52</sup>

With its emphasis on heavy industry and its Marxist critique of the impact of industrialisation on working-class communities, the *Work* exhibition chimed with the social and political concerns of Britain's industrial heartlands. At the same time, it received, as Fuller also anticipated, 'a tepid response' from the metropolitan art world.<sup>53</sup> Just one venue in London, the Science Museum, agreed to show the *Work* exhibition, only to change its mind after the museum's director saw the exhibition in Cardiff and concluded it was 'too heavily biased towards the portrayal of the horrors of work'.<sup>54</sup> Deeply held cultural prejudices towards Wales – a country long seen as culturally backwards – may also have put off some of the more progressive galleries in the capital from taking the show.<sup>55</sup>

### **The *Art and Society* book series**

The opening of the *Work* exhibition coincided with the publication, in partnership with Lund Humphries, of the books *War* and *Work*, the first two volumes in the *Arts and Society* book series.<sup>56</sup> *Worship*, the third in the series, followed soon afterwards.<sup>57</sup> This was the first time WAC had ventured into art publishing. Although the cost of researching and writing the books was high, it complemented the new policy of democratising art. Now even those who missed the exhibitions had the chance to experience the series for themselves. Baynes also hoped the publications would provide 'a way of strengthening the study of art and society in universities, polytechnics, and colleges of art and design'.<sup>58</sup> However, the response from academia was muted. Although Wales had several art colleges and universities in the 1970s, few did any research on the history, theory or sociology of the visual arts, as evidenced by the poor record of art publications during this period.<sup>59</sup>

Nevertheless, the *Art and Society* books did receive extensive coverage from both the mainstream British press and specialist art journals. *The Times Literary Supplement* devoted an editorial to *War and Work*, hailing them as ‘excellent publications [that] deserve to be widely argued over’.<sup>60</sup> Others praised the books’ educational benefits. Anthropologist Ronald Frankenberg, in *Studies in Design Education and Craft*, thought *War and Work* had much to teach teachers about the imaginative use of visual aids, while *The Sunday Times*’ John Russell suggested they would ‘make the best possible present for an imaginative sixth-former’.<sup>61</sup> The series even caught the eye of foreign newspapers. France’s *Le Monde*, for example, commended *War and Work* for their ‘careful presentation and pedagogical quality’ and called on French publishers to ‘imitate the example’.<sup>62</sup>

The publication of the *Art and Society* book series cemented WAC’s growing international reputation for challenging traditional cultural hierarchies and offering a more inclusive, sociological definition of art and culture. For *The Guardian*’s Merete Bates, this approach provided important lessons for ACGB’s leadership in London:

[I]t’s not far short of astonishing to find anything so immediately responsive and purposeful come out of a hierarchical body such as an Arts Council. Maybe it’s taken the Welsh to realise that the current, accepted nebulous and neutral role of a body with such great organisational and communicational power cannot only be a waste but a negative clog in the works.<sup>63</sup>

Yet certain voices within the arts establishment still remained sceptical about the *Art and Society* series. In *The Anatomy of Wales* (1972), the former Director of WAC, Roger Webster, wrote that, while *Art and Society*’s inclusive approach to art ‘has particular attraction for us in Wales, lacking as we do anything but the most tenuous tradition of high art..., one inevitably has the nagging fear that we may be fooling ourselves – rather like the contemporary pretence that the Beatles have the same value as Bach’.<sup>64</sup> His thoughts were echoed by his Scottish counterpart, Ron Mavor, who, during an interview with the radical arts magazine *Scottish International*, rejected the idea that the Scottish Arts Council (SAC) should follow Wales’ example in embracing a more democratic understanding of art and culture: ‘I think that as a simple bank the Arts Council is doing a useful job in allowing this to

go on.... [But] I wouldn't like to think that either the Marxist position or any other position would have too big a say, in any country, in the way the arts were organized'.<sup>65</sup>

### ***Sex and Marriage***

The issue of critical standards was certainly one which dogged the *Art and Society* series. The *Worship* exhibition was particularly criticised in some quarters for failing to distinguish between different forms of belief and treating its subject with far too much irreverence. A senior Catholic priest, for example, complained in one Welsh newspaper about the way the exhibition made a visual connection between 'a blow-up photograph of Muslims at prayer, and hard by on the wall a pattern of hands raised in salute of Hitler'.<sup>66</sup> Similarly, in the arts journal *Leonardo*, Walter Gaudnek chastised the *Worship* book for including 'photographs of a dancing monk from a television still, of a poster of a nun exposing her thighs above her black stockings and of Bing Crosby from "White Christmas"'.<sup>67</sup>

Yet by far the most controversial aspects of the series was not its challenge to traditional cultural hierarchies but rather the theme of the fourth and final exhibition. Planning for the exhibition *Sex* had begun as early as December 1969, with the aim of opening the show in autumn 1971. But worried the National Museum of Wales, whose trustees included the Archbishop of Wales, might object to its subject-matter, WAC's Art Committee decided to postpone the exhibition in favour of the less contentious *Worship* exhibition.

Despite this setback, the organizers continued to research the topic. Between summer 1971 and spring 1972, Baynes approached various collections about sourcing relevant material, including historic examples of pornography and other sexually explicit imagery. The response was largely positive: both the Bodleian Library and the Victoria and Albert Museum were 'extremely helpful and... willing to lend some excellent material for the *Sex* exhibition'.<sup>68</sup> Meanwhile, Peter Jones visited the Playboy Club in London to view back-copies of *Playboy* magazine and was grateful to the Head of Playboy Europe, Victor Lownes, for agreeing to loan various items, including sketches by the Peruvian pin-up artist Alberto



Vargas.<sup>69</sup> Indeed, the only uncooperative organisation was Walt Disney Productions, which refused to lend a film still from *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*, although according to the company spokesperson, this was due to ‘conflict with the licensing agreement’ rather than any moral objections to the exhibition itself.<sup>70</sup>

WAC made no secrets of its plans to organize the *Sex* exhibition. Yet the project attracted little public attention until December 1971, when Peter Jones was prosecuted for obtaining ‘an obscene magazine’ from the Continent, the contents of which were described by the stipendiary magistrate as ‘the crudest filth I have seen’.<sup>71</sup> Unimpressed with the defence’s explanation that ‘it would be impossible to produce an intelligent major exhibition without all aspects of sex being investigated’, the court fined Jones £20.<sup>72</sup> The incident caught the eye of the Cardiff West MP and former Welsh Secretary, George Thomas, a long-term critic of WAC, who took the opportunity to table a question in the House of Commons asking how much the Council spent on pornography.<sup>73</sup> Baynes went on the BBC’s *Good Morning, Wales!* radio show to defend the *Sex* exhibition and stress its ‘educational’ purpose, while Thomas appeared alongside the Wales-based artists Jonah Jones, Alan Richards and Robert Hunter in a special televised debate on art and censorship.<sup>74</sup>

The *Sex* scandal broke at a time of growing moral unease that the progressive social reforms of the previous decade had gone too far. In April 1971, Labour peer Lord Longford had begun a high-profile private campaign against pornography, and in January 1972 Mary Whitehouse, who had been campaigning to ‘clean up’ television since the mid-1960s, launched a ‘Nationwide Petition for Public Decency’, which called for the strengthening of obscenity laws.<sup>75</sup> Meanwhile, grassroots movements like the Responsible Society or the Nationwide Festival of Light sprung up to combat ‘permissiveness’ and restore what they regarded as ‘traditional’ Christian family values.

In the face of the escalating moral panic, WAC’s Art Committee decided to postpone the *Sex* exhibition. Officially it claimed that, at £14,000, it was too expensive in the current year.<sup>76</sup> Yet in reality, no gallery or museum in Wales prepared to host such a controversial exhibition (although the Art Committee did receive offers from the ICA in London and Push

Pins Studios in New York). This was not the first time WAC had cancelled an exhibition due to public pressure. In May 1971, the exhibition *Snap!* had been closed at the Newport Art Gallery after a local Labour councillor complained about three satirical drawings by the political cartoonist Gerald Scrafe, one of which depicted former Prime Minister Harold Wilson being sodomized by 'the gnomes of Zurich'.<sup>77</sup>

Under pressure from publishers Lund Humphries to complete the *Art and Society* book series, WAC's Art Committee nevertheless agreed to proceed with the *Sex* book. It was hoped a successful and well-received book might even sway galleries in Wales to host the *Sex* exhibition. Baynes agreed to write a 'mature and open' publication directed 'specifically at school leavers' in which sex was presented 'as an important, serious and, indeed, happy factor in adult married life'.<sup>78</sup> While he refused to exclude pornographic images, these were to be included as part of a critical discussion on 'modern attitudes to pornography and the ability of the mass media to enlarge the circulation of such images'.<sup>79</sup>

The archives show WAC went to great lengths to prepare the ground for the publication of the *Sex* book and limit any potential media controversy. Jones circulated a memorandum 'to assist anyone who has any official dealings with the public or press' and asked a senior school inspector, a priest and a headmaster to attest to the book's pedagogical value.<sup>80</sup> WAC's Director, Aneurin Thomas, and ACGB's Secretary-General, Hugh Willats, in London were also briefed about the planned publication. Meanwhile, Lund Humphries consulted their solicitors, who, after reviewing a draft copy of the book, concluded it was unlikely the publishers would be publically prosecuted for obscenity.<sup>81</sup>

With these preparations in place, the *Sex* book was finally published in November 1972.<sup>82</sup> Although it attracted some slightly sensationalist coverage in the local press, most commentators responded quite sensitively to the publication.<sup>83</sup> Writing in the *Western Mail*, Rev. Dr. W. Bolt, for example, praised the 'ambitious project' as 'impressive' and highlighted the book's moral and educational value: 'I believe that this intelligent work is far more constructive than the pornographic swill of erotica which fills so many shop-windows'.<sup>84</sup>

Some critics expressed surprise that such a permissive book should come out of Wales, a country described by *The Toronto Star* as ‘damned and dampened by Baptist preachers’.<sup>85</sup> *The Liverpool Daily Post*, which had a large readership in north Wales, felt the book was inappropriate for Welsh audiences:

Some of the pictures seem to have been included to titillate, and while the current permissive atmosphere may mean this would be acceptable in a smart Metropolitan atmosphere, one must remember that the vast majority of Welsh people whom the Arts Council must serve, live in small rural towns.<sup>86</sup>

Yet it would be wrong to assume the Welsh were particularly puritanical in their response. The Welsh language magazine *Y Faner* described *Sex* as a ‘beautiful book, and a contribution to sociology’.<sup>87</sup> Its only criticism was that the volume did not include ‘a chapter on the sexual symbols of Wales’.<sup>88</sup> Meanwhile, speaking on the BBC’s *Good Morning, Wales!*, the Welsh novelist and broadcaster Gwyn Thomas characteristically delighted at the amount and diversity of sexual imagery on offer: ‘It’s a vast subject and Mr. Ken Baynes in this book has done well by it.... All the methods and approaches are revealed, everything short of seeing the sultan expressing his affection while dangling off the bedroom window’.<sup>89</sup>

Despite the book’s positive reception, WAC’s Art Committee decided, in May 1973, to cancel plans for the *Sex* exhibition. It perhaps reasoned that while a book could be privately consumed an exhibition was a far more public event and therefore exposed the Council to greater risk. For Baynes, the decision was ‘a timid one’ but ‘comprehensible’, since ‘the times in 1973 are certainly worse for liberalism than they were in 1968’.<sup>90</sup> Nevertheless, he spotted a chance to salvage ‘something of value’ from the project ‘without causing embarrassment to Cardiff’.<sup>91</sup> In recognition of the impact of the *Art and Society* series, Baynes and Jones had both been recently appointed as advisers to the British Council as the institution was preparing to organize Britain’s contribution to the Council of Europe exhibition *Love and Marriage: Aspects of Popular Culture*, due to take place in Belgium in 1975. Baynes suggested using some of the material from the *Sex* exhibition as the basis for the British section of the *Love and Marriage* exhibition. Not only could this provide an acceptable way of rounding off the *Art and Society* series, but it could be represented ‘as a very direct and

practical international gesture' so that WAC could save face for having cancelled the *Sex* exhibition.<sup>92</sup>

Baynes's suggestion was accepted, and the exhibition *Love and Marriage* opened in Antwerp in 1975, before the British section, enhanced by additional material from Europe, Asia and American, returned to the National Museum of Wales under the title *Marriage* in March 1976 (figure 4). Meanwhile, Lund Humphries published a 'jumbo' edition of the books *War, Work, Worship* and *Sex* for the international market under the title *Art in Society*.<sup>93</sup> Translated into French, German, Spanish, Italian and Dutch, this new book was reviewed by several American journals and provoked considerable discussion on the Continent.<sup>94</sup>

Yet despite its international standing, the *Art and Society* series failed to recapture its earlier impact. '*Marriage* alas is a let-down', wrote *The Guardian's* Caroline Tisdall.<sup>95</sup> 'The show was optimistically billed as "A glass of champagne to finish the series off with" but the champagne had somehow gone flat.... *Marriage* is a sentimental look at the finery surrounding weddings.... It's charming but uncharacteristically unquestioning'. Paul Overy in *The Times* likewise lamented the fact the series had ended 'not with a bang but with bubbly'.<sup>96</sup> Over four years had passed since the last *Art and Society* exhibition, in which time much of the radical impetus which launched the series in the late 1960s had been lost.

*Marriage* was to be one of the last major exhibitions organised by WAC. Although the Council continued to support a broad range of artistic form and activities, with exhibitions devoted to toys, lanterns, maps, newspapers, television graphics, masks, fabrics and film posters, these were much smaller affairs. There was a feeling within the organisation that the large multimedia exhibition had run its course and a new approach was needed. In the early 1980s WAC stopped organising exhibitions altogether. At a time when budgets were being squeezed and the Council's paternalistic role in setting the cultural agenda was being questioned, it was decided to redirect funds towards developing a network of galleries across Wales which could coordinate its own exhibition programme. Never again would WAC take such a leading role in the visual arts in Wales. Since 1946, it had been

responsible for 236 exhibitions in Wales. Yet in that time, no exhibition ever matched the scale, popularity or impact of the *Art and Society* series.<sup>97</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The post-war period was an important time for rethinking ideas about art and culture. With the growth of the mass media, education and consumerism, artists and intellectuals, such as Richard Hoggart, Raymond Williams, Marshall McLuhan, Laurence Alloway and the Independent Group, began to challenge traditional cultural hierarchies and work towards a more inclusive understanding of culture. This article has argued that WAC's *Art and Society* series contributed to this new mind-set. Although WAC was certainly not the first to put forward a broader, sociological definition of art and culture, it was the first major arts institution to base its policy on these ideas. As such, it showed how the new model of culture worked in practice and also helped to popularise it amongst the wider public.

The popularity of the *Art and Society* series suggests audiences were receptive to the new democratic model of art and culture. Certainly there were occasional criticisms about the marketing or layout of some exhibitions. But on the whole the series was extremely well-received and was the most popular WAC ever organised. The response of the press was also extensive and generally positive. Both conservative and liberal newspapers praised WAC for attempting such a bold and innovative display.

The view of the arts establishment was more mixed, however. Some, like WAC's Director Aneurin Thomas, defended the *Art and Society* series on the basis that it helped the Council to make the visual arts more accessible. Others, such as Thomas's predecessor Roger Webster or Gabriel White, ACGB's Art Director in London, deplored the rejection of critical standards of taste and judgement, for it meant all cultural objects, from paintings to comic books, were given equal value, making it impossible to determine what was good and bad. For such critics, the mixing of high art and popular culture undermined the very purpose of organisations like WAC to support 'excellence' and raised difficult questions about why some activities deserved state subsidy and not others. The use of a sociological

definition of art and culture also meant WAC's exhibitions became far more politicized – a problem for an organisation which was meant to stay at 'arm's-length' from government.

Either way, *Art and Society* showed WAC to be at the forefront of cultural debates. In this sense, the series was important not only because it challenged cultural hierarchies but also because it put Wales on the map. To be sure, the series sometimes estranged itself from Welsh society. The decision to frame exhibitions in a universal context rather than one culturally specific to Wales, for example, meant that shows like *Work* and *Worship* did little to illuminate the changing nature of Welsh industry or religion. Still, *Art and Society* certainly resonated with Wales' democratic traditions. The series also made a mark outside Wales. The exhibitions were popular in the north of England and were widely discussed in the British and international press. They even influenced thinking at the British Council and the Council of Europe. As such, the *Art and Society* series stands as an important example of the contribution of the Welsh 'periphery' to key cultural debates in post-war Britain.

## **Acknowledgements**

The author would like to thank Ken Baynes and the late Peter Jones for agreeing to be interviewed about the *Art and Society* series and for the use of images from the exhibitions. The author would also like to thank Professor Steve Blandford and Dr Ruth McElroy for their helpful comments and suggestions. This article stems from the author's PhD research on 'Art, Politics and National Identity in Wales: 1940-1994', which was supported by an AHRC Doctoral Award 2003-2007.

Huw David Jones is a Research Assistant at the Cardiff School of Creative and Cultural Industries, University of Glamorgan. His research focuses on the art, media and culture of Wales and other small nations. Email: [hjones6@glam.ac.uk](mailto:hjones6@glam.ac.uk)

## **Notes**

(See end of document)

## References

- Alloway, Laurence, 'The Long Front of Culture', reprinted in *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty*, ed. David Robins, 165-166. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1990.
- Arnold, Matthew, *Culture and Anarchy and Other Writings*, ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baas, Jacquelyn. Introduction to *The Independent Group: Postwar Britain and the Aesthetics of Plenty*, ed. David Robins, 10-11. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1990.
- Baynes, Ken. Introduction to *Art and Society: War*, by Ken Baynes/Welsh Arts Council, n.p. Cardiff: Welsh Arts Council, 1969.
- Baynes, Ken, 'Art at Work', *Design* 264 (1970): 61-65.
- Baynes, Ken, 'The Reinterpretation of Culture', *Planet: The Welsh Internationalist* 9 (1970): 25-34.
- Baynes, Ken, *Art and Society: War*, London: WAC/Lund Humphries, 1970.
- Baynes, Ken, 'The Art and Society Project of the Welsh Arts Council', *Leonardo* 6, no.2 (1973): 97-102.
- Baynes, Ken and Alan Robinson, *Art and Society: Work*, London: WAC/Lund Humphries, 1970.
- Baynes, Ken and Kate Baynes, *Art and Society: Worship*, London: WAC/Lund Humphries, 1971.
- Baynes, Ken, *Art and Society: Sex*, London: WAC/Lund Humphries, 1972.
- Beardsley, M. C., 'Art in Society by Ken Baynes', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 35, no. 1 (1976): 91.
- Clark, Kenneth, *Civilisation: A Personal View*, London: BBC, 1971.
- Frankenberg, Ronald, 'Review: Art and Society', *Studies in Design Education and Craft* 5, no.1 (1972): 53-54.
- Gelliot, Emma, ed., *It Was Never Going to be Straightforward*, Cardiff: Eclipse, 2013.
- Guadnek, Walter, 'Worship by Kate Baynes; Ken Baynes', *Leonardo* 5, no. 4 (1972): 364-365.
- Horowitz, Daniel, *Consuming Pleasures: Intellectuals and Popular Culture in the Postwar World*, Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- Hoggart, Richard, *The Uses of Literacy*, London: Chatto & Windus, 1957.
- Hutichison, Robert, *The Politics of the Arts Council*, London: Sinclair-Browne, 1982.
- Johnes, Martin, *Wales since 1939*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012.

- Jones, Huw David. "An Art of Our Own": State Patronage of the Visual Arts in Wales 1945-67'. *Contemporary British History* 27, no.1: 44-64.
- Jones, Peter. Foreword to *Photographs by Raymond Moore*, by Welsh Arts Council, 1. Cardiff: Welsh Arts Council, 1968.
- Keynes, J. M. 'The Arts Council: Its Policy and Hopes', reprinted in *Annual Report 1945-46*, ed. Arts Council of Great Britain, 20-23. London: ACGB, 1946.
- Lord, Peter, 'Homogeneity or Individuation? A Long View of the Critical Paradox of Contemporary Art in a Stateless Nation', in *Globalisation and Contemporary Art*, ed. Jonathon Harris, 56-70. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2011.
- Massey, Anne, *The Independent Group: Modernism and Mass Culture in Britain, 1945-59*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- McLuhen, Marshall, *The Gutenberg Gallery: The Making of Typographic Man*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.
- McNally, Neil, 'A Madhouse on Fire? Art and Censorship', *Planet: The Welsh Internationalist* 207 (2012): 114-123.
- Philips, G. 'Art in Society by Ken Baynes', *Leonardo* 10, no. 2 (1977): 163-164.
- A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps* (Cmnd. 2601), London: HMSO, 1965.
- Sandbrook, Dominic, *State of Emergency. The Way We Were: Britain 1970-1974*, London: Penguin, 2011.
- Thomas, Aneurin. Foreword to *Annual Report 1972-73*, by Welsh Arts Council, n.p. Cardiff: WAC, 1973.
- Webster, Roger, "For Wales – See England." 'The Artist in Wales', in *Anatomy of Wales*, ed. R. Brinley Thomas, 227-248. Peterson-super-Ely: Gwerin, 1972.
- Weight, Richard, *Patriots: National Identity in Britain 1940-2000*, London: Pan Books, 2003.
- White, Eric, *The Arts Council of Great Britain*, London: Davis-Poynter, 1975.
- Williams, Daniel, 'Introduction: The Return of the Native' in *Who Speaks for Wales? Nation, Culture, Identity*, ed. Daniel Williams, by Raymond William, ed. Daniel Williams, xv-liv. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2003.
- Williams, Raymond, 'Culture is Ordinary' reprinted in *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism*, by Raymond Williams, 3-14. London: Verso, 1988.



## Figure captions

Figure 1. The *War* exhibition showing one of the large film stills that were a feature of the show (copyright: Ken Baynes/Peter Jones)

Figure 2. The *Work* exhibition at the Glynn Vivian Art Gallery, Swansea (copyright: Ken Baynes/Peter Jones)

Figure 3. The *Work* exhibition at the National Museum of Wales, Cardiff. A colliery works band plays on the balcony (copyright: Ken Baynes/Peter Jones)

Figure 4. The *Marriage* exhibition at the National Museum of Wales, Cardiff (copyright: Ken Baynes/Peter Jones)

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Royal Charter of Incorporation of the Arts Council of Great Britain, August 9, 1946, reprinted in White, *Arts Council*, 294.

<sup>2</sup> Hutchison, *Politics of the Arts Council*, 83.

<sup>3</sup> Arnold, *Culture and Anarchy*, 79.

<sup>4</sup> In a radio broadcast to announce the establishment of ACGB, the Council's Chairman, John Maynard Keynes, called for 'Death to Hollywood'. Keynes 'The Arts Council', 23.

<sup>5</sup> Horowitz, *Consuming Pleasures*.

<sup>6</sup> The article is based on primary research using archival records, exhibition catalogues, newspaper reports, journal articles and interviews with the exhibitions' curators, Ken Baynes and Peter Jones.

<sup>7</sup> One exception is Lord, who touches on *Art and Society* in 'Homogeneity or Individuation?', 61.

<sup>8</sup> Jones, 'Art of Our Own', 44-64.

<sup>9</sup> Hebert Williams, 'Is It Art or a Load of Meaningless Rubbish?', *South Wales Echo*, June 18, 1966; M. O'Brien, M. and H.R. Payne, letters to editor, *South Wales Echo*, June 23, 1966.

<sup>10</sup> Gordon Redfern, memorandum, c.1968, file A/E/103, Welsh Arts Council Archive, National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth (hereafter cited as WAC Archive).

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> *Policy for the Arts*, par. 4.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., par. 71.

<sup>15</sup> Weight, *Patriots*, 416

---

<sup>16</sup> An example of Wales' tradition of cultural democracy is the *eisteddfod*, a Welsh festival of literature, music and performance, which is traditionally open to be both professionals and amateurs.

<sup>17</sup> Thomas, foreword to *Annual Report 1972-73*, n.p.

<sup>18</sup> Jones, foreword to *Photographs by Raymond Moore*, 1.

<sup>19</sup> Baynes was already an accomplished writer, having been a former editor of the Royal College of Arts' magazine *Arc* and a contributor to the Zurich-based design journal *Graphis*.

<sup>20</sup> See Baynes, 'Art and Society Project'; Baynes, 'Art at Work'; Baynes, 'Reinterpretation of Culture'.

<sup>21</sup> Baynes, 'Art and Society Project', 98.

<sup>22</sup> Baynes, introduction to *War*, 1.

<sup>23</sup> Horowitz, *Consuming Pleasures*.

<sup>24</sup> Hoggart, *Uses of Literacy*.

<sup>25</sup> Williams, 'Culture is Ordinary'; McLuhen, *Gutenberg Gallery*.

<sup>26</sup> Baas, introduction to *Independent Group*, 8. See also Massey, *Independent Group*.

<sup>27</sup> Alloway, 'Long Front of Culture', 165.

<sup>28</sup> Baynes also credited the exhibition *Art and the Industrial Revolution*, curated by the Marxist art historian Frances Klingender, for showing the potential for exploring social themes through art.

<sup>29</sup> Baynes, introduction to *War*, n.p.

<sup>30</sup> Robert Breen, 'How War Can Woo the Apathetic to Art', *Western Mail*, December 4, 1972.

<sup>31</sup> G.M. Roderick to the Director of WAC, April 7, 1969, file A/E/103, WAC Archive. See also E.

Williams to the Director of WAC, March 12, 1969, file A/E/103, WAC Archive.

<sup>32</sup> Swansea Anarchists, 'Violence Comes to Swansea', flyer, c. February 1969, file A/E/103, WAC Archive.

<sup>33</sup> Eric Rowan, 'Themes for a Series of Exhibitions', *The Sunday Times*, February 9, 1969.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Griffith Williams, 'The Swastika Comes to Swansea', *Western Mail*, February 15, 1969.

<sup>36</sup> Raymond, memorandum, c. February 1969, file A/E/103, WAC Archive.

<sup>37</sup> Iorwerth Peate to Peter Jones, September 23, 1969, file A/E/148, WAC Archive.

<sup>38</sup> Peter Jones, interview with the author, Cilgerran, March 29, 2005.

<sup>39</sup> Roy Fuller, 'Philistines and Jacobins', *Times Literary Supplement*, February 20, 1969. Fuller later resigned from ACGB in 1977 in protest of its support for performance art.

- 
- <sup>40</sup> The final episode of *Civilisation* was broadcast on BBC 2, May 18, 1969. The programme's transcript is reprinted in Clark, *Civilisation*.
- <sup>41</sup> 'Revolutionaries Meet Mrs Tiggy-Winkle at the National Museum of Wales', press release, September 24, 1970, file A/E/154, WAC Archive.
- <sup>42</sup> 'Worship', flyer, c. November 1971, file A/E/165, WAC Archive.
- <sup>43</sup> Johnes, *Wales since 1939*, ch.8.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>45</sup> Williams, 'Introduction', xvii-liii.
- <sup>46</sup> Baynes, 'Reinterpretation of Culture', 34.
- <sup>47</sup> Peter Fuller, 'Work', *Arts Review*, November 21, 1970.
- <sup>48</sup> Lord, 'Homogeneity or Individuation?', 61
- <sup>49</sup> WAC, *Annual Report 1970-71*, 75.
- <sup>50</sup> Based on questionnaire returns held in files A/E/260 and A/E/262, WAC Archive.
- <sup>51</sup> Roderick Bisson, 'Absorbing Exhibition', *Daily Post*, April 6, 1971.
- <sup>52</sup> Peter Fuller, 'Work', *The Connoisseur*, April 1971.
- <sup>53</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>54</sup> Sir David Follet to Peter Jones, December 7, 1970, file A/E/156, WAC Archive.
- <sup>55</sup> Ken Baynes, telephone discussion with author, February 20, 2013.
- <sup>56</sup> Baynes, *War*; Baynes and Robinson, *Work*.
- <sup>57</sup> Baynes and Baynes, *Worship*.
- <sup>58</sup> Ken Baynes, 'Future of the Art and Society Series', memorandum, April 26, 1971, file A/E/292, WAC Archive.
- <sup>59</sup> The archives suggest only one academic (Alan Gowans, a social art historian based at the University of Victoria) contacted WAC about the *Art and Society* series. See file A/E/155, WAC Archive.
- <sup>60</sup> *Times Literary Supplement*, 'Commentary', January 29, 1971.
- <sup>61</sup> Frankenberg, 'Art and Society', 53; John Russell, 'Art and Society', *The Sunday Times*, c.1972.
- <sup>62</sup> Le Monde, 'Art et Soiete', *Le Monde*, January 15, 1971 (translated by author).
- <sup>63</sup> Merete Bates, 'What Art Does', *The Guardian*, December 31, 1970.
- <sup>64</sup> Webster, 'Artist in Wales', 246.
- <sup>65</sup> Ron Mavor, interviewed by Robert Tait in *Scottish International*, February 1971.

- 
- <sup>66</sup> Alfred Winsborough, 'Art and the Law', *Western Mail*, January 10, 1972.
- <sup>67</sup> Guadnek, 'Worship', 364.
- <sup>68</sup> Ken Baynes to Peter Jones, December 15, 1972, file A/E/292, WAC Archive.
- <sup>69</sup> Peter Jones to Victor Lownes, May 21, 1972, file A/E/299, WAC Archive.
- <sup>70</sup> Malcom Wren to Joy Goodfellow, August 7, 1972, file A/E/200, WAC Archive.
- <sup>71</sup> 'Art Director Fined Over Magazine', *The Guardian*, December 31, 1971.
- <sup>72</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>73</sup> George Thomas was particularly critical of WAC for subsidising 'nationalist' magazines like *Planet: The Welsh Internationalist*, which had been highly critical of his tenure as Welsh Secretary.
- <sup>74</sup> The transcripts of the radio show and the television programme are in file A/E/292, WAC Archive.
- <sup>75</sup> Sandbrook, *State of Emergency*, ch.11.
- <sup>76</sup> John Edgington, 'Sex for Art's Sake', *The Guardian*, December 18, 1972.
- <sup>77</sup> McNally, 'A Madhouse on Fire? Art and Censorship', 123.
- <sup>78</sup> Peter Jones, 'Memorandum on the Welsh Arts Council/Lund Humphries *Art and Society* Series', October 19, file A/E/292, WAC Archive.
- <sup>79</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>80</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>81</sup> Michael Rubinstein to John Taylor, August 30, 1972, file A/E/294, WAC Archive.
- <sup>82</sup> See Baynes, *Sex*.
- <sup>83</sup> 'Schools Inspector Backs Sex Book', *South Wales Echo*, November 30, 1972.
- <sup>84</sup> W. Bolt, 'Art Which Teaches Students the Facts of Life', *Western Mail*, December 4, 1972.
- <sup>85</sup> Kildare Dobbs, 'An Exciting View of Erotic Art', *The Toronto Star*, April 21, 1973.
- <sup>86</sup> 'Art and Society: Sex', *The Liverpool Daily Post*, December 9, 1972.
- <sup>87</sup> 'Cymdeithas a Rhyw', *Y Faner*, December 21, 1972 (translated by author).
- <sup>88</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>89</sup> Gwyn Thomas, 'Transcript of talk given by Gwyn Thomas which was broadcast on "Good Morning, Wales!" on Tuesday, 5<sup>th</sup> December, 1972', transcript, December 2, 1972, file A/E/296, WAC Archive.
- <sup>90</sup> Ken Baynes to Peter Jones, June 5, 1973, file A/E/434, WAC Archive.
- <sup>91</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>92</sup> Ibid.

---

<sup>93</sup> 3000 copies of the French edition of *Art in Society* were produced; 2000 of the Dutch edition; 3000 of the US edition; and 2000 of the UK edition. See files A/E/444-445, WAC Archive.

<sup>94</sup> See for example: Beardsley, 'Art in Society', 91; Philips, 'Art in Society by Ken Baynes', 163-164.

<sup>95</sup> Caroline Tisdall, 'Marital Rift', *The Guardian*, March 30, 1976.

<sup>96</sup> Paul Overy, 'Weddings through the Ages', *The Times*, May 23, 1976.

<sup>97</sup> *Art and Society* continues to inspire artists and curators in Wales. Cardiff's g39 gallery, for example, drew "its influence from the *Art and Society* series published in the 1970s by the Welsh Arts Council" when it opened in 2002. See Gelliot, *It Was Never Going to be Straightforward*, n.p.