

# **Utopia and Digital Museum Policy in the Web 2.0.**

**Cristiano Agostino**

## **Abstract**

*This article begins to address, through a theoretical review and an analysis of select primary sources, the complex interplay between museum digital policies for the Web; and the utopian rhetoric which underpins what is known as “Web 2.0.” In particular, the article looks at the rhetorics of audience participation, inclusion and democratisation that museums routinely employ to justify the permanence of their cultural mandate in the digital realm: by looking at select “media strategy” documents, we can get a sense of the deep investment in the supposedly “inclusive” rhetorics of Web 2.0 that most museums seem to buy into, as they move their agency into the digital.*

## **Keywords**

Museum, Web 2.0, Utopia, Digital strategy.

## **Utopia and Digital Museum Policy in the Web 2.0.**

In this article I aim to address some select facets of the current state of museums' web policies and the philosophies that guide them, as seen through the lens of one of the overarching paradigms of postmodern culture – the Western tradition of utopia. As I will suggest through the tools of literature review, theoretical discussion of current trends, and inspection of primary sources, the ongoing construction of paradigms for the development of museal web presences (be them web sites proper; outreach projects that involve the web in some capacity; or distribution of museal content by way of virtual third parties) owes a great debt to an utopia-fuelled ideal of social amelioration by creation of technology-supported 'alternative realities'. In this endeavour, institutions are buttressed by evolving controversial views on the relationship between museum and society, as well as a wealth of widespread, yet somewhat dubious theory systems, among which the most influential are: Web 2.0; social media; and folksonomies.

## **What Utopia is in Contemporary Culture**

As the meaning of the term 'utopia' in our context is rather specific and the word is, more generally, widely deployed in academia in sometimes less than clear contexts, in order to define a seemingly infinite series of issues, attitudes and paradigms, it is necessary to offer a brief *excursus* on utopia as a historical strand of thought, from which then meanings relevant

to our topic might be extracted.

Utopia emerged first as a literary form, officially initiated by Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), and continued in countless literary products, from William Morris' *News from Nowhere* (1892) to Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888), all the way to the more politically ambiguous, post-scarcity science fiction of contemporary authors such as Ursula K. Le Guin, Cory Doctorow and Margaret Atwood. It is not overly relevant to our topic, however, to over-emphasise the literary acception of the term, in spite of it being chronologically the earliest, and the main one from which all others sprung up by extension and association: this because, in a more contemporary context, utopia has become a sort of overarching paradigm, which has constructed a life of its own, very often far from its literary origins in both context and channels of diffusion (Braungart, 2005).

More relevant to our topic is the larger, complex issue of the rhetorical charge that 'utopia' as a cultural paradigm entails. On one hand, we understand utopia as a condition where a certain ideology or worldview is entirely fulfilled, leading to the satisfaction of a desire of some sort – desire for a life that is better / safer / fairer / fuller / etc. (Levitas, 1990); on the other, a chimera of the mind detached from reality, which can be envisioned but hardly realised – essentially, an implicit judgement on the possibility itself for utopia to be realised. From this basic ambiguity built within the very semantic meaning of utopia, can be construed many basic parallels / opposition couples that roughly constitute, when considered in their globality and interconnectedness, the utopian vision: reality / fantasy; collectivism / individualism; action / inaction. All of these, and more, constitute and define utopia.

The coexistence of these semantic oppositions that, as a collectivity, define contemporary utopia, has of course its consequences. Throughout the twentieth, and early twenty-first century, different understandings of utopia have emerged: construed according to emphasize one aspect over others; spread over a wide-ranging ethical spectrum, spanning readings of utopia as a privileged space for positive intervention and socio-cultural change; or as heavy criticism of utopian thinking as pernicious, if not parasitic to meaningful human improvement.

Contemporary utopia is better understood by providing a few key examples. Starting from a literary terrain J. Wilson, as he criticises the dismissal of the utopian mindset as a 'popular misapprehension' (Wilson, 1971: 51), draws an ethical line between what he dubs Utopian Fantasies, escapist fables designed to compensate the lacks of the real world, and Social Criticism Utopia, which instead seeks to proactively raise thought and action against

those lacks (Wilson, 1971). A host of material has been produced around the issue of utopian thinking and utopian action within Marxism and, more generally, socialism, often underlining the complex embracing and rejection of utopia within such ideologies: Sciabarra, for example, in his *Marx, Hayek and Utopia*, states that the father of Socialism regarded utopians as 'aiming to create new social formations based upon a pretence of knowledge', and adopted throughout his work a 'profoundly anti-utopian mode of inquiry' (Sciabarra, 1995).

More recently and in light of a more positive reading of utopia, Hakim Bey configures the possibility of an anarchist utopia as he describes his Temporary Autonomous Zones (Bey, 1991); Frederik Jameson has been widely discussed as a figure leading the critical utopia implicit in the thinking of the Frankfurt school toward new developments which value utopia at least as a theoretical alternative to the fragmentation of reality and agencies brought along by late capitalism (Jameson, 2004); David Harvey, in his influential book *Spaces of Hope*, describes the contingency of re-evaluated socialist / utopian ideas with regard to the spread of late capitalism-fuelled globalisation (Harvey, 2000).

Yet, some writers have identified as typical of the postmodern condition new types of utopia, ones that deny the possibility of changing reality on a macro level, and instead retract into more circumscribed, therefore more easily manipulated realms, be them actual or fictional (Kumar, 2005). In some instances, as pointed out by Levitas (Levitas, 1993), there is a tendency toward utopias that do not configure an unified, wide-ranging plan of action that can be set in motion to move us toward an ideal society; rather, many fragmented, insular alternatives of the mind, 'glimpses of a utopia which is unattainable'; explosive action and agency are substituted with intellectual speculation and appeals to our sense of wonder. Somewhere in between there has been, especially within strands of contemporary 'oppositional' artistic practices such as Institutional Critique and Relational Aesthetics (Fraser, 2005; Bourriaud, 1995; English, 2007), a return toward proactivity and engagement with the intent to move reality towards utopia, but on a different scale; instead of aiming for sweeping, revolutionary changes of society at all levels, these practices seek instead to create temporally and geographically circumscribed 'alternative spaces' where utopian elements can be reintroduced, if only for the duration of a gathering or exhibit – 'microtopias' (Bishop, 2006). This last strand of utopian thinking, the microtopia, has become (perhaps due to its popularity in contemporary art practices) the dominant model of utopian thinking for the contemporary museum.

## The Museum as Utopia

The public museum, as an institutionally sanctioned agent and instrument of societal change, since its inception has been deeply entangled in the logics of utopia: from the birth of the 'proto-museum' of the Renaissance, essentially an effort to construct a thorough artificial reality that could reproduce, and therefore compete with, the perfection of the natural world (Findlen, 1989); through its evolution as a donation to the public by powerful men, ideally benefitting the former by their cultural and social amelioration, as well as the latter by further legitimisation of status and power (Pierce in Carrier, 2006); to the modern (or modernist) art museum as a place for the legitimisation of canons and acceptable cultural terms, as exemplified by Carol Duncan's, or Brandon Taylor's analysis of MoMA's semiotics of architecture and display history (Taylor, 1999; Duncan, 1993); the museum, and perhaps even more so the art museum has always been implicated in an exercise of public cultural amelioration that, upon close analysis, bears the hallmarks of an utopia-informed endeavour, often times a locally or temporally circumscribed microtopia.

The utopian instinct within the museum seems to be so pervasive, transversal and radicalized, it has easily survived even the museum itself undergoing a paradigm shift of sorts in the second half of the past century: the transition from the museum as an instrument to uphold the artwork as a Modernist 'masterpiece', with all the cultural /social / political baggage it entails, to a competing ideology of the museum as a *locus* for an experience built around the visitor, rather than the work displayed. Playing a central role in this overarching shift (that did not entail a displacement of the paradigm of utopia to the slightest) are two of the 'buzzwords' that characterised the cultural climate museums inhabited starting in the late 1960s: Postmodernism; and education (Mayer, 2005: 356).

The birth, development and eventual obsolescence of Postmodernism has been chronicled time after time in a myriad of more or less celebrated publications; it seems therefore redundant to retrace its steps at large in this context. What would be useful, on the other hand, is to briefly rehearse the discussion of postmodern 'intertextuality' that Mayer presents us, arching back to Barthes. According to her, 'intertextuality' is the crux of a shift, within museal practices, from an artwork-oriented approach, to a viewer-oriented one: the 'text', the *locus* where the meaningfulness of an exchange of information lies, is no longer the 'radiant' work of art presented to the visitor, but rather the (not always) critical understanding and interpretation of the work by each visitor's point of view, not to mention an incorporation into daily life of the new knowledge provided by the meeting of visitor and artwork (Mayer,

2005: 357-358). This reversal of focus, when conjugated with new practices and policies that better and more holistically connect visitor and museum should, at least in theory, produce a 'new museum', a place no longer 'hostile to the achievement of its own purpose' (Goodman, 1985).

I believe, however, that it is fundamental to recognise how the so far described paradigm shift has, in fact, done very little to displace the powerful drive toward utopia that is ingrained in the museum not only as a socio-political institution, but more generally as a veritable way of seeing the world. By moving from the Modernist absolute position of the artwork, to the Postmodern relative position of the visitor, a switch from utopia proper to microtopias, from utopian master narratives to instances of utopian prefiguration, has occurred. Most analysis tend, however, to gloss over or deny the inherent danger that a microtopia might be, even when disguised under the more friendly trappings of a non-ideology, still an utopia; and it still expresses a desire for social control, engineered amelioration and fantasy world-making; only on a smaller, perhaps less threatening hegemonic scale. When Bourriaud states that the micro-utopia is 'a utopia without teleology, without grand speeches, one that refers to everyday life' (Bourriaud, 1995: 34), or Johansson tells us that 'the focus... is about "little stories" rather than the so-called "grand narratives" of Modernist ideology' (Johansson, 2006: n/p), they implicitly disguise half the story: that these new narratives are still hegemonic in intention, if not scope; and they are not the sole precinct of visionary artists, but institutions and cultural agents alike. This has not changed, but rather it has been radicalised by the advent of the World Wide Web.

### **The Utopian Internet, and 'Web 2.0'.**

From its early inception as a tool for limited communication between research institutions, to its current global reach (Leiner et al, 1999), the Internet's history and development are deeply entwined with utopian ideas of social amelioration and alternative world-making. This rhetoric of the Web as a place for generation of a 'new world order', be it hegemonic or 'underground', continues and intensifies as the Internet completes its last steps from a bottom-down system of content delivery, toward a far more complex and layered paradigm in which the 'audience' is no longer a passive fruitor, but rather it socially and actively shapes the content and, more important, the structure of the Internet itself. Recent iterations of the Internet have become social platforms ripe for experiments in cultural engineering and education, from Flickr Commons to 'games with a purpose', and it seems that many instances

of museal online Web presences aim to take full advantage of this rubric.

In 2005 Web entrepreneur Tim O'Reilly illustrated, in his article 'What is Web 2.0', a gamut of Internet trends that he saw as defining a new iteration of the World Wide Web (O'Reilly, 2005). Rather than by definition, Web 2.0 is better described by the meme map provided in the article: from it, we can extrapolate that Web 2.0 consists of:

- A platform structure.
- 'Play'
- 'Emergent': user behaviour not predetermined.
- Hackability
- Rich user experience
- Web as components
- 'Trust your users'

Richard MacManus of ZDweb pools a few more 'definitions floating around' (MacManus, 2005): Web 2.0 is 'the underlying philosophy of relinquishing control' of Web technology, architecture and content to the user; 'glocalization', the ability to 'generate information in a locally meaningful fashion that is locally accessible'; 'giving up control and setting the data free' (Merholz, 2005; Boyd, 2005; DeWitt, 2005; MacManus, 2005). Hand in hand with Web 2.0 comes a paradigm that has been dubbed the 'social Web': hinging heavily upon new technologies and platforms for social Web interaction and content sharing such as blogs, 'like' and 'share' buttons, RSS feeds and social networks, the Internet becomes a *locus* for real-time, dynamic social interaction as much as economic and cultural exchange; people who navigate the Web can form permanent identities, and construct relationships that resemble their offline ones. Information also tends to travel along horizontal axes (peer-to-peer), going 'viral' and spreading in a user-fostered, 'meme' like fashion.

Beyond its dubious nature as a marketing ploy, rather than an effective way of describing the reality of a 'new Web' (Scott, 2007; Berners Lee, 2007), the Web 2.0 paradigm has come under close scrutiny for the utopian vision it proposes of the Internet as a promised land of intellectual, social, cultural and sometimes physical freedom through avatars. At the eve of Web 2.0, Richard Coyne, in his seminal 1999 book *Technoromanticism*, lays down a cogent critique of the 'digital utopia': he lets us know that 'many digital narrative are unabashedly utopian' (Coyne, 1999:21): that is to say, he diagnoses within them the general characters of the worst kinds of utopia: they are one-dimensional, as they rarely engage into a

critical appraisal of its own nature; and they always postpone into the future the breakthrough that will finally realise whichever utopian imaginary has been conceived. In this sense, 'many digital narratives are utopian... they give credence to information technology as a means of realizing the Enlightenment project of a world where reason holds sway over unreason... people are free, equal and in harmony.' (Coyne, 1999:26)

Along with Coyne, and among many others, Corey Doctorow reminds us of the peril of expecting participation, democracy and Enlightenment to spring out off a technological platform: 'in meta-utopia everyone engaged... carefully weighs the stuff in the balance and accurately defines the stuff's properties, noting those results. Simple observation demonstrates the fallacy of this assumption' (Doctorow, 2001: n/p). According to him, the online utopia that Web 2.0 allegedly fosters requires a uniformity of vocabulary, aims, commitment and goals among users that simply is not there. Technology writer Nicholas Carr compares the Web 2.0 craze to a New Age movement, its proselytizers 'seeing the Web in religious terms' (Carr, 2005: n/p).

In spite of the mistrusts of many toward Web 2.0's promises of alleged participation, cultural equality and 'power back to the people', cursory analysis of the most well known aggregators for professional museum knowledge (i.e. ICHIM, or the Museum and the Web yearly conference) suggest that the museum as an institution has put sizeable stock on the participatory Web's promises of true interaction between the user and institutions, and among users themselves: trade papers are ripe with references to folksonomies; crowdsourcing; online content constructed by the audience and for the audience. This should, of course, come as no surprise if we consider the aforementioned cultural mandate of the museum, and the ways in which such mandate legitimises the existence of the institution itself: the museum is always on the lookout for arenas in which to develop new tools for ameliorating its publics, exercising its role of social improver of the masses by exposing them to its collections, events, and various repositories of knowledge. In this sense the Web, especially in its apparently democratic, free and friendly version that is Web 2.0, is an ideal avenue for increasing outreach.

The result is, I would argue, the creation within museum's public Web policies of a rhetoric that expounds the promise of freedom and inclusion of Web 2.0, while seeking to retain the museum's own primacy as an institution, an authority, and a repository of knowledge. To corroborate this statement, I will now look closely at a interesting example of an understudied segment of museum policy writing: a media strategy document. Situated

halfway between internal directives and public 'manifestos', these programmatic documents offer themselves open for close analysis of ambiguities, rhetorics and paradigms. The case chosen, 'Tate Online Strategy 2010-2012', has been selected for its timeliness, depth and widespread dissemination (*Tate Papers* and *Museum and the Web* among others.) It is, of course, one among many, and its analysis should serve mostly to provide corroboration to my hypothesis and pointers for future, deeper research.

### **'Tate Online Strategy 2010-2012'**

As part of the "Tate Vision" project, an overarching rehash of Tate as an institution and a brand scheduled for 2015, a Web redevelopment strategy has been envisioned, and published as a freely available document under the name "Tate Online Strategy 2010-2012" (Stack, 2010). In a nutshell, Tate's strategy essentially aims at redesigning the Web identity of Tate Online from the ground up, rehauling the entirety of its media assets and overarching digital philosophy. All this falls within a wider rethinking of the ways in which Tate approaches and caters to that valuable pool of visitors that is its Web audience: 'Tate Online aims to help fulfil Tate's mission... Tate Online is uniquely placed to reach new audiences and engage them in new ways' (Stack, 2010: n/p).

The text can be roughly subdivided in three sections. First, Tate Online sets out its programmatic goals of redefining its function, context and brand on the Web: to this end, it configures a series of ten 'principles for Tate Online'. In the second section, the vision for a new Tate Online is contextualised within what is described as 'The new Web': 'The emergence of the social Web has transformed once passive consumers into authors, editors, feature writers, columnists, photo journalists, TV moguls and publishers' (Stack, 2010: n/p). Special emphasis is put on the new brand role that the Tate Online name would have within this new Web. Finally, the third section outlines in detail the specifics of Tate Online's rehaul, including website redesign, learning and scholarship, and content reorganisation.

Central to Tate Online's rationale for the overhaul is the perception that the museum's current modes of content pooling and delivery cannot keep up with the ever-evolving context of the Web and the increasing demands of its digital public. Their fear is, even two years later, within reason: in October 2012, nearing the end of Tate Online's time frame for its programmatic redesign, in spite of improvements since 2010 the website still remains – from a 'new Web', which is to say Web 2.0 point of view – very much a work in progress: content is almost entirely geared toward advertising and display of Tate's 'real world' gallery events;

interactive content, such as apps and blogs, are visually subordinate to purely informational content; little improvement has been made toward integrating Tate Online with other social media platforms.

While Tate Online's overhaul, then, might have been (or might be) long overdue, what are its paradigmatic coordinates? Which is to say, to what paradigms does it ascribe to? I believe a close reading of the basic overarching ideas, and language employed throughout the strategy might enlighten the redesign of Tate Online as deeply indebted to the idea of Web 2.0 as a culturally utopian (or rather, since the scope is limited to Tate Online's activities, 'microtopian') space.

Some of the key characteristics of the new Tate Online, according to the strategy document: the new web presence will be 'alive with thoughts, conversation and opinion', enable 'a range of possible user journeys', have 'open and shared' content and will be 'sustainable', both developmentally and ecologically (Stack, 2010: n/p). In the language deployed there is an abundance of 'organic' terms, so to speak: the vision for a new, Web 2.0 Tate Online is humanised by constant reference to the living metaphor: not only, as mentioned, the site will be 'alive' and filled with thought and conversation, as if it were a sort of neural node (and one should consider the often touted metaphor of Web 2.0 as a brain-like, intelligent system (O'Reilly, 2005)); further, references to the website as having a 'heart', and a geographic body that can be journeyed through, abound. These are of course metaphors, which should not be stretched too far by way of analysis; still, the tangible, organic, eminently non- virtual language deployed not only seeks to give the envisioned website a parvence of life, but also resonates with ideas of the Web as a living, breathing collective intelligence that informs much of the Web 2.0 philosophy.

Where the consonance between the revised Tate Online, and the utopia of Web 2.0 can tangibly be seen, is in the envisioned construction of a socially and culturally utopian space for Tate's users that the document's statements configure:

- 'Tate Online will be ideas-led and diverse through a proliferation of opinions, including multiple voices on the same subject, exchanging views'
- 'The strategy for Tate Media aims to create a platform for participation through the user comments and the nurturing of online communities'
- 'We must transparently interact with an audience... and the result will be an engaged audience with whom we will have a deep relationship' (Stack, 2010: n/p).

Each of these exemplary statements heavily echoes the rhetoric of, respectively, democratisation of participation; amelioration of audiences through a less hierarchical Web based communication; transparency, openness and sharing at all levels; that is ingrained in Web 2.0, and that has made this paradigm so successful among those that seek in the digital a liberation from cultural hierarchies, control over information, and intellectual subordination to established expertises.

By adhering to the dictates of Web 2.0, Tate Online will become 'more porous', a 'deep, rich experience' that will 'driv[e] visitors to explore further and deeper into the collection online' (Stack, 2010: n/p): the museum will therefore find public participation in its mandate for social and cultural engineering, a direct digital translation of the overarching goal it already works toward in the context of the physical gallery. The difficulty, however, in realising such lofty utopia can be read in the partial, incomplete success of Tate Online to fulfil its goals in 2012, as well as the pernicious persistence of unresolved problems that the document itself acknowledges – among them, the problem of how to differentiate expertise and 'institutional' voice from 'public voices, as the museum can hardly do away with its authority even in a digitally democratic context; innumerable issues of copyright; the underlying (and, if we are to agree with Doctorow and others, incorrect) assumption that inclusion and calls for participation will automatically kickstart a virtuous circle of sharing and lively debate (Kellogg Smith, 2006).

## **Conclusion**

In spite of a slow progress in actually deploying its own mandates, Tate Online's web page shows (and along with it many other online museum presences) that change steeped into realistic, pragmatic attitudes toward the institution, the public and the Web's own ontology can lead to improved platforms for the dissemination of museal material and expertise. The dangers, however, are many and, counter to the widespread concepts of the Web as a radically new space, tend to reflect the philosophical issues that museums always had to wrestle with since their very inception: balancing the institution and the audience's voices, while upholding the museum's mandate as preserver of heritage, as well as educator; tireless and expensive work to develop and disseminate authoritative information in a context where, almost without exception, one size does not fit all; and the need to remain current and relevant, without recurring to flimsy paradigms and technocratic optimism, a hundred years ago as much as today.

## References

- Bey, H. (1991) *TAZ: The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism*. Autonomedia.
- Berners Lee, T. (2007) 'DeveloperWorks Interview: Tim Berners Lee'. <http://www.ibm.com/developerworks/podcast/dwi/cm-int082206.txt>.
- Bishop, C. (2006) 'Utopia and Avant Gardes'. *Tate Modern Study Day Even*, Tate Modern.
- Bourriaud, N. (1995) "Correspondence: Nicolas Bourriaud/Philippe Parreno" *Paletten* 4/95, No. 223, Vol. 56.
- Braungart, W. (2005) 'Art, Science, Utopia in the Early Modern Period.' *Thinking Utopia: Steps into Other Worlds*. Berghahn Books.
- Carr, N. (2005) 'The Amortality of Web 2.0'. *rougtype.com*. <http://www.rougtype.com/?p=110>.
- Carrier, D. (2006) *Museum Skepticism: A History of the Display of Art in Public Galleries*. Duke University Press.
- Coyne, R. (1999) *Technoromanticism*. MIT Press.
- Doctorow, C. (2001) 'Metacrap'. <http://www.well.com/~doctorow/metacrap.htm>.
- Duncan, C. (1993) *The Aesthetics of Power*. Cambridge University Press.
- English, T. (2007) 'Hans Haacke, or the Museum as Degenerate Utopia.' *Kriticos* vol. 4.
- Findlen, P. (1989) 'The Museum: Its Classical Etymology and Renaissance Genealogy.' *Journal of the History of Collections*. Oxford Journals.
- Fraser, A. (2005) 'From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique'. *Artforum*, 44:1.
- Goodman, N. (1985) 'The End of the Museum?' *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*. Harvard.
- Harvey, D. (2000) *Spaces of Hope*. California, University of California Press.
- Jameson, F. (2004) 'The Politics of Utopia'. *New Left Review*. London.
- Johansson, T.D. (2006) 'Art in the context of design, design in the context of art.' *Working Papers in Art and Design* 4.
- Kellogg Smith, M. (2006) 'Viewer tagging in art museums: Comparisons to concepts and vocabularies of art museum visitors'. *DLSIT*. University of Arizona.

- Kumar, K. (2005) 'Aspects of the Western Utopian Tradition'. *Thinking Utopia: Steps into Other Worlds*. Berghahn Books.
- Leiner, B. et al. (1999) 'Brief History of the Internet'. *Internet Society 20 Years*. <http://www.internetsociety.org/internet/internet-51/history-internet/brief-history-internet> .
- Levitas, R. (1990) *The Concept of Utopia*. Peter Lang.
- MacManus, R. (2005) 'What is Web 2.0' *ZDNet* <http://www.zdnet.com/blog/web2explorer/what-is-web-2-0/5> .
- Mayer, M. (2005) 'A Modern Puzzle: Rewriting the Place of the Visitor in Art Museum Education'. *Studies in Art Education*. National Art Education Association.
- O'Reilly, T. (2005) 'What is Web 2.0'. O'Reilly Media. <http://www.oreillynet.com/oreilly/tim/news/2005/09/30/what-is-web-20.html>
- Sciabarra, C. (1995) *Marx, Hayek and Utopia*. SUNY Press.
- Scott, D. (2007) 'Bubble 2.0: Organised Critique of Web 2.0' *Media in Transition* 5. <http://web.mit.edu/comm-forum/mit5/papers/TraversScott.pdf> .
- Stack, J. (2010) 'Tate Online Strategy 2010-2012' *Tate Papers* 13. Tate Online.
- Taylor, B. (1999) *Art for the Nation*. Manchester University Press.  
*Tate Online* web site <http://www.tate.org.uk/>
- Wilson, J. (1971) 'Is Utopia Possible?' *Oxford Journals: English*. The English Association.

**Author:**

Cristiano Agostino, BA Msc Msc  
PhD Candidate, History of Art, University of Edinburgh  
s0897254@sms.ed.ac.uk