

Viewpoint

Readers who feel that they have something they would like to say, which is not strictly a research report but which could be included under the heading Viewpoint, are invited to submit papers to the Journal in the usual way. Such papers will normally be between 4,000 and 8,000 words in length.

Dumbing down intellectual culture: Frank Furedi, lifelong learning and museums.

Jean Barr*

University of Glasgow

Introduction

I have become intrigued by a debate which has been underway for some time in the United Kingdom. This involves museum and gallery directors and administrators, cultural workers, and the Institute of Ideas. The Institute of Ideas which operates from an office in London, was launched in 2000; it says on its website that its mission is to 'expand the boundaries of public debate by organizing conferences, discussions and salons, and publishing written conversations and exchanges'. The debate has largely escaped the notice of adult educationalists such as myself. Yet many of the themes and polarities are familiar to our tribe. On one side are defenders of wider access and social inclusion policies and practices on the part of art galleries and museums; on the other, representing something of a backlash against such policies and practices, are those who see in them an oversimplification or dumbing down of complex ideas and artworks. Some of the latter accuse gallery staff of dabbling in 'therapy' or 'social work' rather than education when they seek to broaden their visitor base. The resonances with long-standing debates within adult and higher education are obvious.

Much of the debate is widely accessible in the 'quality' press, in arts magazines and on the web, and it is conducted in a singularly bad-tempered manner, conveying to a relative outsider such as myself a degree of passion I have seldom encountered since that period in the 1970s when different factions of the Left berated one another over such pressing issues as whether or not Russia should be described as a 'state capitalist' society. It resonates, too, with the so-called 'Culture Wars' which raged in the United States in the 1980s and 1990s and which were experienced by some of its participants as a life and death struggle over the very continuation of the western world or culture itself.

It may be that what gives the current version of the debate its particular tone and urgency is the much inflated role of the arts and 'culture' in modern consumer capitalism (dubbed a 'design-and-display' culture by Hal Foster, 2002). Museums have become the focus of political and economic attention in recent years in ways analogous to that paid to adult education, which, until the current political drive towards 'lifelong learning', scarcely registered in the attention span of politicians.

Some academics argue that since the 1970s at least, it is as a space of *consumption* that the museum has increasingly come to be defined and that the notion of 'access' needs to be viewed in relation to this: 'Access within the arts and heritage industries has been associated most of all with consumerism. Issues of access in terms of citizenship rights, though lip service has been paid to them, has had a less prominent position in practice than the emphasis on consumer wants' (Hetherington, 2000: 450; see also 2003a and 2003b). Increasingly across the globe buildings such as the Guggenheim Museum at Bilbao are used as brands in the marketing of cities, an aspect of what Hal Foster refers to as the contemporary inflation of design and display: 'Design is inflated as the package all but replaces the product' (Foster, 2002:20).

Yet the claim that broadening access is a move towards the market and away from public service - though familiar to many of us - must be viewed with suspicion and interrogated for the vested interests which so often lie behind it; it also needs to be viewed historically.

The History of adult education

Museum debates about access have entered the space of cultural politics, but in ways which seem scantily informed by longstanding debates within adult education, some of which are particularly relevant to the museum debates. This is surprising, given the role played by adult education, historically, in the emergence of cultural studies (and *ipso facto*, museum studies), a relationship most clearly embodied in the life and work of Raymond Williams, one of British cultural studies' founding fathers, and an adult educator with the Workers Educational Association for many years (see Steele, 1997).

Adult education (as a field of study and practice) draws on many traditions, as Tom Steele informs us:

At least two strands stand in some degree of contradiction to each other and in some respects a very persuasive story of adult education is how these two strands have confronted each other and, through the agency of teachers and activists from both sides, produced interesting outcomes' (Steele, 2004: 1).

Histories of adult education in the UK usually mention this duality but most histories stress the role of universities, colleges and leading liberal intellectuals in extending (access to) educational opportunities to working people (portrayed as 'in deficit'), especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The other (sometimes neglected) half of the story is that of popular educational movements that were often self-help in style and radically political in motivation. Most of the key events in (official) adult education's history in Britain need to be seen as much in terms of upward pressure 'from below' for education as in terms of provision 'from above'.

Thus, had it not been for the demand of Glasgow artisans for technical and political understanding, George Birkbeck might not have pursued the idea of Mechanics' Institutes; without the demand of excluded middle class women and workers for university education, James Stuart might not have persuaded Cambridge to begin its extension lectures; if workers, newly organized into trades unions and fired by socialist ideals had not demanded high level study of social, economic and political studies, Alfred Mansbridge might not have persuaded Oxford to support the Workers' Educational Association. However, 'the contradictory narrative running through all these collaborations is as much one of *containment* as enlightenment' (Steele, 2004: 1; see also Fieldhouse, 1996). According to this narrative, we cannot understand developments in access to education without understanding this duality. Such an understanding might usefully inform the museums debate around access. It does not inform Furedi's narrative, which frames the debate in much more monochrome tones.

The Institute of Ideas

The debate centres on the notion of 'dumbing down', or in Frank Furedi's words, 'twentieth first century philistinism', as he refers to it in book, *Where Have All the Intellectuals Gone?* (2004). Furedi is a leading light in the Institute of Ideas, which is itself the subject of some lively debate on the web because it is a re-formation of a group who once published the bankrupted magazine, *Living Marxism* (later titled simply *LM*), itself a reincarnation of the Revolutionary Communist Party, a breakaway from the International Socialist party (IS). But we should not be misled into thinking the Institute of Ideas is of the left, caution its critics. According to such critics, including George Monbiot, the group's success is explained in terms of its willingness to support the most brutal policies of the right and to oppose environmentalism, poll tax demonstrations, the anti-apartheid movement and trade union campaigns against spending cuts (see O'Neill, 2002a; Cohen, 2002; Monbiot, 2003).

The Institute of Ideas recently hosted a conference in London on the role of intellectuals. In an article in *The Guardian* newspaper, written to accompany the conference, Furedi takes up the theme of the estrangement of intellectuals from the public. Increasingly, he says,

intellectuals direct their writing at other experts in their field and, especially in the academy, their work is more and more jargon-ridden and incomprehensible to all but an inner circle. Few spaces exist to encourage public conversation about the key issues of the day. The punch line comes when he gives his diagnosis. The immediate question, says Furedi, is whether or not intellectuals are prepared to cultivate a public for their ideas: 'The real issue is not whether or not academics have a public role to play. The question is whether they have a public to interact with. And that to a considerable extent depends on how seriously they take the public and how seriously they take ideas' (Furedi, 2003:16). Furedi's thesis is that intellectuals in Britain – defined by him as universalist thinkers whose role is to search for Truth (his capitalization, as Aaronovitch points out) and who speak out publicly on contemporary issues of the day – are dying out in Britain and, more generally, elsewhere. The result of this is a growing philistinism throughout all aspects of life (see Aaronovitch, 2004).

The term 'intellectual' is a job description, not a commendation, comments Terry Eagleton. There are dim-witted ones just as there are incompetent chefs. One mark of the classical intellectual, recently dubbed a 'theorist', says Eagleton, was that he or she refused to be pinned down to a single discipline; the idea was to bring ideas to bear critically on social life as a whole. A snap definition would be 'more or less the opposite of an academic' (Eagleton, 2004:48).¹

A culture of flattery

Furedi's main idea is that intellectual life has been undermined by the pursuit of inclusion *for its own sake*, by the desire of the 'cultural elite' not to exclude anyone, with the result that universities and museums alike adopt policies that 'flatter' students and visitors. The biggest culprit here is the public policy of widening access to higher education. Whilst many have seen this as democratization on the cheap, broadening access without the resources necessary to maintain the standards of the narrow system, the issue for Furedi is not about resources *per se* but about *loosening standards in order not to exclude* potential new entrants. 'University lecturers are put under pressure to mark positively... Galleries and museums are charged with affirming visitors, and ensuring that they don't feel overwhelmed or daunted by their experience' (Furedi, 2004:121). Art and culture become substitute forms of cohesion, participation and self-esteem in a deeply divided society: rather than tackle the underlying social and economic causes of these divisions, culture is used (by government and the 'cultural elite') to make us *feel good* about ourselves. In this way, social exclusion is made to appear to be a psychological matter.

The market *per se* is less corrosive than the social inclusion agenda itself, says Furedi: 'The imperative of social engineering, rather than the market, today represents the greatest threat to the integrity of intellectual and cultural production. Compared to the politics of inclusion, the problems posed by the entertainment industry pale into insignificance' (Furedi, 2004:113). In a review of Furedi's book, Terry Eagleton comments that this is because the policy of social inclusion belittles the capacities of the very people it claims to serve, implying that excellence and popular participation are bound to be opposites, thereby 'slighting people's capacity for self-transformation under cover of flattering their current identities' (Eagleton, 2004: 49).

I think that this elegant reformulation in fact flatters Furedi, who seldom locates himself as explicitly, theoretically and intellectually. In fact Furedi is more concerned to stress that the cumulative impact of recent policy is the 'construction of a docile and conformist public' and that an anti-elitist 'celebration of the ordinary' or 'culture of flattery', instead of promoting public engagement with the sphere of ideas, only 'reinforces people's estrangement from this realm' (Furedi, 2004:136). In place of the traditional role of artists and intellectuals in cultivating the public imagination and enlightening people, the role of the 'cultural elite' becomes to 'validate and celebrate it' (Furedi, 2004:151).

Further, 'The massive expansion of the universities, the rise of credentialism and the growing intervention of the state in cultural life have reduced the terrain on which the public can exercise its autonomy. Policies which fly the flag of inclusion, access and participation lead to the encroachment of official institutions into people's lives' stimulating a mood of conformism

and leading to the 'colonization of people's informal lives' (Furedi, 2004:154). Intellectuals need an intelligent public and artists need an engaged critical audience, insists Furedi, but 'the politics of cultural flattery create little incentive for people to rise to the occasion' (Furedi, 2004:155). At the same time, postmodernists have provided an alibi for philistinism through their relativism: everything is, more or less, equally valid. Furedi ends his book with a rallying cry. We can do little about the 'cultural elites' who influence and regulate the flow of cultural ideas: 'But we can wage a battle of ideas for the hearts and minds of the public. How we do this is one of the key questions of our time' (Furedi, 2004:156).

This formulation and use of 'we' makes clear Furedi's self-perception as located outside these elites, situating himself as an autonomous public intellectual. It also suggests an essentially one way traffic in terms of intellectual authority, *from* self-styled critical intellectuals to the listening audience/public, a notion that comes uncomfortably close to the traditional figure of the universal intellectual as authoritative legislator, leading society towards enlightenment. This seems contradictory and perverse in view of his apparent championing of ordinary people's capacities and also in view of the fact that Furedi has himself become an example of those he derides – a star of the capitalist media and provider of soundbites to whoever will listen (see Cohen, 2002).

The fall of the public intellectual

Marjorie Garber is suspicious of people, like Furedi, who display nostalgia for a supposed golden past. She argues that the current nostalgia for 'lost' public intellectuals is, like all nostalgias, produced retrospectively and structured like a fantasy - the implication being that assertions about it bear scant relation to any supporting evidence (Garber, 2001:51). David Aaronovitch is caustic. In his view, Furedi really wants to go back to 'Cambridge 1936, to that fabulous race of warrior dons who knew everything, to the days when intellectuals were intellectuals and women were their wives and mistresses, to a world when some people got to talk and never had to listen' (Aaronovitch, 2004:4). Certainly, Furedi has nothing at all to say about how the condition of being an intellectual is complicated by being female or/and non-white, failing even to register that one of the most significant changes in the 'knowledge class' in recent years has been its altered gender and, to a lesser degree, ethnic constitution.

According to the Institute of Ideas, accessibility and inclusiveness are part of a new political agenda that has come to dominate museum policy, as well as education. This, in their view, makes museums seek their rationale in something external to themselves – 'The People'. As a result, museums have abandoned scholarship and rigour, causing a reversal in the role and purpose of museums. Mark Ryan, a member of the Institute of Ideas, takes up this point in a strangely abstract incantation in an article in *Living Marxism*, Summer, 2000: 'Whatever tries to justify itself by reference to something unrelated to it should be treated with scorn and derision...At the end...we may find the cultural landscape bleak and bare...Better less, but better' (quoted in O'Neill, 2002a:36).

This is odd. Radicals do not usually see artistic culture as being of unequivocal value, always and everywhere positive. They are usually mindful of the abuse and exploitation so often at its roots and how culture is in many ways complicit with unsavoury forms of power. So, although this does not invalidate art for them, their approach to it tends to be more tentative and multi-faceted; they avoid being too sweeping about the matter in the manner of their liberal humanist colleagues who tend to see it as politically innocent (see Eagleton, 2003:100-1). And after all, Raymond Williams, a hero of radical adult education, insisted that 'culture is ordinary': artistic and culture in the sense of a 'way of life', are mutually dependent and everyone has a part to play in defining what they mean. To insist on the separateness of art from everyday life is to miss the significance of this ordinariness which is the wellspring of all art (Williams, 1993a). We can contrast this with Furedi's notion of the current 'celebration of the ordinary', which he derides.

Re-framing the debate

The arts-for-arts-sake (and pure knowledge-for-its-own-sake) philosophy is a familiar one. It incorporates an educational philosophy and mode of communicating which has changed very

little since its heyday in the Victorian 'universal' museum whose displays aspired to be detached, academic and decontextualised (outside time and politics) and which actually privileged a *specific* Western aesthetic (of cultural elites) over other meanings and frames. In a recent article on Enlightenment museums in *Museum and Society*, Mark O'Neill, Head of Glasgow Museums, observes that a specific type of intelligent visitor is presupposed in this philosophy, one who is 'intelligent' and well-educated. Intelligence from this perspective equates with 'educated'; it is one dimensional, clear and simple. It does not depict that complex and wide spectrum of inherited and nurtured abilities (culturally and variably valued) which is emphasized in other educational philosophies. Correspondingly, the way such so-called universal museums engage with visitors (their mode of address, as it were) is narrowly metropolitan – implicitly insisting on being the centre, not simply geographically, but as the *point from which* all other viewpoints are viewed and judged: 'The clearest evidence for this is the almost complete absence of any but the curatorial voice from their displays', says O'Neill (O'Neill, 2004:198).

Mark O'Neill quotes Ryan's 'bleak and bare' sentiment, referred to above, in a searing riposte entitled 'The people versus' which first appeared in *Museums Journal*, February 2002, and was later reprinted in the arts magazine, *Engage*. O'Neill's main object of criticism is the Institute of Ideas itself, which, under the banner of 'Conversations in Print', had recently produced a booklet on museums, *Museums for 'The People'?* (Appleton, 2001). The introduction to the booklet, written by Ryan, makes clear the Institute's own self-perception as honest, radical, challenging, nonconformist, committed to open debate and, above all, to the importance of *intellect*. O'Neill comments on the opening essay by Josie Appleton whose title is that of the pamphlet: 'Appleton suffers badly from assumptions' (O'Neill, 2002a:35). Appleton asserts that 'the core activities of curatorship and scholarship' are 'swamped by an ever-expanding array of "audience-related" activities' as a result of 'a remorseless growth of education, helpdesk and marketing functions' (Appleton, 2001:21). O'Neill says simply, 'For museum staff, combining research with an awareness of visitors *is* the job', continuing, 'The lol's desperate clinging to reason-without-awareness means it is more likely that it is not honest from choice but from incapacity. Its intensity is reminiscent of a phenomenon noted in millenarian sects – when the world fails to end on the appointed day, belief increases rather than decreases' (O'Neill, 2002a:36).

Contesting the backlash to access

The point about incapacity hits home, I believe. It is taken up by Liz Ellis, artist and arts educator at Tate Modern, in a succinct rebuttal of what she calls 'the backlash to access' in an article of that title (Ellis, 2002). Ellis reminds us that those involved in gallery education are more often than not, women, often working part-time, and that to do the work is demanding, requiring excellent interpersonal communication. Yet, 'Denigration of the skills required to work with new audiences runs as a subtext through the glib dismissal of work with socially excluded groups; but then the refusal of a critical framework is essential if a powerful group is to stay in charge of institutions. We should not be too surprised by the casual sexism hidden in the supposed "debate"' (Ellis, 2002:41).

However, the real problem is that Furedi, like others at the Institute of Ideas, produces absolutely no evidence to support his assertions. It is particularly ironic that his defence of traditional academic values is founded on an unwillingness to engage with empirical research and its implications. Ellis dismisses the notion that those involved in access work are causing the 'important' work (academic study) to be neglected. On the basis of her own research and her own experience as an arts educator and researcher, she argues that such critics of access work have no direct experience of it; they thus fall back on abstract ideas and as a result give inaccurate accounts of gallery education. They literally do not know what they are talking about. Ellis believes that gallery education which aims to widen access is caricatured 'in order to contemptibly dismiss its role in examining inequalities of power' (2002:40). Millions of Britons contribute to and underwrite the cultural provision that a minority of us enjoy regularly, yet they do not feel entitled to what it offers. This, for Ellis, is the main point. Those who oppose broadening access want to maintain their privileges – or, as Aaronovitch puts it: 'They don't

want the unwashed walking through their corridors or inspecting their books' (Aaronovitch, 2004:4). What is at stake here is question of the neutrality of cultural spaces such as schools, universities and museums.

Museums as ritual spaces

The art critic and historian, Carol Duncan, is clear that the possibility of a better educated, more democratic and socially inclusive society poses a serious challenge to what art and cultural institutions are actually *for* and how they operate. Duncan, unlike Furedi *et al.* does not take museums to be, as she puts it, 'neutral sheltering places for objects'. Rather, she sees museums and art galleries as culturally partisan, as, indeed, ritual spaces whose setting is a kind of script or scenario which visitors perform. According to Duncan, 'a museum's central meanings, *its meanings as a museum*, are structured through its ritual' (Duncan, 1995: 2).

In framing her argument Duncan draws on the pioneering museum research of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu which, amongst other things, assessed curatorial responses to attempts to democratize access and to encourage new visitors in the 1960s. As she observes, Bourdieu's conclusions lend credence to the argument that museum visiting is a kind of ritual whose successful performance depends on the possession of relatively high volumes of cultural capital. His argument was that cultural policies which aimed to encourage visiting were most likely to succeed with those people whose prolonged exposure to schooling, an exposure that is in turn correlated with social class, provided them with the means of successfully decoding museum meanings (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991: 95-9). Thus, an important aspect of the 'right' cultural capital is that middle class children are likely to inherit a love for these things and to feel *entitled* to be present whilst they are also likely to be at ease in these places.

Duncan notes that in collaboration with Alain Darbel, Bourdieu interviewed hundreds of museum visitors and documented how art museums give to some a sense of belonging and cultural ownership whilst making others feel excluded and inferior (Duncan 1995: 4-5; Bourdieu and Darbel, 1991). She adds that those most able to respond to the cues of the museum ritual are also those whose identities (social, sexual, racial) it most *fully* confirms: '[w]hat we see and do not see in art museums - and on what terms and by whose authority we do or do not see it - is closely linked to larger questions about who constitutes the community and who defines its identity' (Duncan, 1995:8-9). For her then, art galleries reinforce the existing power structure – *because that is what they are for*.

A parallel and related point can be made about higher education in Britain. Despite the widening access strategies of recent years, little has changed as far as the cultural dominance, both structural and symbolic, of our most elite institutions is concerned. In terms of the patterns of institutional power enshrined in them and the centrality of certain ideas and definitions of knowledge, they have changed scarcely a jot. And whilst access to higher education increases (and may further widen) the most economically rewarding jobs and those with the greatest cultural authority will still tend to go to graduates of the elite universities (see Segal, 2002; Brown, 1997). I return to this issue below.

Custodians of culture

Similarly, it is important not to forget that although the position of the subject (the visitor) within museums has changed in recent years (and dramatically so in recent times, as museums have had to compete with other, mostly popular, cultural forms of spectatorial display) *the status of the object* has changed much more slowly. Museums are still primarily *places of conservation*:

Bought, bequeathed, lent, given, even stolen (some would say in relation to the practices of colonialism), objects have found their way into museums and been constituted thereby as conservable objects held in trust for the nation, the local community or for future generations. Museums remain spaces of the object first and of the subject second.... It is this privileging of the object that has done most to reinforce the idea of the museum as a space of seeing – a space of the 'do not touch' (Hetherington, 2000: 451).

There may have emerged the recognition that visitors come with brown, blue, old, gendered, sexed and so on, eyes which see things in different ways:

...but the idea that such a multitude of eyes might come to the museum with their bodies attached creates potential problems for the conservation minded. And access for those with disabilities, including visual impairments raises precisely such a prospect (Hetherington, 2000: 451)

It has been suggested that the embargo on touching objects in museums is increasingly being questioned but that it is the status of *who* does the touching and knowing which is crucial rather than the use of touch *per se*. Fiona Candlin, an adult educator at Birkbeck College, London, believes that it is *expert territory* and vested academic interests that are at stake here. Blind and visually impaired people's demand for access through touch is challenging not just because it brings individuals' rights of access into conflict with museum conservation. Rather, concerns over conservation may mask and serve to legitimate preconceptions about *who* should have access to collections; *what* counts as 'dirt' and *how* art and artifacts are to be understood and, indeed, enjoyed. In other words, perhaps it is *expertise* rather than conservation of objects which is at stake, and resistance to touch in museums is less a concern for preservation than it is a defence of territory and expertise (Candlin, 2004; see also Latour, 1993).

I wonder if this insight can be applied to what divides Furedi *et al.* from their critics. Although there is no longer a standard *student* in our universities, the status and nature of what counts as *knowledge* enshrined in them has actually changed very little, paralleling their continuing and deeply entrenched patterns of institutional power. Furedi, by dividing the world into intellectuals and the rest clearly displays his own anxieties and blindspots. These seem to have much to do with preconceptions about who should have access to knowledge and knowledge creation, about what should count as legitimate knowledge and about how this should be understood and developed.

Furedi laments the 'loss' of a public for *his* ideas and has little or nothing to say about independent sources of knowledge, particularly those older collective styles of producing knowledge in learned societies, groups and social movements which have been the mainstay (and underlying dynamic) of adult education – adult education, perceived that is, as itself a social movement (or 'coalition of the willing', as Tom Steele has recently referred to it; see Steele, 2005). In other words, his status as custodian of culture is at stake. He remains an old-fashioned, reactionary elitist.

A more democratic intellect?

I want to suggest that there is a similar line of defence – of territory and expertise - which divides the left at present and which impacts on a number of social movements. This divergence of standpoints is influenced, crucially, by different philosophies of education and a conflict of political cultures. This difference is evident, for example, in the European Social Forum (ESF). The ESF is inspired by the global slogan 'Another world is possible', which, countering the fatalism of 'There is no alternative', helped unite people seeking a different world *now* and not just 'after the revolution'. The slogan emerged out of the 'anti-capitalist' or 'social justice' movement, recently expressed as 'a networked movement of movements', emphasizing new social actors creating *new* links and practices (see Levidow, 2004; Klein, 2003; Waterman, 2003).²

I suggest that there are parallels in this development with that strong adult education tradition which is committed to the collective creation of knowledge, where community-based, 'dialogically inclined' groups of activists and citizens work collaboratively to examine their experiences and practices with a view to transforming society in democratic directions. This frames adult education practices as an analogue of the participatory democracy it seeks (see Brookfield, 2003).

The terms, 'horizontals' and 'verticals', have been used to express divergent political models or cultures which developed within the movement. According to a prevalent model of left politics, the main task is mobilization through *spectacle*, an ideal arena for selling party

newspapers and recruiting members (see Levidow, 2004). From a different perspective the anti-capitalist movement is an opportunity to create horizontal networks, inspire creativity, ask new questions and mobilize practical alternatives here and now. For example, web designers and media collectives proposed interactive websites and a cheap method of technological simultaneous translation, but the organizers chose to organize the event vertically.

Vincenzo Ruggiero has pinpointed the contrasts between these two political cultures: The members of 'vertical' ones are essentially a *resource* to strengthen the *leadership's* capacity to implement decisions (compare this with Furedi's formulation of the relationship between intellectuals and their need for a public for *their* ideas). Italian delegates at the European Social Forum 2004 Programme Working Group criticized the British contingent for their unwillingness or 'incapacity' (that word again) to discuss things, and for seeing *their* concerns (but no-one else's) as of universal significance (Benzi *et al.*, 2004). In contrast, 'horizontals' draw their strength from the 'participatory intensity of their members and from the breadth of networks which their activities inform' and such movements 'take shape while trying out practices: to change the world and to change life are co-existing aims' (Ruggiero, 2004:46-9).

In a parallel fashion there are divergent educational philosophies underpinning museum education. A model of learning and engagement in cultural activities which is based on dissemination of the knowledge of experts is the model which in practice still drives much adult education in museums and it is one which goes against fostering participation in cultural activities. Museums have lost touch with best practice in adult learning believes David Anderson, the current Director of Learning and Interpretation at the Victoria and Albert Museum. Anderson draws on George Davie's book, *The Democratic Intellect*, for a philosophy to better inform museum education (see Anderson, 2000; Davie, 1961).

This philosophy derives from the Scottish Enlightenment of the eighteenth century; Davie is a contemporary Scottish philosopher who has warned against cultural apartheid and made the case for a 'common sense', where the expertise of individuals is illuminated by and accountable to the understanding of the public. 'Common sense' can be read here as 'democratic' and it refers to the social distribution of knowledge and understanding and to the processes of their generation. The notion has roots in cultural traditions which emphasize 'democratic intellect' rather than intellectual elites and rule by experts. The role of museums in this model is to foster skills, creativity and learning through their resources *and* to provide a space for exchange and debate with and by the wider public.³

Anderson provides an example. The emergence of digital media technology is likely to have the most profound and rapid impact on the nature of adult learning in museums. Most museum staff and certainly most European funding streams seem to assume that the most important application of these technologies is to put their collections on-line. The old fallacy – that learning is about the absorption of information and that the curator's expertise is the most useful information, flowing one way from museum to public – is thus 'resurrected anew in the digital age' (Anderson, 2000:9).

Anderson believes that more investment should be put into the development of museums as participatory public digital spaces. The point here is that digital media provide a huge opportunity to bring into museums a tide of ideas and expertise generated in the wider society and which is much greater than museums themselves can contribute to the huge sea of learning which surrounds them. And as knowledge of technology is increasingly acquired by creative artists and educators as well as the public there will be a huge potential for learning through museums to be developed through the informed 'common sense' of the public.

Culture is ordinary; learning is ordinary

Raymond Williams wrote inspiringly about adult education and culture. His starting point was that 'Culture is ordinary' and that any discussion about the relation between the arts and culture must begin with the recognition of the symbolic creativity in *everyday* ordinary culture. For Williams, the place to start from in the search for new and expanded 'audiences' for the arts, museums and galleries is not from within institutional perspectives and traditions. The place to start from is people in their everyday life and the ordinary human symbolic creativity involved

there in making meaning. And, returning to one of Williams's central convictions, already referred to above: to insist on the separateness of art from everyday life or to view the world of ordinary people, including the least well educated, as a cultural desert from which they can be saved by doses of art and culture is to miss the significance of this ordinariness which is the wellspring of all art (Williams, 1993a).

Starting from people means recognizing that most of the learning that people do is done informally and without the help of educational institutions. This is something that adult educators take particularly seriously. Informal learning reminds us that learning, like culture, is ordinary. It occurs throughout life, in a whole host of affiliations and networks, from books, TV, the internet, visiting galleries, films and museums. Education ought to make *extraordinary sense* of this ordinary activity and experience, says Jane Thompson, Principal Research Officer for NIACE. It should help people to examine critically what is already known by adding new insight and different knowledge and so help them use their creativity more effectively (Thompson, 2002). That is to say it should start from where people are but not leave them there.

Few would dispute that although 'lifelong learning' enjoys increasing prominence in arts and policy discussions, as well as in education and training circles, it is not a 'big idea' that has so far provoked much enthusiasm amongst its targeted potential recipients. European lifelong learning policy has emphasized formal educational institutions such as colleges, universities and traditional adult education and has tended to see museums as marginal. This is changing, as awareness grows that learning and culture are two sides of the same coin. And it is precisely, putting school visits to one side, because visiting libraries, galleries and museums is a voluntary activity associated with entertainment and pleasure (and is not associated in the public's mind with education with a big E) that their potential contribution to the expansion of informal and non-formal learning opportunities is huge, particularly with those previously excluded or marginalized.

Most museums continue to provide adult education services for their existing audiences rather than try to engage excluded groups in their activities, although there are some examples of work in publications such as *Bread and Roses* and *Museums and Adults Learning* which suggests that the picture is changing (Thompson, 2002; Chadwick and Stannett; 2000). Both publications stress the contextual and social nature of learning, as well as the active and multiple nature of 'intelligence'. They also emphasize that what is not needed is *adding on* a few short-term targeted projects for the regularly disregarded in order to appease political pressure. Such a 'social welfare' approach, though encouraged by current funding regimes, may serve institutional funding interests, but it does little about genuinely widening (not just increasing) access and participation.

The expansion of higher education

What can we learn about access (and 'standards') from the case of the expansion of higher education? The British government's relentless reduction of spending per student head in a context of expansion in student numbers in higher education is directly responsible for ever-worsening conditions at 'new' post 1992 universities. These are the 'old' 'polytechnics' ('central institutions' in Scotland) which, in the late 1960s and 1970s, along with the Workers Educational Association and some of the 'red brick' universities, pioneered some of the most creative anti-elitist work (and 'challenge to knowledge') which helped transform the conservatism of the academic profession.⁴ Arguably, this work represented an experiment in 'democratic epistemology', to use Logie Barrow's striking phrase; part of it involved disclosing the cultural exclusion of subordinated groups within traditional disciplinary frameworks (see Barrow, 1986; Barr 1999).

One of the most pernicious effects of the government's widening participation strategy (in a context of expansion but inadequate resources) could be to solidify existing hierarchies (of institutions and knowledge) within higher education. The older, elite universities have jumped on the bandwagon by appointing widening access officers to encourage recruitment of students from non-traditional backgrounds, drawing on the supplement paid to universities specifically for this purpose. The result is more bureaucrats, more government friendly personnel and more auditing (but few 'new' students). At the same time, the successful old

polytechnics are becoming the 'failing' new universities. How could it be otherwise when they were forced to line up and be assessed on a single hierarchical scale? (see Segal, 2002).

In addition to this, the old universities cream off some of those students who might previously have gone to the polytechnics, and the poorer new universities have to shed staff, as their student numbers fall, mainly because less privileged students drop out because of debts incurred paying for their courses – courses which league tables encourage them to think lead to inferior qualifications. Recent reports suggest that access to the older universities by working class students may even be lower than in the 1980s, whilst the proportion of mature students from working class backgrounds has fallen in recent years. Most working class students in higher education are in further and higher education colleges and post '92 universities, often in part-time courses. The higher education hierarchy could soon be set in stone (see Osborne, Gallacher and Crossan, 2004; Steele, 2005; Taylor, Barr and Steele, 2002).

One lesson to glean from all of this in the context of museum access is that add-on services which pose no real challenge to the traditions of the museum are unlikely to create new visitors from non-visitors; rather, access needs to be integral to the whole way a museum is organized (see Barr, 2004). For this, a more deeply rooted and sustained approach which draws on notions of 'democratic intellect', 'common sense' and what I call 'slow learning' (as in 'slow food') is more appropriate. I want to try to illustrate this with an example which I believe incorporates at least some aspects of such a philosophy of education.

Shifting practices

I come from Glasgow. A major transformation has been underway in Glasgow's museums and galleries for well over a decade. This has grown out of and at the same time departs from local traditions which, amongst other things, include the much frequented, celebrated and widely cherished 'People's Palace'. Located on Glasgow Green, place of rallies, marathons, suffragette marches and anti-conscription campaigns, the People's Palace has, since its inception in 1898, housed a museum, gallery, winter garden and music hall and has also been a place for popular education and entertainment. Its museum represents the city's history as a set of deeply interacting *relations* between ways of life and popular entertainment of ordinary Glaswegians on the one hand, and on the other, their political traditions, pointing up a history of struggles and of links between past and present (see Bennett, 1988).

When I was a girl my dad took me most Sundays either to the People's Palace or to Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum which, when it opened in 1902, was perhaps the greatest achievement of the British municipal movement. Glasgow's seven civic museums and galleries now receive three million visits annually – one million from the city (including half a million from working class communities). A third of the city's population visits museums once a year, a third more than once a year, and a third never. Consultation with non-visitors is revealing: some prefer other things, most are potentially interested but find them unwelcoming: 'not for the likes of us' is the expression often used. Many say they are too expensive, which is interesting because all are free and always have been (see O'Neill, 2002b).

For most of the 1990s a radical re-structuring of Glasgow galleries and museums took place. This resulted in much outrage from the critics. This re-structuring continues with the refurbishment of Kelvingrove Art Gallery and Museum. The planning of the redisplay of Kelvingrove involved consultation with an Education Forum and a Community Advisory Panel with members drawn from alliances built up over years through the city's Open Museum, the name for its community outreach department. This has shaped every decision taken about the new gallery and museum, including approaches to themes, themes selected for display, and the style of interpretation. It is a slow, sustained approach to social inclusion which is committed to finding new ways to work with people and the objects which they as citizens own. It is based explicitly on a notion of democratic ownership of cultural wealth which is quite inconsistent with the idea of bolting on education as an optional extra: 'We are committed to ensuring that every citizen has access, as a matter of right, to their collections, not only through outreach but by making the museums themselves more accessible' (O'Neill, 2002b:42).

The Open Museum did not just take exhibitions out to people but worked with local

people to *create* displays. In the Preface to a report on this work, Mark O'Neill comments that traditional museum workers assume that the kind of impacts aimed at in the Open Museum – an increase in personal self-confidence, a greater sense of being able to generate meaningful experiences – are not appropriate objectives of museums. Appropriate objectives are seen to be presenting the facts of history or science or enabling a purely aesthetic experience. But, says O'Neill, implicit in this is a narrow definition of the role of museums as places where those with the appropriate background can go to learn more about what they *already* feel confident about. O'Neill comments, 'Those with a stake in society feel they have inherited its valued public culture – its 'heritage'. Excluded people do not feel this sense of belonging or inheritance' (or even entitlement). Well, says O'Neill, 'if self confidence is a pre-condition for a positive approach to the task of making sense of life, and for visiting and enjoying museums, then providing museum services which develop self-confidence seems perfectly appropriate' (O'Neill, 2002b: 6).

On being a good enough visitor

In fact, many people who feel comfortable in museums, the typical visitor perhaps, actually know very little about the objects on display. However, because they have the crucial understanding of how galleries and museums work, this enables them to feel they belong. They may even resist better displays of information, seeing this as patronizing, precisely, suggests O'Neill, because it threatens their privileged position. When their special knowledge is available to all they are no longer flattered (see O'Neill, 2001). Here he turns the tables on Frank Furedi. Cultural flattery is not new, although it may be more promiscuous nowadays. Perhaps this is why proposed changes are so fiercely contested, as they were in Glasgow in the 1990s.

Mark O'Neill has documented brilliantly the hostile reaction of critics in the press to mildly experimental exhibitions which took place in the city throughout the 1990s and which experimented (but really fairly mildly) with the content, display and interpretation of art in its galleries. The Stanley Spencer exhibition (1994) for example, was jointly curated by a social historian and art curator and had paintings from when he was a war artist in Greenock shipyards in a display setting which suggested this physical context. This exhibition, held in Kelvingrove Art Gallery, was 'hammered' in the *Glasgow Herald* for popularizing Spencer 'to bring the punters in'. By the time of the Birth of Impressionism Exhibition of 1997 which included other reconstructions such as the boat from which Monet did much of his painting, the critics had tasted blood and it was deemed by another newspaper, *Scotland on Sunday*, to be a positive danger to the general public. Yet whilst the critics were very angry with the curators, their implied target is also the *intended audience*:

All the critics strongly imply that anyone who enjoyed the exhibitions is somehow not a good enough person to be in an art gallery. If they liked the videos and the costume and the theatricality of the Birth of Impressionism, if they thought the shipyard sets were evocative, if they found St Mungo's inspiring, if they thought the eclectic mix in Glasgow's Gallery of Modern Art exciting, then they were punters, they can't take their art neat, they are shoppers or voyeurs in a pornography shop, they have a mental age of four, and are so weak-minded that they might be damaged by the exhibition; they are the kind of ghouls who would enjoy public executions. This kind of exhibition, the critics say, is no longer for us, who belong here, but for *them*, who don't (O'Neill, 2001:7)

The views of the critics referred to by Mark O'Neill resonate with criticisms of those art galleries and universities which attempt to be more socially inclusive that they are 'dumbing down', turning away from anything *difficult* and pretending that everything can be made easy. O'Neill reminds those who romanticize an earlier golden age that it never existed and that there has only ever been a tiny minority of the population privileged enough with time, wealth and leisure to grapple with subjects of intellectual difficulty. It is also mean-minded to the extent that 'it implies that people whose life opportunities have been limited by poverty, illness, poor education and discrimination, have to undergo some sort of painful initiation, to earn the right to basic information about what they as citizens own' (O'Neill, 2001:8). Cultural growth, says

Raymond Williams, needs 'full space' for difficulty and 'full time' for originality so that it is not just a continuation of the old rules. The experiment underway in Glasgow is one practical attempt to introduce *new rules*.

Full space, full time

The point which needs to be underlined is that, far from simply 'including' a wider 'public', museums could (and some do) promote the active and critical engagement of the public. Crucially, this requires recognizing how culture relates to power, as well as to education and to creative agency. Bourdieu adds to our understanding here. His research into museum visiting shows how the museum's pedagogical success in engaging with visitors depends on the latter's learnt ability to interpret displays which, in turn, depends on culture and family background. Interpretation of high culture and the institutionalized opportunities to acquire such interpretive skills are both subject to the *same rules*. Thus a vicious circle of the reproduction of cultural capital is created and initial inequalities are intensified. Simply increasing access does not address this issue; nor does 'outreach' (taking the museum to the community) either physically or electronically/digitally.

For Bourdieu there are no cultivated people, only cultivated *pleasures* which are acquired by systematic exercise and *habitus*; in this, usually, museums enforce a kind of hegemony, by reinforcing 'for some the feeling of belonging and for others the feeling of exclusion' (Bourdieu and Darbel, 1991:110). Museums will only become places for 'the likes of us' when they become spaces for critical engagement, when, in the words of Sotiria Grek, 'they give the public meaningful opportunities to articulate voice and exchange ideas' (Grek, 2004,7).

Hal Foster insists that the fundamental stake in art and academy 'is the preservation, in an administered, affirmative culture, of spaces for critical debate and alternative vision' (Foster, 2001: xvii). Thus far the Right has dominated the public imagination of art and academy and 'while the left talked about the political importance of culture, the right practiced it. Its philosophers have succeeded where readers of Marx have not – they have transformed the world, and it will take a great struggle to transform it otherwise' (Foster, 2001:xvii). If we take this sentiment to heart it necessitates taking issue with those like Furedi who harbour a lost ideal against which the 'bad object' of the present is judged. Such fixation on the past is the other side of cynicism about the present.

Furedi *et al.* fail to see openings in the present for possible *new spaces* for critical debate and alternative ideas and practices. Some of the most interesting 'critical' projects which connect art/academy and 'life' have developed slowly and collaboratively over time with different groups *as a form of practice*, rather than as a kind of grand opposition. Developments such as those of the European Social Forum (ESF) 'horizontalists', and those which are underway in Glasgow's museums share an approach to the future which is experimental and open to new possibilities of thought and action. This contrasts with an approach which operates with a predetermined script. It also incorporates a particular notion of democracy which I suspect is not shared by Furedi.

In an interview with Brendan O'Neill, a recording of which is available on the web, Furedi says: 'I take a very traditional view of democracy. When people want to be included they don't wait for an invitation; they kick the door down, they demand to be let in. The Suffragettes didn't wait to be included in the electoral system, and trade unionists didn't wait to be included in collective bargaining – they insisted on it. When working class people wanted to learn they didn't wait around for an 'inclusion policy'; they became autodidacts' (O'Neill, 2004:3-4). The suspicion remains that, as David Anderson suggests, Furedi's notion of democracy 'presupposes an Eden in which exclusion is essential, because only then will there be a barrier which will reveal the metal of true democrats – those prepared to sacrifice everything to win their rights. If blood doesn't continually run in the streets, there is no salvation. One begins to suspect that it is blood sacrifice – not democracy – that really appeals to Furedi' (Anderson, personal communication, 22 February, 2005).

It is the economy

There are good reasons to be suspicious of the government's pushing the access and social inclusion agenda, but Furedi points the finger in the wrong place. There are more penetrating analyses (for example, see McGuigan, 2004). To put it bluntly, it is blindingly obvious that the consumption of culture for most people most of the time has very little to do with public subsidies for creative work or audience-building or widening access strategies. It has everything to do with the performance of market-oriented cultural industries and mass-popular consumption. The public debate over 'dumbing down' may raise issues for cultural policy but it has little or nothing to say about the political economy of culture; indeed, it acts as a kind of *sideshow* to this much bigger show.

Jim McGuigan, a contemporary cultural theorist who is much influenced by Raymond Williams (and therefore no simple economic determinist) comments: 'Questions of value should, of course, be debated. Yet such debate often fails to penetrate the economic and political determinations of culture which, in our day, are largely those of neo-liberal globalization' (McGuigan, 2004:113). McGuigan concludes: 'A superficial attention to apparent cultural trends that may or may not be really significant does not grasp the structural processes that connect political economy to culture' (McGuigan, 2004:119. 5

Furedi is strangely silent on issues concerning the political economy of culture, even downplaying the impact of the market in order to make his central point concerning social inclusion policies; and he provides scant evidence for his assertions.

Perhaps he needs to apply the reflexivity he seeks to encourage in others to himself and to his fellow travellers; he needs to read more, and more widely (and generously); and perhaps he should do some more research on this topic. He should at the very least find out what adult educators, including those involved in museums/arts access work, say and do. Perhaps most importantly, he needs to listen to and talk to others who are unlike himself; he should get around more.

Conclusion

Almost fifty years ago, in 1959, Raymond Williams wrote: 'But its (adult education's) whole spirit, most admirably expressed by the WEA [the Workers' Educational Association] at its best, is of growth towards a genuinely common culture, and educated and participating democracy' (Williams, 1993b: 220-1). Williams signalled our present situation exactly two decades ago: 'Yet what is now happening, in the existing institutions, is a steady pressure from a late capitalist economy and its governments to reduce education both absolutely and in kind, steadily excluding learning which offers more than a preparation for employment and an already regulated civic life' (Williams, 1985:151). Many adult educators have by now lost heart. Renewed efforts to work towards a reinvigorated independent popular education movement cannot work by the old rules, limited by the arguments of Furedi. New ones have to be found. I believe that some of these are being forged within the arts and museums access movement.

Notes

1 Rita Felski offers a fascinating overview of shifting images of notions of the intellectual from philosopher king/universal intellectual to more modest and nuanced notions of the value of intellectual work, relating this to the influence of cultural studies compared with that of philosophy (see Felski, 1998).

2 The European Social Movement's antecedents include the 1994 Zapatista uprising and the 1998 founding of the People's Global Action Against Free Trade and the World Trade Organisation. The first World Social Forum (WSF) of 2001 took its lead from these movements and initiatives and its Charter commits it to pluralism. The first European Social Forum, held in Florence in November 2002, was inspired by the WSF.

3 Anderson is also responsible for the impressive and theoretically sophisticated report, *A Common Wealth: Museums and Learning in the United Kingdom* which stimulated much

professional interest in the development and importance of the educational role of museums and which sees them as a resource for public learning of exceptional value – ‘a common wealth’ (Anderson, 1999).

4 In 1992, with the publication of the Further and Higher Education Act, the whole post-compulsory system in the United Kingdom was rationalized by the creation of unified Funding Councils for HE, though, as a result of a climate of devolution, with separate bodies in England, Scotland and Wales. This ended the old binary divide between universities and polytechnics (‘central institutions’, in Scotland) set up post the Robbins Report of 1963, which had constituted the polytechnics as a new public sector of mainly vocational higher education, formally in local government control. As a result of the 1992 Act, polytechnics became the ‘new’ universities and, with the establishment of the Further Education Council (FEFC), further education was put on a primarily national basis. The Scottish Higher and Further Education Councils have recently merged as a result of Scottish Parliament legislation.

5 McLachlan and Golding have studied the press since the 1950s. Between the 1970s and late 1990s they detect convergence between serious and popular press rather than simple dumbing down. But they discern a much more troubling trend than that identified by critics of dumbing down: ‘the conglomerate strategies and economic exigencies of a commercialized cultural apparatus of awesome power and reach and increasing integration’ (McLachlan and Golding, 2000:88).

References

- Aaronovitch, D. (2004) ‘The thinking classes: too clever by half’, Observer Comment, *The Observer*, September 12
<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,6003,1302696,00.html>
- Anderson, D. (1999) *A Common Wealth: Museums and Learning in the United Kingdom*, London: Department of National Heritage
- Anderson, D. (2000) ‘Conceptual framework’, in A. Chadwick and A. Stannett (eds) *Museums and Adults Learning: Perspectives from Europe*, Leicester: NIACE
- Appleton, J (2001) *Museums for “The People”*, *Conversations in Print*, London: Institute of Ideas
- Barr, J. (1999) *Liberating Knowledge*, Leicester: NIACE
- Barr, J. (2004) ‘Cultural Entitlement and What Galleries can Contribute to Adult Learning’, Keynote Address at *Engage International Colloquium*, London: Tate Modern [http://www.collectandshare.eu.com/\(sfsvkmoblsny45u3wv4y55\)/reports/index.aspx](http://www.collectandshare.eu.com/(sfsvkmoblsny45u3wv4y55)/reports/index.aspx)
- Barrow, L. (1986) *Independent Spirits*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Bennett, T. (1988) ‘Museums and “the People”’ in R. Lumley (ed) *The Museum Time Machine*, London: Comedia, Routledge
- Benzi, G. et al. (2004) ‘Italian delegation report on the ESF Programme Group Meeting in Paris’, 29-30 May, trans. Massimo de Angelis, <http://esf2004.net/en/tiki-index.php?page=HorizontalDocumentIndex>,
- Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A. (1991) *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*, Cambridge: Polity Press (first published in 1969 as *L’Amour de l’art: Les Musees d’Europeens et leur public*, Paris, Edition de Minuit)

- Brookfield, S. (2003) 'Racializing the Discourse of Adult Education', *Harvard Educational Review*, 13 (4) 497-523
- Brown, P. (1997) 'Cultural Capital and Social Exclusion: Some Observations on Recent Trends in Education, Employment and the Labour Market' in A.H. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown and A. Wells (eds) *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press
- Candlin, F. (2004) 'Don't Touch! Hands Off! Art, Blindness and the Conservation of Expertise', *Body and Society*, 10 (1) 71-90
- Chadwick, A. and Stannett, A. (eds) (2000) *Museums and Adults Learning: Perspectives from Europe*, Leicester: NIACE
- Cohen, N. (2002) 'The rebels who changed their tune to be pundits', *New Statesman*, August, <http://squawk.ca/lbo-talk/0208/0760.html>
- Davie, G.E. (1961) *The Democratic Intellect*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Duncan, C. (1995) *Civilizing Rituals: inside public art museums*, London and New York: Routledge
- Eagleton, T. (2003) *After Theory*, London and New York: Allen Lane, Penguin Books
- Eagleton, T. (2004) 'Too clever by half?' review of Frank Furedi, *Where Have All the Intellectuals Gone?*, *New Statesman*, 13, September, 48-9)
- Ellis, L. (2002) 'The backlash to access', *Engage* 11, 40-2
- Evans, M. (2004) *Killing Thinking: The Death of the Universities*, London and New York: Continuum
- Felski, R. (1998) 'Images of the Intellectual: from philosophy to cultural studies', *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 12 (2) 157-71)
- Fieldhouse, R. (1996) *A History of Modern British Adult Education*, Leicester: NIACE
- Foster, H. (2001) *The Return of the Real, the avant-garde at the end of the Century*, Cambridge Mass., London: MIT Press
- Foster, H. (2002) *Design and Crime (And Other Diatribes)*, London and New York: Verso
- Furedi, F. (2003) 'Room for Debate?', *Guardian Education*, June 17, 16
- Furedi, F. (2004) *Where Have All the Intellectuals Gone? Confronting Twentieth Century Philistinism*, London and New York: Continuum
- Garber, M. (2001) *Academic Instincts*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press
- Grek, S. (2004) 'Museums and adult education in the UK: from the old "cabinets of curiosities" to museums as new sites for non-formal learning', paper presented at SCUTREA Conference, Summer
- Hetherington, K. (2000) 'Museums and the visually impaired: the spatial politics of access', *The Sociological Review*, 48 (3) 444- 63
- Hetherington, K. (2003a) 'Urban Regeneration, Museums and Symbolic Economies:

Manchester's Urbis', Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, at <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Hetherington-Urban-Regeneration.pdf>

Hetherington, K. (2003b) 'The Kinaesthetics of Capitalism: Fetishism, Spectacle and the Body', Department of Sociology, Lancaster University, at <http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Hetherington-Kinaesthetics-of-Capitalism.pdf>

Klein, N. (2003) 'What happened to the New Left? The WSF 2003', <http://hubproject.org/news/2003/02/69.php>

Latour, B. (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*, Harlow: Longman

Levidow, L. (2004) 'Making another world possible? The European Social Forum', *Radical Philosophy* 128, 6-11

Matarasso, F. (2001) 'In defence of the middle ground', in J. Appleton (ed) *Museums for 'the People'*, *Conversations in Print*, London: Institute of Ideas, 39-41

McGuigan, J. (2004) *Rethinking Cultural Policy*, Maidenhead, Open University Press

McLachlan, S. and Golding, P. (2000) 'Tabloidization in the British press – a quantitative investigation into changes in British newspapers, 1952-1997', in C. Sparks and J. Tulloch (eds) *Tabloid Tales – Global Debates Over Media Standards*, Oxford: Roman and Littlefield

Millar, S. (2001) 'The death of the curator', in J. Appleton (ed) 27-29

Monbiot, G. (2003) 'Invasion of the entryists', *The Guardian*, December 9, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentary/story/0,3604,1102753,00.html>

O'Neill, B. (2004) 'Down with 21st century philistinism: Frank Furedi explains why his latest book calls for a new Culture War', *Spiked*, at <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CA6F5.htm>

O'Neill, M. (2001) 'Glasgow City of Culture: beyond the welfare model of cultural provision', Museums Australia Conference Keynote Speech (unpublished)

O'Neill, M. (2002a) 'The people versus', *Engage* 11, 34-6

O'Neill, M. (2002b) *A catalyst for change: the social impact of the Open Museum*, Glasgow: Glasgow City Council

O'Neill, M. (2004) 'Enlightenment museums: universal or merely global?' *Museum and Society*, 2 (3), 190-202

Osborne, M., Gallacher, J. and Crossan, B. (eds) (2004) *Researching Widening Access to Lifelong Learning: Issues and Approaches in International Research*, London: Routledge Falmer

Ruggiero, V. (2004) 'Orizzontale e vertical', *Carta d'Identita* (15) 46-9

Segal, L. (2002) 'The brain drain', *The Guardian*, May 17, <http://education.guardian.co.uk/universityaccess/comment/0,10670,717257,00.html>

Steele, T. (1997) *The Emergence of Cultural Studies 1945 to 1965*, London: Lawrence and Wishart

Steele, T. (2004) 'Marxism and education', draft paper (unpublished)

Steele, T. (2005) 'Reclaiming Popular Education, is "lifelong learning" enough?', unpublished paper presented at *The End(s) of Adult Education Seminar*, Sheffield University, 25 April
Taylor, R. Barr, J. and Steele, T. (2002) *For a Radical Higher Education: After Postmodernism*, Buckingham and Philadelphia: SRHE and Open University Press

Thompson, J. (2002) *Bread and Roses: Arts, Culture and Lifelong Learning*, Leicester: NIACE

Waterman, P. (2003) 'First reflections on the 3rd World Social Forum', <http://hubproject.org/news/2003/02/69.php>

Williams, R. (1985) *Towards 2000*, London: Pelican

Williams, R. (1993a) 'Culture is Ordinary', in J. McIlroy and S. Westwood (eds) *Border Country: Raymond Williams in Adult Education*, Leicester: N.I.A.C.E

Williams, R. (1993b) 'Going on Learning', in J. McIlroy and S. Westwood (eds) *Border Country: Raymond Williams in Adult Education*, Leicester: N.I.A.C.E

***Jean Barr** has worked in adult education and in higher education for most of her life, spending most of the 1980s as District Secretary of the Workers' Educational Association (WEA) in the West of Scotland District, the 1990s in the Open University and the Universities of Warwick, Stirling and Glasgow where she currently holds a chair in the Department of Adult and Continuing Education. Professor Barr has written on policy in adult and lifelong learning and three books, *Liberating Knowledge*; *For a Radical Higher Education* (with Tom Steele and Richard Taylor) and *Common Science* (with Lynda Birke). She has lived in the UK and in Florence.

Address

Department of Adult and Continuing Education
University of Glasgow
St Andrew's Building
11 Eldon Street
Glasgow G3 6NH
Tel: 0141 330 1824
Fax: 0141 330 1821
Email: J.Barr@educ.gla.ac.uk