



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.ccs.2010.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2010.08.003)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dean, C., Donnellan, C., & Pratt, A. C. (2010). Tate Modern: pushing the limits of regeneration. *City, Culture and Society*, 1(2), 79-87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2010.08.003>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Tate Modern: Pushing the limits of Regeneration

Professor Andy Pratt

Professor of Culture, Media and Economy
Director, Culture, Media and Creative Industries

Email andy.pratt@kcl.ac.uk

Tel +44 (0)20 7848 1595

Culture, Media and Creative Industries

King's College London

5C Chesham Building, Strand Campus

London, WC2R 2LS

This pre-print paper is copyright of the author, but it is free to be used for research purposes as long as it is properly attributed. Permissions for multiple reproductions should be addressed to the author. This paper is intended to circulate work that readers might not otherwise be able to access. If your institution does subscribe to the journal, please access it via that link.

Please cite as Dean, C., C. Donnellan, et al. (2010). "Tate Modern: pushing the limits of regeneration." *City, Culture and Society* 1(2): 79-87. ISSN 1877-9166

doi:10.1016/j.ccs.2010.08.003

IMPORTANT: When referring to this paper, please check the page numbers in the journal published version and cite these.

Tate Modern: pushing the limits of regeneration

Corinna Dean¹, Caroline Donnellan² and Andy C Pratt³

Abstract

This paper questions the conventional limits of regeneration and highlights the limited range of approaches, especially in relation to cultural institutions and their multiplicity of audiences, and the fact that different policies evoke, or construct, various 'publics', 'visitors' and 'audiences'. The question of who gains and loses is given an extra twist when the object or instrument of regeneration is a cultural institution: a gallery or museum. To this end we identify the manifest tensions between the instrumentalisation of museums and galleries, and the potential to undermine their core purpose. We draw upon a second literature of museology to provide contrasting notions of audience and inclusion since such analyses sensitize the debate regarding audience and regeneration and will illustrate these issues by reference to Tate Modern in London.

¹ Urban Programme, London School of Economics, London WC2A 2AE. Email: C.L.Dean@lse.ac.uk

² Urban Programme, London School of Economics, London WC2A 2AE. Email: CarolineDonnellan@ukgateway.net

³ Centre for Culture, Media and Creative Industries Research (CMCI), King's College London, London WC2R 2LS. Email: andy.pratt@kcl.ac.uk

The Tate Modern: pushing the limits of regeneration

Which audience, which impact?

There has been a huge upswing in the establishment of new museums and galleries in last 40 years. As Babbidge (2005: 44) notes: "The threefold increase in the museums population that has taken place over [1960-2000, further fueled by a growth independent museums in the 1970/80s (Babbidge, 2000)] has mainly been adventitious, often enabled by employment and regeneration policies rather than purposeful interventions of cultural policy." As Babbidge suggests, this may not be a steady growth of interest in or appreciation of cultural artifacts; but is evidence perhaps of a new instrumentalism in cultural policy. Of course, one can make good arguments for instrumentalism (Gibson, 2008), and in practice it is difficult to untangle motives and uses. However, most readers would agree that there is always a balance to be struck between the poles of intrinsic value and instrumentalism.

This paper argues for a clear reconsideration of the relationship between museum and galleries and regeneration. On the one hand, much of the urban studies, planning and regeneration literature tends towards the explicit or implicit instrumental use of museums. On the other, the museum studies literature has primarily been concerned with the relationship between artifacts and audiences. The continuing confusion, or opportunistic use of sometimes contradictory objectives may do more harm than good.⁴ This is not simply an appeal for clear thinking, it is more serious; a caution against misrepresentation by funders, the galleries, their publics or users. Such challenges are not only acute in periods of funding review or evaluation; they are at the forefront of gallery managers' everyday decisions. Often, the evidence that gallery managers and policy makers need to sustain a policy either cannot be found, or they are compromised by multiple (and contradictory) funding streams and objectives.

⁴ Of course, for practitioners the realpolitik of arts and cultural funding is to secure the money then try to direct it to cultural ends whilst fulfilling regeneration ends. It would be unusual if galleries and institutions operated differently. If it accepted that this process takes place, it tends to undermine the meaning of much evaluation of the impact of funding; or more seriously still, the processes by which outcomes are achieved.

We are now familiar with the arrival of a new iconic gallery, the pattern is looking a little threadbare: an old industrial building re-developed by a 'starchitect' to create a new temple to contemporary art, with a collection franchised from a 'world collection', usually located on the bank of a river, or open water, traversed by a designer bridge. Of course, this is simply the latest physical manifestation of a rather crude instrumentalism deployed in cultural policy. This recent phase has been driven by the perceived need to attract foreign direct investment of cities undergoing industrial decline (Florida, 2002; Short and Kim, 1998). The argument, put crudely, is to create a must-see tourist attraction, or cultural facility, that will appeal to an affluent middle class executive. This is because such facilities are the hooks for mobile investors and their staff. More generally, this is represented by Quality of Life indices that are used by international firms to convince key employees to re-locate (Rogerson, 1999). Of course, culture is seen, quite literally, as the icing on the cake of such processes.

Clearly, this is not the only reason for galleries to be built, but in periods of public sector funding constraints it is a significant one; aided and abetted by the possibility that such an iconic gallery will create a media event, and prime cultural tourism (code for affluent tourists who take short stays in expensive hotels). The idea that galleries may be a critical part of urban regeneration is one that has come into its own (although, as we will discuss, there are critical voices). This argument is primarily about hitching the gallery business to local economic development and urban vibrancy (Law, 1992), the gallery becomes the anchor of a cultural quarter or neighbourhood that attracts visitors and generates retail trade (Mommaas, 2004). Such arguments have attracted scepticism, and some criticism in particular from those that have pointed to the over optimistic or speculative returns on investment, or the true economic sustainability of such schemes (Plaza, 1999; 2000a; 2000b; 2006).

There has been less attention on the undermining or weakening of the intrinsic value, or core purposes of the gallery (see Miles 2005). Others have pointed, not exclusively, to the focus on consumption and the cultural sector, at the expense of investment in knowledge production (Travers, 2006). Others still have highlighted the potential impact on, or use by the audience. It is this latter issue that is our point of departure here; moreover, we take our lead from the museums studies field, especially debates about the new museology, to question the position of institutions, objects, audiences and society.

In the UK there has been much made of the potential for social inclusiveness by involvement in cultural activities (DCMS, 1999), or extending access to museums and galleries. This leads us into yet another field of instrumentalism, one not related to the idealist uses of culture for social improvement, but simply that through the use of, or participation in cultural activities or institutions people will feel more included, or have access to other 'inclusive' resources (friendships, networks, and clubs) (Puttnam 2000). This question is complex (Levitas, 2005) and we believe needs careful further investigation. For example, as we point out, protagonists of regeneration have their own notion of a target 'audience'; those within the museums and galleries community also have lively debates about audiences. Pity the policy maker who asks only for an evaluation of the impact on the audience.

Our point here is simple, but significant: while there are many audiences, each could have quite different expectations since they operate at a number of spatial scales, and with a varying social scope. We argue that a fundamental appreciation of these characteristics should be a precursor to any debate about the impact and role of museums and galleries. We have sought to illustrate our argument by a reflection of what is generally regarded as one of the most successful galleries in the world, Tate Modern, London, with its reputation for access and inclusion. Simply, we want to echo Zukin's (1995: 1) provocation: 'Whose city, whose culture?' which we might re-represent as 'Which audience, which impact?'

In this paper, based upon ongoing research on Tate Modern, its history, organization and practice, we want to think about inclusion and regeneration together. Traditionally, the two fields of debate although sharing the same words are divided by divergent conceptualizations, and hence prone to misunderstandings. Our argument is that there are numerous audiences with conflicting needs, which is critical to any evaluation of a museum regeneration or purpose. As often as not the question is, what is the precise relationship between the institution or museum and audience, or which audiences interests are given priority. In line with museum studies scholarship, we argue that one might sensitize regeneration to debates about audience, and accordingly think about regeneration in a different manner. Moreover, we hope that this paper will contribute more generally to analyses of culturally led regeneration, a literature which has been criticised for its lack of broader "methodologies which bring together approaches across anthropology, sociology, cultural and urban studies" (Evans, 2005).

Regeneration and inclusion: missing audiences

There is a vast literature on regeneration and inclusion in the context of museums and galleries which we can only outline here. However, these debates can be usefully divided into two bodies of literature; the first mainly concerns economic arguments and the second, social and cultural debates. We point out that there are several troubling aspects to these literatures, all the more so when we try to bring them together. First, the notion of audience that is deployed: in particular, the various articulations and multiplications of audience; only some of which are represented in these debates. Second, the problem of scale, which is seldom addressed in these debates: most obviously we point to the internal and external dimensions (inside and outside the museum) to highlight the multi-scalar character of the audience.

Our objective is to pull together these ideas and issues and use them as the lens through which to examine Tate Modern and, in so doing, challenge more unitary narratives. Whilst, social inclusion⁵ was heralded by New Labour post-1997 as a defining concept at the level of the society (Byrne, 1999), a whole range of nuanced analyses of the very nature of the museum and its relationship to the audience have been explored under the banner of the 'new museology' for a longer time (Macdonald and Fyfe, 1996; Vergo, 1989). These notions have superficial similarities, but fundamental differences.

Museums and regeneration

We have already noted the economic focus of regeneration, this notion gained popularity in reaction to the economic decline experienced by Western European and North American inner cities in the latter part of the 20th century, and it is associated with a loss of manufacturing employment. In many cities gross employment has been maintained or grown by service sector jobs. This led many cities to make significant efforts to develop their own economies, but more so to attract foreign mobile investment. Of course, many other cities have taken the same approach thereby unleashing a period of urban competition: initially by offering subsidies, and later by quality of life or cultural incentives (Pratt, 2008a; 2008b). As noted above, museums and galleries have become notable (and willing) players in this game. Although seldom explicitly discussed, museums and galleries have willingly partaken in such

⁵ The notion of social inclusion as well as being a very difficult concept to operationalise is further complicated by the fact that the notion of social exclusion relates to French notion of (inclusion through) citizenship of the Republic, which has no parallel in the UK.

strategies to leverage investment which would otherwise not be directed at the museum (especially in a period of public sector budget cuts). However, it can seem like a Faustian bargain.

A second economic logic for museum investment has been the anticipated spill over, or multiplier effects (Bassett, 1993; Griffiths, 1993; Law, 1992). A museum visitor, it is hoped, will not simply visit the gallery, but spend at least a night in a hotel (preferably an expensive one), use restaurant and bars, buy something in the now ubiquitous gallery shop, and maybe go shopping elsewhere in the city. The very visit will also generate income for transportation services, especially air travel, if the visit is short (Richards, 1996). This is an argument that has been deployed for the 'heritage city' or 'cultural tourism' more generally (Poria and Ashworth, 2009; Richards and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009); but in most cases the museum, gallery or quarter is the anchor and locus of the tourist trade (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000; Mommaas, 2004). As noted above, such niche tourism can be viewed as very resource efficient with a greater return on investment per visitor. Not surprisingly, a central plank of contemporary urban regeneration is a good marketing strategy and an active tourist office⁶.

A third strand of debate concerning museum and gallery development is a little more contentious and rests on the impact of economic and social investment that is attracted to new artistic activities in cities (Pratt, 2009; Zukin, 1982). This gentrification impact of artistic activities also has the effect of making the location too expensive for artists. Not that this is a problem for the museum or gallery when it is a property freeholder, though it is for the people who have to move due to rising rental values. Those with a stake in the property market will, of course, benefit as, critically, will city tax payers. In an allied literature, urban politics have been discussed as being dominated by urban growth machines, or urban regimes that seek to maximize the profits on urban space for retailers or owners of retail real estate (Judge et al., 1995; Logan and Molotch, 1987). It might be argued that in some cases retail has given way to cultural activities as one focus of the urban regime.

So, we can discern a strong instrumental logic, and one that is economically reductive. Museums and galleries have a part to play in attracting and

⁶ The co-incident of Film tourism, book tourism and cultural tourism is perhaps best illustrated in the 'perfect storm' exemplified by Dan Brown's (2003 book, and 2006 film) blockbuster The DaVinci Code that takes place in several museums and heritage sites!

sustaining investment and income. Questions about distribution, and whom, and whose identity and cultural representation benefits from being represented in such a way are generally *sotto voce*. As we will note below, social exclusion debates do not really engage with either this economic logic, or, as we will discuss below, with another variant of social inclusion derived from the museums literature.

Museums and inclusion

The argument for museums is not solely economic; there are parallel rafts of social and cultural debates that seek to articulate the museum/gallery to them: these would be considered the traditional or 'core' arguments. However, there are many strands of such justifications, and we identify four below. Whilst the economic debates are mainly about the external environment, the social ones cut across such boundaries. Moreover, they more directly impinge upon notions of the purpose of the museum.

The first body of work is that which leads back to the very introduction of notions of civic culture and the role of culture as a civilizing tool. In particular, it is the role of museums in the process of education that underpins the establishment and development of these institutions (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu et al., 1991). Linked to this is a significant literature on the establishment and sustenance of the idea of the nation, and of empire in the museum tradition, and of course the notion of the 'national' museum (Bennett, 1995). Interestingly this notion was taken up by Demos, the New Labour think tank, to suggest that Tate Modern could be allied to a project of remaking the nation (Leonard, 1997).

Working against this is a second tradition of museum studies that viewed the museum as having a civilizing or social role of its own in terms of a support structure and a place to re-examine local identity, or to communicate and transmit a local identity (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994, 1997); a more radical articulation of this strand has been to question which parts of the population are included in the optic of the museum (Sandell, 2002). Taken more generally, these debates have been informed by the new museology that encourages museums - as institutions - to 'de-sacralise the object' and to play an active part in intervening in social and cultural debates in society (Vergo, 1989).

Third, in parallel with the new museology has been a debate about spectatorship and audiences in the arts more generally that has sought to debate the role of the active audience, most notably in the debates about performativity (Phelan, 1993). These come to a particular focus with those who have debated the commodification of the cultural object, within which the museum has been condemned sustaining a static and dominant reading of texts (Barker, 1999; Crimp and Lawler, 1993; Duncan, 1995).

Thus debates about social inclusion in the museum are not simply about building audiences, or about their role in 'outreach' of the socially excluded. Rather they start from a premise of a new engagement with audiences, who are always plural and diverse. They suggest a problematic relationship with the spaces and places of representation, who and what is being represented. This does have more in common with the critics of the dominant social inclusion mantra (Levitas, 2005; Pantazis et al., 2006), but goes further in the sense that it raises a critical question about whom the inclusion is for, and into what they are excluded or included (Dibosa, 2007; Hooper-Greenhill, 1997; National_Museums_Directors'_Conference, 2006).

This section of the paper has highlighted the fact that the instrumentalism within which museums and galleries operate is a complex optic. It represents a strongly economic inflected narrative wherein the museum acts as anchor or hub, as well as beacon, for economic development. However, in so doing it presents a particular representation to the world, one which within the museum curators and academics have been contesting. Outside the museum there are tensions between the anticipated 'global' benefits of more investment, and the local or individual benefits: many of which are highly partial and differentiated.

Cutting across these economic discourses are the social and cultural ones that primarily have emanated from inside the museum. Generally the new museology has generated a rethinking of the role and social engagement of the museum in society, issues that very much cut across the physical threshold of the building. This constitutes a fourth emergent argument seemingly with a tenuous link to both debates. This is the substantive policy debate about social inclusion, which in many respects is the legitimation for much cultural investment in museums. Here the focus is upon access and visitor numbers, the presence of museums in remote and poor communities, and the museums role as a social glue: often as not conveying little about the

museum, its artifacts, or the gallery, but simply representing it as an opportunity for social activity.

Our objective is to use ongoing research on Tate Modern to highlight a number of wider issues and tensions that are manifest in many similar institutions. However, we are not simply extrapolating this experience, we acknowledge that the ways that these tensions will be manifest will be as various as the institutions, and their particular forms will require more detailed field work. Instead, we aim to sensitize readers to a range of issues that have been otherwise neglected, by addressing both the social and economic drivers, which have made culture a major government agenda, so that we can reflect upon what regeneration or inclusion means in practice. The case study is divided into two parts, the first explores the wider institutional setting and its re-configuration as a result of new forms of public sector governance, and the second examines practices of curation within the museum. In the conclusion we return to the main issues raised and examine whether these trajectories intersect.

Tate Modern: configuring the audience

Tate Modern is an icon, perhaps the seminal modern museum of the 21st Century. It is not, of course, the first time that the museum/gallery, or in fact the contemporary art gallery has played such a role. However, Tate Modern is a significant place holder to link a number of notable changes to the role and practice of art galleries in the contemporary city. Aside from anything else, such galleries are planned to be accessible and inclusive to all-comers, physically and intellectually, as well as culturally. It has been argued that modern art, being shorn from some of the weight of cultural inheritance of western history and education, is in essence more accessible and egalitarian; however, as Stoner Sanders (1999) has shown, this can be an excuse for another form of 'soft power' and cultural dominance.

From a purely urban planning and architectural perspective, Tate Modern represents the new breed of cavernous warehouse galleries, retrofitted into an old industrial shell, which is itself symbolic of urban and economic transformation and re-use. The fact that it is located away from the existing South Bank cultural complex and quite clearly off the tourist trail on a Brownfield site in a poor part of London is significant. Master planners are

very pleased to argue that this building, and the footfall that it generates has emphasised the importance to London of the river once again, the River Walk providing pedestrian linkage to the South Bank complex (Newman and Smith, 2000). Moreover, the Millennium Bridge that crosses the River Thames to Tate Modern connects to a bridge head less than 100 meters from St Paul's Cathedral in the City of London: the prime tourist locus and financial core of London.

Picture 1 here

Picture 1: Tate Modern (c. Andy C Pratt)

As an institution, Tate Modern has been very active, and arguably very successful, in its outreach and inclusion activities. It plays a significant role in its locality, working closely with other employers businesses and community organisations. It has been actively involved in developing employment opportunities for local people in the Cultural Sector (Arts Training Trust), in tourism and marketing initiatives (Bankside Marketing Group) and the development of the business sector (Better Bankside, Bankside Business Partnership, Tate_Trustees, 2002: 20). Another notable initiative, aimed at the inclusion of 13-17 year olds, was the £1.8 m DCMS funded 'Invest to save' education workshop initiative (London SE1 2006) .

Tate Modern is a clear success in relation to its positive impact on the urban fabric having stimulated and benefitted from a huge infrastructural investment immediately to its south (with commercial and residential development at Bankside 1,2,3 and 4 developed by Land Securities). And at the level of public engagement it has a significant outreach and audience development programme, and has become one of London's most successful tourist sites, with visitor numbers exceeding even the most optimistic projections. Visitor numbers averaged 4.2 million per annum in the first five years of operation (2000-5) Gayford, M. et al. (2005). So, if the Tate Modern is apparently an unalloyed success, what can be learnt from the experience?

a. Institution

In this first section we want to place Tate Modern in its wider historical and political contexts. For sure, the current Tate Modern did not appear from the drawing board fully formed. Whilst it has been heralded as emblematic of

Tony Blair's New Labour (post 1997) administration (Leonard, 1997), Tate Modern's roots lie in the shifts in museum funding and administration set in motion by the previous Conservative administration (a decade of Margaret Thatcher, followed more briefly by John Major as Prime Minister) when a major cost cutting strategy was initiated in all areas of public spending, including the arts. Their legacy to the arts and New Labour was a new funding paradigm, which as heirs to the neo-liberal governance of the Conservatives, New Labour continued. Museums and galleries were forced into finding new ways of funding themselves in order to maintain their intrinsic roles of museum and gallery practice, curation and education. A culture of arts professionalism emerged in response to the changing political climate, which extended beyond cultural expertise into business and marketing strategy. Some extended or established Development Departments, others adopted admission charges, while some smaller ones faced closure without private sector support. In the early 1990s, the new arts managers morphed into business practitioners who had to 'think outside the box'.

The Tate Gallery developed a new level of expertise during the late 1980s-1990s which went beyond the usual parameters of gallery and museum curation. Two key appointments were made. In 1988 Nicholas Serota was appointed as the new Director and Denis Stevenson the new Chairman of the Tate Trustees (1988-1998). Stevenson was strategic in creating business funding networks and during his appointment as Chair he joined English Partnerships in 1994 from whom Tate was to secure £12 million in funding for their new museum of modern art. Serota realised quickly that had two collections 'gridlocked' in the same building. His long term solution was to find another building/box.⁷ Meanwhile, he began experimenting with a thematic approach to gallery hanging, to disguise the gaps in the modern foreign collection: an approach that subverted the chronological conventions of canonical art history established by Alfred Barr at MoMa (Kantor, 2001).

The Tate announced its plan to split the modern Foreign and British collections in December 1992. Due to funding constraints, the initial intention was to lease a temporary building, but just two days later the National Lottery Bill was passed. The Millennium Commission, one of the Lottery's principal distribution bodies, distributed major awards in the form of 'Capital Projects', which offered up to £50 million to fund 21st century landmark buildings

⁷ Tate Archive TG 12/1/2/2 TGMA (00/04/1994) Brief for Architectural Competition Draft Notes, p. 1.

(Millennium_Commission, 1995: 6). Significantly, this presented the Tate with an opportunity to consider establishing a permanent home for its modern foreign collection, and the search for suitable sites began with some vigour.

The news that Tate was formally considering the former Bankside Power Station as an option received a mixed reception. Sam Wanamaker who, after many years of political wrangling, had recreated Shakespeare's Globe Theatre adjacent to the site declared:

“The Shakespeare Globe Trust would strongly oppose the retention of the Power Station which not only overwhelms the more modest Globe structure, but would prohibit the multipurpose potential use of the largest redevelopment site in central London for sympathetic environmental change.”⁸

Nevertheless, in 1994 the Tate hosted an architectural competition to select an architect whose design would transform the building into an art gallery. The competition promoted nationally and internationally raised the Tate's profile, stimulating public interest which helped to secure public funding. The Millennium Commission's key criteria for 'Capital Projects' specified that the winning proposal must 'enjoy public support' and be of 'high architectural design' (Millennium_Commission, 1995: 12). One hundred and forty-eight applications were made to the architectural competition - the two-stage heat was reduced to thirteen and then six. The Swiss architects Jacques Herzog and Pierre de Meuron were appointed the winners. They imaginatively chose to expose the entire former engine room of the Power Station, retaining its original name – the Turbine Hall – to provide space for large specially commissioned art works.

The total project cost for Tate Modern was £134.5 million, with £50 million later secured from the Millennium Commission and £12 million from English Partnerships. Additional government funding of £6.2 million was allocated by Arts Council England and £5 million from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). The Clore Gallery Foundation and associated Vivien Duffield Foundation donated £2.5 million. Additionally, £1.25 million was provided by Unilever for work to be commissioned specifically for the Turbine Hall. The remaining funding came from private UK and US sponsors: the

⁸ TG 12/3/2/1 Sam Wanamaker (07/10/1993) Vice Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The International Globe Centre, letter to Dennis Stevenson.

American Fund for the Tate Gallery having been created in 1988, and the American Patrons of Tate set up in New York in 1999 (Tate_Gallery, 2000).

When it opened in 2000 the public sector had provided 60% of the total funding required and the private sector 40%. In retrospect, it is apparent that Tate Modern responded to Thatcher's 'better value for money' challenge by matching private sector money with public sector funding pound for pound. Moreover, in terms of its economic viability, it is estimated that Tate Modern now generates £100 million per annum for the London and UK economies (Travers, 2005: 27).

The architectural vision was for Tate Modern to create a spectacular landmark in London and a signature building for Britain in the new millennium.⁹ In doing so, a new type of a museum was created accessible to a wide audience and that offers a broad visual and cultural experience. Rather than drawing on an existing model, Tate Modern had a vision and patronage distinct from those of the privately funded MoMA, New York, and the state funded Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris. It arguably offers a new paradigm for the 21st century museum, which attracts greater audience numbers than MoMA and the Pompidou and has also drawn people to the Bankside area, assisting in its regeneration. With the development of the Millennium Bridge, the Tate functions as a major landmark on the South Bank opening up the view and spatial axis over the River Thames. The next section considers the vexed question: who are the audiences and visitors who are drawn to the internal and external spaces created by Tate Modern.

b. Curation

The discussion of cultural regeneration and museums tends to downplay the visitor experience and focus on the regeneration impact (CABE, 2002). A conventional response to this is illustrated by Tate Britain's audience engagement, development and outreach work: a good example of which is the research project Diasporas, Migrations and Immigrations (Dibosa, 2007), which seeks to extend and challenge curatorial themes and reach audiences not previously visiting the gallery. However, such an approach fails to question either the spatial and social relationships of the gallery, and the position of the audience with regard to it. Moreover, a normative definition of the audience as passive is undisturbed. In this section we shift scales and

⁹ Tate Gallery (15/07/1994) TGMA: Defining the Vision Tate Gallery.

locations to inside the gallery; or, arguably, in the spirit of the new museology, turn the gallery inside out. We want to briefly raise two issues: first, related to the practices of inclusion and re-negotiating who, and what, the audience is; and, how they might relate to the gallery and its objects. Second, we discuss the potential of new technologies to create new engagements that are not simply inside and outside museums, but trans-local in their orientation. We begin by considering more familiar tactics concerning the design of the building itself.

One strategy to address exclusion is through architectural and design means; the architect took this opportunity offered by the rebuild. Unique to Tate Modern is the creation of what is designated a 'publicly accessible space', and it was clearly part of the architect's and the clients' intentions that the Turbine Hall would have all the attributes of a street or public space. This is an explicitly and purposefully constructed public space which was conceived of both as a gallery, and to its location within a previously neglected post industrial part of London. The original intention of the architect and client (albeit not achieved) was to keep the space open 24 hours a day. Within the space there are no visible signs of surveillance, entry through the space is without admission fee, and the public are able to carry out public activities there. The debate concerns the condition of this public space as mediated through the institution of Tate Modern.

Habermas (1989), whose work has been taken up by design professionals, argues that the public sphere is in decline through the increasing ability of states and corporations to manipulate information and discussion. Hence, it could be argued that by bringing the public inside the gallery and designating it a public space is a radical move, one that challenges social norms and authority. Against this, it could be equally argued that the context of such a space within the coded gallery space (Duncan, 1995; O'Doherty, 1986) is sufficient discouragement to non-normative behaviour. Moreover, it can be argued that the influence of public relations and advertising (the Unilever Space, the Tate Gallery) also play a powerful role in suppressing critical discourse.

Pictures 2 and 3 here

Picture 2: The Turbine Hall (c. Corinna Dean)

Picture 3: Shibboleth by D.Salcedo, 2007 (c.Corinna Dean)

In a complex and sometimes contradictory manner, galleries and curators are now competing through the use of spectacle and scale, displaying artworks from a global roster of artists to perform on the international scale. These exhibitions appear to be examples of public art located in quasi-public spaces of the museums. The Unilever Series of installations in the Turbine Hall is a case in point. Perhaps the best known uses of the Turbine Hall in recent years was Olafur Eliasson's installation titled the 'Weather Project', and Jeff Koons's 'Puppy', a 12.4 metre topiary sculpture of a White Island Terrier, travelled to Sydney, and the Rockerfeller Centre, NY, before being bought by the Guggenheim in Bilbao. Likewise, the French artist Louise Bourgeois' 14 metre high sculpture, 'Maman', which can now be viewed on the concourse outside of Bilbao's Guggenheim. These projects, and the spaces that have been constructed to enable them to be appreciated, have aspirations of inclusion and 'public-ness' which can be illusory. The Unilever sponsorship of the Turbine Hall would probably upset Habermas for being a commercially sponsored space; and subverting the gallery 'white cube' as a critical strategy has simply resulted in the creation at Tate Modern of a bigger 'white cube'.

In this context, artists are struggling at the limits of representation: prosaically in terms of what can and cannot be represented; and, more radically, whether their art can be owned and reproduced, or whether it is embedded in a specific place. Contemporary art theorists and practitioners have responded with temporary and site specific installations, as well as the use of every day artefacts that resist commodification and reproduction, because they are already mass produced commodities (Kwon, 2002; Phelan, 1993). Allied to this radical practice is the attempt to engage with, or configure audiences as active and participatory. A particularly suggestive self-authoring version of the audience's reaction to a work has been experimented with based around representations and discussions of the Turbine Hall installations which have been posted on flickr¹⁰. The characteristics of flickr, a photo sharing website, allows individuals to upload their images. Within flickr there is no hierarchy of selection of the 'best' images by a voting system, instead they are categorised or multiply tagged by visitors to the site as 'most interesting', 'most relevant' and 'most viewed'.

¹⁰ There were approximately 10,000 posted by May 1st 2009.

Whilst flickr depends on the physical environment for content, the flickr community exists in cyberspace, thus opening up the possibility of multiple reinterpretations of the public and private space. This interpretive or dialogical space exists semi-independently from any reading of the Turbine Hall, or the physical locality around Bankside. Effectively, this demonstrates the notion of at least two definitions of community: the online and offline. More importantly, many of the flickr images illustrate an engagement with the installations: research of these is ongoing (Dean, forthcoming). On a recent consultation of flickr, Olafur Eliasson's 'Weather Project' in the Turbine Hall received the highest number of hits under tagged images. Achim Bockhart-Hume, a past curator of contemporary art at Tate Modern, described the installation as having giving the space a new reading and interpretation by the public, which has not happened with the previous installations, the users having demonstrated a sense of transgressive behaviour. Further conversations on flickr focused on the experiential quality of the piece.¹¹

Principally, the images open up a discourse and reinterpretation or transgression from the curators'/artists' intentions, expanding debate beyond the geographical limitations of the site, giving it a global reach. Additionally, the flickr user becomes both receiver and transmitter of images, constructing a two-way platform on the interpretation of the space and providing a far-reaching platform for the art as interpreted by each viewer. It is worth noting, however, that there are seldom involved discussions between flickr users about the art work itself. This experiment raises the issue of how these audiences or communities on line are using the platform of the Turbine Hall, which undeniably has a global identity as a landmark, and what are the implications of such a globally recognised space when mediated through an art institution bound up with issues of publicness: of spectacle viewed through a web-based site.

In this section we have used displays in the 'quasi-public space' of the Turbine Hall to discuss the cutting-edge issues in what might be called engagement between audience and artwork. However, the more active and multi-dimensional (re-) configuration of both viewer and viewed is the core of what is implied. Artists and curators are struggling with ways and means to communicate with audiences physically and in cyberspace, locally and trans-locally. Such experiments should not simply be discounted as minority artistic

¹¹ www.flickr.com/groups/tate_galleries/discuss/72157594319779274/ (Date consulted 4/2/09)

debates, they are indicative of the challenge and construct of what it might mean to be an audience for art and culture, and regeneration. Our examples have shown how audiences are co-constructed by institutions, art practice, politics and buildings. This is not to suggest that this is a seamless web that is equally accessible to all. Clearly, those active in, and using, such modes of representation are still the most privileged; maybe the same class factions that visit museums. Clearly more research is needed here, although there is evidence from similar experiments (see for example Bakhshi, Mateos-Garcia and Throsby 2010) that they can be limited to the same social and economic groups. But the question raised here concerns the mode and character of engagement, not the simple numerical inclusion/exclusion.

4. Conclusion: Representing and regenerating

The objective of this paper has been to question the conventional limits to regeneration. We have sought to highlight the limited range of approaches, especially using cultural institutions, and the multiplicity of audiences. Different policies evoke, or construct, various 'publics', 'visitors' and 'audiences'. Thus constructed, they connote particular included and excluded populations. This is nothing new: in many respects the literature critical of normative regeneration represents aspects of this debate.

Arguably, however, the question of who gains and loses is given an extra twist when the object or instrument of regeneration is a cultural institution: a gallery or museum. The notion of intrinsic value of culture is often raised, or at least a tension between value systems that sustain regeneration and the arts and cultural field. In this paper we have identified the manifest tensions between the instrumentalisation of museums and galleries, and the potential to undermine their core purpose. These tensions are particularly acute where investment or performance is evaluated in a uni-dimensional manner. The potential confusion of what are the objectives of investment is represented at their crudest as the tension between regenerating neighbourhoods and creating an educational, or insightful, cultural experience. As we have discussed, such evaluations are difficult enough when there is a settled view of inputs and their relationships to output targets and indicators. However, where these relationships are new, or changing, such as in the case that we have been discussing above, where audiences are multiple, and there is a complex political trade off between cultural and economic regeneration, the task of evaluation is extremely difficult, if not impossible.

The point that we have underlined in this paper is that evaluation cannot be reduced to a uni-dimensional bottom line in a multi-causal environment. We have pointed to the role of institutional changes changing the conditions of museum priorities and processes; and redefining who their audience(s) might be. We have highlighted the way that different representational or curatorial practices can, likewise, re-configure who and what, as well as where the audience is. In this context, what we mean by regeneration, and for what and who, require situated analyses.

The final part of the paper provided an illustration of the innovative responses from artists and curators to 'reach out' from the museum and gallery. On one level these touched upon normative strategies of social inclusion either through access or education. In many ways, these approaches sit alongside traditional regeneration approaches. However, we also pointed to the example of the Tate Modern Turbine Hall which provides examples of a number of intersecting strategies to challenge the passive notion of audience that regeneration, and social inclusion, implies.

What are the implications? Clearly, we are not making the case for extrapolation or replication of little Turbine Halls. Tate Modern, as well as every other gallery/museum, is a product of a particular history, and is embedded in a particular locality. However, we can suggest that Tate Modern affords us an optic through which to view some challenges to contemporary art, gallery practice and regeneration. Our paper has sought to illustrate the benefits of attempting to 'think together' two quite different literatures on audience and representation: of normative regeneration and museology. We pointed out that whilst both literatures contain concerns with impacts and audiences, they do so in quite different ways (albeit using similar terms). The former can be characterised as passive, the latter as active. Our Tate Modern example also highlighted the role of the physical structures and institutions of the museum, as well as their audiences engaged in an on-going re-configuration. The static and remote instrumentalism of current regeneration policy is unlikely to connect: it will not be instrumental. The literature on museology and its conceptions of audience offer some pointers toward a reformed vision of what and who is being regenerated. To borrow the sentiment and rhetoric of J.F.Kennedy's 1963 speech in Berlin: "Ask not what the museum can do for regeneration, but what regeneration can do for the museum"

References

- Ashworth G J, Tunbridge J E, 2000, *The tourist-historic city: retrospect and prospect of managing the heritage city*, Pergamon, Amsterdam; Oxford.
- Babbidge A, 2000, "UK museums: Safe and sound?" *Cultural Trends* 10, 1-35.
- Babbidge A, 2005, "Forty years on", *Cultural Trends* 14, 3-66.
- Bakhshi, H., Mateos-Garcia, J., and Throsby, D, 2010, *Beyond Live*, National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts, NESTA, London
- Barker E, 1999, *Contemporary cultures of display*, Yale University Press in association with the Open University, New Haven, Conn.; London.
- Bassett K, 1993, "Urban cultural strategies and urban regeneration: a case study and critique", *Environment and Planning A*, 25, 1773-1788.
- Bennett T, 1995, *The birth of the museum: history, theory, politics*, Routledge, London.
- Bianchini F, Parkinson M, 1993, *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: the West European experience* Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Bourdieu P, 1979, *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*, Routledge, London.
- Bourdieu P, Darbel A, Schnapper D, 1991, *The love of art: European art museums and their public*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Byrne D, 1999, *Social exclusion*, Open University Press, Buckingham, England; Philadelphia.
- Byrne D S, 2005 *Social exclusion*, Open University Press, Maidenhead, England; New York.
- CABE, 2002, "The project design brief: professional client's guide", in *CABE* London.
- Crimp D, Lawler L, 1993, *On the museum's ruins*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass; London.

DCMS, 1999, "A report for Policy Action Team 10: Arts and Sport", in *National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal*. Department of Culture, Media and Sport/Social Exclusion Unit, UK, London.

Dean C, Forthcoming, *'Establishing the Tate Modern Cultural Quarter: Social and Cultural Regeneration through art and architecture 1995–2005'* PhD thesis, City Programme, LSE

Dibosa D, 2007, "Migrations", in *Tate Encounters [E]dition 1* (London).

Duncan C, 1995, *Civilizing rituals: inside public art museums*, Routledge, London; New York.

Evans G, 2005, "Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration", *Urban Studies* 42, 959-983,

Florida R, 2002, "The economic geography of talent", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 92, 743-755.

Gayford, M., Holden, J., Moore, R., Smith, C., Snow, J. and Travers, T, 2005, *Tate Modern: The First Five Years*, Tate Modern, London

Gibson L, 2008, "In defence of instrumentality", *Cultural Trends* 17, 247–257.

Griffiths R, 1993, "The Politics of Cultural Policy in Urban Regeneration Strategies", *Policy & Politics*, 21, 39-46.

Habermas J, 1989, *The structural transformation of the public sphere : an inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*, Polity, Cambridge.

Hooper-Greenhill E, 1994, *The educational role of the museum*, Routledge, London.

Hooper-Greenhill E, 1997, *Cultural diversity: developing museum audiences in Britain*, Leicester University Press, London.

Judge D, Stoker G, Wolman H, 1995, *Theories of urban politics*, SAGE Publications, London; California.

Kantor S G, 2001, *Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and the intellectual origins of the Museum of Modern Art*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.; London.

Kwon M, 2002 *One place after another : site-specific art and locational identity* (MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. ; London).

Law C M, 1992, "Urban Tourism and its Contribution to Economic Regeneration", *Urban Studies* 29, 599-618.

Leonard M, 1997, *Britain TM: renewing our identity*, Demos, London.

Levitas R, 2005, *The inclusive society?: social exclusion and New Labour*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.

London SE1 (2006) Budget boost for South Bank and Bankside 'cultural quarter' (Sunday 26 March 2006) <http://www.london-se1.co.uk/news/view/2089> [accessed 24.4.10]

Logan J R, Molotch H L, 1987, *Urban fortunes : the political economy of place*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Macdonald S, Fyfe G, 1996, *Theorizing museums: representing identity and diversity in a changing world*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Miles, M. (2005). "Interruptions: Testing the rhetoric of culturally led urban development." *Urban Studies* 42.5: 889 - 911.

Millennium Commission, 1995, "Annual Report and Accounts 1994/95", Millennium Commission, London.

Mommaas H, 2004, "Cultural clusters and the post-industrial city: Towards the remapping of urban cultural policy", *Urban Studies*, 41, 507-532.

National Museums Directors' Conference, 2006, "Cultural Diversity: Final Report and Recommendations", NMDC, London.

Newman P, Smith I, 2000, "Cultural production, place and politics on the South Bank of the Thames", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24, 9-24.

O'Doherty B, 1986, *Inside the white cube: the ideology of the gallery space*, Lapis Press, San Francisco.

Pantazis C, Gordon D, Levitas R, 2006, *Poverty and social exclusion in Britain: the millennium survey*, Policy, Bristol.

Andy Pratt
May 3, '10, 10:16 PM
Added: Paragraph Break

Phelan P, 1993, "The ontology of performance: representation without reproduction", in *Unmarked: the politics of performance*, Routledge, London, 146-166.

Plaza B, 1999, "The Guggenheim-Bilbao Museum effect: A reply to Maria V. Gomez' 'reflective images: The case of urban regeneration in Glasgow and Bilbao'", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 23, 589-592.

Plaza B, 2000a, "Evaluating the Influence of a Large Cultural Artifact in the Attraction of Tourism: The Guggenheim Museum Bilbao Case", *Urban Affairs Review*, 36, 264-274.

Plaza B, 2000b, "Guggenheim museum's effectiveness to attract tourism" *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27, 1055-1058.

Plaza B, 2006, "The return on investment of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30, 452-467.

Poria Y, Ashworth G, 2009, "Heritage Tourism – Current Resource for Conflict", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36, 522-525.

Pratt A C, 2008a, "Creative cities: The cultural industries and the creative class", *Geografiska Annaler Series B-Human Geography*, 90B, 107-117.

Pratt A C, 2008b, "Innovation and creativity", in *The Sage Companion to the City* Eds J R Short, P Hubbard, T Hall, Sage, London, 266-297.

Pratt A C, 2009, "Urban regeneration: from the arts 'feel good' factor to the cultural economy. A case study of Hoxton, London", *Urban Studies*, 46, 1041-1061.

Putnam, R. D., 2000, *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*, New York; London, Simon & Schuster.

Richards G, 1996, *Cultural tourism in Europe*, CAB International, Wallingford, UK.

Richards G, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009 *The impact of culture on tourism*, OECD, Paris.

Rogerson R J, 1999, "Quality of life and city competitiveness", *Urban Studies*, 36, 969-985.

Sandell R, 2002, *Museums, society, inequality*, Routledge, London).

Short J R, Kim Y-K, 1998, "Urban crises/urban representations: selling the city in difficult times", in *The entrepreneurial city: geographies of politics, regime and representation*, Eds. P Hall, P Hubbard, John Wiley and Sons, London, 55-75.

Stonor Saunders F, 1999, *Who paid the piper? The C.I.A. and the cultural cold war*, Granta, London.

Tate Gallery, 2000, "Philanthropy, The Role of Benefactors, Opportunities for Giving & Tax Effective Ways of Giving", Tate Modern, London.

Tate Trustees, 2002, "Tate Report 2000-2002", Tate Gallery Publishing, London.

Travers T, 2005, "Renewing London", in *Tate Modern: The First Five Years*, Ed. M E A Gayford, Tate Publishing, London.

Travers T, 2006, "Values & Vision: The Contribution of Culture", a report for Arts Council England, The National Museum Directors' Conference, The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, The Association of Independent Museums, The Group for Large Local Authority Museums, The Museums Association, and The University Museums Group.

Vergo P, 1989, *The new museology*, Reaktion Books, London.

Zukin S, 1982, *Loft living: culture and capital in urban change*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Zukin S, 1995, *The cultures of cities*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.