

Tracing the Genealogy of Art Instruction in Colonial Lahore: German Philosophy, Design Pedagogy and Nineteenth-Century England^N

Abstract

In 1875, John Lockwood Kipling, the founding principal of the Mayo School of Arts, Lahore, devised a curriculum for imparting craft training to artisans in Punjab. He borrowed theoretical assumptions from German natural philosophy which was already incorporated in the curriculum of design education in nineteenth-century England. Strongly influenced by James Mill's Utilitarian ideas and German philosophy, English art administrators institutionalised the design pedagogy under the auspices of the Department of Science and Art set up in South Kensington, London. The department owed its establishment and achievements to Henry Cole's perseverance. Inclusion of philosophical assumptions about nature, geometry, science and beauty in the curriculum led to the emergence of a new category, designer, which was supposed to focus on design, utility and marketability of industrial production. Artisan was supposed to assume this new role of designer by acquiring proficiency in reproducing designs from nature along with considering the demands in the market and by developing knowledge of machine. In this way, handicrafts could be replaced with mechanical production of commodities. The basic question of this article is how did capitalist interests define *value* of objects? By considering this question from Marxist point of view, I trace the genealogy of art instruction in colonial Lahore by studying the development of design pedagogy in nineteenth-century England.

Key Words- Design Pedagogy; Henry Cole; Immanuel Kant; Utilitarianism; John Lockwood Kipling; Mayo School of Arts; Lahore; England.

Established in 1875, Mayo School of Arts, Lahore (MSA), was among the four leading art schools in India, which aimed at giving training to artisans according to the emerging needs of colonial economy. British art administrators defined two contradictory objectives for the school: "to disseminate general art culture, so that at least as the future deputy magistrate or government clerk must know about Chaucer, Edwardian glories in the stone building, Elizabethian literature, etc.",ⁱ and to "revive crafts now half forgotten, and to discourage as much as possible the crude attempts at reproduction of the worst features of Birmingham and Manchester work now so much common among natives".ⁱⁱ The first objective romanticised British cultural practices and argued to introduce these in Punjab through art instruction, while the other objective idealized Punjab's pre-colonial art and craft practices which should be protected from the European influences. However, in both objectives, colonial art administrators assumed that the British were knowledgeable and trained enough to set up an art school in

¹ Assistant Professor, COMSATS Institute of Information Technology, Lahore

Lahore. I have discussed somewhere else the colonial art education in Lahore,ⁱⁱⁱ which is not the scope of this article. Here, I explore the ideas (concerning nature, beauty, geometry and science) incorporated in design pedagogy in England, which the colonial administrators used later on for devising the curriculum for the art school in Lahore.

In nineteenth-century France and England, the process of industrialization and urbanization was accompanied by the disappearance of certain crafts, the emergence of industrial areas and large cities with slums and elite areas, the establishment of large markets, and a growing consciousness about the modern values and increasing threat to the natural landscape.^{iv} Art critics responded to such social transformation in two ways: some believed in promoting rational, scientific and secular values in art practices; while others contested industrialization and supported medieval craft practices, Christian morality and mysticism. These two analytically broad categories are important to understand the theoretical underpinnings of art education in England and Lahore, respectively.

Current scholarship on nineteenth-century art education in England mainly relates the emergence of schools of design to the increasing role of the middle class in a centralized state structure and the process of industrialisation.^v Others suggest that the question of “national taste” led to the reforms in the art and design education, which involved civic and moral attitudes, a sense of what is good design among customers and manufacturers that was not necessarily linked to the economic rationale.^{vi} Such scholarship also identifies multiple tensions between the local elites, the state authorities in London and the management of art schools, which changed the utilitarian agenda of education in England.

Following Arindam Dutta, I propose in this article a complex relationship between the state and design pedagogy based on the reformulation of German romantic and natural philosophy to support the colonial economy.^{vii} Henry Cole’s (1808-82) pedagogical efforts attempted to ensure a smooth transition from handicrafts to mechanical mass production with “aesthetically” improved designs.^{viii} In other words, the economic interests of the middle class defined the parameters of art education in England. For Karl Marx, the conditions of capitalism involving the division of labour, the use of machinery, state, laws and institutions, not only lead to the alienation of labour from its own product,^{ix} but also to the fetishism of the commodities. He sees this alienation in industry and art works as representing the superstructure of the bourgeois society.^x Here, I am concerned with the intellectual exercise involving the establishment of various institutions in England, the appropriation of science and philosophical ideas for producing the “conditions of capitalism” to increase the market value of commodities. Several art critics contested Cole’s pedagogical endeavours, which influenced educationists in England and Lahore as well.

Henry Cole and the Establishment of Art Institutions

In England, Henry Cole and his associates institutionalized the rational perspective of art and its application to the industrial production. More than French positivism, Cole and his associates were influenced by Jeremy Bentham’s utilitarian philosophy. Bentham contended that to achieve maximum happiness, the human conduct should be based on law and reason rather than any emotional,

religious or traditional association.^{xi} Art could only survive if it was useful for a society. By quantitatively distinguishing various forms of pleasures into moral, intellectual and physical, J.S. Mill further developed utilitarianism and argued that human beings who existed at a higher level, experienced more happiness because of their higher abilities to use rational faculties.^{xii} Thus, the British, because of their superiority in knowledge, could teach morality and art in the colonies. This reformist agenda formed the basic assumptions of art instruction in England and Lahore, too.

In the 1820s and the 30s, English intellectuals debated various reforms concerning the electoral process, the individual's rights, the issues of trade, the role of the state in the public sphere, etc. Construction of some major buildings (the British parliament and the British Museum) engaged intellectuals and parliamentarians with philosophies of design and aesthetics and the type of architecture that could best reflect the democratic values and the nations' rich cultural heritage.^{xiii} The Reform Act of 1832 opened the way for the middle class to play a role at the state level in controlling design education, which could increase the prospects for exports.^{xiv} In 1835, a select committee on arts and manufactures underlined deplorable conditions of the British industrial products; the members proposed to establish an academy to train local designers in order to compete with other countries, especially France.^{xv}

In this context, Cole wrote booklets, manuals and pamphlets, which preoccupied him with the contemporary debates on art and design education, industry, traditional crafts, and architecture.^{xvi} Cole theoretically engaged the definition of art in the 1840s. By then, the term "art" or "fine art" was strictly used for the Greco-Roman sculpture and Renaissance art. "Art" was either fine or applied depending on its beauty or utility. But with the publication of several commentaries on buildings, architecture was also included in the concept of art despite its utilitarian nature.^{xvii}

In 1845, Cole used for the first time the term "Art Manufacture" to denote the application of "Fine Art" to mechanical mass production.^{xviii} The aim of art manufacturers was "to produce in each article superior utility, which is not to be sacrificed to ornament; to select pure forms; to decorate each article with appropriate details relating to its use, and to obtain these details directly as possible from Nature".^{xix} To popularize the concept, Cole established a firm, Summerly's Art Manufactures, and inaugurated the *Journal of Design and Manufacture* to codify and standardize the principles for design and manufacturing.^{xx}

Henry Cole's involvement in organizing the landmark Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations in 1851 brought him close to the official circles and established his contacts with the manufacturers, artisans, art schools, local communities, and traders.^{xxi} This network helped him to understand the relationship between the state machinery, artisans, designs, industry and consumers. For the rest of his life, he worked to institutionalize this relationship in England and India.

The post-exhibition literature, especially that produced by the Cole circle, systematically codified these art theories.^{xxii} Cole and other commentators appreciated the display of the East India Company as they found a strong relationship of utility and design in the Indian products.^{xxiii} They believed that European art was then “in discredited state” and European artisans lacked “guiding principles in design and still less of unity in its application”.^{xxiv} To improve this situation, they laid emphasis on the scientific training of artisans in geometry, drawing and proper use of colours, through an organized system of art instruction for artisans and industrial manufacturers which could improve public taste. A key concern of the Cole circle in these debates was how to increase the “market value” of artisanal and industrial products. One of the ideas that emerged in these debates was that designers should take inspiration from nature rather than ancient art, industrial design should not be too decorative; rather, that decoration should accord with the use of a product.

In 1852, the government established the Department of Practical Art (renamed Department of Science and Art [DSA] in 1855) under Henry Cole, who was assisted by Richard Redgrave (1804-1888), a painter and etcher. Owen Jones (1809-1874), an architect and designer, famous for his studies of the Alhambra Palace in Spain, was appointed as Redgrave’s assistant. The main objective of the department was to devise and promote art education in schools to lay “the foundation of correct judgement” among the consumers and manufacturers.^{xxv} Cole from the very beginning centralized the DSA and by the 1860s its main occupation became management rather than training.^{xxvi} The pedagogical framework of the DSA involved not an individual relation of a teacher-student, rather it was a textbook-teacher-student relationship, as Dutta describes it.^{xxvii} Teachers were selected because of their abilities to impart the prescribed curriculum rather than their individual creativity and excellence in art. The system of art instruction devised by Cole and his associates is called the South Kensington School System (SKSS).

Design Pedagogy and German Philosophy

Arindam Dutta suggests that the DSA’s intellectual exercise of devising the national curriculum intended to incorporate artisans in industrialization and to forge a new category of designer to increase the market value of industrial products. Here, I will explain the concepts of nature, geometry, science and beauty with reference to the natural philosophy of Immanuel Kant and Johann Wolfgang Goethe, and the incorporation of such ideas in the curriculum of the DSA and the art school in Lahore.

Immanuel Kant considers “nature” as the sole source of all phenomena. Human beings understand nature as it appears to their faculties in its diverse and complex forms. Nature cannot be divided into components and “the proper unchangeable fundamental basic measure of nature is its absolute whole”.^{xxviii} Due to its infinite magnitude nature cannot be understood as a whole. Only parts of the diverse components of nature can be comprehended either through empirical laws known to us through experiences or analogies based on the “transcendental laws of nature, *a priori* propositions that are intellectual and at the same time synthetic”.^{xxix} The studies of the diverse components must be located within a unified concept

of nature. This notion of “one nature” reflecting in “all appearances” became one of the basic assumptions in the SKSS.

Kant suggests that mathematics is applicable to nature through figurative expressions, that is, geometry. Geometrical demonstrations, if they cannot be related to pure mathematics (empiricism), are nothing more than imagination. The advancement in the mathematical and geometrical principles was a *revolution* in the “mode of thinking” showing the progress of human civilization.^{xxx} Kant considered Euclidean geometry as a model which explained the logics of nature, and non-Euclidean (Oriental) geometry as fantasy. This Kantian notion that the western tradition of geometry “acquired a secure path of science” and that the geometrical demonstrations reflect the internal logics of nature became an important principle in the curriculum of the DSA.

For Kant, the idea of beauty is fundamentally non-cognitive because its judgement is either a source of happiness (a feeling for the persistence of life) or unhappiness (a feeling for the restraint in life); therefore, beauty becomes aesthetic and subjective. So, beauty is unsymmetrical and an excess of form rather than a form itself. It is a form that is yet to be incorporated into any conceptual framework; hence, beauty cannot be grasped empirically. It is emotional rather than rational.

Kant argues that our aesthetic feelings can lead to four moments of aesthetic judgement about beauty. The first is quality, that is, our disinterestedness: “we take pleasure in something because we judge it beautiful” and we do not have any moral or empirical concerns about it;^{xxx} the second is quantity, that is, universal appreciation: we expect agreement on beauty despite knowing that it is subjective. Kant underlines that we suppose that there is some consensus on the concept of beauty, that’s why we argue for a universal agreement, but “if we judge objects merely in terms of concepts, then we lose all presentation of beauty. This is why there can be no rule by which someone could be compelled to acknowledge that something is beautiful”.^{xxxii} The third one is relation, that the beautiful object is “purposive without purpose”,^{xxxiii} in other words, that it has no other purpose except to be beautiful. In that case, if an object is judged either according to its external purpose (use) or internal purpose (its design or manufacturing), then, utility (in the case of former) and perfection (in the case of later) cannot be termed as beautiful because utility and perfection are characteristics which cannot be considered as beauty. The fourth moment is modality or necessity. It combines all the previous three moments in an “idea of a common sense”, that is, an “a priori principle” of one’s own taste. But for Kant, it is a possibility that we do not have such type of “common sense” or it is regulated by some reason.^{xxxiv}

Goethe, while accepting Kant’s idea of nature as an archetype, contends that what happens in nature is also reflected in its components (object and subject). Unlike Kant, he reduces the difference between object and subject and argues that both (object and subject) interact with each other through experiment.^{xxxv} By conducting biological experiments, we can grasp the laws of nature, the very ideas which govern nature and its beauty. In this way, beauty can also be understood empirically, which is impossible in Kantian philosophy. Goethe establishes a relation between aesthetics and science. He suggests that scientific experiments are

like mathematical equations, both lead us to the original value (ideas or objects), helping us to understand successive steps of evolution. In other words, everything is conceptually unified with an inherent purpose and direction, and by learning the basic principles, we can understand the growth of biological forms (plants, animals and human beings).^{xxxvi} Accordingly, the study of each evolutionary step of a biological form subordinated to the natural laws, helps us to comprehend the beauty of that object. It was Goethe's argument of empirically grasping beauty, and understanding the laws of nature through the observation of various biological forms, which the DSA applied in the SKSS.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, German philosophy made its way to England when the authorities of different design schools arranged lectures of distinguished biologists and anatomists on beauty and the laws of nature. Also, various museums in England housed biological specimens to guide design students as how to reproduce the patterns of plants and other natural objects on industrial products. Two associates of Henry Cole, William Dyce (1806-1864) and Christopher Dresser (1834-1904), introduced German natural philosophy in the curriculum of the SKSS while keeping it consistent with the interests of the English capitalists.

William Dyce systematized the instruction of geometry. In 1837, Dyce visited France, Prussia, Saxony and Bavaria on the instruction of the Select Committee on Arts and their Connections with Manufacture. After studying various models in Europe, he developed a curriculum for the English schools of design for improving industrial products.^{xxxvii} For Dyce, geometry was a tool which could be used for improving the tastes of manufacturers. Before him, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827), a Swiss educationist, formulated geometrical exercises for developing artistic skills among the children of kindergarten age. These exercises involved a practice of various geometrical forms like line, square, circle, moving from simple to complex.^{xxxviii} Dyce used these ideas in his model. For Pestalozzi, basic geometrical skills, rather than fine art, could enhance children's artistic and expressive faculties. Dyce had a similar opinion about artisans as needing training not in the fine arts but in basic geometry in order to polish their skills. The way Pestalozzi treated children, Dyce treated "illiterate" artisans.^{xxxix}

By following Kant's idea that beauty lies in nature, and by borrowing Goethe's concept that the beauty of nature can be grasped empirically, imitation of nature became an important exercise in the SKSS. The emphasis on nature was also due to the aversion of Utilitarian philosophers towards other philosophies. Geometry was integrated with drawing to enable the students to understand the logics of the beauty of nature.^{xl} Dyce emphasized that a craftsman should learn different geometrical forms of the natural objects to know the delicacies of natural beauty, which craftsmen can apply to handicrafts.^{xli} Unlike Kant, Dyce argued that beautiful designs had other purpose (utility) and beautifully designed objects (in the form of industrial products or crafts) are closely connected to our daily life. For him, a designer mediated between machine and art through his designs by taking care of the inner beauty of an object, as reflected in nature, and understanding the rational function of the machine, which imprinted those designs on different products.

Like Dyce, Christopher Dresser, a product designer and drawing teacher at the London School of Design (LSD), also articulated a notion of aesthetics on scientific basis in the design curriculum of the SKSS. Dresser used Goethe's idea of a unified nature which could be comprehended through observation and anatomy. For him, various geometrical forms were similar in all plants and even animals, suggesting a unity in the diversity of nature.^{xlii} So the main objective of an art student or designer should be to understand this unity of concept.

The implication of such assertion was far reaching. In the SKSS, Dresser and others shifted their emphasis from handling the material to the observation of natural objects and beautification of the industrial products. They regarded artisan as one category, which could be trained through a uniform curriculum.^{xliii} They envisioned a designer who could design or draw a variety of objects on different surfaces, and possessed diverse artisanal skills. As the designers were supposed to facilitate in mechanical production, the machine assumed an integral part of the notion of beauty in the design curriculum. If laboratory instruments could help in understanding the laws of nature, machines could also reproduce patterns similar to those in nature. If a designer used repetitive geometrical patterns, the machine could perform the same function, both designs looking equally beautiful.^{xliiv} In this way, Dresser constructed a close relationship between the machine, nature and beauty. So the training of artisans and designers in aesthetics was not only meant to equip them with a notion of natural beauty but also to train them to handle the machine, and to make them realize that this industrial transformation could produce equally beautiful objects.

Utility becomes an integral part of aesthetics in the design curriculum; a product has to be beautiful as well as useful, unlike the Kantian concept for which beauty has no purpose. The desire for expanding market was deriving the very value of this beauty. Dresser makes it clear in his writing: "At the very outset we must recognize the fact that the beautiful has a commercial or *money value*".^{xlv} He claims that it is design that makes the value of any product; if the material is precious but it is not well finished, it cannot have any market value. So the Utilitarian project of the DSA assumed that the value of an object can be defined on the basis of its beauty and utility.^{xlvi} This is exactly what Marx intends when he writes that it is capital and its working conditions which ascribe a particular value to an object.^{xlvii} In short, the assumptions in German natural philosophy were altered and incorporated in the SKSS to serve the interests of the English capitalist class by integrating artisanal practices with manufacturing processes and the market.

Selective assumption of German natural philosophy made their way to colonial Lahore, when the British state appointed John Lockwood Kipling as first principal of the MSA. Born to a Methodist minister, Joseph Kipling, Lockwood Kipling was trained at South Kensington and had a good grasp over the theoretical debates in the SKSS. In India, he also worked as an in-charge of decorative sculpture at Bombay School of Arts. While devising curriculum for students in Lahore, Kipling assumed that SKSS was perfectly suitable for them.^{xlviii} For him, artisans in Punjab lacked theoretical insights into their work and this problem could be overcome by introducing geometry, drawing and science.

Following Kant, Kipling believed that ornamental geometry practiced in Punjab had no theoretical or analytical basis. It was a product of intuition and should be discouraged. He introduced western geometry in MSA as it could instil rationality among the artisans in Punjab.^{xlix} In the same way, Kipling also introduced Goethe's idea of understanding the laws of nature by making drawings of biological objects such as plants and humans in the third and fourth year of teaching.¹ He believed that artisans in Punjab had imagination based on superstitions largely derived from religion. Such fantasy also reflected in their craft practices. Knowledge about the laws of nature acquired through observation and drawing could bring accuracy and precision in the products of Punjabi artisans. Unlike in England, where DSA's theoretical courses meant to train artisans to work with machine, Kipling's use of theory aimed to invoke artisans' understanding of their own work. His disliking for industrialization was due to the influence of the critics of SKSS, which I will discuss in the following paragraphs.

Many commentators in England became critical of industrialization and saw mechanization as destruction of social and moral values, and culture. Some of them laid emphasis on the continuation of tradition to define modern as close to nature,^{li} while others rejected modernization and argued for the revival of medieval traditions.^{lii} In this context, two leading figures, John Ruskin (1819-1900) and William Morris (1834 –1896), voiced criticism of the SKSS.

John Ruskin, the renowned British art critic, saw Cole's instruction plan as a fallacy because teaching drawing was possible but inspiration for design was a God-given ability which could not be sold.^{liii} For him, refinement in perception was more important than the ability to draw, and this refinement could be improved by observing natural objects, and composition of colours, especially light and shade.^{liiv} This approach was contrary to Dyce's and Dresser's views, which stressed line drawings and geometrical forms. Ruskin proposed that art should aim at praising God (as in the case of Gothic art), and that history and natural sciences should be included in art instruction. Ruskin believed that the SKSS would soon lead to the erosion of intellect and morality.^{liv}

Opposition to the SKSS also came from the proponents of the Arts and Crafts Movement, especially from William Morris, an English furniture and textile designer. In his youth, he had refused to see the Great Exhibition since many commentators believed the display of handicrafts to be "wonderfully ugly".^{livi} Inspired by romanticism, medievalism and spiritualism, he proposed that production and marketing of traditional crafts could counter the influences of the SKSS. Like Ruskin, Morris called for patronage of the lesser arts and supported the socialist view of reforming art and design techniques for everyone. Morris considered that mass production and reduction of artists to labourers in the industrial system would lead to the decadence of art. Only manual skills with knowledge of treating materials used in various crafts could form a good art. William Morris' views enjoyed limited popularity among the English middle class.

Ruskin's and Morris' ideas of patronising lesser crafts also influenced Lockwood Kipling in Lahore. He instituted the *Journal of Indian Art and Industry* in 1884 to argue the support for and revival of (pre-colonial) Indian arts and crafts. However, as a member of colonial education service, Kipling could do little in making radical amendments to the design curriculum devised within the

framework of SKSS, which served the objectives of English middle class. In a way, Kipling supported the economic interests of the colonial state by encouraging Punjabi artisans to learn western theories, use modern raw material (such as colours, leather, building material, etc.) and finally prepare and sell their products to European traders for overseas exports.

Conclusion

For tracing the genealogy of theoretical assumptions in the curriculum of art education in colonial Lahore, we must consider the development of design pedagogy in nineteenth-century England. By engaging Karl Marx's concept that "conditions of capitalism" define the market value of commodities, I argue that Henry Cole and his associates incorporated German philosophical assumptions in SKSS. Henry Cole, son of a middle class British army officer, and a staunch supporter of James Mill's Utilitarian ideas, came close to the Royal family because of successfully organizing the Great Exhibition. The government assigned him to look after a newly established DSA which designed pedagogical framework for schools in England and India. Major objective of this exercise was to ensure "the foundation of correct judgement" among buyers and producers. This could be done by imparting training to designers whose designs would make industrial products more profitable. In this way, aesthetics were linked with market.

Cole and his associates borrowed the concepts of nature, geometry, science and beauty from the philosophy of Kant and Goethe for incorporating in the design curriculum. John Lockwood Kipling institutionalised similar assumptions in Lahore. Ideas such as "one nature" representing all appearances, Oriental geometry as a fantasy, mathematics and Euclidean geometry as a revolution in the mode of thinking, empirical understanding of beauty through the laws which govern nature, and observation of biological forms to appreciate what is beautiful became salient features of design pedagogy. Inclusion of these ideas in the curriculum of SKSS and MSA significantly shifted the focus of design education from handling material to observation of nature, use of mathematics and geometry, utility and beautification of industrial products. At the same time, designers must be trained to keep a low cost of production, thus, increasing the margin of profit. Cole's ideas were resisted by art critics such as John Ruskin and William Morris who argued to patronize hand-made crafts but Cole circle remained influential in policy making as it catered to the needs of English middle class. Ruskin and Morris also influenced Kipling but such influences could not stop him in encouraging artisans of Punjab to learn geometry, mathematics and western theories.

Notes and References

* I owe an intellectual debt to Arindam Dutta for this article as most of the ideas presented here are discussed by him in *The Bureaucracy of Beauty: Design in the Age of its Global Reproducibility* (London: Routledge, 2007). Meticulous feedback of Maurizio Peleggi, Tan Tai Yong and Tania Roy on multiple drafts of this article greatly helped in refining my argument.

ⁱ“Memorandum on the formation of MSA by Henry Hoover Locke” in Samina Choonara (ed.), *“Official” Chronicle of the Mayo School of Art: Formative Years under J.L. Kipling (1874-94)* (Lahore: National College of Arts, 2003), p. 155.

ⁱⁱJ.L. Kipling and T.H. Thronton, *Lahore as it was* (Lahore: National College of Arts, 2001, reprinted), p. 49.

ⁱⁱⁱ See Hussain Ahmad Khan, *Artisans, Sufis, Shrines: Colonial Architecture in nineteenth-century Punjab* (London: IB Tauris, 2015), pp. 61-91 (for art education in Lahore).

^{iv}Augustus Welby Pugin, *Contrasts; or, A Parallel between the Noble Edifices of the Fourteenth Centuries, and Similar Buildings of the Present Day; Shewing the Present Decay of Taste* (London: St. Maries’ Grange, 1836), pp. 30-5. Robert Vaughan, *The Age of Great Cities: or, Modern Societies Viewed in its relation to Intelligence, Morals and Religion* (London: Jackson and Walford, 1843); Edgar Allan Poe, *Tales of Mystery and Imagination* (London: Henry Frowde, 1903), 339-48 (for the story “The man of the Crowd”, describing Urban population). For various aspects of daily life in London see James Ewing Ritchie, *About London* (London: William Tinsley, 1860).

^vNicolaus Pevsner, *Academies of Art Past and Present* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1973); Lewis Mumford, *Art and Technics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952); Quentin Bell, *The Schools of Design* (London: Routledge, 1963); Mahrukh Keki Tarapor, “Art and Empire: The Discovery of India in Art and Literature, 1851-1947” (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Unpublished PhD dissertation, 1977); Arthur D. Efland, *A History of Art Education: Intellectuals and Social Currents in Teaching the Visual Arts* (London: Teachers College Press, 1990), pp. 49-114; Stuart Macdonald, *The History and Philosophy of Art Education* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2004), pp. 73-252; Dutta, *The Bureaucracy of Beauty*, pp. 79-154; George Sutton, *Artisan or Artist?* (London: Pergamon, 1967); R. Carline, *Draw They Must* (London: Arnold, 1968); C. Ashwin, *Art Education Documents and Policies 1768-1975* (London: SRHE, 1975).

^{vi}Mervyn Romans, “A Question of ‘Taste’: Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth-Century” in Mervyn Romans (ed.), *Histories of Art and Design Education: Collected Essays* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2005), pp. 41-54; Mervyn Romans, “Social Class and the Origin of Public Art and Design Education in Britain: In Search of a Targeted Group” in *Ibid.*, pp. 55-65; John Swift, *An Illustrated History of Moseley School of Art: Art Education in Birmingham 1800-1975* (Newton Stewart: An Machair Press, 2004).

^{vii} Dutta, *The Bureaucracy of Beauty*.

^{viii}See his autobiography, Henry Cole, *Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, Accounts for in his Deeds, Speeches and Writings*, 2 Vols. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1884). Born to a British military officer of a middle class family, Henry Cole, soon after graduation, worked under Francis Palgrave at the Record Commission in the 1820s. Cole had a close interaction with John Stuart Mill, Horace Grant, Edward Chadwick, and Charles Buller. This group of scholars strongly influenced Cole when he was assigned by the government to establish various institutions (art schools, museums and exhibitions).

^{ix}Karl Marx, “Estranged Labour” in *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, trans. Martin Mulligan (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1959), p. xxii.

^xFor the emergence of bourgeoisie society see Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, trans. Samuel More (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1908 [1848]).

^{xi}Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, 2 Vols. (London: W. Pickering, 1823).

^{xii}John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism* (London: Parker, 1863), pp. 8-37 (for his definition of utilitarianism), also see John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1859).

^{xiii}For one such debate, see George Cleghorn, *Ancient and Modern Art, Historical and Critical*, Vol. I (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1848), pp. 156-222.

^{xiv}John Benn Walsh Ormathwaite, *The Practical Results of the Reform Act of 1832* (London: John Murray, 1860), pp. 64-77.

^{xv}Its objective was “to enquire into the best means of extending knowledge of the arts and of the principles of design among the people (especially the manufacturing population) of the country; and also to enquire into the constitution, management, and effects of institutions connected with the arts”. Edward Edwards, *The Administrative Economy of the Fine Arts in England* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1840), p. 317.

^{xvi}Cole wrote manuals and designed railway chart for tourists, who visited the old sites, and explained old buildings, moments, and other important sites (like Church Temple, Canterbury Cathedral, Windsor and Oxford) along the railway track. He also published a series of books for children, *Home Treasury*. See for instance, Henry Cole (ed.), *The Pleasant History of Reynard the Fox* (London: Joseph Cundall, 1843).

^{xvii}James Fergusson, *Picturesque Illustrations of Ancient Architecture in Hindostan* (London: J. Hogarth, 1847); Welby Northmore Pugin, *True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (London: W. Hughes, 1841); John Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, 5 Vols. (London: Smith, 1857-1860, [1843]).

^{xviii}Henry Cole, *Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, Accounts for in his Deeds, Speeches and Writings*, Vol. I (London: George Bell and Sons, 1884), pp. 103-4.

^{xix}John Timbs, *The Year-Book of Facts in Science and Art: Exhibiting the most Important Discoveries and Improvements During the Year 1846* (London: David Bogue, 1847), p. 8.

^{xx}From the platform of Summerly’s Art Manufactures, Cole designed a tea-set for a competition organized by the Society of Arts in 1846, and won the first prize due to a simple design and cheap price.

^{xxi}On Henry Cole’s suggestion, Prince Consort Albert organized the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations to give “a true test and a living picture of the point of development at which the whole mankind has arrived..., and a new starting point from which all nations will be able to direct their further exertions”. *Official Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue of the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations, 1851*, Part 1 (London: W. Clowes & Sons, 1851), p. 4. The exhibition was a landmark in many ways: It globally presented Britain as a proud, modernized state by displaying its industrial and manufacturing products; it strongly influenced the theories of art, design and manufacturing; and it set a model for other exhibitions in various countries. For instance, exhibitions were organized in 1853, in Dublin and New York, and in 1855 in Paris. Like in the Great Exhibition, these world fairs also followed the classification of raw products, manufacturing, machinery and Fine Arts.

^{xxii}Ralph Nicholson Wornum, “The Exhibition as a Lesson in Taste”, *Art-Journal Illustrated Catalogue* (London: Bradbury and Evans, 1851), p. I-XXII; Mrs Merrifield, “On the Harmony of Colours, as Exemplified in the Exhibition”, in *Ibid.*, p. I-VIII; Richard Redgrave, “Supplementary Report on Design” in *Reports by the Juries on the Subjects in the Thirty Classes into which the Exhibition was Divided* (London: William Clowes & Sons, 1852), pp. 708-49; Digby Wyatt, “An Attempt to Define the Principles which should determine Form in the Decorative Arts” in *Lectures on the Results of the Great Exhibition of 1851* (London: David Bogue, 1853), pp. 213-51; Owen Jones, “An attempt to define Principles which should regulate the employment of Colour in the Decorative Arts” in *Ibid.*, pp. 253-300; Matthew Didby Wyatt, *The Industrial Arts of the Nineteenth Century: A Series of Illustrations of the Choicest Specimens by every nation at the Great Exhibition of Works of Industry, 1851* (London: Day and Sons, 1853); Ralph Nicholson Wornum, *Analysis of Ornament, The Characteristics of Styles: An Introduction to the Study of Ornamental Art* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1856); Owen Jones, *The Grammar of Ornament* (London: Day and Son, 1865).

^{xxiii}Several commentators criticized the Indian artisans, see Lara Kriegel, *Grand Designs: Labor, Empire, and the Museum in Victorian Culture* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2007), pp. 117, 120-1.

^{xxiv}First Report of the Department of Practical Art (London: George E. Eyre and William Spottiswoode, 1853), p. 231.

^{xxv}The objectives were: “a. general elementary instruction in art, as a branch of national education among all classes of the community, with the view of laying the foundation of correct judgment, both in the consumer and the producer of manufactures; b. advanced instruction in art, with a view to its special cultivation; and lastly, the application of the principles of technical art to the improvement of manufactures, together with the establishment of museums, by which all classes might be induced to investigate those common principles of taste, which may be traced in the works of excellence of all ages”. Ibid., p. 2.

^{xxvi}Initially the department controlled over sixteen schools. In 1855, nearly one thousand teachers were instructed in the art schools. In 1857, the Department’s central offices were shifted to South Kensington. In the same year, the South Kensington Museum was established. Cole was made as its first director. To engage artisans in his design discourse, Cole arranged one penny lecture series. In 1859, the Royal School of Art was established to train teachers for prospective art schools and “to establish a connection between art and industry”. *Accounts and Papers of the House of Commons, Education*, Vol. LIV, Session 19 Nov. 1867-31 Jul. 1868 (London: Parliament, House of Commons, 1867-68), p. 288 (for its objectives and courses).

^{xxvii}Dutta, *The Bureaucracy of Beauty*, p. 135.

^{xxviii}Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, Nicholas Walker (ed.), (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 86.

^{xxix}Immanuel Kant, *Critick of Pure Reason* (London: William Pickering, 1838), pp.198-9.

^{xxx}Ibid., pp. xi-xii.

^{xxxi}Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, pp. 35-41.

^{xxxii}Ibid., pp. 45-9.

^{xxxiii}Ibid., pp. 51-66.

^{xxxiv}Ibid., pp. 67-70.

^{xxxv}See Goethe’s article, “The Experiment as Mediator between Subject and Object” (1792) in Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Scientific Studies*, trans. & ed. Douglas Miller (New York: Suhrkamp Publishers, 1988).

^{xxxvi}M.F.G. Pictet, “On the Writings of Goethe relative to Natural History”, in W. Jardine, W.J. Hookers, Richard Taylor (eds.), *Annals of Natural History; Or, Magazine of Zoology, Botany, and Geology*, Vol. II (London: R. and J.E. Taylor, 1839), pp. 316-22.

^{xxxvii}William Dyce, “Continental Schools of Design”, in William and Robert Chambers (eds.), *Chambers’s Edinburgh Journal*, Vol.ix, nos. 417-68 (Edinburgh: William and Robert Chambers, 1841), pp. 132-3.

^{xxxviii} See for his ideas on education, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, *Letters of Pestalozzi on the Education of Infancy. Addressed to Mothers* (Boston: Carter and Hendee, 1830). Pestalozzi’s ideas were put in practice in Britain when the government established the Home and Colonial Society to train kindergarten teachers. See “Extracts from Syllabus of Lessons on Education, Given to Students in Training at the Home and Colonial School Society” in Henry Barnard & Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, *Pestalozzi and Pestalozzianism, Life, Educational Principles, and Methods, of Johan Henry Pestalozzi; With Biographical Sketches of several of his Assistants and Disciples*, part 1 (New York: F.C. Brownell, 1859), pp. 32-6.

^{xxxix}Dutta, *The Bureaucracy of Beauty*, p. 96.

^{xl}Cole picked this idea of integrating geometry and drawing from Burchett’s publications. See R. Burchett, *Practical Perspective, The Course of Lectures on Linear Perspective* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1858, third edition), pp. v-x. On the use of geometry in art instruction, see R. Burchett, *Practical Geometry: A Course of Construction of Plane Geometrical Figures, for use of Art Schools* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1871, 12th edition).

-
- ^{xli}“Dyce’s Lecture on Ornament” in J.C. Robinson, *A Catalogue of the Museum of Ornamental Art, at Marlborough House, Pall Mall*, part I (London: Chapman and Hall, 1856, 3rd edition), p. 126.
- ^{xlii}Christopher Dresser, *Unity in Variety, As induced from the Vegetable Kingdom: Being an attempt at Developing that Oneness which is Discoverable in the habits, mode of growth, and Principle of Construction of All Plants* (London: James S. Virtue, 1860), pp. 158-9, 162.
- ^{xliii}Christopher Dresser, *Principles of Victorian Decorative Design* (London: Cassell, Petter and Galpin, 1873, 2nd edition), pp. 3-4.
- ^{xliv}Christopher Dresser, *The Technical Educator: An Encyclopaedia of Technical Education*, Vol. 1 (London: Cassell, Petter and Galpin, 1872), p. 279.
- ^{xlv}*Ibid.*, p. 49.
- ^{xlvi}Wormum, *Analysis of Ornament*, p. 6.
- ^{xlvii}Karl Marx, *Theories of the Surplus-Value*, Vol. IV of *Capital* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968 [1863]), p. 870.
- ^{xlviii}See the proposed plan, “Proposed Plan for the organization of MSA by J L Kipling, Esquire (1875)”, dated 27 May 1875, in Choonara (ed.), “*Official*” *Chronicle*, p. 159.
- ^{xlix}*Ibid.*, p. 159. For this purpose, Kipling used R. Burchett’s *Practical Geometry: A Course of Construction of Plane Geometrical Figures, for use of Art Schools* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1871, 12th edition).
- ^lJ.L. Kipling, “Report of the Principal, School of Art, Lahore, for 1882-83” in Choonara (ed.), “*Official*” *Chronicle*, p. 49.
- ^{li}John Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, Vol. I (London: Smith, 1857 [1843]).
- ^{lii}For instance, Paillot de Montabert and Friedrich Theodor Vischer (1807-87) promoted religious art.
- ^{liii}John Ruskin, *The Laws of Fesole: Joy Forever--- Our Fathers have told Us and Inaugural Address* (Boston: Dana Estes & Co., 1877), p. 8; John Ruskin, *Fors Clavigera: Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain*, Vol. IV (London: George Allen, 1895), p. 134.
- ^{liv}John Ruskin, *The Elements of Drawing; In Three Letters to Beginners* (London: Smith Elder and Co., 1857), pp. xi-xii.
- ^{lv}John Ruskin, *The Two Paths: Being Lectures on Art, and its application to Decoration and Manufacture* (New York: John Wiley, 1859), p. 22.
- ^{lvi}Charles Harvey and Jon Press, *William Morris: Design and Enterprise in Victorian Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), p. 9. In Oxford in the late 1850s, Morris along with his other friends formed “the brotherhood”, a “Crusade and Holy Warfare against the age”. Morris also instituted Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings.