

19thC creative meets Theory's hegemony
by Richard D North

5500 words (including c1000 words of Appendix)

1 December, 2024

Standfirst

This essay and its research leads are intended to help erode the hold of Critical Theory (CT) and, in particular, Colonial Theory (CTCT) and Post-colonial Theory (CTCT&PCT) over many modern minds.

The case of Lockwood "Arts & Crafts" Kipling is fascinating in any terms. Here, I am keen to unpick the way Dr Nadeem Tarar looks at the Lockwood Kipling case. Dr Tarar, a Pakistani academic who studied in the UK and works in the USA, is an advocate of CTCT&PCT.

To be clear: I think CTCT&PCT is mostly malign in its effects. It is a theoretical account of historical processes, but paradoxically CTCT&PCT would not survive its own analysis. CTCT&PCT is a better account of its own influence than of how empires wielded theirs. In effect, it has hoodwinked a couple of generations of students into loathing the West, its capitalism, and its history (both domestic and imperial). It has achieved this by supposing that all histories are false, but that the West's history is not merely false but entirely nasty too.

Contents

[Some Background](#)

[Issue_1: JLK, V&A\(2007\), NT, BR Singh](#)

[Issue_2:JLK, NT and Arts & Crafts India](#)

[Issue_3: Design schools and government](#)

[Issue_4: Economics, craft and commerce](#)

[Issue_5: What's a school to teach?](#)

[Issue_6: Educating painters or craftsmen?](#)

[Issue_7: Who owns anthropology?](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[Appendix_1: Sources: The V&A and Lockwood](#)

[Appendix_2: Sources: Nadeem Tarar sources](#)

[Appendix_3: Sources: Design education](#)

[Appendix_4: Sources: Anthropology sources](#)

Some background

This piece is a twin of another, online, “20thC creatives meet Theory’s hegemony”. They are both case studies which substantiate my claims in my online piece, “Critical Theory, Etc: An interrogation”.

The issues are: does the classic 20th Century Western CTCT&PCT Imperial narrative well explain Lockwood Kipling as he worked in 19th Century India? Or, contrariwise, is Dr Nadeem Tarar misled by his belief in CTCT&PCT narratives as he discusses Lockwood in Pakistan and the USA in the 21st Century?

My conclusion is that Dr Tarar wholeheartedly deploys CTCT&PCT narratives (which were designed in the 20th Century to be thorough-going) and that they obscure more than they reveal about Lockwood Kipling and the British Empire.[mfn]See: Tarar, (2022) in Appendix #2[/mfn]I take Dr Tarar to be honourably representative of a dominant academic fashion: this is not an ad hominen attack.[mfn]Dr Tarar is an anthropology fellow of the University of Texas at Austin. He has an MA in Critical Theory and Cultural Studies from the University of Nottingham, UK and earned his PhD in Art History and Theory from the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. He was formerly the Director of the National College of Arts (NCA) in Rawalpindi and an Associate Professor and Director of the post-graduate program in Communication and Cultural Studies at NCA Lahore. Accessed at academia.edu, 07/11/24. Note: The National College of Arts (NCA) in its various campuses is the re-named successor to the Mayo School of Industrial Design, Lahore.[/mfn]

All this hinges on one’s opinion of the French thinker Michel Foucault, who was not much, interested in Empire, and of his follower, Edward Said, a Palestinian in self-exile in the USA who obsesses about it. My conclusion on these matters is that Foucault was an extreme but conflicted version of a fascinating 19th Century line of thought and that Said, who largely follows the frenchman, was gorgeously convincing and even more conflicted in his account of it. It is Said’s Orientalism which most informs CTCT&PCT and which lurks in the references Dr Tarar relies on in his deconstruction of the archival material he has almost literally inherited.

Dr Nadeem Tarar has been uniquely placed to produce accounts of Lockwood Kipling’s part in the British Empire. He is a senior figure in the modern incarnation of Lockwood’s Mayo School in Lahore (now in Pakistan), and thus - on the face of it - ideally situated to give us accounts of its archive (which Dr Tarar was the first to investigate seriously) and the pedagogy of the Mayo (now called the National College of Arts). [mfn]Dr Tarar is poetic and moving on his unearthing of the Mayo School’s archive, see the Introduction to “The Colonial and National Formations of the National College of Arts, Lahore, circa 1870s to 1960s: De-scripting the Archive”, Anthem Press, 2022. Tarar (2022) in Appendix #2[/mfn]

This piece does not aim to establish whether Dr Tarar's latest book gives us some nuggets of straight history amongst his Theorising about the Mayo's records. I wanted to deal with material freely available online, and there is more than enough of that to examine both the history of the Mayo and the thinking of Dr Tarar so far as it concerns CTCT&PCT and its reliance on Foucault and Said.

I do not claim to be a proper historian. Indeed there are several distinguished historians who are making sure that old-school respect for historical facts remains of interest. The work I have been doing is unusual (so far as I can see) in being directed here, and elsewhere at interrogating CTCT&PCT.

[Back to Contents](#)

Issue_1: JLK, V&A(2007), NT, BR Singh

Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936), famously interesting on Empire, was born in India, and hated his childhood exile to the home country's Southsea, next door to the Imperial naval base of Portsmouth, in Hampshire. It was that wrench which perhaps best explains Kim, Kipling's vital 1901 novel. It was his account of a young person who cannot decide whether he more values his inheritance of the much-vaunted English rationality or of his borrowed and adopted much-vaunted Indian spirituality. It could stand for the problem facing Rudyard's father, John Lockwood Kipling (1837-1911), usually known as Lockwood.

Ten years ago, I knew little about Lockwood Kipling except that his son Rudyard was given access to Indian realities - and unrealities - because his father as a particular sort of colonial was preoccupied with these matters.

The 2017 show, "Lockwood Kipling: Arts and Crafts in the Punjab and London" at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London promised to fill big gaps in my education. The exhibits were fine and the story behind them rather moving. But it was the presentation that cheered and moved me as much. This was a nuanced celebration of what definitely was a colonial enterprise (and stuffed with narratives), whichever way one looked at it. One didn't expect that in modern London where the curatorial world generally kowtows to Critical Theory (CT), and its child, Colonial Theory (CTCT).

It is now almost normal (verging on compulsory in some circles) that people believe that the British should be ashamed of the rise and even the fall of the British Raj and its aftermath. I prefer the older, quite common view that the Empire's impact is quite difficult to assess one way or the other. After all, the ambition to have an empire was a historic norm for millennia, and each example can only be evaluated according to its actual behavior and period. Even my side of the argument doesn't suppose the British Empire was provably an unambiguous positive for the sub-Continent, or was - for that matter - any worse than India's pre-British imperial masters.

Dr Tarar bats for the CTCT&PCT on all its wickets but is especially useful when showing us its obsession about knowledge systems. After all, these are refracted both in the Mayo's pedagogy and its archival record of itself.[mfn]See Appendix #2 for online Tarar sources, especially Tarar (2022)[/mfn]

The CTCT&PCT view assumes that the British Raj was driven and blinded by its need to understand Indian society only to govern and exploit it. Indeed, it follows Edward Said's view that the West's Eastern empires (including Africa's) were premised on a certain exoticisation of the Oriental "Other" which - in the West's eyes - legitimised colonisation by more modern, intellectually forceful countries. The second view (mine, and that of many non-CTCT&PCT old-school historians) allows at least the possibility that some British colonialists, some of the time, might have taken an interest in Indian society out of curiosity or admiration and with India's interests in the forefront of their minds.

Before we go on, it is worth celebrating the success of Bhai Ram Singh (1858-1916). Dr Tarar does tell us some of Singh's story, but without seeming to notice the degree to which Singh's case somewhat undermined CTCT&PCT.[mfn]See Tarar(2018) and Tarar (2022)] in Appendix #2[/mfn] Singh drove a standout and perhaps unique career. I don't doubt that it had its tensions and complications.[mfn]Singh on racialism: "If my Master Kipling condescended now to be the Principal of the Mayo School of Art, at Lahore, would the post be denied to him? No! If Ram Singh, who takes after him in all the important departure[s] of the School of Art, can, by his own choice, be considered worthy of his master's chair, should he be sent to the dogs merely because he is a little deep complexioned?" Cited in Nadeem Tarar (2018), see Appendix #2[/mfn] Still, I imagine there are thousands - or millions - of complicated but untold stories of Indians whose brushes with Empire turned out pretty well.

Indeed, it is interesting that there is so clear a line connecting Lockwood Kipling, BR Singh and Dr Tarar, with the Mayo School of Arts being common to them all. BR Singh internalised some Western thinking and Dr Tarar might be said to have absorbed Critical Theory thinking which is derived from German and French thought from the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries.

BR Singh thrived under a range of imperial opportunities and one might say he did so in particular under opportunities afforded him by Lockwood Kipling's School Industrial School of Art and Design (as it was sometimes called when it was set up in 1875).[mfn]"The Mayo School of Art", as it came to be known, was called by various names in the official correspondence of the British government in Punjab: "Mayo Memorial School of Industrial Arts," "Industrial School of Art and Design," "Lahore School" and "the Mayo School of Art." Post-colonial Pakistan renamed it "The National College of Arts" See Tarar , Appendix #2[/mfn] Singh became a talented architect and the principal of the Mayo school in 1903. Dr Tarar has occupied senior

roles in the institution's Post-colonial iteration a hundred or so years after Singh's tenure.

It is one of the ironies of CTCT&PCT that Post-colonial Theory prides itself on hearing the voices of colonial subjects - sometimes called "subaltern" voices - whose self-expression is assumed to be a sort of impossibility under the Theory's own strictures. These demand that one see any cultural cross-over between the thinking, of say, Indians and Britons, as being a matter of the former being suborned by the latter. CTCT&PCT's view does not accommodate the idea of a productive interplay of cultures: it seems to think of such exchanges as a class of miscegenation.

Ram and Lockwood did powerful (usually Indo-Western hybrid) architectural work together in Lahore, and Singh, I think alone, did even more elsewhere in India. On Kipling's retirement to England, the pair were reunited in the 1890s when they designed an Indian room in Osborne House on the Isle of Wight, across the Solent from Portsmouth, and the favourite rural retreat of Queen Victoria, the Empress of India. It was and is a work of love somehow on behalf of creators and customer alike. Dr Tarar tells this story, but doesn't quite celebrate Singh, even as a man who broke the colonialists' normal narrow expectations for a subject person.

[Back to Contents](#)

Issue_2:JLK, NT and Arts & Crafts India

For my money, Nadeem Tarar's love of Theory has led him to get hold of the wrong end of a few sticks. He asserts, for instance, that the Arts and Crafts movement was "the official ideology of late nineteenth-century Britain" and that it "provided a hegemonic context through which the Indian aesthetic sphere was restructured and consumed by the colonial state in India." [mf] See Tarar (2022) at Appendix #2 [mf] That is a perverse reading of the politics, economics and aesthetics of the Empire. In particular, it doesn't properly acknowledge that the advancement of Indians was a large part of the colonial (quite self-interested) ambitions for education and especially for education in the arts and crafts. And it crucially ignores the very real devotion showed to Indian crafts by Lockwood Kipling.

Dr Tarar's declarations and reticences or lacunae are a good starting point for understanding where much modern academic post-modern thinking has got.

Critical Theory (CT) in effect sub-contracts its thinking on imperialism to its subset, Colonial Theory (CTCT) and its successor, Post-colonial Theory (CTCT&PCT). Its lineage includes Hegel and Nietzsche's legacy to Marx as revved-up by Michel Foucault and Derrida and popularised by Edward Said, as I discuss in my Critical Theory, Etc: An Interrogation.

There is, of course, something to be said for the Marx-Foucault-Said thread which lies behind CTCT&PCT. Its obsession with power relations makes a useful perspective

to adopt when interrogating the rationale of empire. (Just as considering power relations in race, sex, gender, and class issues can be illuminating.)

The difficulty, though, is that CTCT&PCT “knows” as a matter of pre-conception that no imperial action can be intended to benefit the colony in any way. Thus the British Empire’s attempts to educate Indians become, for CTCT&PCT, a matter of a brutall attempt to westernize - to suborn - the sub-continent. CTCT&PCT is also structurally cynical about any account of itself Empire gives the colonies. What’s more CTCT&PCT assumes that any information Empire gathers about its colony is totally corrupted, whether garnered by whites, or by “subaltern” non-whites who are following the orders of whites. CTCT&PCT simply presumes that no information of any value could come out of empire’s narratives, and narrative-making. And it thinks that’s as true of the Raj’s censuses and anthropology in general as it is of Dr Tarar’s main case in point, the Mayo archives started by Lockwood.

[Back to Contents](#)

Issue_3: Design schools and government

Dr Tarar's deployment of CTCT&PCT puts his account of Lockwood Kipling and his doings in India wonderfully at odds with British and Indian facts. It misreads the state of affairs in the 19th Century arts and industry administration in Britain, let alone in the British Raj. It leaves even more on one side the contrary and conflicted mind and works of Lockwood Kipling.

It is slightly to the point that the Arts and Crafts movement wasn't called that until 1888, over 20 years after Lockwood arrived in India and over 10 years after he founded the Lahore Museum and Mayo School of Industrial Arts (1875), the institutions for which he is famous.[mfn]"The Mayo School of Art, as it came to be known, was called by various names in the official correspondence of the British Government in Punjab: ‘Mayo Memorial School of Industrial Arts’, ‘Industrial School of Art and Design’, ‘Lahore School’, and ‘School of Arts’. The fluctuating emphasis from industry to arts, implied in the various names for the school, marked divergent conceptions proposed for the art school in Lahore," from Tarar (2011), see Appendix #2[/mfn]

To be more precise: the Mayo School of Industrial Arts was a Johnny-come-lately to the Indian design school world, which was sponsored from London’s South Kensington (as the institutions of the proto-V&A were nicknamed, because of their location) but well predates any serious arts and crafts “ideology”. [mfn]My distant relative Canon Hardwicke Rawnsley and his Keswick School of Industrial Arts, founded in 1884, also make an interesting parallel. That its economic impact was pretty sight may be another parallel, but I haven’t seen evidence about the Keswick School’s economic impact. The economic impact of Lockwood Kipling’s "revival" of crafts in India is likewise hard to unravel, but seems to have been slight.[/mfn]

It is true that the Ruskinite anti-industrial and anti-capitalist ideals of the movement were well-known by the 1860s, and that William Morris was a famous exponent from around then. Lockwood had imbibed much of that, without perhaps reckoning with the inherent conflicts within the “ideology” of Arts and Crafts as exemplified by William Morris’ rather capitalistic and even industrial approaches to monetising A&C. Additionally, Lockwood certainly chafed against some of the Empire’s commercial agenda in India.[mfn]The emerging arts and crafts movement was indeed fashionable amongst romantic, left-leaning artistic or aesthetic Britons. The Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society from 1887 promoted itself with displays of British craft works, in rather the manner of the 1851 Great Exhibition which had inspired Lockwood with a love for Indian crafts.[/mfn]

It wasn’t these romances which inspired the British government. For much of the 19th Century British officialdom at home and abroad was interested in up-skilling working class people whose skills had previously been largely unlettered, whether in carpentry, ironwork or textiles. It also sought to widen the imaginative scope of working class artisans. The state part-funded London’s South Kensington Museum, a collection of design artifacts, and there was an associated national network of Government Schools of Design from the 1830s aimed at up-skilling crafts people. All that was indeed a probable model for the Empire’s agenda for an arts and crafts industry and training system in India. These elite agendas were fundamentally emancipatory as well as self-interested.

The Mayo School in Lahore of 1875 had long back stories in Mechanics’ Institutes and the other schools of industrial arts. In Britain they date from the 1820s and in India from the late 1830s.[mfn]See Shafe, and Fujita in Appendix #3[/mfn] The point here is that what the British government promoted in India was what it was promoting at home, and that was being promoted all over the world by progressive governments. People did not think the strategy, when domestic, was designed to suborn anyone.

Only CTCT&PCT can see anything sinister in this educational agenda being adopted in the Empire. Indeed, it would have been racist to think the Indian worker was less educable than the European. As a long-shot, one might think that the UK governing elite’s relations with its indigenous British working class ‘Other’ were similarly prone to manipulative narratives. But the more one accepts that, the less punch would apply to the same elite’s colonial manipulations’ being out-and-out racist in origin.)

On a casual view, Lockwood’s eventual curatorship of the Lahore Museum and his foundation of the Mayo School of Industrial Arts seems the epitome of this grand imperial ambition. But it wasn’t, actually. Indeed, Lockwood schemed and beavered to make Lahore as near as possible a working model of a wholly different approach to producing and monetizing craft than his departmental masters in London or Calcutta intended.

Lockwood, who really was an arts and crafts idealist (but an ambitious one), would have been surprised by Dr Tarar’s stringing-together of influences. It is true that

Lockwood arrived in India hot from working at South Kensington and - having seen their work in the Great Exhibition of 1851 - was already in love with the idea of India's craftsmen. He believed that their trades were threatened and in need of imperial rescue. However, his new employer was the Department of Revenue and Agriculture of the British imperial government and it had a quite different view of the revival of craft industry to the one Lockwood longed to develop.

[Back to Contents](#)

Issue_4: Economics, craft and commerce

In fairness to Dr Tarar, it should be pointed out that the British Raj's Department of Revenue and Agriculture probably did want to do what their departmental title implies: to make money out of rural districts, not least by reviving rural crafts.

The theme which emerges throughout the 30 years of Lockwood's work in India is that his employers wanted a modern, industrial and commercial focus even in craftwork. Presumably that strategy aimed to bring new products to market, increase taxation, and alleviate poverty. Lockwood - a romantic idealist, so not a fan of capitalism or commerce - resisted the economic vulgarities and aesthetic indifference that his departmental masters wanted or tolerated.

Lockwood's position in India was conflicted, but rich. As well as being the head of his prestigious if contrary Lahore operations, Lockwood happened to be his imperial department's best all-India salesman. He ran much of the large programme of exhibitions his department insisted on - in India and abroad. He was pleased to see Mayo students producing replicas of Lahore Museum artifacts to the delight of affluent Indian, British, French and Australian consumers. But Lockwood was deeply uncomfortable with the mismatch between his ideals and his salesmanship and its implications.[mfn]See sources in Appendix #1 and #3[/mfn]

Whether one sides with Lockwood or his masters, their ideas do not seem to have added up to a thriving industry for the modern age. Lockwood and the department may have been making the same mistake that Ruskin, Morris, Walter Crane and Hardwicke Rawnsley seem to have been making back in Britain. Namely, they thought a revival of traditional craft products could be a major economic force in the future. The future has not yet endorsed them.

There was a fatal mismatch between building on an inherently small, artisanal process and up-scaling production to satisfy domestic and global markets. Everyone from William Morris and Lockwood Kipling to Jay Blades and King Charles III has to face the reality that the skills they care about are expensive and valued because they are niche.

It is an interesting wrinkle that Lockwood was at loggerheads with his masters in trying to keep low-priced British goods out of Indian markets: imports to India were undermining the economics of his own government-sponsored artisanal efforts.

[Back to Contents](#)

Issue_5: What's a school to teach?

Dr Tarar is on decent ground when he asserts that Lockwood's schema for his students' education was profoundly western and textual, which they found difficult. But it is as indicative of the conflicts in Lockwood's mind as of anything else. Lockwood admired the apprenticeship approach to passing on a family's inherited learning, and yet seemed to accept that formal education had a role in developing it.

The insoluble issue here faces all educators, anywhere. At each level in the system, one is wondering whether one's job is to train the student's mind or to liberate it? In art terms: is the educator after technical or creative progress in the student? Arts and Crafts enshrines but does not resolve the dilemma: is the craftsperson a creative artist or a skilled tradesperson? In what degree can either the educator or the craftsperson find a middle way?

The facts suggest that Lockwood believed Indian students could in principle as readily respond to a blended education as did their working class equivalent in the Government Design Schools in Britain. However, he was irritated by his students' obduracy: they resisted doing the hard yards of technical learning. Even so, it strikes me that Dr Tarar is wrong to insist that Lockwood's pedagogical views were corrupted by his being an imperialist. Where was the inherent imperialist wickedness in educating Indians? Wasn't it precisely the liberating effects of Western education of Indians that scuppered Dr Tarar's reviled British Raj?

Lockwood must have been torn between his desire to produce something like the organic education of a craft apprenticeship and his contrary desire to see intellectual advance in his students. (Some, rather cannily, quickly imbibed an elementary Western education and then high-tailed back to street workshops, with their course uncompleted but their employability enhanced.)[mfn]See Appendix #2 for Tarar (2011)[/mfn]

[Back to Contents](#)

Issue_6: Educating painters or craftsmen?

It is one of the oldest issues in arts vs technical education to disentangle whether one is trying to produce creative art or industrial design. What is the interface, anyway, between "commercial" art and "creative" art? It is (see above) a question

how much technical, or mechanical, understanding a craftsman needs. But as much: how much “craft” skill does a “pure” artist need?

Much of this debate surfaces in Lockwood's management of the Mayo School. He discouraged the admission of more affluent students, who wanted drawing and painting lessons. He was not keen on emphasizing an Art School approach in Lahore's Mayo school (though other imperial schools did teach “fine art”). He preferred his to emphasise the “craft” dimension over taking an artistic - or painterly - direction. He was keen to advance the interests, as he saw them, of the “lower” ranks of Indian workers (whose craftsmanship was a family inheritance) as against those of the higher class of Indian who might have wanted to become artists rather than bureaucrats. The imperial powers-that-be were rather more keen than Kipling on encouraging an Indian artistic profession to develop alongside the commoner craft skills. But surely there is very little of the oppressor/victim relationship in that part of Lockwood's scheme? Or indeed the Empire's. Far from it.

[Back to Contents](#)

Issue_7: Who owns anthropology?

A major Tarar theme is his work on the decennial official censuses which he describes as being imperialist in the pictures they took of India's population. It is as though he is opining that Britons should discount the 11th Century Domesday Book on account of its being undertaken as an administrative convenience by the Norman oppressor.

Dr Tarar not only writes in classic Critical Theory style about the Mayo's archive. From the relevant passages in the Introduction to his latest book, one deduces that he loves the structuralist meta-analysis style as well. I should perhaps apologise for not being able to make head or tail of this sort of material.

There are at least three centuries of more or less organised people-watching in the sub-Continent's history. Something like ethnography appealed to many of the earliest visitors to India, as they looked at the exotic Other they found there. Come the 19th Century enumerations of the imperial census and there were constant twists and turns both in its methodologies and in the ethnography and anthropology which were derived from the data.

Almost everyone involved seems to pass muster as being diligent in their researches. That has been the judgment of most serious (post-colonial) students from the sub-continent and from the West alike.[mfn]See Appendix #4[/mfn]They detect and anatomise false trails and misconceptions along the way, but see nothing deliberately mischievous or sinister. So far as I can see, Dr Tarar resists giving anything like a fair hearing to this counter-narrative, let alone a charitable one, when he reviews the material, wearing CTCT&PCT spectacles.

[Back to Contents](#)

Conclusion

One has the feeling that the more they understood the country they had been sent to rule, the less clear it was to the 19th and 20th Century British Raj how one could manage for imperial advantage the huge shifts which were at work in India, alongside the remnants of deeply-imbued habits of mind and social organisation. Forces inside India and outside meant that the country was moving from varieties of feudalism to varieties of capitalism. Customary law was being replaced by contracts. Democratic self-government and human rights agendas were rallying India's "native" (but increasingly westernised) leading lights. An alien government could see all this, but not with any hope of controlling it, monetising it, or earning glory from it. One can easily imagine that the more its imperial masters knew about India the less they thought they could do the country or themselves any good by staying. They could also see that any attempts to suppress political nationalism and religious sectionalism would backfire. Besides, any push-back by them would require levels of violence their conscience and their convenience wouldn't allow.

[Back to Contents](#)

Appendix #1: Sources: The V&A on Lockwood Kipling

I have been keen to produce an account of the V&A's 2017 exhibition and its account of Lockwood Kipling. The better to do so using sources anyone can get hold of (and to spare my own pocket), I have deployed only resources available free online (at November 2024).

Julius Bryant, Susan Weber, et al., John Lockwood Kipling: Arts and Crafts in the Punjab and London.

New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2017.

This important official book of the V&A Show is available, but I haven't bought it.

Susan Weber introduces her book and the V&A 2017 Lockwood exhibition on YouTube

Some V&A material and a review of the V&A 2017 book is available free online at the The Kipling Journal, Volume 92 May 2018 Number 373, aka Kipling Society (2018)
<https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/journal/kj373>

A good survey of the V&A book is available at:

Kirstin Gotway, book review of John Lockwood Kipling: Arts and Crafts in the Punjab and London by Julius Bryant, Susan Weber, et al., Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide 18, no. 2 (Autumn 2019)

<https://doi.org/10.29411/ncaw.2019.18.2.12>.

[Contents](#)

Appendix #2 Sources: Nadeem Tarar material:

Tarar (2011)

Nadeem Omar Tarar, From 'Primitive' Artisans to 'Modern' Craftsmen: Colonialism, Culture, and Art Education in the Late Nineteenth-Century Punjab

This is an article in South Asian Studies, September 2011

It includes the note on artisanal academic drop-outs: "Lessons in reading, writing, and arithmetic also took place. There was a high drop-out rate from the junior classes, attributed to the poverty of the students. With an elementary training from the school, the young boys could find quick employment in the workshops in the bazaar."

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254359468>

Tarar (2018)

There is a Nadeem Tarar essay material available at the Kipling Society Journal, June 2018, Number 373

<https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/journal/kj373>

Tarar (2022)

Nadeem Omar Tarar, The Colonial and National Formations of the National College of Arts, Lahore, circa 1870s to 1960s: De-scripting the archive, Anthem Press, 2022 (Paperback edition, 2025)

The Introduction is available free online:

https://www.academia.edu/71893388/The_Colonial_and_National_Formations_of_the_National_College_of_Arts_Lahore_circa_1870s_to_1960s

The entire book is available online, behind a paywall.

[Back to Contents](#)

Appendix #3: Sources: The evolution of 19th Century design education

The story of the evolution of British government involvement in arts, mechanical, industrial and craft education (separately and in various combinations) at home and colonially is complicated but quite well covered online.

Haruhiko Fujita, "Art and Design Education in Nineteenth Century India: British Background and Development in South Asia" The Second Asian Conference of Design History and Theory, Design Education beyond Boundaries, ACDHT, Tokyo, September 2017

<https://acdht.com/download/2017/10fujita.pdf>

Laurence Shafe, "The Design Reform Movement" (Undated)

<https://www.shafe.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/34-01-The-Design-Reform-Movement.pdf>

And

Sara J. Oshinsky,
Design Reform, Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum/Parsons School of Design,
New York, October 2006
https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/dsrf/hd_dsrf.htm

For an approach strikingly different to Dr Tarar's one might look at one of his references in Tarar (2011)
Tarapor, Mahrukh. "John Lockwood Kipling and British Art Education in India."
Victorian Studies, vol. 24, no. 1, 1980, pp. 53-81:
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3826879>

[Back to Contents](#)

Appendix #4: Sources: History of Indian anthropology sources

This is a resources list by which one might interrogate the long history of ethnography, ethnology, anthropology and the censuses of India.

To trace the evolution of Colonial Theory in archive work, one might look at one of Dr Tarar's 2011 references:

Ann Laura Stoler, 'Colonial Archives and the Art of Governance', Archival Sciences (2002), pp. 87-109
<https://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~sj6/stollerarchivegovernance.pdf>

And

Peter Mayer (1990s) nods toward some Theory language and reminds us that researchers may by mistake (or to suit themselves) retrofit narratives on the evidence they are reviewing. He also says that under the British Empire at least some artisanal and other workers, previously hampered by caste, were able to prosper better under their white masters than under their traditional leaderships.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/231796679_Inventing_Village_Tradition_The_late_19th_Century_Origins_of_the_North_Indian_%27Jajmani_System%27

And now for material which seems more ordinarily historical and less Theory-driven

Book review of Imran Ali, The Punjab Under Imperialism

This reminds us that Imperialism was out of its depth in understanding how to handle underlying economic and political forces on the ground.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/41259238>

Padmanabha, P (Registrar General, India, 1977-83)

This seems to be a comprehensive account of the evolution of ethnographic, ethnological, anthropological and census data in India. It is reassuring as to the lack of any particular colonialism/independence agendas.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20220706165844/https://elearning.skbu.ac.in/files/5C1F414516087060666.pdf>

Sarat Chandra Roy (1871-1942)

Roy seems irritated at how little anthropology (ethnology) was produced by Indians, but he blames no-one and sees no particular agenda in the narratives either Indian or British workers produced.

SC Roy, "Anthropological Research In India", The Presidential address of the Anthropological Section of the Indian Science Congress at its eighth annual meeting held in February 1921

https://www.academia.edu/42204318/Anthropological_Research_in_India_by_S_C_Roy20051024/Anthropological_Research_in_India_by_S_C.pdf

Also:

Roy mentions an interesting tension in British colonial ethnography, that between the confidence of RG Latham and the modesty of "Mr Justice Campbell". Roy notes that Campbell actually knows the places and peoples that he writes about.

Here are the works Roy contrasts:

Robert Gordon Latham: (1812-88)

RG Latham, The Ethnography of India, published by John Van Voorst, London, 1859
<https://archive.org/details/cu31924079570879>

And:

George Campbell, 1824-1892

Campbell, George, "The ethnology of India", in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Published by CB Lewis, Calcutta, 1886
<https://archive.org/details/ethnologyofindia00camp/page/1/mode/1up>

And:

I came across the above whilst looking at:

<https://histanthro.org/news/announcements/the-victorian-anthropology-of-indian-tribes-castes-and-society-by-fuller/>

Here is an interesting organisation which seems to have no particular axe to grind:
<https://histanthro.org/>

[Contents](#)

Ends