

The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs



Carol A. Breckenridge

Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Apr., 1989), 195-216.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-4175%28198904%2931%3A2%3C195%3ATAAPOC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>

Comparative Studies in Society and History is currently published by Cambridge University Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/cup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Aesthetics and Politics of Colonial Collecting: India at World Fairs

CAROL A. BRECKENRIDGE

University of Pennsylvania

Carelessly

I gazed, roving as through a cabinet
Or wide museum (thronged with fishes, gems,
Birds, crocodiles, shells) where little can be seen
Well understood, or naturally endeared,
Yet still does every step bring something forth
That quickens, pleases, stings; and here and there
A casual rarity is singled out,
And has its brief perusal, then gives way
To others, all supplanted in their turn.
Meanwhile, amid this gaudy congress, framed
Of things by nature most unneighbourly,
The head turns round and cannot right itself;
And though an aching and a barren sense
Of gay confusion still be uppermost,
With few wise longings and but little love,
Yet something to the memory sticks at last,
Whence profit may be drawn in times to come.

William Wordsworth 1805

(cited in Altick 1978:32)

In the second half of the nineteenth century, objects from India were repeatedly assembled for display at international exhibitions, known then and now as world fairs. Their transience and ephemerality set world fairs apart as extraordinary phenomena in the world of collecting.¹ They are special be-

This essay was originally prepared for the symposium on "Patronage in Indian Culture," National Humanities Center, October 10–12, 1985. I am variously indebted to Arjun Appadurai, Bernard S. Cohn, Nancy Fraser, Ronald Inden, Lee Schlesinger and Peter Stansky, for their support, stimulation and criticism; to Ronald Mahoney for having the imagination to make exhibitions (and their ephemera) a Special Collection of the Henry Mann Library, State University of California at Fresno; in the academic year 1984–5, to colleagues at the Stanford Humanities Center, who provided the intellectual context and support for my background thinking for this essay; and, subsequently, to colleagues at The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, who have enlarged my thinking about the nature of collecting in the modern world.

¹ The world of collecting was considerably expanded in the post-enlightenment era. With the emergence of the nineteenth-century nation-state and its imperializing and disciplinary bureaucracies, new levels of precision and organization were reached. This new order called for such

0010-4175/89/2167-2117 \$5.00 © 1989 Society for Comparative Study of Society and History

cause, despite the permanence they imply, they do not last; they come and they go. Their buildings are constructed, and then, by international charter, they are deconstructed. They are also special because they place objects in the service of commerce and in the service of the modern nation–state, with the inevitable imperial encounters that these two forces promote. In doing so, they yoke cultural material with aesthetics, politics and pragmatics.

It is by now a commonplace that objects undergo a metamorphosis when they are collected. Everyday things are transformed (by the arranger's synchrony of categorization and placement) into the *spectacle of the ocular*. In the second half of the nineteenth century, everyday things from India were displaced from their ordinary and their sumptuary contexts. They were shifted to terminal and semi-terminal display contexts like world fairs and museums; and they were featured in art and archaeological books, in mail-order catalogues and in newspapers. In these new arenas, objects were managed and valued in modes that were radically different from those of the past. The most far-reaching aspect of these innovative venues was created by the relationship of world fairs to colonial regimes (the subject of this essay).

Because this essay will seemingly go far afield, I will state my overarching assumptions here. To say that world fairs serviced colonial regimes is too general a frame with which to grasp the social formations facilitated by an emergent colonial presence in global relations. A better frame would see late nineteenth-century world fairs as part of a unitary, though not uniform, landscape of discourse and practice, that situated metropole and colony within a single analytic field, through precisely such cultural technologies as the international exhibition. Such technologies created an *imagined ecumene* (in much the same way that Benedict Anderson [1983] talks about print media creating imagined communities underlying the nation–state). I will call this the *Victorian ecumene*. This Victorian ecumene encompassed Great Britain, the United States, and India (along with other places) in a discursive space that was global, while nurturing nation–states that were culturally highly specific. One condition for the construction of cultural specificity, particularly in relation to the development of the nation–state, was a concept of the cultural other, for these new technologies, routines and rituals of rule were frequently developed in relation to this imperialized or imperializing other.

Discussions of culture and of the nation–state for the period of British imperium usually proceed as though cultural constructs more or less correspond with and are constrained by national boundaries.² The Victorian ec-

agencies as archives, libraries, surveys, revenue bureaucracies, folklore and ethnographic agencies, censuses and museums. Thus, the collection of objects needs to be understood within this larger context of surveillance, recording, classifying and evaluating.

² A good example of the constraints placed on scholarly explanation by such designations as "India" and "Britain" comes from two essays in *The Invention of Tradition* (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983). The essay by Bernard S. Cohn, and the one by David Cannadine advances our understanding of the critical relation between ritual and authority in India and in Britain in the

umene that I want to capture, by contrast, offers us an analytic frame oriented to the transnational cultural flows that lay at the heart of an imperium in which the nation–state was not an entity *sui generis*. Rather, in the late nineteenth century the nation–state depended on this larger ecumene for its cultural and political functioning. By contextualizing world fairs in the colonial *topos* to which they belonged, this essay examines a small piece of the process by which this Victorian ecumene was created. This *topos* involves a major transformation in visual culture, and thus the prehistory of world fairs requires a brief discussion.

II

In the century preceding the first world fair in 1851, Londoners were being prepared for the shift that was about to occur in Britain's romance with the things of distant lands. In this pre-cinema age, before photography and the illustrated daily newspaper, Londoners led culturally insulated lives. Their curiosity about the world beyond their tiny island was severely circumscribed, arguably due to disinterest (Altick 1978:457, 482). Even the eighteenth-century Grand Tour of Europe, in part made difficult by wars on the Continent, ceased to be a means for expanding the cultural horizons of the cultivated upper class of English men and women (Holt 1983). This climate of cultural insularity frustrated men like Charles Grant, who—motivated by the need to renew the East India Company charter in 1813 and again in 1833, and to affirm the ever expanding Company *raj*—sought to bring India to the attention of the metropolitan public.

The parochialism of Londoners, and their reliance on vicarious rather than actual travel, was encouraged and reinforced by two constellations of activities: the one revolving around the latent entertainment industry, and the other, around the wonder cabinets of enterprising private collectors. These two modes of experiencing the “world” required a specialized gaze that was non-analytic, non-judgmental, and undiscerning, while being shaped by the experience of wonder. Neither mode offered the refined and constrained training in visual literacy that was to develop later in the century.

At the turn of the eighteenth century, the London entertainment industry was beginning to appear in such quarters as Leicester Square. The theater had fallen into disfavor with families of respectability, who turned instead to new forms of amusement including the panorama (literally “all-embracing view”). This new entertainment form, housed in rotunda-shaped rooms and buildings,

Victorian era. But neither essay goes far enough: Cohn's *darbar* ritual (in India) is insufficiently metropolitan, and Cannadine's Crown (in Britain) is insufficiently imperial. Interdigitated into a single essay (a proposition suggested by their respective evidence), the problem of ritual and authority in relation to the global orbit that underlay the British Crown in Britain and in India would become clearer, and the problem of colonialism and the political economy of ritual would become more apparent.

encouraged Londoners to cast a transient gaze on their own world as well as on the world beyond them. This gaze, not yet groomed by authoritative expectations and standards of beauty, fixed the eyes of the beholder on views of distant lands, as well as on imported natives and their objects, that, when placed on stage, were elevated to the position of disoriented commodities.

India was regularly featured in a new form of mercantile realism on panoramic canvases. In 1800, a young and promising painter named Robert Ker Porter stretched a canvas over two hundred feet long on a semicircular (some sources say three-quarter circle) plane; and in six weeks painted the *Taking of Seringapatam*, a pictorial reconstruction of the fourth Mysore war fought the previous year to defeat the indefatigable South Indian king named Tipu Sultan. This victory, more than any other on the Indian subcontinent, offered a symbol of hope and promise to Londoners, and inspired confidence and certainty that a new imperial ecumene was about to be put in place. Displayed at Somerset House, this representation (of the war that technically brought about the British East India Company's final mastery over southwestern India and ultimately the rest of the subcontinent) launched a euphoric season in London's entertainment quarters.

This panorama did more than create a desire for victory; it transported viewers to the scene of the defeat. One spectator noted that "you seemed to be listening to the groans of the wounded and the dying," whose "red hot blood" was spilled all over the canvas (quoted in Altick: 135). The realism of the scene, and its large scale, fostered a fantasy that overwhelmed and encompassed the observer, and thereby produced "a sight that was altogether as marvelous as it was novel. You carried it home, and did nothing but think of it, talk of it, and dream of it," our observer reflected (*Ibid.*).

The *Taking of Seringapatam* was the first of several noteworthy India panoramas that turned the attention of London viewers to the subcontinent where their countrymen were systematically domesticating life to the rule of the British East India Company. As late as 1858, in the waning years of panoramas, and one year after the now famous 1857 uprisings in North India that stunned and outraged the English at home and in India, two shows respectively entitled the *Fall of Delhi* and the *City of Lucknow* could be seen at Burford's on Leicester Square. This scene (and the reality it depicted) presented a shocking reversal of the overwhelming English victory at Seringapatam celebrated panoramically fifty-eight years earlier. Like the Seringapatam painting, the 1857 challenge to British rule was an experience, both as reality and as entertainment, that was to become indelibly embedded in the memory of English men and women, and was to contribute indirectly to the escalation and expansion of British rule in India.

The emphasis in panoramas on place, travel, and ethnography (Altick: 131), particularly the ethnography of the princes and of warfare, must have had a dialectical relation to certain political realities on the Indian subcontinent. Panoramas engendered a yearning, and commemorated its satisfaction.

The Seringapatam painting, for example, created and intensified a longing to participate in the political and military domestication of India that had to be vicariously satisfied by men and women sent to fulfill the charge mandated and shaped by this desire. At Seringapatam, British-led troops defeated an extraordinary South Indian king, Tipu Sultan, who was remarkable for his organizational skills, vision, cultural agility, and ability to resist.

Tipu's defeat was celebrated by English men, women, and children in Britain as well as in India. His defeat provided London's entertainment world with a rich set of images and an extraordinary collection of objects that were manipulated to create shows attracting unprecedented crowds, and it provided India with the sobering reality that one of the last bastions of resistance to British rule had unwillingly capitulated to the undisputed military strength of the East India Company. With India's leaders diminished in number and fortitude, the Government of Madras was formed four years following this vanquishment and its monumental celebration in London. For the next century and a half, this colonial regime ruled over the domains of Tipu and others like him, who were conquered in battle. Thus, British imperium was advanced in India: What was soon to be experienced in India as political domination, was first experienced in London as entertainment. The mode of this experience, already seen in the workings of the panorama, can be more closely examined by looking at the wonder cabinet.

Wonder had long been the sensation provoked by the sight of select and unrelated objects randomly collected from around the world, and placed in glass cabinets, known variously as *wonder cabinets* or as *cabinets of curiosities*. Thus, while Londoners were accumulating collective experiences of India at the panorama, they were also continuing to patronize older forms of acknowledging other cultures. The experience of the Seringapatam panorama in the year 1800, for example, was not easily forgotten. It was soon reshaped for London audiences. In 1808, objects taken as booty from Seringapatam (Tipu's impressive South Indian capital) were brought to London to be housed along with other artifacts in an "Oriental repository" kept by the East India Company. Londoners flocked to gaze and gawk at Tipu's regalia displayed at an exhibit thought by some to have been one of the most popular of all time.

This Oriental repository (in effect a wonder cabinet) staged objects without framing them visually, conceptually, or theoretically (e.g., Bunn 1980; Mullaney 1983). Minimally labelled and uncluttered by such modern devices as classification systems, selective thematic displays, and retrieval concerns, such cabinets and repositories represented an eclectic aesthetic of mercantilism soon to be displaced by one of imperialism in which collecting served as a sign of connoisseurship, and hence, of control. Value in wonder cabinets was derived less from an object's aesthetic associations, and more from its uniqueness that was the product of its decontextualized presentation. Guided by a *laissez faire* ethic, the eclecticism of wonder cabinets promoted an aesthetic of randomness: no exacting standards existed to judge a particular

object; specialization was unheard of; and the fabrication of meaning was unexpected.

This virtuoso impulse to accumulate objects from afar and to place them in glass cabinets yielded a network of agents, correspondents and dealers strewn from Europe to China (Impey 1977). These middlemen catered to the imagination of their clients, who were scholars in Northern Europe, princes in Western and Eastern Europe, bankers in Germany, and royal gardeners in England. Zoological, botanical, and geological objects were placed face-to-face in the wonder cabinet with such man-made objects as implements, weapons, and samples of clothing. Thus natural history objects were categorically undifferentiated from cultural ones.

The object in a wonder cabinet celebrated nothing but itself as rare, sensational, and unusual. Neither beauty nor history appear to have been promoted as a value by which to behold the housed object. Objects were judged according to the amazement they aroused largely because they were rare, uncommon, and even unthought of creations. Intrigue and allure clearly motivated collectors who maintained such cabinets. The enticement of the hunt was associated less with the artifice of a world perceived to be exotic, and more with one perceived to be awe inspiring because of its incredible qualities.

Cabinets of curiosities were on the wane on the Continent in the late seventeenth century when they were becoming fashionable in Britain—first in Oxford and subsequently in London. Compared to her continental rivals, Britain had been a latecomer in the world of collecting in general, and with respect to India in particular. This changed during the course of the nineteenth century when English royal collections were developed specifically to house art objects. At his 1821 coronation George IV renewed his commitment to “do more for . . . every refined pursuit, than any monarch that ever sat on the British throne” (quoted in Altick: 404). Generating and pursuing such refined pursuits, including the collection of art, were among the innumerable modern practices of the imperial crown being shaped then. These activities anticipated the enthronement of objects that was to follow at world fairs.

III

The 1850s signaled a change throughout the world: reverberations of the 1848 revolutions on the European continent were felt; the American Civil War was approaching; and Britain inaugurated the Government of India, thereby launching the most imperious of all modern regimes. This was indeed the age of patriotism and enterprise, imperialism and reach, indispensable features of modern nation-states and capitalist societies centered on urban complexes.

The reach of imperialism was facilitated by other changes which came to have global implications. In the 1850s, the modern entertainment industry began to take shape in European urban centers. Trains, the latest in transport inventions, facilitated the temporary movement of people for leisure, and advanced the idea of the excursion as a sign of an accomplished middle-class

person. Developments in photography “enormously expanded the scope of the commodity trade by allowing unlimited quantities of mechanically reproduced figures, landscapes, [and] events to be available on the market” (Benjamin 1978:151). Advertising, a term coined at this time, enlarged and recontextualized the world of the object, and patronage relations became entangled with transnational practices in which the accumulation, display, and admiration of objects from near and far came to be highly valued.

Such changes marked capitalist societies, conditioned urban life, and encouraged the development around the world of modern publics. Of all these changes, the world fair anticipated and helped shape both the form and the content of public life in respect to global issues. At international exhibitions, most of the processes unleashed by the above technological, commercial, and cultural advances were in evidence. Fairs, for example, enthroned merchandise in an “aura of amusement,” thus making them special “sites of the commodity fetish” emerging at that time (*Ibid.*). Such enthronement inevitably had both aesthetic and political ramifications that transcended national boundaries for it implicated the “world,” and not just its regional locales.

The Crystal Palace Exhibition of 1851 was the unsurpassed founding spectacle of the world fair genre.³ The legacy of Crystal Palace launched a period of exhibition mania in emporia and metropolises around the globe. Scores of exhibitions followed, but only some of them approached its impressive scope. The world fairs that followed, in part, made modern cities. Although their buildings were for the most part ephemeral, they nevertheless left an indelible mark on urban configurations wherever they were held. They provided and promoted the symbols and signs we associate with modern urban semiotics. There is Paris’s Eiffel tower (for the Exposition of 1889), New York’s Statue of Liberty (parts of which were exhibited at two fairs before it was domiciled in New York’s harbor), and more recently Seattle’s Needle (for the exhibition of 1964).

India was represented at all the major world exhibitions—a process that continues today. Colonial officials also hosted their own exhibitions throughout the Indian countryside, usually in association with a visit from a member of the British royal family. At some fairs, illustrative collections of India’s objects were framed and shaped in the India court or the India pavilion by traders, and at other fairs by professionals and/or officials in government service. India was also well represented by contractors who negotiated for space in the amusement zones of fairs. Native village- or street-scenes were constructed on the midway, complete with foreign vendors and dancing girls imported especially for the entertainment of fairgoers.

At world fairs, Asian lands other than India could also be seen in the courts and pavilions that graced the aisles and thoroughfares of fair grounds. De-

³ The most comprehensive historical study of this (or any) fair is Utz Haltern (1971). Other fine studies include Allwood (1977), Plum (1977), Benedict (1983), Rydell (1984), and Silverman (1977).

pending on the year, there might be Egypt, China (Cortinovis 1977), Japan (Hariss 1975), and Iran. Among the dignitaries at the Crystal Palace extravaganza, for example, was the Shah of Iran, who was received with full regalia in a grand three-day reception that conformed to the protocol of royalty. More than spectacles featuring prominent people, or occasions to display goods from all nations, world fairs were venues that (through selective representation) reduced cultures to their objects. In the course of time, multi-vocal representations emerged, and demanded (and framed) a special way of seeing that surmounted the ‘gay confusion’ created by the ‘gaudy congress’ of objects noted by Wordsworth earlier in the century (Wordsworth, in Altick 1978:32).

IV

Although its official title was ‘The Great Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations,’ the first world fair was popularly known as the Crystal Palace Exhibition, an apt description of the enormous, even humorous, iron and glass structure housing the exhibition on an eighteen-acre plot of London’s Hyde Park. Like Cinderella, whose life was transformed by a glass slipper, Britain’s glass greenhouse foreshadowed modern twentieth-century architecture and transformed the landscape and discourse of images and objects available to modern publics. It was this transformative power of world fairs that quickly made them a ubiquitous and unavoidable part of the decor of modern metropolises.

The Crystal Palace, and its associated rituals and amusements, titillated and delighted more than six million sightseers. Wide-eyed and open-mouthed, they gaped at its displays, romped through its amusements, and marvelled over its objects. Prince Albert and Queen Victoria were the patron-sponsors (through the Society of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce) of this magical showcase of objects, where India, as well as other cultures, was represented through her things. The British East India Company, at short notice, crated and shipped a ‘noble’ display of Indian objects to the exhibition, thus confirming the growing suspicion that India was a wellspring of ‘Oriental’ splendor and luster. Occupying several courts, the Indian display considerably outstripped (in size and floor space) the courts designated for the other twenty-eight places represented at the extravaganza.

Not only was India’s floor space considerable, but India was also given the place of honor within the Crystal Palace: the central location in the court on the southwest corner of the intersection of the palace’s two grand transepts. This pivotal location meant that India faced the towering Crystal Fountain, whose flowing waters ritually marked the center of the exhibition and symbolically encouraged a flow of money to purchase displayed wares.

India’s endless courts ran along the entire west side of the north–south transept, the shorter of two grand intersecting aisles. This transept began at

the main exhibition entrance in the south where the park gates were located, and ended with the Queen's regally appointed retiring room (and its adjacent refreshment court) in the north, making it the reception hall for the royal family. The Queen and her court disembarked from their royal carriage (their privatized exterior), traversed the reception hall dotted with royal statuary and fountains, and entered their retiring room (their privatized interior). In addition to India, the Queen was symbolically received by Tunis, China, Persia, Egypt, and Turkey (the respective occupants of the east side of the north-south transept. Thus, at the Queen's entryway, the lands of the Orient were appropriated by the Crown to construct its own high rituals of monarchy. They were lined up to offer the Queen, in her private movement (from her carriage to her retiring room), a continuous gaze on objects of what were to become her distant and cultural others. These were parts, even if only potentially and metaphorically, of her royal "household" and were hence separated from the main processional aisle.

In being situated at the intersection of the two transepts, India's position was also favorable in respect to the much longer and grander processional aisle along which the Queen moved in her public and ritual appearances for the opening and closing of the fair. The privileged position awarded India at the Crystal Palace was amply repaid. Her sumptuous objects made a splash. They inspired favorable comment from most viewers (notwithstanding the criticisms of Wornum, Ruskin and others). Her "curiosities," positioned alongside a veritable empire of things (including machinery, inventions, scientific instruments, raw minerals, and processed materials), were acclaimed as a new-found well of art. India's well-designed objects were a fresh source of inspiration to viewers, who sensed that England was on the verge of a second industrial revolution this time featuring refinement in the design of objects, rather than mere utility.

India's court was also at the forefront of modern display techniques. Her artifacts were carefully choreographed. India's carpets, for example, were intended by the producer for use on the ground, but now were hung for viewing—an innovation in carpet use made popular by the Crystal Palace, although it had been used earlier in the East India Company's Oriental repository.

India was characteristically represented by regalia including such transport and enthronement paraphernalia as palanquins, elephant trappings, thrones, crowns, scepters and vestments. India realia was also there in the form of metal vessels, weapons, woven and printed textiles, and shawls. One room featured the ivory throne of the Raja of Travancore, a present to the Queen notably used by Prince Albert, who was seated on it for the spectacular closing ceremonies of the Crystal Palace. The elaborately carved throne was upholstered in green velvet and embroidered with gold. Critics agreed that the examples of state furniture exhibited by European craftsmen compared un-

favorably with the Indian throne, which exhibited greater control and coherence in both decoration and design (Sparling 1982:35). The throne was accompanied by fine carpets, shawls, saddles and parasols. This repository of sumptuary artifacts also included the crown of the Raja of Oudh and the regal dress of the Raja of Bundi.

By contrast, Britain had no single national court, though her products were seen in various displays organized around categories of objects (e.g., machinery, textile, and china courts), rather than around a particular nation. In underplaying her own presence, Britain forefronted the sumptuousness of India, though it was not yet a jewel in the British Crown. This self-effacement placed Britain in an unique category at the fair: Britain encompassed the world, and her global *ecumene*, not yet politically in place, was anticipated culturally.

American industrialists and agriculturalists, left to their own devices, put the United States on display largely through her machinery and inventions. The barren nature of the American display courts was initially received with ridicule in the English press (Curti 1962:254). But the last-minute patronage of Peabody (and his \$15,000 contribution) rescued the U.S. representation by allowing Americans to decorate and furnish their court. By the end of the exhibition, adolescent America had made her mark on spectators largely through her products and her technologies. There were unrivalled Hobbs' locks, the Colt revolver with its interchangeable parts, Singer's sewing machine, Hayden's ingenious cotton drawing frame and saw gin, stoves and ventilating machines, the Morse telegraph, Goodyear "India" rubber, fire engines and furnaces, printing presses, clocks and surgical instruments, the Jersey locomotive, oil lamps, pianos, violins, daguerreotypes and artificial legs—all of which won high praise.

The objects in the two courts for India and the United States (royal paraphernalia in the one, and inventions, machinery, and products in the other) stood in stark contrast to one another. One presumed a monarch; the other, a producer or inventor. This disjuncture between the two courts was the inevitable result of the comparative critique implicit in putting lifestyles and cultures, distant from one another in time and space, on display through their objects.

In the Crystal Palace, India made consumption and its orientation to the human body central. Robes, crowns, jewels, thrones, and weapons were all vehicles for meaningful ornamentation, enhancement, display and protection of the body. In everyday life, the associated technologies used to manipulate these objects were *sumptuary technologies* of honor, prestige, and blood, that focused on the body as body politic, rather than as a private reality. The value system that gave meaning to the objects in India's display presumed that the royal body was the embodiment of social and political realities and activities. Put another way, Indian objects took on value based on a human corporeal relation.

Unlike India, the United States made production and its distantiating of the human body central. The daguerreotype distanced and positioned the body of the other, according to the desire and intention of the beholder. Surgical instruments altered the body of the other, according to the design of the surgeon. The Morse telegraph relayed messages of the other, without requiring face to face relations. And the artificial leg mimed the body, without actually being the body. These technologies required, but did not directly relate to, the human body; rather, the relation to the body was one mediated by instruments, techniques and implements, thus rendering the body the object, rather than the subject, of attention. The associated technologies were *aesthetic technologies* of taste, opinion, judgment, and practicality.

Briefly put, in association with consumption, and the sociality it engenders, objects were tools or vehicles whose meaning was derived from their relation to the human body. When associated with production, and the sociality it engenders, objects became ends in themselves, products disoriented from particular persons.

v

Objects on display do *not* provide their own narrative. Displayed objects must be textualized, and, therefore, require verbal and written explication in the form of signs, guides, and catalogues—if they are to be anything other than a mere accumulation of disoriented curios and wondrous artifacts. As world fairs progressed, such explication became embedded in the discursive languages of history, ethnography, archaeology, and eventually art. These emergent forms of knowledge and colonial rule were dialectically tied; their emergence was dependent on a colonial presence in India (and in other parts of the world), while, at the same time, their development facilitated colonial modes of governance.

India was imprinted on the minds of viewers in numerous illustrated publications, lecture series, and scholarly debates spawned by the Crystal Palace Exhibition. At the exhibition, men such as the novelist Gustave Flaubert, the architect M. Digby Wyatt, and the renowned Henry Cole saw an assemblage of India's objects for the first time. Until then, they had encountered India largely piecemeal through lithographs, manuscripts, panoramas, verbal accounts, and the stray object from which they generated their own mental images of India. In the Crystal Palace, an India constructed by colonial rulers was on public view. India's material culture, denuded of social context and natural environment, was choreographed and displayed to impress the world with the talent, skill, and splendor of the subcontinent.

This seminal experience of seeing India through her objects inspired viewers to textualize objects in identities they created for them. Wyatt, for example, printed a monumental publication of chromolithographs featuring select exhibition objects. Indian artifacts (more than half were textiles) were seen in twenty of his 157 lavishly colored plates. This glamorous publication imple-

mented a reproductive process then in its infancy, and in so doing involved engravers, such as Philip H. Delamotte, in the representation of Indian curiosities. As is typically the case in the ephemeral brochures, handbooks, and catalogues accompanying exhibitions, this volume unfortunately contained no lithographs of any one section of the several India courts in its entirety. Rather than reproducing the scene that was composed and staged for exhibition-viewers, professional photographers and lithographers decomposed the exhibit, and once again decontextualized the object.

In reproductions, the object was highlighted on its own, where it inevitably called attention to itself, rather than to the other objects brought together to address one another in the display. Thus, we have an example of Indian lac-work in one plate, and a detail from either Indian embroidery, kincob, or gold-work in others. Indian objects appear as an assemblage in only four plates: the Travancore throne, a set of enamelled metal vessels, a helmet ensconced in feathers, and a set of elephant trappings. Even these small frames are likely to have been new compositions created by the lithographer, rather than reproductions of displays seen in India's court at the fair.

The India court at Crystal Palace, and at exhibitions that followed, bred antiquarians, publishers, and chromolithographers of indomitable industry, keen intelligence, and lively imagination. These men, most of whom were either medical practitioners or botanists, struggled with the knotty and intractable problems of arrangement, classification and reproduction (a logical extension of their training in science, that, as a field of knowledge, had not yet been fully and decisively separated from art). Their experiments, publications and influence enabled private as well as public collections of Indian objects to acquire an aura of authenticity. In their endless displays and publications, they identified, organized, and codified Indian objects according to a variety of schemes, including the *place of origin* (e.g., from Kancipuram), the *time of origin* (e.g., Chola period), the *nature of its raw material* (e.g., bronzes), and *style* (e.g., Chaluykan). Eventually, many of these men received titles from her Majesty the Queen Empress, and later from His Majesty the King Emperor.

This group included men such as J. F. Royle, George Birdwood, E. B. Havell, Thomas Hendley, George Watt, J. Forbes Watson, and William Griggs. Unlike the others, Griggs never lived in India, though it was his professional focus on India that (in part) enabled him eventually to become the chromolithographer to Her Majesty the Queen. He exemplified a class of professionals, whose careers were sustained by manipulating objects in their various categorical incarnations, ranging from specimens, finds, and products to acquisitions, relics and treasures. His name first appears on the rolls of the Honourable East India Company as an artisan of the Indian Court of the Great Exhibition of 1851 when he was only nineteen (Birdwood 1908:ii). This formative experience led him to pursue objects—not primarily as a collector, but as a facilitator of collecting. He was a *reproducer* and *representer* of

objects. His illustrations and publications enabled collectors to identify particular holdings that had been featured in his journals and books, and in this process to fabricate myths of origin and genealogies for them. In short, he provided the scholarly tools necessary for collectors to become connoisseurs. These tools were intertwined with the market and with the refinement of knowledge.

His services were offered for the Paris Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1857, for the Annual International Exhibitions at South Kensington of 1871–74, and for the international exhibition at Vienna of 1873. His repeated association with the representation of India at world fairs derived from his appointment (from 1855 to 1878) as technical assistant to the Reporter on the Products of India, a bureau of government that, until it was transferred to the South Kensington Museum in 1878, built collections of Indian objects characterized as natural products or industrial arts.

Lodged successfully at the East India House on Leadenhall Street, and Fife House and the India Office at Whitehall, Griggs must have come into contact with men at the forefront of the reproductive arts, and with old India hands at the forefront of Indian commerce and politics. He knew, for example, both George Birdwood and Thomas Hendley. Interested in color reproductions, Griggs experimented with photolithography and chromo-photolithography in order to heighten the effect of light in his prints. Over the years, his prolific press produced a host of Indian texts, illustrations, and manuscripts that benefited from Griggs's inventiveness (*Ibid.* 1908:iii).

In one elegant publication, Griggs's compulsion even transformed the artifacts of everyday life in the East India Company into "relics" (*Ibid.*). This portfolio, published after the dissolution of the East India Company, featured fifty glossy plates of old Company objects that, under former conditions, would have been either lost or forgotten. Included for reproduction were such objects as the Company's original 1609 license to trade, the consecration of colors in the Third Regiment in 1799, and an old East India Company clock. Through the mechanical representation of documents and objects whose utility lay in the past, Griggs singlehandedly transvalued East India Company artifacts. Glossed as relics, they now become objects worthy of public admiration and esteem. Such admiration provided a mode not only of celebrating the object, but its past as well. This celebration of objects, whose value and utility in one sense already had been realized, linked objects to what Guy Debord has called the growing spectacle of the commodity.

VI

An astonishing surge of interest in collecting Indian objects occurred in the post-Crystal Palace period. This surge inaugurated a new era in which collecting, like culture itself, became institutionalized and internationalized. Numerous discreet but public settings for this phenomenon emerged. There were

exhibitions, museums, royal receptions (*darbars*), archives, libraries, and surveys of a variety of materials, including archaeology, epigraphy, zoology and geology. Each of these forms of generating and controlling knowledge had a discrete set of associated practices that formed a field of action within which the acceptable and unacceptable could be defined and continuously shaped.

Government officials, Indian princes and British royalty all collected (as did connoisseurs on the Continent). Many collected while on their India Tour (that came to replace the Grand Tour of the eighteenth century). While in India, members of the royal family amassed collections of objects composed largely of presents given to them by India's aristocracy. At home, such presents often formed either the principal or a secondary collection for an exhibition display. Although presented to British royalty, they were viewed by an audience wider than the monarchy. A case in point is the India court of the 1877–78 Paris Exposition. The core of India's exhibit came from the recently formed collection of objects presented to the Prince of Wales, the heir to the British throne and empire, while he was on tour in India in 1877 (Birdwood 1879:55). There he was the *cause celebre* for a seminal and much-celebrated royal reception (*darbar*) designed specifically to groom and re-shape relations of authority in Victorian India (Cohn 1983). At the same time, this royal ceremony shaped the making of a public culture that partially overlapped, but was not constituted exclusively by either the British monarchy or the Indian princes as they related to their own locales.

The Prince of Wales gave heraldry, escutcheons, and banners (all inventions of the *raj*) to Indian princes. Eschewing the sumptuous and everyday crafted wares of India, they gave him gifts suitable for a future king separated from them by color and lifestyle. These gifts were of a mixed nature (*Ibid.*: 55–56), in much the same way as the *darbar* ritual in which they were exchanged. English society, missionary schools, government art institutes, and the availability of mechanically-produced commodities from Manchester, Birmingham, Paris and Vienna had promoted lifestyles that engendered the naturalization of objects otherwise alien to India. The latest fashions in Birmingham teapots (renaturalized since they originally came from India), paper weights and center pieces, and Manchester- and French-inspired carpets and textiles were given by Indian princes to visiting English royalty.

Other exhibitors with a colonial heritage were also at the Paris Exposition. Unlike the monarchy, their assembled objects were anything but hybrid. In keeping with their experience, colonial officials collected Indian artifacts that they regarded as authentic. In Paris, Mrs. Rivett-Carnac, for example, displayed her collection, alleged to be exhaustive, of approximately 6,000 pieces of jewelry described as being of either aboriginal or peasant origin (*Ibid.*: 71). Birdwood, the Reporter of Products for the Government of India, who directed the Paris exhibit, supplemented these royal and private collections to make the exhibit more representative of the "traditional" crafts of India.

Those colonial officials who maintained private collections exhorted their younger colleagues to do the same. Mrs. Rivett-Carnac's husband, a retired Indian Civil Servant who became an aide-de-camp to the Queen, made one such recommendation in the *Journal of Indian Art and Industry*, Griggs's glamorous magazine for connoisseurs and officials. During his many years of service in such agencies of government as the Opium department of the North-Western Provinces, Rivett-Carnac—like his wife—had become an inveterate collector, not of government revenues, but of coins and of metal objects used in Hindu ritual. Unlike the Prince of Wales, whose artifacts were obtained through the gift economy and so inextricably linked him to politics, Rivett-Carnac built his collection largely through the market economy that denuded the object of social relations. Most purchases were made from bazaar merchants in urban locales, usually pilgrim centers, such as Banaras.

City labyrinths, with their secret and circuitous passageways, revealed themselves to colonial masters, as they hunted for finds to add to their collections. As an officialized etiquette increasingly secluded colonial officers in the world of privatized and exclusive colonial clubs, the hunt for collectable objects gave English men and women an excuse and a place to be and to be seen as private persons in public places.

Collecting satisfied several desires at once for a civil servant like Rivett-Carnac. A collection ordered India's unruly and disorderly *past*, at the same time that it pointed towards India's present by ordering her unruly and disorderly *practices*. Coins, serving as they did as a "landmark of a particular period," ordered the past for Rivett-Carnac, just as his collection of metal Hindu ritual objects ordered India's practices. Such a collection created an illusion of control—in this case, over "the mysteries of the Hindu pantheon" with its endless "curious and often grotesque" gods who belonged to a "polluted faith." Mastery over these multi-armed gods was brought about with Linnaean tenacity, if not obsessiveness. The collector collected them, grouped them, photographed them, and even published them.

Unsatisfied with mere ownership (that permitted all of these manipulations), the collector's journey continued. Rivett-Carnac felt compelled to fabricate histories and identities for the individual objects in his collection, and for the collection as a whole. In addition to reading select reference works, including E. Moore's *The Hindu Pantheon* (1809) and G. Birdwood's *The Industrial Arts of India* (1880), he quizzed and queried Indians who entered his official and unofficial world. He searched for a usable past that he then (rightly or wrongly) called a tradition. This usable past sustained him and his collection. It was always a partial and ambiguous past made up of some admixture of genealogy, observed practice and hearsay. The usability of this past, as Homi Bhabha has pointed out in another context, presumed India "as a fixed reality which [is] entirely knowable and visible" (156).

In constructing a tradition in which to place the object, Rivett-Carnac came to possess a body of knowledge (to accompany his objects) that purported to

represent a recognizable reality called India. As Susan Stewart has so adroitly pointed out, such knowledge at once familiarizes and distances (1984:139–145). It makes India familiar by allusion—an allusion of the part to the whole. As a metonymic gesture, the collected object stands for the whole collection, and the collected objects in this case stand for India. The collection contains and bounds India. But it is India only in a very special sense. The collected object distances itself from its origin, and in doing so, substitutes classification for use value and thus, for history. The collection is self-contained, and the “world is accounted for by the elements of the collection” (*Ibid.*: 162). Rivett-Carnac unwittingly recognized this bind. In explicating his antiquarian posture on the relation between object and history, he quickly shifted to an increasingly more abstract, though unacknowledged, set of reasons for collecting. He notes that “one soon became interested in the ‘finds’ and their arrangement, and in reading up all that related to . . . a curious-looking coin that had a special place in a particular tray” (1900:13). His coin was not only a “landmark of a particular period,” but it also had a “special place in a particular tray,” thus making it the subject of considerations that had less to do with India, and more to do with the modern consumer of the coin. Removed from history and context, the coin and the figurine became vehicles for a host of significations many of which were self-referents.

Self-referencing could be seen when colonial officials marshalled objects in order to reminisce—to tour their own pasts, and to permit it to be toured by others who view the collection. The finely honed art of memory enabled the collector to recollect the degrees by which the “vacant spaces in the trays were filled up during tours through the districts,” and the “red-lettered days of successful ‘finds’ whilst groping amid the rubbish that was brought to one at each camping-ground, as the ‘Sahib’s’ seemingly queer interests became known.” Likening his hunt for collectable treasures to the hunt of the sportsman, Rivett-Carnac records that collecting figures of Hindu gods “brought [him] some of the delights [associated with] securing a specially good head, or meritorious skin” (*Ibid.*: 13).

Permitting others to tour your past by touring your collection necessitates a narrative, not of the object, but of the possessor (Stewart: 155–66). In this case, the possessor was special. He was a colonial official, and that made his collecting of objects also special in that it linked politics to an emergent aesthetic. His was a politics of longing—a longing for reconciliation, both with self and with that radical other (in this case India, the site of Rivett-Carnac’s past). Our collector recognized that, for his own countrymen, his choice of collectables, namely “a lesser Hindu pantheon,” was suspect; his narrative was in part groomed in his defense. It identified the Brahman priest, an urban dweller, as being the culprit who possessed the knowledge and directed the practices which made “idolatry” hideous and abominable. It privileged the “average Hindu” who, like the “average Englishman,” knew

few of the “repugnant” stories and could identify even fewer members of the daunting pantheon.

The collected object in the service of colonial lifestyles turned the collector progressively inward. The junior officer was advised to look forward to retirement when the “interest awakened” by the collection would “remain [even] in the absence of the collection which [had] gone to the local auctioneer, and judicious weeding-out [had admitted] of a few favourite specimens being retained . . .” (Rivett-Carnac: 13). The object would resurrect and reconfigure memories. But, relieved of the other objects in the collection, the collected object was eventually reduced to being a souvenir of a journey that in Stewart’s words, is reportable not repeatable (135).

This privatized world of longing was tied to public strategies. For individual colonial officials, the act of collecting and the building of a collection created an illusion of cognitive control over their experience in India—an experience that might otherwise have been disturbingly chaotic. Since many officials collected, it can be argued that collections promoted a sense of moral and material control over the Indian environment. At the same time, collected objects could be fed into the two growing institutions of the second half of the nineteenth century, the exhibition and the museum, thus allowing this sense of knowledge and control to be repatriated to the metropolis. In the metropole, fairs and museums could serve, over time, as reminders of the orderliness of empire as well as the exoticism of distant parts of the Victorian ecumene.

Unlike the wonder cabinet, such colonial collections, whether private or otherwise, were clearly anything but the static abode of disoriented objects. The birth of the international exhibition (and its handmaiden, the modern museum) changed all that in the second half of the nineteenth century. World fairs generated the practical and ideological apparatus necessary for modern collectors, such as Mr. and Mrs. Rivett-Carnac, to transform objects by lifting them out of their everyday contexts and by placing them within reach of institutions such as exhibitions and museums. In these contexts, textualized objects acquired a new discursive value, and by contrast helped to create a new, object-centered mythology of rule in the imagined ecumene of Victoria.

VII

As should be clear by now, world fairs were more than merchandizing ventures. Without doubt they serviced commerce. They gave new products their start in life. Coleman’s mustard (Paris 1878), Fleishman’s yeast (Philadelphia 1876), Goodyear’s India rubber (Philadelphia 1876), and the ice cream cone (Saint Louis, 1904) were all launched at world fairs. Fairs expanded the world of commodities by transforming all objects into merchandise available for consumption, if only visually. They facilitated long-distance contracts between traders, and inspired the development in a city like London of display-

oriented department stores such as Liberty's, and mail-order suppliers such as the Army and Navy store and Harrods. They even transformed people into quasi-commodities. Natives were brought to stage re-enactments of their everyday lives, a phenomenon that reached its epitome at the 1904 Saint Louis fair where, in the building earmarked the Hall of Anthropology, one could view scantily-clad (Philippine) Ilongots in one corner, and giants from Patagonia in another.

If the task of the world fair had ended there, it could be dismissed easily as a spectacle of modern commerce that placed art in the service of merchandising. But it did not end there. The world fair mixed commerce with culture in a mode that was then innovative, even radical. As I have hinted, world fairs were lively fora for experimentation with systems of classification and presentation for assembled objects, by classifying, organizing, displaying, judging, and labelling them by criteria of *place of production* (nation, town, or village), *mode of production* (handcrafted or machine made), *mode of distribution* (with such categories, for example, as traders), *raw material* (metal, wood, glass, or paper), or *themes* (as, for example, a depiction of modes of labor or transportation).

This surge of interest in classification challenged the pre-eminence of emotive, nonverbal forms of experiencing objects, as was the case with the wonder cabinets, and favored the more disciplinary languages concerned with authenticity, connoisseurship, provenance and patronage that drew some closure on knowledge. These were discursive languages eminently suited to politics and control. Even the memories that permitted colonial collectors to reflect on their past were tied to myths of identification promoted by classificatory devices.

World fairs were a sign of the new and highly urbanized regime of the modern nation-state. Exhibitions supplied the metropolitan nation-state with an occasion to fulfill one of its unquestioned goals, namely universal education through mass mobilization. One by-product of this goal was the disciplining of the popular gaze. Visual literacy was expanded by the emerging discourse associated with taste and art, ideas that increasingly subordinated judgments and opinions. Following the Great Exhibition, the now classic essay by Ralph N. Wornum, on "The Exhibition as a Lesson in Taste," appeared (1851). Assuming a developmental posture, Wornum, like many of his contemporaries, argued that the time had come to combine overall utility (the theme of the industrial revolution) with beauty and elegance in the production of objects, thereby producing a second industrial revolution. Viewing well-designed objects at the fair was intended to have an impact on producer and consumer alike. Manufacturers presumably would aspire to produce aesthetically appealing products, and (middle-class as well as bourgeois) consumers presumably would develop a discriminating eye for refined artifacts. This privileging of the visual experience affected more than individual

choices. The collective and self-conscious “conveying of a distinct aesthetic expression” advanced the development of a “national taste” that was to distinguish one nation from another (Wornum, 1851:xxii).

Nineteenth-century world fairs, like the twentieth-century political and art poster described so well by Susan Sontag (1970), aimed to make selling something beautiful and seductive. While beauty was not the specific categorical imperative for the initial fairs from the beginning, design, arrangement, and in general, visual good taste were dominant concerns. Recall the initial ridicule in the English press of the plain unadorned and undressed U.S. courts at the Crystal Palace Exhibition. By the turn of the twentieth century, the values displayed at world fairs were expressed in a language of discrimination in which taste was the decisive evidence of modernity. It was a language that emphasized fineness, finery and refinement and that made of living a fine art.

If fairs attempted to make selling beautiful, they made buying or acquiring (objects) a refined pursuit by implication. That “transient gaze,” guided by what some have called unfruitful wonder, that was employed by spectators of panoramas and curiosity cabinets, was soon reshaped as an aesthetic gaze. This new gaze was directed by detailed and rule-bound standards, styles, and classificatory protocols associated with such institutions as exhibitions and, later, with museums.

Creating social distinctions between individuals and classes largely on the basis of *taste* has no longer or deeper history in India than it does in Britain, as might be expected. The imperial encounter that spawned the institutionalization of culture was a late nineteenth-century phenomenon anticipated earlier in the century. In 1835, in a now famous government memo, Lord Macaulay, an early architect of a colonial policy on education in India, advanced taste as an agent for the construction of a class of new Indian subjects. These new subjects were to be interpreters between “us and the millions whom we govern—a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect” (quoted in Lannoy 1971:238). Most interpretations of this well-known quote emphasize the position rather than the nature of the new Indian subject envisioned by Macaulay: He was the man-in-between. Equally important was the nature of the new Indian subjects as *English in taste*. The task of delineating taste remained with a host of culture-makers, such as colonial archaeologists, ethnographers, photographers, publishers, and inadvertently policy-makers. These brokers of culture were central to the institutionalization of new cultural forms, as well as to the collection and canonization of cultural content.

In the decades that followed the Crystal Palace Exhibition, the model for what it meant to be English in taste, however, was hardly a straightforward matter in either England or India. For Indians, it meant eating with a knife and fork, using china dinnerware and household furniture, speaking the Queen’s

English, wearing trousers and jacket, reading periodical literature, and playing the gentlemanly game of cricket. For Englishman or woman, it meant furnishing the drawing room with brass and carved wooden lamps, screens, tables and bric-à-brac from India, displaying “trophies” perched on fireplace mantles from relatives in the India Civil Service, covering overstuffed furniture and walls with India print fabrics, wearing Indian shawls, and displaying Indian regalia from dethroned princes for use by members of the British royalty. Such cultural flows both revealed and facilitated the desire of colonizer and colonized to mutually encompass each other, without conflating the differences between them. In mapping the other onto the familiar everyday world, the foundation was laid for the formation of a bi-cultural ruling class, whose distance from the masses in both England and in India was established through distinctions in taste (e.g., Bourdieu 1984).

VIII

Objects from India were thus used to construct an ecumene that went beyond national boundaries, though its cultural forms facilitated the reification of the nation-state. This is one of the cultural paradoxes of imperialism. I have tried to show that the formation of national cultures in the second half of the nineteenth century was accompanied by the development of transnational practices that recurred in the creation of a global class united by their relation to newly invented rituals, newly constructed metropolises, newly naturalized objects. Though all classes and ethnic groups, both in Britain and in India, were implicated psychologically, emotionally and practically in these constructions, some benefited more than others. The greatest beneficiaries of the newly constructed colonial edifices were those members of the ruling elite of the respective nations who, through their associations, practices and consumption patterns were also members of a global and increasingly cosmopolitan elite.

The social conditions under which objects from (and in) India were circulated—in the historical context of (trade and art) exhibitions and fairs throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and up until 1925—were novel and discontinuous with the past. In the practical activities associated with this historical development, new ways of viewing the world and of creating social distinctions emerged. These novel modes for the social use of Indian objects emphasized aesthetic dispositions and display as new ways of deriving use value. The use in question was no longer that of ordinary life in the locality, but became subordinate to the task of creating a set of practices that extended the life of the object globally.

If the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries was a period in England when the arts were ordered and their histories written (Lipking 1970), the second half of the nineteenth century was a period when they were institutionalized and linked to the politics of colonial practice. The com-

modified, colonized and textualized object became a vehicle and a metaphor for the global extension of culture itself.

REFERENCES

- Allwood, John. 1977. *The Great Exhibitions*. London: Studio Vista.
- Altick, Richard D. 1978. *The Shows Of London*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verson.
- Benedict, Burton, ed. 1983. *The Anthropology of World's Fairs: San Francisco's Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1968. *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- . 1978. *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Bhabha, Homi. 1986. "The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourses of Colonialism," in *Literature, Politics and Theory: Papers from The Essex Conference*, Frances Parker et al., eds. London: Methuen.
- Birdwood, George C. M. 1879. *Paris Universal Exhibition of 1878. Handbook to the British Indian Section. Presentation Edition*. London: Offices of the Royal Commission.
- . 1880. *The Industrial Arts of India*. London: Chapman and Hall. 2 vols.
- . 1908. *Relics of the Honourable East India Company: To The Worshipful Memory of the Honourable East India Company* (a series of fifty plates by William Griggs, with letterpress by Sir George Birdwood and William Foster). London: Queritche.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bunn, James. 1980. "The Aesthetics of British Mercantilism." *New Literary History*, 11:2 (Winter, 1980), 303–321.
- Cohn, Bernard S. 1983. "Representing Authority in Victorian India," in *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., 165–209.
- Connadine, David. 1983. "The Context, Performance and Meaning of Ritual: The British Monarchy and the 'Invention of Tradition,' ca. 1820–1977," in *The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsbawm, and Terence Ranger, eds., 101–164.
- Cortinovis, Irene E. 1977. "China at the St. Louis World's Fair," *Missouri Historical Review*, 72:1, 59–66.
- Curti, Merle. 1955. "America at the World Fairs, 1851–1893," *Probing Our Past*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 246–277.
- Debord, Guy. 1977. *Society of the Spectacle*. Detroit: Black and Red Press.
- Desmond, Ray. 1982. *The India Museum, 1801–1879*. London: India Office Library and Records.
- Haltern, Utz. 1971. *Die Londoner weltausstellung von 1851: eine beitrage zur geschichte der burgerlich-industriellen gesellschaft im 19. jahrhundert*. Munster: Aschendorff.
- Harris, Neil. 1975. "All the World a Melting Pot? Japan at American Fairs, 1894–1904" in *Mutual Images: American-Japanese Relations*, Akira Iriye, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 1979. "Museums, Merchandising, and Popular Taste: The Struggle for Influence," in *Material Culture and the Study of American Life*, Ian M. G. Quimby, ed. New York: Norton & Company.

- Havell, E. B. n.d. *Essays on Indian Art, Industry and Education*. Madras: Natesan Company.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Ranger, Terence. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holt, Elizabeth. 1983. *The Triumph of Art for the Public, 1785–1848*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Impey, Oliver. 1977. *Chinoiserie: The Impact of Oriental Styles on Western Art and Decoration*. New York: Scribner.
- Lannoy, Richard. 1971. *The Speaking Tree: A Study of Indian Culture and Society*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lipking, Lawrence. 1970. *The Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moor, Edward. 1807. *The Hindu Pantheon*. London: J. Johnson.
- Mullaney, Steven. 1983. "Strange Things, Gross Terms, Curious Customs: The Rehearsal of Cultures in the Late Renaissance." *Representations*, 3 (Summer), 41–67.
- Plum, Werner. 1977. *World Fairs in the 19th Century: Pageants of Social and Cultural Change*. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Rivett-Carnac, J. H. 1900. "A Lesser Hindu Pantheon. Being An Illustrated Catalogue of Metal Objects Used in Hindu Ritual." *The Journal of Indian Art and Industry*, IX (72), (October), 13–21 (plus 12 plates).
- Rivett-Carnac, Marion. 1900. "Ancient Indian Beads." *The Journal of Indian Art and Industry*, IX (71), (July), 5–12 (plus 11 plates).
- Rydel, Robert. 1984. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Silverman, Debora. 1977. "The 1889 Exhibition: The Crisis of Bourgeois Individualism," in *City and Ideology: Paris under the Academy*, Anthony Vidler, ed., special issue of *Oppositions, A Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture*, 8(Spring), 71–91.
- Sontag, Susan. 1970. "Posters: Advertisement, Art, Political Artifact, Commodity," in *The Art of Revolution: Castro's Cuba 1959–1970*, Dugald Stermer, comp. New York: McGraw-Hill, vii–xxiii.
- Sparling, Tobin. 1982. *The Great Exhibition: A Question of Taste*. New Haven: Yale Center for British Art.
- Stewart, Susan. 1984. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, The Gigantic, The Souvenir and The Collection*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wornum, Ralph N. 1851. "The Exhibition as a Lesson in Taste." *The Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue*, London: Virtue, i–xxii.
- Wyatt, M. Digby. 1851. *The Industrial Arts of the Nineteenth Century: A Series of Illustrations of the Choicest Specimens Produced by Every Nation at the Great Exhibition of Works of Industry*. London: Day & Company (1851–53). 2 vols.