

**AHRC Diasporas Migrations and Identities programme  
Fashioning Diaspora Space, V&A/RHUL**

**Dr Sonia Ashmore, Research Fellow, Victoria & Albert Museum**

**Colour and corruption: issues in the nineteenth century Anglo-Indian textile trade.**

**Summary**

An ongoing preoccupation with issues around natural dyes in the context of Indian hand-made textiles in the late nineteenth century is effectively a metaphor for more fundamental anxieties about the complex relationships between Britain and India. These concerns related directly to attitudes to the production and distribution of textile goods in the (imperial) marketplace and in museum culture. Furthermore, these issues indicate the complex nature of 'diasporic' objects, reflecting the movement of people, objects and ideas and the difficulties noted in a more contemporary context by Brah (1996) of fixing cultural authenticity within this exchange, and indeed the problems of applying the concept of diaspora.<sup>1</sup> Textiles evoked and embodied the presence of the British in South Asia as well as of South Asian cultures in Britain.

**Context**

This paper derives from research being undertaken at the Victoria & Albert Museum and Royal Holloway, University of London, as part of a wider project entitled 'Fashioning Diaspora Space', funded by the AHRC's Diasporas, Migrations and Identities programme. The project as a whole investigates the presence of South Asian clothing textiles in 'British' culture in both the colonial and post-colonial periods; textiles as both carriers of meaning and indicators of 'diasporic' cultures. The historical strand of this investigation, from which this paper derives, examines the collection and use made of 'Indian' textiles by the South Kensington (later the Victoria & Albert) Museum, and in the broader cultures of textile manufacture and consumption during the second half of the nineteenth century; it will recontextualise objects in the Museum's South Asian collections.<sup>2</sup>

**Text**

It is now well established that textiles of the greatest refinement from the Indian subcontinent had been traded throughout South-East Asia and to Europe for centuries before the arrival of European traders or the establishment of the East India companies in South Asia.<sup>3</sup> As Gittinger has remarked, this experience meant that by the seventeenth century, 'The mastery of the technical aspects of [textile preparation] allowed the dyer the freedom to respond to orders for different patterns and designs with assured success. He could meet the demands ... of virtually any market.'<sup>4</sup> By the mid-nineteenth century however, it could be argued that the relationship with British markets in particular, and

intervention by the British East India Company in the production of both cloth and dyes had already 'corrupted' the 'purity' of indigenous textile manufacture to some extent; it was no longer a wholly authentic 'Indian' process from start to finish.<sup>5</sup> As Veronica Murphy has pointed out, the Company had a dual, and 'not properly reconcilable' role as a trader profiting from the production and sale of Indian textiles in Britain, and as supplier of both the textiles (for copying) and raw materials to manufacturers in Britain who were in direct competition with Indian producers; in short, the Company worked the trade at both ends.<sup>6</sup> This conflict of interest continued to pervade the Anglo-Indian textile trade and official attitudes towards it well after the demise of the Company, with genuine attempts to promote Indian hand-made textiles and artefacts on one hand, and loyalty to British manufacturing industries on the other. There were, simultaneously, many contradictory views of India held by the British, for example as a country of refined cultural achievement and also as a primitive 'estate which we have to improve'.<sup>7</sup> Since the 'estate' and its products were displayed at the nineteenth century international exhibitions, its stewardship was also being held to account, and the issue of dyes became part of this reckoning.

The impression often given that nineteenth century India was a pre-industrial country is misleading; nor was industrialization exclusively introduced by foreigners such as the British. By the 1880s, an industrialised cotton spinning industry, established largely by Parsis in Bombay (Mumbai), was well established in the sub-continent, with machinery imported from Lancashire, but largely owned and managed by Indians. Parsis, themselves originally immigrants from Persia, had already long been involved in shipbuilding and overseas trade. This mechanized production increasingly supplied the handloom industry with cotton yarn and complicated the picture of textile trade issues with Britain.<sup>8</sup> Leaving aside for the moment the question of the perception of India both as a source of wealth and a market for British manufactured goods, especially cotton piece goods, the immediate concern of the more benevolent late Victorian guardians of this Indian 'estate' was the degradation of its indigenous artefacts and the threat of western-style industrialisation. In the *Industrial Arts of India*, published in 1880, which paradoxically dealt with hand-made artefacts, George Birdwood (1832-1917), latterly of the India Office in London, suggested that even the Indian collections in the South Kensington Museum were,

... More and more overcrowded with mongrel forms, the result of the influences on Indian art of European society, European education, and above all the irresistible energy of the mechanical productiveness of Birmingham or Manchester. Through all these means, foreign forms of ornament are being constantly introduced into the country; and so rapidly are they spreading, that there is a real fear that they may at last irretrievably vitiate the native tradition of the decorative art of India.<sup>9</sup>

Birdwood emphasised the link between hand-craft, traditional village social life and religion, all simultaneously threatened by the introduction of European ways,

including synthetic colours. He noted with approval that the Maharajah of Kashmir had initiated prohibitive taxes on the use of magenta dyes in his state.<sup>10</sup>

Writing in the *Journal of Indian Art* in 1885, B. H. Baden-Powell noted 'the singular aptitude of even the best workmen and designers to get poisoned', by copying Western models often from woodcuts from catalogue advertisements.<sup>11</sup> There were other, related, issues such as the westernising influence of the Schools of Art established by the British and the manufacture of carpets in Indian jails under British direction where the use of aniline dyes was felt to be typical of the way that standards were compromised. This issue was debated repeatedly in the correspondence columns of the *Times* by people such as the influential dealer in oriental carpets, Vincent Robinson, who wrote that 'the designs have been vulgarized, and the harmony of colouring altogether impaired',<sup>12</sup> and of course Birdwood, who also argued that the British government was implicated;

the corruption of the streams of native art which is going on under our rule all over India is thus directly aggravated by the Government manufacture of carpets ... some of them [use] false colours, and if the aniline dyes are not used their effect at least is produced.<sup>13</sup>

Birdwood quoted a 'Regent-street firm', probably Liberty & Co., which complained that 'The Lahore gaol rugs are made with aniline dyed wool, in vulgar, strong, crude contrasts, in designs which ... are often without the trace of Indian character.'<sup>14</sup> Colour was to be a recurring theme in this idea of western influences corrupting the native artefact, particularly as far as textiles were concerned. There is another aspect to this of course; in India, dyeing itself was embedded in ideas about caste and pollution.<sup>15</sup>

Indian dyestuffs were among the natural materials and 'vegetable' products displayed at the international exhibitions as products of empire. Raw materials, recipes and dyeing methods were meticulously recorded in India and displayed at the exhibitions. Examples can be found in the reports of H.H. Cole (1874), George Birdwood (1878), Thomas Wardle (1878, 1881), T.H. Mukerjee (1888) and George Watt's exhaustive, six volume, *Dictionary of the Economic Products of India*, published in 1892. Coloured fabrics, or one kind or another, were among the most admired articles displayed at the exhibitions.

A key admirer of Indian designs, particularly the textiles, was the architect and educator Owen Jones (1809-74). His interpretation of the examples of 'Indian' design, shown at the international exhibitions at South Kensington in 1851 and Paris, 1855, along with art from other 'Mohammedan' countries demonstrated, in his view, 'all the principles, all the unity, all the truth, for which we had looked elsewhere in vain', and which was set in contrast to 'the general disorder everywhere apparent in the application of Art to manufacture' in Britain.<sup>16</sup> They were held up as models of decorative art to which British manufacturers and design students should aspire. Jones' *Grammar of Ornament*, published in 1856,

was a sumptuous if didactic design manual in which he abstracted designs from objects from different world cultures – as shown at the 1851 Exhibition, and which included a collection of hand-made Indian textiles. For almost the first time, they were illustrated in colour. These patterns could be borrowed, or sampled, to use a more current word, by students and manufacturers. Jones also set out thirty-seven propositions, or ‘General Principles’ of good design, based on what he saw as ‘Oriental practice’; Indian textiles in particular demonstrated perfection of design and making.<sup>17</sup> Although Jones was aware that the publication of these designs would encourage copying, his intention was that the example of Indian design would eventually be absorbed at a deeper level.<sup>18</sup> The lessons in colour he himself absorbed during this project became fundamental to his work as a designer and architect; to Jones architecture was the chief expression of culture. While some admired the ‘surpassing beauty’ of his daring use of colour at the Crystal Palace,<sup>19</sup> others mocked him as the ‘Grand Polychromatist-plenipotentiary’, whose colouring, ‘is another specimen of bad taste’.<sup>20</sup> Colour was an emotive subject. Jones also designed a series of silks for Warner & Sons Limited which attempted to put his principles of the harmony and even distribution of colour into practice; they were given suggestively Indian names such as ‘Madras’, ‘Maharanee’, ‘Sultan’ and ‘Nizam’, indicating a debt to Indian textile designs.

While Jones did not discuss the Indian textiles themselves in detail, it is evident that these ‘principles’ were absorbed and echoed by a generation of taste leaders in Britain, and particularly by those who mediated the cause of Indian artefacts and referred repeatedly to the impeccable restraint in the use of colour, the perfectly balanced relationship of ornament to ground and the connection between craft skill, spirituality and traditional way of life of the Indian producers. As Birdwood later commented, ‘In India everything is hand wrought, and everything, down to the cheapest toy or earthen vessel, is therefore more or less a work of art’.<sup>21</sup> Yet, he added, in prose redolent of Ruskin, the process was being destroyed from within as industrialisation proceeded in India and destroyed the social and spiritual foundations of these same craftsmen who,

... Are being everywhere gathered from their democratic village communities in hundreds and thousands into the colossal mills of Bombay, to drudge in gangs, for tempting wages, at manufacturing piece goods, in competition with Manchester, in the production of which they are no more intellectually and morally concerned than the grinder of a barrel organ in the tunes turned out from it.<sup>22</sup>

In design terms, this could only lead the ‘confusion of principles’ experienced in Britain that had led to the establishment of a ‘Chamber of Horrors’ of British decorative arts, displayed at Marlborough House on the Mall in London, a precursor to the South Kensington Museum, and the establishment of a nationwide system of art education that was both inspired by Indian design, and also, paradoxically, exported to India.<sup>23</sup> Thus we already see links between

British nineteenth century thinking about Indian 'art manufactures', and the contemporaneous Arts and Crafts movement, which associated poor design with dispiriting, industrialised work processes, and which the founders of the South Kensington Museum sought to redress. In the Circulating Collection organised by the Museum from the 1850s for exhibition in public institutions and provincial schools of art, thirteen out of twenty-one objects in the textile section were from the Indian subcontinent. J. C. Robinson, Superintendent of Art Collections at the Museum, emphasised in the catalogue that,

The contributions to the Exhibition of 1851 from various oriental countries were ... recognised as possessing special claims to the attention on the decorative artist, and their superiority, in point of design, over European stuffs, was ... for the first time, fully admitted.<sup>24</sup>

Although they were inevitably illustrated in black and white - with the notable exception of W.H. Griggs' superb chromolithographic plates for the *Grammar* and for the *Journal of Indian Art* - colour was the focus of the wide admiration of Indian textiles in Britain, and cause of the immediate success of Arthur Lasenby Liberty's shop on Regent Street, which opened in 1875. Even the French were rendered 'speechless' by the Wardle/Liberty display of Indian silks at the 1878 Paris Exposition:

The colours are of every conceivable tint from the faintest straw to the deepest depth of old gold and from the palest peacock blue to the darkest sapphire. Shadows, tints, tones, are all represented! The colours cannot be spoken of ...<sup>25</sup>

Birdwood observed in Indian textiles, '... the natural beauty of the dyes used, and the knowledge, taste and skill of the natives of the Indian in the harmonious arrangement of colors ... the simplicity and treatment of the decorative details.'<sup>26</sup> Yet, twenty years later, Birdwood argued that British manufacturers had not learned any colour lessons from these Indian examples:

... one of the greatest improvement in English textiles manufactures would be the substitution of the rich deep-toned Indian dyes for the harsh flaring chemicals, especially of the magenta series at present in use.<sup>27</sup>

William Morris, naturally, provides a key link between these different sets of interests, with his passionate belief in the value of hand-craft and resistance to capitalist-driven industrialism, his dedication to textiles, his connections with South Kensington, his collaboration in using natural dyes with Thomas Wardle of Leek,<sup>28</sup> and his concerns for the integrity of 'native artefacts'. His practical, hands-in-the-dye-tub experience was critical to his understanding. Morris appreciated the clarity of colour and elegant way that the naturally dyed fabrics faded with time:

... I must tell you that they all make in their simplest forms beautiful colours; they need no muddling into artistic usefulness, when you need your colours bright ( as I hope you usually do), and they can be modified and toned without dirtying, as the foul blotches of the capitalist dyer cannot do ... these dyes in fading will remain beautiful, and never, even after long wear, pass into nothingness, through that stage of livid ugliness which distinguishes the commercial dyes as nuisances, even more than their short and by no means merry life.<sup>29</sup>

Colour fastness was a disputed issue, but essentially Morris associated natural dyes with purity of colour, beauty and joy, in contrast to the 'foul' and by implication, synthetic 'blotches' of the industrialised processes driven by capitalism. Although Morris was not exempt from using synthetic dyes in his business, artificial dyes were thus interpreted in principle as symbolizing the corruption of colour, the corruption of taste and the corruption of workmanship. Morris also publicly expressed concern about negative western influences on Indian art. Wardle later wrote, 'I am printing velvets every week with Morris and our sole effort is to avoid the regularity of effect of cheap commercial productions.'<sup>30</sup> At the time he was being chastised for his uneven colouring of some velvet for the Imperial Institute and responded that he did this on purpose, 'to give it an artistic appearance and to avoid mechanical regularity ... In none of the Indian printed work do you see all this regularity that is thought to be wanting in my work ...'<sup>31</sup> It was thus both the quality of application as well as the colour itself that was at issue. Liberty publicly acknowledged Morris's contribution to the cause of colour:

The honour of being leader in the effort to reproduce indigenous art fabrics, is due to one of our great poet-artists, who, in order to direct others, found it necessary to acquire by personal labour and experience, and practical knowledge of the technical processes of the weavers', dyers' and colour printers' crafts.<sup>32</sup>

There was a sense of common goals between those who were fearful of damage being done to the traditional crafts of India, or indeed Japan, or any of the other non-European artefacts that were being 'discovered', admired, bought up and copied at this time, and the attempts to retrieve hand-craft in Britain. These were linked to concerns about other forms of 'pollution', expressed here in Birdwood's prescient defence of Indian craftsmen, 'Who, for all the marvellous tissues and embroidery they have wrought, have polluted no rivers, deformed no pleasing prospects, nor poisoned any air'.<sup>33</sup> Yet even this view was contested in the *Journal of Indian Art* by a British officer- Surgeon Major T. Holbein Hendley, who thought that, 'the dyer is a nuisance to everyone near him. Some of his proceedings are of the most filthy description'.<sup>34</sup> He presumably meant the use of substances like cow dung and urine in the dyeing process. The association of chemical dyes and poison featured frequently in the contemporary British press: poisoning was often the theme of horror stories in the popular and trade press,

as milliners and wallpapers makers were literally poisoned by the arsenic greens they worked with. At the 1886 Colonial and Indian exhibition, Wardle regretted the fashion for aniline dyes evident in the display in the Baroda Court; besides the degraded colour, he thought the aniline dyes 'injurious to health'.

The 1886 Colonial and Indian Exhibition featured a sumptuous display of hand-woven silks bought in India by Thomas Wardle and other textiles recently bought in India for the South Kensington Museum by Caspar Purdon Clarke, later the Museum's Director. Clarke commented that the demand created for Indian textiles by previous exhibitions had led,

... To the production of cheap work of inferior quality, in many cases only a semblance of printing being attempted, the colouring being produced with ordinary water colours, not in any way dyed or fixed.<sup>35</sup>

This speech was given to an audience including Birdwood, Liberty and Vincent Robinson, among others, suggesting that such issues were discussed in these circles.

By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the export trade of cotton piece goods to India from Manchester and Glasgow was already well-developed and challenging Indian textile producers, notwithstanding the existence of factory textile production in India. The vehement debates about customs tariffs in the 1890s exposed some of the tensions between Indian and English and Scottish manufacturers.<sup>36</sup> Birdwood reported on the conflict between price and quality;

In the city of Lucknow ... Manchester chintzes sell for a shilling the yard, while those printed on the spot cost twenty pence the yard. But the Lucknow chintzes are far superior in colour, the Kukail and Baita rivers being famous for the purity of tints their waters give to the deep-toned dyes of India.<sup>37</sup>

Imported goods such as *bandannas*, or head cloths had a price advantage which eventually changed the preferences of local, Indian consumers. The industrialised production of Turkey Red dye in Scotland, enabled by advances in bleaching technology, was one development that made this possible.<sup>38</sup> However, the issue of Anglo-Indian 'trade wars' is a more complex story and it has been pointed out that Manchester did not actually succeed in destroying India's handloom industry.<sup>39</sup>

In the 1880s, the art teacher and critic E.V. Havell recorded the traditional recipe for the fine deep red dye for which Madura, in South India, was famous, noting that the whole dyeing process took a month to complete.<sup>40</sup> By the turn of the century, the botanist and compiler of the ten volume *Dictionary of the Commercial Products of India* George Watt noted that at Madura, in south India, there was,

.... A fairly large trade in both cotton and silk goods, the special feature being the deep Indian madder red that used to be employed. This colour is now largely simulated by an imported alizarine dye that is much cheaper and the fabric when freshly dyed can with difficulty be distinguished from similar goods dyed with the older madder colour. <sup>41</sup>

Watt noted that, 'the value of the annual imports of alizarine and aniline dye to India almost quadrupled' between 1885 and 1890, while use of madder and *manjit* (East Indian madder) had declined. He agreed with the author of a monograph on Madras Cotton, that taste had been degraded by imported goods.

... The unavoidable influence of European domination and civilization is being felt in every direction and is operating often very injuriously on the arts and crafts of the country. Popular favour has turned to goods and designs presumed to be those approved of and used by Europeans, with the result that the older manufacturers have been either starved to death or distorted into new forms, in supposed accord with modern fashion. <sup>42</sup>

In the late 1880s, John Lockwood Kipling, then Director of the Mayo School of Art in Lahore, wrote a series of articles on 'Industries in the Punjab' for the *Journal of Indian Art*. He went so far as to argue that,

The educated Hindu of today takes an especial delight in the most violent and offensive colours that can be found in Berlin wool and aniline dyed silks ... The greens in particular favour are a violent apple green and emerald green; the only blue that is really liked is the raw and crude Chinese blue of English colour makers ... <sup>43</sup>

In a subsequent issue of the *Journal*, Pandit Natesa Sastu commented on the 'invasion of European looms and the arrival of aniline dyes in India.'<sup>44</sup> Thomas Wardle, a practical man rather than a sentimental one, thought the idea of taking dyestuffs to India was like, 'carrying coals to Newcastle'. Taking technical expertise to India was a different matter. Wardle spent a great deal of time and effort working on material solutions to the problems of silk production and dyeing; one was to improve the (natural) dyeing techniques, implying that in parts of India at least, the legendary expertise with dyes was in danger of being lost. There was a broader concern that China would dominate the silk market if the quality of Indian silk were not improved.

In recommending the Government of India to have the native taught the dyeing of their wild silks with dyestuffs indigenous to India I had two motives, one to prevent the native art of India being tampered with by the introduction of foreign fugitive dyes and crude colours, and another that they could be made to utilise ... the remarkable variety of native grown dyestuffs which in the wild silk fabrics they have known probably for thousands of years so well how to use. <sup>45</sup>

In his attempts to improve the Indian silk industry and keep Chinese silk at bay, Wardle thought that proper mordanting was the answer; aniline dyes were fugitive, and he implied that modern methods had become slapdash:

It is perfectly true that the older modes of dyeing generally gave more permanent results than the modern modes ... Old specimens of woven fabrics of silk may be seen in the South Kensington Museum, whose colours have stood, but little impaired, for more centuries than the results of modern dyes would stand months of exposure to light.<sup>46</sup>

There was much disagreement on the subject of colour fastness. George Watt, reporting on Indian art at the Delhi exhibition of 1903, took a rather different view, if ultimately an inconsistent one:

It has to be admitted, as a fact, that perhaps considerably more than 50 per cent of all the colour results attained at the present day are aniline or rather alizarine. And it has to be added that *the better alizarine dyes are more beautiful and more permanent than a large percentage of the vegetable colours that are so much extolled by writers on Indian art* [my emphasis].<sup>47</sup>

Watt thought that, because Europeans –like Morris- preferred pale, faded colours and old things, there was a mistaken belief that bright colours were not so typically ‘Indian’, although he regretted that these had been exaggerated with the use of aniline dyes. Bright, garish colours were often associated with baseness of taste and possibly low morals. The success of an ‘aesthetic’ shop like Liberty & Co. rested on its huge range of subtle ‘Art’ shades, in contrast to the often crudely coloured, mass-produced textiles of late Victorian England. There were unresolved issues, however, which indicate the difficulty of making assumptions about cultural authenticity. Liberty eventually complained that the quality of Indian dyeing itself was inconsistent, a problem for a retailer dealing in volume production, and he returned to having silks dyed and printed in England, often by Wardle; nonetheless, he continued to give them evocative, ‘Indian’ names in order to maintain exotic associations for his shop. In the context of India however, European notions of taste were not always relevant. As Veronica Murphy and Rosemary Crill have pointed out, in parts of India such as Rajasthan, fugitive dyes were preferred, both for reasons of ritual, and because, ‘renewable dyes provided a change of costume without the expense of buying a new one’ for the many ceremonies and events that required new clothing.<sup>48</sup> Bright, newly coloured fabrics had spiritual as well as aesthetic meaning for their consumers.

More than a century later it remains difficult, even with modern analysis, to determine whether specific nineteenth century Indian textiles used natural or aniline dyes, or often, as seems likely, a mixture of both. A number of recorded recipes show a combination of naturally derived Indian dyes and synthetic imported ones. For example, an article on ‘Cloth Stamping and Dyeing’ in Beawar, Rajputana (now Rajasthan) published in the 1880s, noted that besides

native dyestuffs such as *al* shrub (*Morinda* or Indian Mulberry root, containing alizarin), *seet* oil extracted from *til* (sesame) seed, *ajji* (a type of chilli pepper), *haldi* (turmeric), *naspal* (dry pomegranate rind) and earth and wheat flour, 'Europe colours' of yellow and blue are imported in boxes at 5 anas a box and green at 12 anas a box'.<sup>49</sup> Exact recipes are given. (The author also claimed that dyeing in this area had only been introduced in 1835 by a British officer).

Indian textiles were collected and mythologised for ideological and commercial reasons. People like Birdwood wanted to retain cultural purity for philosophical reasons; others, like Liberty, valued the inherent qualities of the goods, but also wanted cultural authenticity as a selling point in his London emporium. Clearly the issues of the colouring of Indian hand-loomed textiles in the nineteenth century are complex and need much closer scrutiny. These were objects in cultural transition as well as transcultural objects. Information still needs to be established on how the synthetic colours were introduced and the extent to which they were used, as has been done regarding the introduction of synthetic indigo for instance.<sup>50</sup>

The Indian textiles collected and sent to Britain in the late nineteenth century went through various stages of transformation as transcultural, diasporic objects via a series of cultural interventions. The export of cotton yarn and subsequently of synthetic dye materials and even technical expertise from Britain and Europe to India gradually altered the 'indigenous' qualities of many of the basic fabrics and their production cycle. Styles, colours and patterns were often subtly altered via British trading intermediaries eager to supply markets in Britain, a practice established in the early seventeenth century, just as British manufacturers strove to reinterpret Indian textile designs for the Indian as well as the home market. The collection, display and use made of these 'Indian' textiles in Britain clearly provided a very different cultural context and function from those in India. Colour was one area in which problematic aspects of such material cultural exchange were recognized and articulated.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brah, Avtar, *Cartographies of Diaspora*. London: 1996.

<sup>2</sup> This article will refer to 'India' rather than South Asia, since that was appropriate and understood at the time.

<sup>3</sup> See for example Chaudhuri, K.N., *Trade and Civilisation in the Indian Ocean: An Economic History from the Rise of Islam to 1750*. Cambridge: 1997; Guy, John and Deborah Swallow, *Arts of India*. London: 1990; Guy, John, *Woven Cargoes: Indian Textiles and the East*. London: 1998.

- 
- <sup>4</sup> Gittinger, Mattiebelle, *Master Dyers to the World: Technique and Trade in Early Indian Dyed Cotton Textiles*. Washington DC: 1982, pp.16-17.
- <sup>5</sup> See for example, Hameeda Hossein, *The Company Weavers of Bengal: the East India Company and the Organisation of Textile Production in Bengal, 1750-1813*. Delhi: 1988.
- <sup>6</sup> Murphy, Veronica and Rosemary Crill, *Tie-dyed Textiles of India: tradition and trade*. London: 1991, p. 151.
- <sup>7</sup> Royle, John Forbes 'The Arts and Manufactures of India', *Lectures on the results of the Great Exhibition of 1851*, Society of Arts, London, Vol. 1. pp. 441-538.
- <sup>8</sup> See Farnie, Douglas A., 'The role of cotton textiles in the economic development of India, 1600-1990', in Farnie and Jeremy Eds. *The Fibre That Changed the World*, 2004, pp. 395-430.
- <sup>9</sup> Birdwood, George, *The Industrial Arts of India*. London: 1880, p. 132.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid, p. 244.
- <sup>11</sup> Baden-Powell B.H., 'On some of the difficulties of Art Manufactures', *Journal of Indian Art* 5, January 1885.
- <sup>12</sup> Vincent Robinson, letter to the *Times*, 23 October 1873.
- <sup>13</sup> George Birdwood, letter to the *Times*, 8 October 1879.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>15</sup> See for example, Hemmeter, Ernst, 'The Castes of Indian Dyers', in 'Indian, its Dyers, and its Colour Symbolism', *CIBA Review* 2, Basle 1937, pp. 51-54. (The literal meanings of the Sanskrit word for *Varna* or caste are 'colour', 'dye', 'tint' or 'pigment').
- <sup>16</sup> Jones, Owen, *The Grammar of Ornament*, 1856, p. 77.
- <sup>17</sup> Jones, Owen, 'Gleaning from the Great Exhibition of 1851', from the *Journal of Design*, June, 1851.
- <sup>18</sup> Jones, 1856, Preface.
- <sup>19</sup> *Illustrated London News*, May 1, 1851.
- <sup>20</sup> 'The Crystal Palace'. *Blackwoods Magazine*, September 1, 1854, pp. 329 and 325.
- <sup>21</sup> Birdwood, 1880, p. 130.
- <sup>22</sup> Birdwood 1880, pp. 243-44.
- <sup>23</sup> For an account of the Indian School of Art, see Mitter, Partha, *Much Maligned Monsters*. Oxford, 1977.
- <sup>24</sup> Robinson, J.C., *Catalogue of the Circulating Collection of works of art selected from the museum at South Kensington*. London, 1860.
- <sup>25</sup> *Le Salon Illustré* on Wardle silks for Liberty shown at the 1878 Paris Exposition. Liberty Catalogue, 1881.

- 
- <sup>26</sup> Birdwood, 1880, p. 298-99.
- <sup>27</sup> Birdwood, 1880, p. 243.
- <sup>28</sup> See for example Linda Parry's *Textiles of the Arts and Crafts Movement*. London, 1988; and William Morris, ex. cat. London, 1996 and Brenda King's *Silk and Empire* (Manchester, 2005).
- <sup>29</sup> Morris, William, 'On Dyeing as an Art', *Arts and Crafts Essays*. London, 1899.
- <sup>30</sup> Letters from Thomas Wardle to Sir George Birdwood, 23 March 1893. IOL India Office Eur. Mss. F216/29.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>32</sup> A.L. Liberty, *Aglaia* 3, 1893.
- <sup>33</sup> Birdwood 1880, pp. 243-44.
- <sup>34</sup> Hendley, T. Holbein, 'The Arts and Manufactures of Ajmere-Merwara', *Journal of Indian Art* III:26.
- <sup>35</sup> Clarke, C. Purdon, 'Modern Indian Art', *Journal of the Society of Arts* XXXVIII, 1890, pp. 511-27.
- <sup>36</sup> See Helm, Elijah (1896) 'The Indian Duties on Cotton Goods'. *Economic Journal* VI, pp. 110-114.
- <sup>37</sup> Birdwood, 1880, p. 248.
- <sup>38</sup> See Arthur, Liz, *Seeing Red: Scotland's Exotic Textile Heritage*. Collins Gallery, University of Strathclyde, 2007.
- <sup>39</sup> See Farnie, 2004.
- <sup>40</sup> Havell, E.V., *Journal of Indian Art* III: 27.
- <sup>41</sup> Watt, George, *Indian Art at Delhi*, 1903, p. 280.
- <sup>42</sup> Thurston, E. , *The Cotton Fabric Industries of the Madras Presidency* p. 335.
- <sup>43</sup> Kipling J. L., 'Industries of the Punjab', *Journal of Indian Art* II: 20.
- <sup>44</sup> Sastu, Pandit Natesa, 'The Decline of South Indian Arts', *Journal of Indian Art* III:29 pp. 23-24
- <sup>45</sup> Wardle, Thomas, *Handbook of the Collection of the Wild Silks of India in the Indian Section of the South Kensington Museum*, London 1881, pp. 28-9.
- <sup>46</sup> Wardle, 1881, p. 40-47
- <sup>47</sup> Watt, 1903, p. 239.
- <sup>48</sup> Murphy and Crill, 1991, p. 73.
- <sup>49</sup> Ravenshaw, C.W., 'Cloth Stamping and Dyeing'. *Journal of Indian Art* II: 17.
- <sup>50</sup> See Balfour-Paul, Jenny, *Indigo*, London 1998, pp. 83-84.