# *Architecture and Politics in the Construction of New Delhi*

Suhash Chakravarty

Essential features of the political strategy that prompted the transfer of capital from Calcutta also influenced the style of architecture and town-planning for New Delhi. The re-unification of Bengal and the transfer of the capital to Delhi must be seen as parts of a larger imperial policy. The Government of India wanted to discover a more stable public opinion than was then available in Calcutta and to use it as the pillar for strengthening the crumbling psychological sensibilities and the ideological edifice of the Raj. Threatened by a runaway Bengali opposition, Hardinge[1] was in search of a fresh mandate. He sought the legitimacy of the Mughals and, accordingly, moved the metropolis of British India into close proximity to Shahjahanabad. Political considerations were reflected in the controversies and discussions around the problems of town-planning and architecture for New Delhi.

Proposals for the re-unification of Bengal became linked to the establishment of a new capital away from the 'pernicious influence of Calcutta's *baboodom*'.[2] The political atmosphere of Bengal was admittedly grave. In terms of organisation, mobilisation and self-awareness the anti-partition and *swadeshi* movements were unprecedented. The period following the partition saw a qualitative transformation of Bengali politics together with the rise of political terrorism and secret societies (*samiti*). The salient features of the agitation could easily remind one of the early phase of the Home Rule movement. It is small wonder, then, that Fleetwood Wilson found no 'little affinity between the Celtic and Bengali races'.[3] A strong impression was left with the administration that a little more provocation might produce an Ireland within the Indian Empire. The political temper of Bengal thus had already had a dampening impact on the administration. It was felt that Calcutta, being the seat of vice-regal

authority, had become an object of special care and the pith of Bengali life preoccupied the Government of India to the exclusion of other areas of the country.[4] Carmichael[5] added, much to Hardinge's comfort, that no Bengali inspired him 'into as much confidence as certain Madrasis do'.[6]

Early in 1911, when the Government of India proceeded to make arrangements for the reception of the emperor in Calcutta, Valentine Chirol remonstrated with the viceroy. He was distressed to learn that the emperor was to sojourn in Calcutta. Probably, Madras deserved to be cold-shouldered, he argued, but this did not mean that Bombay ought to be ignored as well. 'Two wrongs don't make a right and it seems to me extremely unfortunate that the most disloyal city in India should be singled out for the king's entertainment.'[7] Before long Butler was prodded into suggesting that the Presidency College ought to be shifted from Calcutta to Ranchi so that the students could remain unexposed to the evil influence of the capital. Lucknow and Banaras, Hardinge exclaimed, offered 'a freer and wider atmosphere than Calcutta'.[8] In Lucknow he found himself assured of the future of the empire: 'I felt that I was in India, which one never feels in Calcutta, and that the people there have a far broader outlook than those *baboos* and *box-wallahs* who think that they are the masters of India.'[9]

## Flamboyant Exhibition

Both Hardinge and Crewe[10] had decided to give a positive turn to British policy which might otherwise have dried up in an arid waste of recurring repression and immobility. They had decided to take the initiative. Neither thought of dropping India from the imperial charge. Both were aware of the irksome challenge of the nationalist movement. But they had faith in their ability to manipulate social forces in Indian life. They had coaxed a reluctant Minto[11] into admitting the favourable impact of the emperor, a 'semi-divine being', holding an impressive *durbar* in the Mughal capital. They thought that the King-Emperor, if he came with his retinue of princes and notables, would touch the credulous imagination of a traditional India.[12] Hence Hardinge and Crewe decided in favour of an amphitheatre as the venue of the crowning ceremony and not the *Diwan-e-am* so that there might be a large crowd of spectators[13] and it was they who resolved the lively

controversy over the proposed procession, opting for a carriage instead of an elephant *yatra*, which they felt might 'appear unmanly, and so unkingly'.[14] Both felt exalted by the prospect of a flamboyant exhibition of the feudal grandeur of the empire.

The significant decision awaiting their approval was a definite scheme for offering some permanent benefit or a boon designed to fire the imagination and impressionability of the Indian people.[15] Various suggestions were advanced. What was essentially a political move had to be carefully considered. The king had determined to mollify the sentiments of those in India who regarded the partition of Bengal as a tactical blunder. Hardinge claimed that the extremists in India, Paris and London were discomfited by a rumour anticipating a dramatic announcement by the king at the *durbar* which might rally all shades of moderate opinion.[16] It was acknowledged that a recommendation for reverting to the *status quo* could no longer be considered or even entertained. The Congress, it was believed, was veering towards a compromise and might be satisfied if both Bengals could be placed under a lieutenant-governor and if chief commissionerships could be established for Assam, Bihar and Orissa.[17]

Crewe was nonplussed by the official request to institute a lieutenant-governorship for Bengal close to the viceroy's front door. From the unreal detachment of London he was apt to magnify the inconveniences. It would be equally troublesome, he argued, to send the Governor to the interior of the province to find a home for himself.[18] But the final decision, approved by all, was simple and direct. Some modification of the partition had become essential and the proposed scheme was to be camouflaged by an elaborate programme. It was decided that the administrative reorganisation must be accompanied by some adjustments of greater importance so as to overshadow the actual partition re-arrangement, that there must be no appearance of surrender to agitation and that the Muslim population must cordially acquiesce in any change which might be contemplated.[19]

The capital was, therefore, to be shifted to a more congenial site. It was maintained that the Government of India, when in Calcutta, was apt to look at things through binoculars, and when at Simla, the tendency was to reverse the glasses and look at things through the wrong end. In the former case the difficulties were unduly magnified; in the latter they were to some extent minimised. It was, therefore, necessary to

insulate the seat of the Indian administration from the disproportionate impact of the most advanced outpost of Indian nationalism. In this context Delhi figured prominently in the official mind.

Delhi had been the capital of many Indian empires and it had been the focal point of the uprising of 1857. Was it not possible to construct the capital of India, it was argued, in the ruins of the earlier imperial citadels? As successors of the Mughals, the rulers fixed their eyes on Delhi. They did this in search of continuity and of escape from the seething movements of Bengal. Delhi would place them at a distance from the noisy Hindu pleaders of Calcutta and their more virulent literary exponents in the Bengali Press.[20] Surrounded by Mahmudabad, Rampur, Darbhanga, the Awadh Taluqdars, the Aligarh movement, the Benaras' orthodoxy and the native princes, the *Raj* would be more amenable to the needs and aspirations of its erstwhile friends, its present allies and its future defenders.

## European Opposition

European opinion in Bengal, however, was critical. It saw in it a betrayal of trust, a surrender to 'unprincipled agitation', a breach of faith, a blatant step against the bureaucracy and, hence, an impolitic confession of weakness in the face of brute force.[21] *The Statesman* and *The Englishman* were the two principal spokesmen of the agitation. Their virulence was immoderate and they resorted to every form of opposition to administrative measures.[22] Initially, Hardinge had resolved to ignore it. But the opposition of the Islington Committee to the Delhi project and Ramsay MacDonald's public pronouncements gave the agitation fresh life.[23] In Minto and Curzon[24] it found faithful champions in Britain.

Hardinge was particularly incensed at the wily meddling of men who had little to do with India. Curzon had become, he scoffed, 'a Calcutta Gramophone'.[25] He was certain that Minto, fearful of accusations of running, had hesitated to transfer the capital, though he would have liked to. Hardinge had discerned in the agitation against the transfer of the capital the hands of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce. It was, he jibed, 'a question of *amour propre*'.[26] The Europeans in Calcutta disliked being reduced to the status of provincials.[27] The Chamber of Commerce sent a feeler to the effect that the headquarters of the

government be shifted to Simla and the viceroy and his executive council should become what appeared to an irate Hardinge 'a peripatetic circus' perambulating between Calcutta, Bombay and Madras for six months every year.[28]

There was sneaking sympathy for the Calcutta agitation in official quarters who were inclined to offer some minor concession. Hardinge, for example, announced the appointment of an official of the commerce department in Calcutta to look after the interests of the chamber.[29] In June 1912 the chamber raised a hue and cry over the shortage of wagons in the Indian railways. The situation had been strained and the viceroy exasperated.[30] If the Bengal Chamber of Commerce continued its hostility he proposed to extend his patronage to other chambers to oversee the interests of Calcutta. Hardinge suspected that the object of the renewed movement was to induce the government to accept an enquiry by an outside expert who, in all probability, would advocate an abnormal and immediate outlay on railway construction, rendering it impossible for the government to divert adequate funds to New Delhi.[31] The viceroy, though pressurised, refused to yield.

## Viceroy Vindicated

By March 1914 Hardinge was able to push Calcutta into an 'absolutely isolated position'.[32] He was also persuaded to give credence to the insinuation that their attitude was due to self-interest and a certain amount of spite. 'If I built a mean capital', Hardinge moaned, 'they would protest against my meanness, if I built a *godown* they would protest against my extravagence.'[33] The agitation crept and crawled to a premature death as Calcutta failed to gain the support of other chambers. The viceroy felt vindicated as he found that all the Indian members of his council 'played up in the Budget debate and insisted on the value of the transfer of capital to Delhi and on the new city being built upon a worthy' scale.[34] It was a significant and amicable performance. As the viceroy gleefully watched, 'the door was slammed in the face of Calcutta boxwallahs'.[35]

In 1914 Calcutta notables, encouraged by MacDonald and Islington, tried to work up an agitation against Delhi on financial grounds.[36] They maintained that money wasted on the construction of Delhi could

have been fruitfully utilised for public services recommended by their committee.[37] Hardinge contested the merit of the point. Whatever their recommendations might have been, it was impossible to enlarge the public services immediately. In any case, he claimed, no final decision would be taken on the recommendations during the next three years. The viceroy was peeved by the manner in which the Islington Commission did everything 'to hamper the policy of the Government of India in order to grind their own axe'.[38] New Delhi, he was determined, would be built despite all vituperations.

The chamber of commerce, however, gradually came to recognise the significance of the new deal. In particular, the decision of the government with regard to the establishment of Dacca University and the appointment of Shamshul Huda to the viceroy's executive council were noted with satisfaction. It observed that the re-unification was a political move and that it involved no surrender of the basic imperial interests.[39] Thus emboldened, the government decided to disregard the carping of the two English papers of Calcutta, which were intent on criticising the Government of India no matter what it did. 'If the angel Gabriel came down from Heaven', wrote Butler in disgust, 'the Anglo-Indian press would see in him a Mephistopheles.'[40]

Hardinge concurred with Butler. He concluded that the policy of transferring the capital had been judicious. He was relieved to find his government placed in a 'more accessible and independent position than formerly'.[41] It was closely in touch with the commercial interests of the rest of the country. The viceroy's legislative council was no longer exposed to the baleful influences and propaganda of Calcutta and the government could at last acquire an appropriate perspective of the situation in Bengal.[42] Besides, the native princes had already begun to visit Delhi although they could never be induced to travel to Calcutta.

In this air of optimism, Hardinge pooh poohed Curzon's speech in the House of Lords defending the Calcutta agitation. 'I do not know what Curzon wants, and I doubt if he knows himself', he quipped, 'unless it is to create embarrassment and pander to the voice of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, who now exercise no influence whatever, and are in reality an object of ridicule to the rest of India.'[43] From England Crewe extended his warm support. He assured Hardinge that he was not prepared 'to make squalid what ought to be splendid or

to sacrifice the dignity which ought to belong to the seat of Imperial Government'.[44]

## Oriental Splendour

When funds were short, Crewe advised, some economy might be effected by the reduction of the number of apartments, offices, stables, marble columns, mosaic works, etc., which could be erected subsequently but 'not in dimensions or general plan which is rigidly determined'.[45] Besides, the construction should permit growth every year so that the buildings, quite simple in decoration at first, ought to admit, as surplus accumulated from time to time, growth in grandeur for ever. The search for legitimacy appeared to have succeeded at last. New Delhi was to stand in all its oriental splendour as the heir of Shahjahanabad. 'As the buildings rise', the viceroy mused, 'enthusiasm will grow, and when once the Government of India is installed in the new city, the problem will be how to keep the city within proper limits and under suitable control.'[46]

The new city of Delhi was to be the heir of the grand Mughals. It was to reflect the majesty of an imperial metropolis, portray the confidence of matured authority. Above all, it was to possess an Indian air about it. Crewe and Hardinge were unanimous about the project. The architects fought intensely among themselves with regard to planning and design; Ramsay MacDonald[47] polemicised against it. But Hardinge surveyed the area across the ridge of the Raisina village overlooking the ruins of monuments of forgotten glories and decided the norms. These the architects, engineers and financiers adopted with a sense of participation in an imperial undertaking.[48]

Of crucial concern was the selection of the site. The committee[49] was not bound to a particular site and it was free to look in any direction. A fairly extensive study was made. This took many things into account: paramount needs of health; questions of sanitation; sentiments and costs; commercial, civil and military requirements; room for expansion; facilities for internal and external communications and adequate water supply. The Committee then submitted its report.[50]

The site across the Jamuna, despite its fine view of the fort and river frontage, was rejected because of its flat land which was subject to perpetual flooding and because of its unhealthiness and its featureless

landscape. The western site, situated on the higher ground with a healthier climate, offered different problems. The new city at that site would have been entirely cut off from the view; the view it would offer would be that of factories, chimneys and railway lines. The minarets of the Jama Masjid and all the monuments of the Hindu and Muslim rulers would be hidden below the skyline. The committee was apprehensive that perhaps no-one would recognise it as Delhi.

## Northern Site

The claim of the northern site was more convincing. Here, sentiments and associations alike combined to make it particularly the Delhi of the British. 'Fifty years ago', wrote an official correspondent, 'we consecrated this area with blood. In late years, in three successive durbars, we have identified it with all the colours and pageantry of royal magnificance.'[51] But the site did not meet the requirements of modern military strategy. Its position was not suitable for siege battery and it was not the model for a great city.

The historic ridge was the only picturesque feature in a monotonous landscape but it was believed to be far too sacred to be desecrated by the creation of modern buildings. The site was, however, rejected primarily on political considerations. 'It is that Indian public opinion, which rejoiced in the transfer of the capital', Hardinge expostulated, 'would have been alienated entirely if a city had been built which would have still further perpetrated and enhanced the memory of the events of the Mutiny, since all loyal Indians regard the episode with shame while disloyal Indians regard it as a defeat.'[52]

Towards the southern outskirts of the existing Delhi the committee found what Hardinge required: the site of seven cities of the earlier days, rich with crumbling ruins. The construction of the city would have meant a judicious incorporation of some historical relics and edifices into a modern town. Higher up on the slopes of the hills, lying to the right of the road to the Qutb, there was virgin soil. On one side of the ridge, the imperial capital ought to dominate the plains, and on the other side, the cantonment could muster the immediate military power by which that domination would be maintained.

Land, primarily agricultural, was fairly inexpensive, immense possibilities for expansion lay to the south and the south-east. The

Jama Masjid was close by and the approach from the old city would be magnificent. Open space between the two cities would provide ample room for all forms of sports and recreation. Talkatora was rejected on account of difficulties in alignment, and Malcha for being situated too far away from the Mughal Delhi. The Raisina Hill was selected by an impatient Hardinge and was forced on the town planners.

Originally, the axis of Government House was to face the Jama Masjid and the processional highway was to terminate at Shahjahanabad. Thereby the citadel would reflect the projected continuity of political authority from Mughal India to British India and underline the basis of unimpaired loyalty. But the celebrated Kali Masjid and the overcrowded Paharganj stood in the way of this design. The axis, accordingly, had to be altered slightly in order to acquire a fresh terminal point.[53] The whole panorama of Indian history, as reflected in the legendary Indraprastha and the Pathan-Mughal monuments of Purana Qila, was to provide, in the revised plan, a permanent view.

Thus would the representative of the emperor preside over the new Parthenon on the Raisina Ridge. Visions of imperial hegemony predominated. 'In India we must have space', Butler echoed Hardinge, 'we could not breathe with a Champs Élysées.'[54] With something like the Ring in Vienna and with a road down the centre flanked by graceful trees and room for large throngs, New Delhi was to be laid out for the future. Government House not only retained a good view of Jama Masjid, but also views of Indraprastha, Humayun's Tomb, the Lodi Tombs and Safdarjung's Mausoleum. It would hold a commanding position in the whole scheme. The imperial city was to draw legitimacy from the remnants of the empires of the past.

## The Central Motif

Government House, the Council Chamber and the Secretariat were to be the central motif of the whole layout. In the first plan, Government House alone was to adorn the Raisina Hills. Owing to the intervention of Baker, the Secretariat buildings, in the final plan, climbed up the hill to be placed along with Government House on an even platform primarily to be viewed by the inhabitants as a spur of the hill itself. The Council Chamber reciprocated by climbing down the hill in keeping with the spirit of the Montagu-Chelmsford Act. Behind the hill a raised

forum was to be built, flanked by the Secretariat buildings and terminated at its western end by the mass of Government House with its wide flight of steps, porticoes and dome, leading the imagination from the machinery of government to the moving vice-royalty itself.

The forum would be approached by the inclined ways on its north and south sides. The axis of the main avenue would centre on the gate of Indraprastha, the site of the oldest of all the Old Delhis. 'Right and left the roadways go', welding into an empire of today and merging with 'the empires of the past', and in the south into the Cathedral. At the intersection of this avenue with the main axis a place would be formed, around which would be gathered the buildings of the Oriental Institute, the Museum, the Library and the Imperial Record Office. To the south-east would be the park area in which stood the ancient monuments of Safdar Jang's Makhbara and the Lodi Tombs.

The axis running north-east from the Secretariat buildings to the station and towards the Jama Masjid would form the principal business approach to Old Delhi. At the railway station another place was to be laid out, around which would be grouped banks, shops and hotels with the post office in symmetrical relation to the station. The Connaught Place would faintly resemble the classic colonnade of Nash's Regent Crescent and the Royal Crescent of Bath. To the south-west of the station would lie the houses of the local bureaucrats and the residence of the European clerks.

**For Indian Clerks**

Between Talkatora Garden and Paharganj would be the area for Indian clerks, the press and other government establishments. From the baboo quarters it would be fairly convenient for ageing clerks to retire in the housing complex of Karol Bagh. In normal circumstances, with easy access to the North Block from Talkatora park area, provisions for market and temple and playing field, the Indian clerks would have a self-sufficient existence away from the European settlement and its shopping and recreation centre. To the south of the forum was to be placed the residence of the commander-in-chief. Round the vice-regal estate and the forum were to be grouped the residences of the members of council, the secretaries and other officials.

The principal avenues, in addition to the main avenues, enclosed

the imperial centre and were the outer main sinews of the frame, thus giving the effect of a spider-web pattern. The commemorative column, situated on the axis, was the focal point of the roads and avenues on the parkway. The palaces of the princes around the focal point, the India Gate, would provide the outer periphery of 'fat Indians' settled as an important buffer between the white settlement and the distant old Delhi.

The Acropolis, the wide straight processional ways, the central vista connecting the Secretarial blocks, vice-regal palace and the Cathedral, the seclusion of the necessary undesirables of the city in the baboo quarters with adequate civic amenities, the vast squares of the official facades, the diagonal avenues, the places and squares with radiating roads, the strict proportion and ratio maintained between the height of the buildings and the width of the roads, the shadowy mystique of the bungalows of the white sahibs, the clever linkage between the Assembly, the Chamber of the Princes and the Federal Court hidden by the imperial colonnade almost encircling in strict privacy the potential hankerings of the natives for a parliament—all these provided the ceremonial furnitures of the imperial city which separated the rulers and the ruled.

A remote, awful and majestic pomp was to confront an admiring and applauding audience for ever. The *folie de grandeur* of the ruling class was impressive; the layout of the city, accordingly, was symmetrical and the desire for secluded existence in a closed society was ever increasing. Patrick Geddes' relentless plea for a generous dose of humility and reverence in dealing with human dwellings and social sentiments, his unfailing voice against the attempt to impose the Western cult of streets on the defenceless bank of Jamuna and his sharp polemics directed towards the 'death-dealing Haussmannism' of the 'callous, contemptuous city bureaucrats at Delhi' were irrelevant for the planners who wrote off Geddes as a 'crank who does not know his subject' but was 'apt to talk much "rot" in an insulting way'.[55]

Lanchester's reports on the Delhi project were discarded despite initial promise. The new imperial consciousness approved of another cantonment city submerged in a lush green garden. The importance of the roads and streets were foremost in the mind of Bordie despite the fact that Lutyens dismissed his strong provincial accent and his slow but steady mind whose rigidity could only match that of Lutyens himself. Captain George Swinton, a self-taught expert on town-planning, was the chairman of the committee. He was appointed because of his ability

to appreciate the importance of military strategy, the problems connected with possible mob violence, and his remarkable skill in insulating the key zones, the axis and the principal poles of the city as well as its railway terminal, from a possible assault by an unruly public.

Lutyens, a domestic architect, understood little of it; he derided the pomposity of Swinton and his elaborate ornate style of expression. Swinton, however, continued to preside over the committee despite Lutyens' spitefulness and his intrigues. Swinton's paper on the military and security problems of the proposed city became the basis of the search for the site. Lutyens himself came to terms with a capital complex on an Acropolis in his own way.

**Roman Colonial Establishment**

True, no industrial revolution had created a suffocating cramped atmosphere in Delhi for a Haussmann to demolish the relics of the past and open up a congested community to fast moving vehicles and armed brigades, ready as ever to combat urban guerrillas behind intricate barricades. And yet, it was a repeat performance in modern terms of a Roman colonial establishment: a military bureaucratic order in a camp placed on a raised platform and insulated from the plebeians by a stratified city structure based on the coordinating principles of town-planning worked out by Baron Haussmann.

Peter the Great's Moscow was not expected to be a typical Russian city; it was more a European establishment and it offered a false promise. Washington was to provide an international image to the United States as different from the purely American city of New York. Rio de Janeiro was the Brazilian capital; Brasilia was meant to symbolise the nation's unfulfilled visions and hopes. Pretoria reflected the architectural endeavours of a closed community which sought to reinforce an arrogant racial aloofness by manipulating a Dutch tradition and the natural surroundings of a rugged surface and by invoking the spirit of the Roman Empire. Canberra, a safe colonial settlement of white people, was conceived as a simple spider-web pattern; considerations of hygiene, communications and security rather than those of tradition or cultural legacy occupied the imagination of its contemporary administrators and its architects.

New Delhi was to represent the determination of Britain, a European

imperial power in Asia, to demonstrate the permanence of its rule in India. The poet in Lytton had dreamt of it way back in the 1870s. The grandiose imperial scheme of Curzon encompassed it. Hardinge sought to concretise that mission. In visual effect, sentimental importance and sheer magnitude the New Delhi of Lutyens was to surpass both Pretoria and Canberra.

## Intense Controversy

There was intense controversy over the style of architecture to be adopted for New Delhi. The European experts wanted to apply Western forms. The problem, as Hardinge saw it, was whether or not it was possible to assimilate that style of Indian architecture which preceded the Mughals, i.e., the Pathan style.[56] It was essential, he urged, that the Secretariat and other government buildings should be of a broad and simple style of architecture within an 'oriental motif' that should blend itself with the Government House which ought to be a 'dignified and noble monument'.[57]

Hardinge emphasised that pure Eastern or pure Western architecture would be quite out of place. As he put it, 'we have to find a blend'—a broad style of architecture with Indian motifs throughout. Hardinge did not approve of the architects' opinion that such a style would clash with a Government House built in the Palladian manner.[58] It was with this in view that he insisted on the Government House in Lutyens' plan having a flat gilt dome, these being the 'oriental touches that should be appreciated in the country'.[59] The concept of a gilt dome on the Government House came from what Hardinge had seen on public buildings in Russia.[60] He seemed quite inflexible in his views. When seriously questioned on aesthetic grounds by the experts, a harassed Hardinge began to despise them and misprize their advice. He found Lutyens as 'obstinate as a mule' with fixed ideas; he would not touch the concepts of Eastern architecture 'with a pair of tongs'.[61]

Both Lutyens and Baker were slurred as absolute philistines with no regard for Indian sentiments and traditions.[62] Lutyens, according to Hardinge, was obsessed with Italian Renaissance architecture, having come to India with the utmost scorn for all Indian art forms, even calling the Taj 'rubbish'.[63] Brodie, Hardinge derided, had determined to construct a wider avenue than existed in any other city.[64] Swinton Jacob

appeared to Hardinge to be a far more reasonable person than the two architects; he was amenable to Hardinge's ideas. Jacob's inclusion in the team of Lutyens and Baker would avert, Hardinge thought, the possible attempt at 'transplanting Whitehall on the banks of Jumna'. But Jacob was bullied and hectored by Lutyens and the retired engineer declined to join the team. Lutyens triumphed.

Hardinge recommended to the architects the ruins of Mandu near Indore, raised by the Pathans, as a model of solidity and breadth of treatment. A reproduction of St Paul's Cathedral or a glorified Apsley Home in the plains of Delhi would be, he contended, a 'magnificent monstrosity'.[65] Hardinge was confident of the popularity of the new imperial architecture of Delhi. 'I have no hesitation in saying that I have absolutely the whole of India at my back in wishing that the new city should be built in accordance with Indian sentiments. I do not by this mean that the town should be built of highly ornate or Hindu architecture; but my idea is that it should be a fine broad style with minimum of decoration, but that decoration should be of the purest and most ancient Hindu ornament. Opinion in this country is quite unanimous on the subject and after all who are we building for—the Indian or the British public?'[66]

He took keen interest in the minutest details of the work. He participated in the selection of the site; he approved the initial sketches; he suggested changes in style; argued with his architects; he saw to it that 'private and eccentric fancies' were not allowed to predominate;[67] he strove to make sure that New Delhi, 'the King's God-child,' should not be too cheaply provided for;[68] he arranged financial support for the construction and he even insisted on economy when required, approving the reduced proportions of the new rooms in the revised plan.[69] He was convinced that the structure of Government House ought to be a worthy residence of the king's representative. The internal decoration, though of the simplest kind, should be a prolonged effort and a succession of viceroys ought to take in hand each year the decoration of 'one piece of capital importance' so that the house would become something of which 'England and India can be proud'.[70]

## The Imperial Idea

The government did not cavil about financing the construction of

New Delhi. The viceroy's council endorsed Butler's opinion on this score. They agreed that it was of imperial importance that things ought to be done on a big scale, 'something which will impress India with our determination to stay here and to govern the country on Imperial lines'.[71] One of the objects of the move to Delhi was to develop the imperial idea and this was the primary reason in favour of the selection of the site. In support of its gigantic proportions Butler urged Hardinge to overlook the various financial arguments advanced against it and insisted that the imperial idea could not be ignored. One could not lose sight of the greatness of the opportunity.[72]

Hence, departmental considerations were to be subordinated, Butler pleaded, to the imperial conception. 'What I am afraid of', he warned, 'is that the biggest thing in our time and one of the biggest things for centuries is going to be spoilt by being carried out in too small a spirit.'[73] New Delhi ought to be a big thing, he added, and he was sure that public opinion would veer round to support its expenditure. Nothing could be too high for it. 'It is so important in my mind to have these central buildings worthy of an imperial city that I would agree to this. We have to make New Delhi one of the world's wonders and topics of discussion.'[74] Crewe had already sanctioned the scheme. Nobody in London would suggest, he underlined, that the Board of Agriculture, for instance, must 'go on being housed in a variety of sunless dens because the Post Office wages were being raised'.[75]

It was assumed that the Government House of Calcutta would not be the best model for the viceroy's mansion. Despite its great suitability for entertaining, it was not enough of a residence to be an ideal palace.[76] Crewe wanted to see the atmosphere of Hampton Court and the Louvre reproduced.[77] Montagu pleaded for a fine chamber for the legislative council with the appearance of a parliament house. Of course, Montagu[78] did not desire to extend parliamentary powers to that body. But he felt that the council's growing importance would eventually demand such recognition.[79] Crewe demurred. He endorsed the view of Hardinge that names and forms contained subtle significance in politics of which Montagu seemed quite innocent. 'A number of your advanced politicians', wrote Crewe to Hardinge, 'who are the reverse of sedition (sic) regard a Parliament as the goal of their ambition; and ... no colour should be given to any notion that we favour their hopes.'

Thus, 'a good council chamber with a separate entrance to go with

it' was officially prescribed. 'It is going to be the Viceroy's Council', Crewe decreed, 'and the circumstances and surroundings should emphasise the fact.'

## Laboured Exercise

The planning was a laboured exercise involving constant shuffling of ideas, plans and blueprints and by the end of the initial phase of the programme Lutyens agreed to be persuaded. 'Of course, my idea is a compromise between the Eastern and Western architecture', Hardinge elucidated his views, 'and the purists who demand entirely Western architecture will call it a bastard style, and if I am forced between the two, I would reluctantly have to agree to a purely Eastern rather than a Western style of architecture.'[82] Hardinge was anxious to remind his audience that it was Indian public opinion that had to be considered.

Lutyens could not altogether comprehend the reverence with which the oriental style of architecture was mentioned. He had examined the wonderful architectural creations of India which 'were full of strange ideas' which 'shook his Western sense of truth'.[83] He was struck by the 'monotonous riot of nonsense' with an 'occasional lapse to really fine proportions and great simple conceptions'.[84] Amber failed him. Mandu disappointed him.[85] Agra and the Taj teased him.[86] 'The Mogul architecture', Lutyens was ready as ever to pass judgement, 'is cumbersome, ill-constructed building covered with a veneer of stone marbles and very tiresome to the Western intelligence.'[87] The whole country was full of shrines, mosques and temples. 'But nothing,' a vexed and disturbed Lutyens lambasted, 'was built to last, not even the Taj.'[88]

He conceded that some of the buildings including the Taj had inscrutable charm but the effect, he hastened to add, was ephemeral. 'When in ruins the buildings—especially the Mogul—are bad ... and have none of the dignity a ruin can have that has been the work of any great period.'[89] He was annoyed by the official 'tongue wagging' in defence of the Indian style.[90] He did not believe that there was any Indian architecture or any great tradition—'they are just the spurts of various mushroom-dynasties'.[91] The Indians, he argued, knew the Italian mouldings and used them. But they had no knowledge of anything other than two-dimensional work.[92] One could not do a portrait or a statue, he pontificated, in Mughal or Hindu style.[93] There was no scope for

sculpture within the accepted line of Indian architectural conceptions. 'It is all tommy rot.'[94]

He found in them a fanciful use of stone and marble. But they had been used not for structural purposes but for decoration. 'When they built', he contemptuously dismissed the impressive specimens of Indian architecture, 'it is exactly like children's bricks.'[95] He was scornful of the suggestion that some Mughal structural forms and innovations ought to be applied in the buildings of New Delhi. Splendour of size, Lutyens claimed, of the Mughal architecture was offset by their sheer vulgarity.[96] 'Why should we throw away', he raised his voice, 'the lovely ... Greek columns for the uncouth, careless, unknowing and unseeing shape' of the Qutb Minar?

India had turned him 'very Tory and even pre-Tory feudal'.[97] Hardinge's attempts to separate architecture from the problems of town-planning was viewed by him with suspicion and concern.[98] The Indian bureaucracy, despite its acknowledged efficiency, shocked him by its remarkable 'tastelessness'.[99] The viceroy's desire to evolve an Anglo-Indian architecture seemed to him meaningless sentimentality.[100] If one wishes to be logical, Lutyens asserted, one cannot get anything that might be termed Indian 'for all that they have done is constructively illogical and its very essence is fairy tale elusiveness got by veneers'. If the desired effect was to be achieved, he derided, it ought to have been accompanied by 'Tom Tom music'.[101] 'I shall try and start an Indian school and Western traditions must be there for as Englishmen we cannot help it', wrote Lutyens, 'and then send the Indians straight to nature and let them invent and conventionalise to fit given space and teach them to think in three dimensions ... to build in stone for stone and wood for wood.'[102]

### Universality of Beauty

Beauty, Lutyens claimed, was ageless, dignified and simple. It had, he expatiated, no nationality. It was universal in its application. The daffodil was, Lutyens pointed out, beautiful in itself; the rose had no nationality and a rainbow had no distinct sentimental idea.[103] He was not opposed to adaptations and adoptions in art: 'I adopt a pattern with a great tradition', but creation 'is not the easy method of a mean copyist'.[104] He was a stickler for perfection and perfection was rational.

It had to be worked out methodically. It ought to be self-contained and also functional.[105] It could not afford to live in peace with the superfluous excursions of an unrestrained mind. It had to be trained, tutored and measured.

A great work of art should not stand in need of the imagination of a poet or his well-framed sentences for expression.[106] It must speak for itself. 'Artistic endeavour', he developed the theme in one of his letters to Baker, 'means hard labour, hard thinking on every line in three dimensions and in every part; and no stone can be allowed to slide.... Every stone being mentally handled must become enveloped with such poetry and artistry as God has given you.'[107] Treatment of a particular style, he added, must be conducted with a sense of sympathy. It must always provide a 'new care and invention'.[108] Certainly, it was not a mean game and could not be dealt with light-heartedly.

Lutyens was adamant about using a chaotic architecture in the name of local style. Indeed, he did not mind being 'scolded for not being Yorkshire in Yorkshire'.[109] 'In modern work—unlike the old—the thinking machine is separated from the labour machine so that the modern architect cannot have the same absolutism as we gave the old man when the thought and labour came from the same individual.'[110] Designing and thinking, he emphasised, were specialised areas of work and he insisted that they ought to remain so.[111] As specialised 'super thought', modern architecture would remain distinctly 'beyond the conceptions of the architect's fellow man—the poet'.[112] An architect, he underlined, could only express himself in his buildings, as a painter could only express himself in his paintings, a sculptor through his clay and a poet through his words.[113]

## Extreme Positions

As he had to drive his point home against the determined and aureate vocabulary of Baker, who had arrived in India with well-conceived notions of a modern Acropolis towering over the plebeians of the Raj,[114] Lutyens was often forced to adopt extreme positions. He was aware of the limitations of his own expression. The poet could inspire the artist, he wrote in haste, but 'once inspired, he should go to work, not dissipate his inspirations and emotions by absorbing more poetry'.[115] The formulation might not be neat, the point was made nevertheless.

He approved of Baker's flexibility and his adaptibility but not his irrational excursions into abstract theory. These often spoilt the natural light and shadows and disturbed the 'majesty of atmosphere on a perfectly geometrical shape'.[116]

Rationality involved a sense of order and priority, a mathematical discipline and simplicity of form. It operated against impulsive and accidental decisions. Every line and curve was, he reminded Baker, 'the result of force against impulse—through the centuries'.[117] Nothing substantial in art, he added forcefully, was done by accident. As an architect he would not shake off the responsibility that nature imposed on man. He would not avoid the demand made on his intelligence by the compulsions of topography and contours by saying, 'Why not build on another site?'.[118] He was in favour of incorporating the details of the environment and natural surroundings within his drawing board. He would recommend a plan only if it was 'well digested and worked-out'.[119] To make a good house in which people were happy would be a great thing; but to make a house which would satisfy the architect's own critical judgement was greater.[120] What was most rewarding, however, was to work for a near approximation to refinement.

Lutyen's treatment of the site was singularly interesting. He was eager to ensure that the roughness of the material did not destroy the texture and the articulation of the building, did not make it crude and bald.[121] He impressed on Baker that to make a desert bloom with roses 'would in the first place destroy the desert'.[122] He, therefore, wanted to put an oasis in the desert, an enclave bounded on all sides by walls forming a great room sharply contrasting the desert beyond. The room becomes, as a result, not a temporary camp but an eternal city.[123] He found the highest attainment of European art in the simple forms, mathematical restraint and noble ideals of Greek art.[124]

John Ruskin[125] was his ideal in conceptualising standards of arts and values. He was keen to execute in reality the staggering contrasts so vividly described by Ruskin. He was enamoured by the concept of a desert rolling up 'and stopped abruptly by walls—within them gorgeous culture in marbles, bricks, textiles and roses!'[126] Indeed, he had inherited in full measure the legacy of John Ruskin and William Morris.[127] They had sought to demolish the Benthamite criticism of the fine arts and architecture.[128] Every bit of interior decoration and every household article, however utilitarian, should possess a beauty of its own. Outside

the home, the eye should be soothed and nourished by well-designed structures of every sort, their architecture being both functional and complementary to the natural features of the landscape. Lutyens followed their tradition.

There was, however, some confusion in Lutyens' conceptions; his ambivalence was that of his era. The factories, foundries, collieries and smoky cities and the encroachment of the ignorant multitude upon contemporary culture disturbed his devotion to the Ruskinian view of art which was inseparable from the artist's concern for society. William Morris had reinforced it. But the environmental ugliness unfortunately pushed Lutyens on to an élitist position claiming an uneasy autonomy of beauty.

## Genius Tempered

By the time he arrived in India a 'Lutyens house' had begun to mean something. It was generally assumed that he was about to be recognised as the Pontifex Maximus and Architect Laureate of the British Empire. Following the tradition of Butterfield and Philip Webb, Lutyens believed that living architecture must have more in it than imitated style. The Central Square of the new Hampstead Suburb anticipated a large conception.[129] In India his genius was tempered and mellowed. In the vice-regal palace, Robert Byron wrote, 'The coloured and theatrical facade of Islam has been annexed to a more intellectual, three-dimensional tradition of solid form and exact proportions—the tradition of Europe'.[130]

The result was an impressive palace—large, arrogant and yet lovely. Its climax was the extraordinary dome rising suddenly from the middle of the house. The principles of lines, proportion and mass were fused with local traditions—the Buddhist railings of Sanchi and Pathan compositions of Mandu. Nevertheless, it remained distinct, imperial and 'a monumental affirmation of temporal power'.[131] It creates, all the same, the impression of the simple perspective of a Doric temple. There was no attempt to storm the heavens, no effort to defy the laws of gravity and matter. Instead, it reflected a sonorous Greek balance and a sense of harmony with the universe.[132] Lutyens had worked out the great fusion of the West and the East despite himself. The Parthenon of New Delhi's Acropolis echoed an Athenian tradition as it was judiciously

placed to welcome the rising sun every morning.

Lutyens' collaborator, Herbert Baker, had developed a distinct individuality of style. In South Africa he had taken advantage of the existing Dutch tradition to produce a mature colonial architecture. He was successful in introducing in the governmental architecture in Pretoria a sense of dignified aloofness and stern grandeur, reflecting the racial arrogance of a small ruling community. His treatment of the rocky and uneven surface of Pretoria was original.[133] His model, the Athenian Acropolis, had particularly attracted him to the architectural possibilities of an imposing propylaeum along the slopes of a rising surface.[134] He lacked Lutyens' intensity and attachment to pure forms. He was also less rigid than his colleague in his devotion to precision, simplicity of lines and the beauty of the interplay of light and shadows in architectural creation. Theory came first.

## Eclectic Mind

Architecture, Baker seemed to conceptualise, was to reflect that theoretical proposition.[135] It was not for him to concern himself with whether the work of art represented faithfully all the rules, conventions and aesthetic sensibilities of a true form. The political principle of the organic unity of a universal empire envisaged by Cecil Rhodes, Alfred Milner and Lionel Curtis had a lasting impact on his eclectic mind.[136] He drew strange and exotic parallels between Western and Indian or Eastern forms. He favoured primarily the ideas of the classic style of Jones and Wren and their followers in the eighteenth century, as being easily adaptable to the needs of a tropical climate.

Without losing its more 'eternal' qualities and their finer national characteristics, this style, he considered, should gain in freedom and power of expression by adaptation and expansion to the needs of a more southern climate. It might be asked, Baker argued, whether the employment of such styles ruled out any of the noble features of Indian architecture. 'There should exist, therefore', he contended, 'in the style which has been advocated, all the necessary elements ready to the hand of an architectural alchemist.' But to the artist's creative power must be added 'sanity of judgement'. He must avoid a Whitehall on the one hand, and a Palace of Delight which must come perilously near a 'White City' on the other.[137]

His architecture must have the spirit of life and growth, so that it may take root in the country and not prove 'sterile and unproductive in the generations to come'. He pleaded that there should be no conscious attempt to initiate originality.[138] A frank acceptance of modern methods and materials, he insisted, ought to be adopted. 'The controlling mind must heat and weld into his orderly conception all that India has to give him of subtlety and industry in craftsmanship.'[139] Finally, the architect must arouse imperial consciousness in artists and craftsmen of the empire to create an imperial hegemony in arts and leave a permanent record in the 'history, learning, and romance' of India.[140]

Baker had a marginal difference with Lord Curzon who believed that some form of the classical style was well-nigh inevitable. The form of this style, he maintained, had been most widely adopted by the English in India, and the best examples were to be found at Calcutta and Madras. It might be described, he added, as a colonial adaptation of the Palladian style. Referring to the Renaissance architecture of Spain, the visible legacies of the Moors, Curzon wondered if the architects of New Delhi could find in India models which would 'give a similar Indian flavour, a native aura to the forms of the West'.[141]

For Herbert Baker an imperial architecture, though derived from the classical tradition, encompassed other styles and other concerns as well. He wrote to Lutyens at the very outset of their collaboration: 'It must not be Indian, nor English, nor Roman, but it must be imperial. In 2,000 years there must be an imperial Lutyens tradition in Indian architecture, as there now clings a memory of Alexander.' In a letter to *The Times*, 3 October 1912, Baker spelled out what he conceived to be the proper style for the New Delhi. At its heart lay a political objective: that of capturing in stone the spirit of the British Indian Empire. 'The new capital', he wrote, 'must be the sculptural monument of the good government and unity which India, for the first time in its history, has enjoyed under British rule. British rule in India is not a mere veneer of government and culture. It is a new civilisation in growth, a blend of the best elements of East and West.... It is to this great fact that the architecture of Delhi should bear testimony.'

## Arrogant Gesture

Baker believed that Indian sentiments could be satisfied by grafting

onto classical architecture certain decorations expressing the myths, symbols and history of the Indian people. Thus, spacious colonnades, open verandahs, overhanging eaves or cornices, small high window openings, the *chajjas* or wide-projecting shade-giving stone cornices, the *jaalis* or pierced stone lattice screen to admit air and not sunshine and *chhatris* or free-standing pavilions breaking the long horizontal lines of the flat roof were incorporated in his scheme for the two Secretariat blocks.

The result was a patronising and arrogant gesture by a self-righteous political forum.

In common with Lutyens, Baker disparaged the Indo-Saracenic tradition. But his objection was guided by political considerations. This style, he argued, simply did not have 'the constructive and geometrical qualities necessary to embody the idea of law and order which has been produced out of chaos by the British Administration'.[142] Classical architecture, on the contrary, had 'eminently the qualities of law, order, and government'. European classicism, then, was to be offered a predominant place in New Delhi, primarily because of its political expressiveness. The architects wrote in their joint report: 'The old buildings that have most impressed the imagination of mankind are those raised upon an eminence, such as those of ancient Greek cities and the Capitol at Rome'. The whole capital complex, as they conceived it, stood from 'one high platform expressing the importance of the unity of the viceroy with his government', a unity which would grow in importance with the constitutional evolution of the future.[143]

For Baker, schooled as he was under Rhodes and Milner, architecture served always a political purpose. For Lutyens the Empire was incidental. And yet, while working within the context of an imperial architecture, he imbibed unconsciously Baker's political principles of imperial norms. Emotionally Baker belonged to the generation of empire-builders who found in the 'moots', 'eggs' and 'omelettes' of Lionel Curtis' Round Table a permanent solution to the complex political problem of the empire.[144] The viceroy's house represented the Parthenon on the Acropolis and reflected the divinity of Zillulah. It would be somewhat obscured by the dominant secretariats, themselves more ornate than the Government House; and they would represent the propylaeum of the Acropolis. The Athenian complex in its Indian setting offered Baker the architectural blueprint for the capital of a reinvigorated

British India. While Lutyens wanted to reject Indian elements as childish and ornate, superficial and ephemeral, Baker extended his moderating influence to soften Lutyens' austere and uncompromising standard.[145]

## Eerie Uncertainty

The project was undertaken in an age of crisis in imperialism. The Raj was still full of life but the extravagant strides of Curzon had given way to the cautious steps of more circumspect and less spectacular administrators. The high noon of the empire was past. The prospect of a gloomy evening must have disturbed the minds of the rulers in their pensive moments.[146] The situation was dangerous but not desperate; it was explosive and capable of taking unpredictable turns but it was not threatened with extinction. The government was autocratic but it was conscious of the necessity of striking a new equilibrium of relationship between the ruler and the ruled. The Montagu-Chelmsford declaration was still to be announced and there was an element of eerie uncertainty in Whitehall and the Writer's Building. But there was no lack of eagerness to guide Indian policy along a more durable strategy and to impart to it a sense of purpose.

The arrangement of the buildings on the Raisina Hills betrayed the ideology of those diffident middle class imperialists and their endeavour to offer a programme of an organic development of the empire. As a poet and a painter, Baker, a close associate of the Round Table Group, loved words, worked out a political principle in theory and then turned to his drawing-board. Lutyens abhorred theory. He sniffed at Baker's continual preoccupation with the Round Table and sought beauty for its own sake. But the amateurs in charge of policy-making listened to Baker, who in his turn, eagerly lent his ears to the set of phoney theories and well-meaning phrases of an Oxford don. With an almost humourless sincerity he executed what appeared to Lutyens a well-hatched plot to overshadow the supreme achievement of his career by means of a pair of sentimental secretariat buildings commanding (as an oversized propylaeum) a gradient processional way.

Baker pleaded that a remote aloofness maintained by the Government House affirmed a desirable political idea. It invested the unapproachable and dignified vice-regal authority with an element of semi-divine

mystique. But he could not meet Lutyens' trenchant architectural arguments. For two decades Lutyens grumbled, protested and petitioned. Experts sympathised with him but a succession of viceroys encouraged, backed and confirmed Baker. They sought to use architecture as a political front which was brought into line with economic and administrative activities of the government.

New Delhi was to be a subliminal advertisement of the might of the Raj; it was to embody the determination of the British to hold India. But the Acropolis on the Raisina Hills merely remained a reconnaissance flight sent to unknown territory and it brought back unexpected and unwelcome reports.[147] The viceroys desired to use art exclusively to implement Britain's so-called social mission in India. But official resolutions and leading articles in *The Times* offered a poor diet. New Delhi, which turned away from all social contents, tendencies and possibilities, ran the risk of dying of malnutrition. It became blind, deaf and mute.

## Notes

1 Charles Hardinge of Penshurst, 1st Baron (1858–1914), British Diplomat and Viceroy of India (1910–16).

2 Hardinge to Butler, 3 February 1912, Hardinge Papers, Cambridge University Library.

3 Carmichael to Hardinge, 1 April 1912, Hardinge Papers.

4 See, for example, Craddock to Hardinge, 27 April 1913, Hardinge Papers.

5 Lord Carmichael of Sterling, the first Governor of Bengal (1912–16).

6 Note by Fleetwood Wilson, Fleetwood Wilson Papers, India Office Library, London.

7 Chirol to Hardinge, 9 June 1911, Hardinge Papers.

8 Hardinge to Sydenham Clarke, 26 February 1912, Hardinge Papers.

9 *Idem.*

10 Robert Offley Ashburton Crewe-Milnes, 1st Marquess of Crewe (1858–1945), British Statesman, Secretary of State for India (1910–15).

11 Gilbert John Eldiet-Murray-Kynynmound, 4th Earl of Minto (1848–1914), Viceroy of India (1905–10).

12 Secretary of State to the Viceroy, 16 December 1910, Hardinge Papers.

13 Secretary of State of the Viceroy, 27 January 1911, Hardinge Papers.

14 Secretary of state to the Viceroy, 23 December 1910, Hardinge Papers.

15 *Idem.*, also Hardinge to Crewe, 25 January 1911, Hardinge Papers.

16 *Idem.*

17 Hardinge to Crewe, 20 February 1911, Hardinge Papers.
18 Secretary of State to the Viceroy, 13 December 1910, Hardinge Papers.
19 Note, by Fleetwood Wilson, Fleetwood Wilson Papers.
20 Duke to Hardinge, 1 April 1912, Hardinge Papers.
21 Bayley to Hardinge, 12 February 1912, Hardinge Papers.
22 Butler to Hardinge, 16 February 1912, Hardinge Papers.
23 Sydenham Clarke to Hardinge, 6 March 1913, Hardinge Papers.
24 George Nathaniel Curzon of Kedlestone, 1st Marquess (1859–1925), Viceroy of India (1898–1905).
25 Hardinge to Sydenham Clarke, 26 February 1912, Hardinge Papers.
26 Hardinge to Crewe, 7 February 1912, Hardinge Papers.
27 *Idem.* 28 *Idem.*
29 Hardinge to Crewe, 9 May 1912, Hardinge Papers.
30 Hardinge to Crewe, 19 June 1912, Hardinge Papers. 31 *Idem.*
32 Hardinge to Crewe, 12 March 1914, Hardinge Papers. 33 *Idem.*
34 Hardinge to Crewe, 2 April 1914, Hardinge Papers. 35 *Idem.*
36 Hardinge to Crewe, 19 February 1914, Hardinge Papers.
37 *Idem.* 38 *Idem.*
39 *Idem.*, also Butler to Hardinge, 7 February 1912, Hardinge Papers.
40 Hardinge to Butler, 3 February 1912, Hardinge Papers.
41 Hardinge to Crewe, 2 April 1914, Hardinge Papers. 42 *Idem.*
43 Hardinge to Holderness, 13 May 1914, Hardinge Papers.
44 Crewe to Hardinge, 13 March 1914, Hardinge Papers. 45 *Idem.*
46 Hardinge to Crewe, 2 April 1914, Hardinge Papers.
47 James Ramsay MacDonald (1866–1937), British statesman, one of the founders of the British Labour Party.
48 Crewe to Hardinge, 13 March 1914, Hardinge Papers.
49 It included George S. C. Swinton (Chairman), John A. Brodie and Edwin L. Lutyens.
50 See the final report of the Delhi Town Planning Committee in Crewe Papers 1/9 at Cambridge University Library.
51 'The New Delhi' from a correspondent in India, undated 1912, Hardinge Papers.
52 Hardinge to Crewe, 24 April 1913, Hardinge Papers.
53 Hardinge to Crewe, 6 June 1912, Hardinge Papers.
54 Butler to Crewe, 1 August 1912, Hardinge Papers.
55 Lutyens to Baker, 10 August 1912, Lutyens Papers.
56 Hardinge to Crewe, 11 July 1912, Hardinge Papers.
57 Hardinge to Crewe, 16 July 1912, Hardinge Papers.
58 Hardinge to Crewe, 22 August 1912, Hardinge Papers. 59 *Idem.*
60 Hardinge to Crewe, 8 October 1912, Hardinge Papers. 61 *Idem.*

62 *Idem.* 63 *Idem.* 64 *Idem.*
65 Hardinge to Crewe, 22 August 1912, Hardinge Papers.
66 Hardinge to Crewe, 29 August 1912, Hardinge Papers.
67 Hardinge to Crewe, 2 April 1914, Hardinge Papers. 68 *Idem.*
69 Hardinge to Crewe, 22 August 1912, Hardinge Papers.
70 Hardinge to Crewe, 2 April 1914, Hardinge Papers.
71 Butler to Hardinge, 1 August 1912, Hardinge Papers.
72 *Idem.* 73 *Idem.* 74 *Idem.*
75 Crewe to Hardinge, 13 March 1914, Hardinge Papers.
76 Crewe to Hardinge, 5 June 1912, Hardinge Papers. 77 *Idem.*
78 Edwin Samuel Montagu (1879–1924), British politician, Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the India Office (1910–14), subsequently, Secretary of State for India (1917–21).
79 Crewe to Hardinge, 5 June 1912, Hardinge Papers. 80 *Idem.*
81 *Idem.*, also, Hardinge to Crewe, 24 July 1912, Hardinge Papers.
82 Hardinge to Crewe, 22 August 1912, Hardinge Papers.
83 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 16 February 1913, Lutyens Papers, Royal Institute of British Architects, London.
84 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 15 April 1912, Baker Papers.
85 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 16 December 1912, Lutyens Papers.
86 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 25 April 1912, Lutyens Papers.
87 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 7 June 1913, Lutyens Papers.
88 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 3 June 1912, Lutyens Papers. 89 *Idem.*
90 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 2 December 1913, Lutyens Papers.
91 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 3 June 1912, Lutyens Papers.
92 *Idem.* 93 *Idem.* 94 *Idem.* 95 *Idem.*
96 *Idem.*; Lutyens to Baker, 14 June 1913, Baker Papers.
97 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 14 April 1912, Lutyens Papers.
98 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 26 December 1912, Lutyens Papers.
99 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 26 May 1912, Lutyens Papers.
100 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 31 August 1912, Lutyens Papers.
Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 29 August 1912, Lutyens Papers. 101 *Idem.*
102 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 14 April 1912, Lutyens Papers.
103 Lutyens to Baker, 23 December 1910, Baker Papers.
104 Lutyens to Baker, 29 January 1911, Baker Papers. 105 *Idem.*
106 Lutyens to Baker, 29 January 1911, Baker Papers. 107 *Idem.*
108 *Idem.* 109 *Idem.* 110 *Idem.* 111 *Idem.* 112 *Idem.* 113 *Idem.*
114 Baker to C. Hill, 18 March 1916, Baker Papers.
115 Lutyens to Baker, 29 January 1911, Baker Papers. 116 *Idem.* 117 *Idem.*
118 Lutyens to Baker, 23 June 1910, Baker Papers. 119 *Idem.*

120 Lutyens to Baker, 28 December 1910, Baker Papers.

121 Lutyens to Baker, 29 January 1911, Baker Papers.

122 Lutyens to Baker, 26 December 1904, Baker Papers. 123 *Idem.*

124 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 14 April 1912, Lutyens Papers.

125 John Ruskin (1819–1900), writer, critic and artist, who more than anyone else influenced the public taste of Victorian England.

126 Lutyens to Baker, 26 December 1904, Baker Papers.

127 William Morris (1834–1896), English poet, artist, manufacturer and socialist, whose decorative designs revolutionised Victorian taste.

128 Richard D. Altick, *Victorian People and Ideas*, London, 1974, pp.281–8.

129 Robert Lutyens, *Six Great Architects*, London, 1959, p.168.

130 Cf. *Country Life*, 6–27 June 1931. 131 *Idem.*

132 H. W. Janson, *History of Art*, New York, 1962, Part I, Ch. 5, pp.76–122.

133 Lutyens to Baker, 28 December 1910, Baker Papers.

134 H. Baker to C. Hill, 18 March 1916, Baker Papers. 135 *Idem.*

136 Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 23 November 1913, Lutyens Papers.
Lutyens to Emily Lutyens, 27 November 1913, Lutyens Papers.

137 H. Baker to C. Hill, 15 April 1916, Baker Papers.

138 *Idem.* 139 *Idem.* 140 *Idem.*

141 Note of New Delhi, 15 April 1913, Curzon Papers.

142 Baker to Lytton, 13 May 1913, Baker Papers.

143 Baker to Lutyens, 6 February 1912, Baker Papers.

144 Cf. Papers of the Round Table Group and those of Lionel Curtis, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

145 H. Baker to C. Hill, 18 March 1916, Baker Papers.

146 Sydenham Clarke to Hardinge, 2 December 1910, Hardinge Papers.

147 Cf. Ernst Fischer, *Art Against Ideology*, London, 1969, pp.56–62.