

Dangerous Liaisons

Relationships between Design, Craft and Art

Grace Lees-Maffei and Linda Sandino

The title for this special issue takes its starting point from Choderlos de Laclos' novel depicting the machinations, seduction and jealousies of a *ménage à trois*, a fitting analogy for the complex matrices of the affinities between design, craft and art over the last two hundred years.¹ Drawing on our analogy, design, craft and art can be seen to occupy an unstable territory of permanently shifting allegiances, and this is true of both the histories of these three sets of practices and the three families of discourses surrounding them.² The evolving nature of design practice on the part of some leading exponents defies categorization: the designed goods of groups such as Droog and manufacturers such as Alessi demonstrate a concern for allusive and narrative qualities beyond functionalism.³ The claim to art status by some craft practitioners of this century and the last is more vociferous than ever, and recent fine-art practice has increasingly looked outside the armoury of fine-art techniques to employ strategies previously considered to fall into the domain of material culture, architecture and design, and processes more traditionally associated with the crafts.⁴ The rich and deepening liaison of textiles and fine art exemplifies this dynamic.⁵ Dale Chihuly's work provides another example of such convergence.⁶ Existing debates have centred on liaisons between these practices and their objects as subject to a conventional hierarchy of the visual arts with fine art as the dominant partner. More recently, however, questions of status have no longer been seen as relevant,⁷ and understanding of the development of these cultural strains has been seen in terms of parallel development, or convergence, rather than hierarchy. Where design, craft and art can be seen to have existed distinctly, it is important to consider the extent to which these practices have developed internal principles or characteristics, or whether those principles have been forged solely in contradistinction to one another. To appreciate the significance of

liaisons between design, craft and art it is necessary to interrogate the mutually informative relationship between practice and discourse. The principles that define the differences and relations between design, craft and art are subject to historical change, and vary regionally and culturally. This introduction proposes what the following articles demonstrate: namely that the interplay between design, craft and art is a compelling and revealing focal point for analysis. The articles establish, in addition, the inadequacy of normative or unchanging usage of the terms design, craft and art, which is mutable in relation to both time and space. This introduction reviews some salient instances in the development of discourses about the interplay of design, craft and art, while the articles which follow identify case studies of visual and material practice which mobilize or confound normative categories in a manner which invalidates, or at least complicates, discourses dependent upon conventionally discrete definitions.

Present

The *Objects of Our Time* exhibition held at the Crafts Council in 1996 to celebrate its Silver Jubilee provided an excellent opportunity to take stock of the place of craft within contemporary visual trends. The curator and the then director, Tony Ford, referred to the conclusive shift of craft from the margins to the mainstream: 'to occupy an integrated position with fine art, fashion, architecture and industrial design.'⁸ The use of the term 'integrated' is appropriate, if a little optimistic. In December 2001, Rosemary Hill delivered the Peter Dorner lecture at the Royal College of Art in which she discussed the demise of 'the new crafts', which had 'found their voice and flourished' in the space between art and craft, in the early 1970s, and specifically with the publication of the first *Crafts* magazine in 1973.⁹ These new crafts had become so

integrated with art, and indistinguishable from it, that they no longer existed, subsumed instead into a holistic category akin to the 'Arts, Manufactures and Commerce' shown at the Great Exhibition in 1851. Hill's ambiguous obituary—the new crafts never quite arrived. They certainly never made it to the Tate—overlooked the exhibition of ceramics at the Barbican in *The Raw and the Cooked* (1993).¹⁰ Six months earlier, in the summer 2001 issue of *Tate* magazine, potter and critic Emmanuel Cooper complained that 'although the definition of art continues to expand, craft is still left out in the margins'.¹¹ Cooper cited recent exhibitions, including those at the Hayward Gallery ('following exhibitions on art and film and art and fashion, would not one entitled "Art and Craft" push the boat out further?')¹² and *New British Art 2000: Intelligence* at Tate Britain, which had been 'fearless in challenging accepted definitions between folk/naïve art and fine art' and had neglected the crafts. Cooper ended with the rhetorical question that it was 'surely time for institutions such as Tate and the Hayward to take a lead?'¹³

In his acceptance speech for the Turner Prize 2003, Grayson Perry commented that the art world found it easier to accept his alter-ego transvestite personality Claire than the fact that he is a potter. Perry clearly identified the continuation of the institutional, perceptual and cultural distinctions between craft and art and did so from a high-profile position. With his work, his personae and his philosophy, Perry contradicts the assumptions and categories through which contemporary practice has been understood.¹⁴ His 'pots' are canvases for the depiction and exploration of socially relevant themes such as gender identities, dysfunctional families, violence and unrest. Perry's work demonstrates the impossibility of understanding objects without sensitivity to the categorization of people, practices and products. Recognition of Perry's work by the art establishment surrounding the Turner Prize reflects recent institutional convergence of the kind that led, in 1999, to the Crafts Council becoming a 'client' of the Arts Council of England, meaning that independent makers would need to compete for Arts Council funding on a wider stage.¹⁵ With reorganization of the government Councils concerned with design, craft and art and changes in the higher education sector, scholars, students and practitioners of the various forms of visual and material culture need increasingly to

view their subjects in a range of contexts and to make connections across disciplines.¹⁶ The institutional context has altered in a manner that reinvigorates discussion of the relationship between these fields.

Six months before Perry won the Turner Prize, in the thirtieth-birthday edition of *Crafts* magazine published in 2003, Geraldine Rudge's editorial began with the following résumé of the changes wrought over three decades:

In March 1973, in issue 1, an article called *The Concept of Craft* asked—among others—two questions: 'What is Craft?' and 'How does it differ on the one hand from industry and on the other hand from art?' 30 years on, a third question follows up the second: 'Does it matter?' Certainly today few makers consider the barriers between art, craft and design of such significance. Craft and industry are routinely partners, and many designers happily combine the making of one-offs with the production-line process . . . [and] the term craft is now simply 'inadequate' to summarise the collaborative, interdisciplinary diversity of current practice.¹⁷

Rudge's position contains a contradiction commonly seen in contemporary discourses of making. On the one hand, it is felt, 'barriers' between design, craft and art no longer matter; on the other, the term 'craft' is inadequate to describe the diversity of current practice. Evidently, terminology both matters and does not matter, simultaneously. Rudge steps away from the next logical question: 'If not craft, then what?' Perhaps she is not sure whether the answer is 'design' or 'art', or something else. It seems that some practitioners and consumers of contemporary artefacts disregard or confound categorization while others are keen to uphold such distinctions. In 2001, writer Giles Foden published an article about the Jerwood Prize for Ceramics in which he presented the view that the exhibitors, whom he termed 'parodists', needed to 'go back to basics'.¹⁸ The article elicited a rush of reactions from readers, published the following week, which illustrated the breadth of very strongly-held opinion clearly divided between those who believe that ceramics can be art and those who wish to champion the production of domestic utility wares.¹⁹ Given the range of views held and the strength of feeling about design, craft and art, anyone broaching the subject needs not only to be aware of the dangerous, inflammatory nature of the topic but also to recognize these liaisons as creative

and dynamic. Suppression of these debates results in a failure to acknowledge that the ‘collaborative, interdisciplinary diversity of current practice’ produces hybrid artefacts that render discussions of the interplay between design, craft and art essential. Such practice invigorates these constantly shifting relationships and necessitates further exploration.

Three decades ago, when the first issue of *Crafts* magazine was in press, a group of design historians were involved in forging a shared identity through special-interest group meetings at the Association of Art Historians’ annual conference.²⁰ This led to the founding of the Design History Society in 1977 ‘to consolidate design history as a distinct field of study’.²¹ Thirty years on, this concern for distinction endures, but it is within a mature field that design historians can today engage with art history, craft, architecture, technology and other forms of material culture. Following a continuous stream of conferences and events concerned with articulating the changing nature of crafts practice in Britain, debates around craft theory are flourishing and maturing.²² As craft theory gathers momentum, its concerns move from statements of general principles as it was towards greater specificity of discourse. The same is true of design, which is increasingly positioned within the category of visual culture. This special issue brings together work by design historians, craft theorists and art historians for the benefit of the similarly diverse readership of the *Journal of Design History*.

Past

Two significant ways in which relationships between design, craft and art manifest themselves are, firstly, in the artefacts themselves as hybrid practice, and secondly in the reception of those artefacts. Consequently, any examination of the liaisons of the three domains needs to engage with the history of three sets of practices and with the genealogies of the discourses about these practices. We need to consider not only changes in the ways makers relate to these categories, as exemplified by Perry, but also changes in the categories themselves as they are applied through various institutions and discourses. Artefacts and their surrounding discourses are each subject to historical and cultural changes. Rosemary Hill has discussed the way in which ‘criticism has an existence

independent from art’, referring to focal shifts in critical writing from watercolours, to *pâte de verre*, to the crafts.²³ In her keenness to qualify the role that the objects and practices of design, craft and art have in shaping their discourses, Hill obscures the role that the practice of criticism plays in forming the artefacts it scrutinizes. Criticism may well enjoy histories distinct from those of design, craft and art, but to say so without acknowledging the mutually constitutive relationships between these histories is to disregard the liaisons which under scrutiny are so revealing.

As the articles in this special issue demonstrate, the principles that distinguish design, craft and art and their respective histories vary in type and over time. The various principles applied to design, craft and art have produced different hierarchical models within which they have been situated. It is more appropriate, then, to view these histories in the form of parallel tracks that have converged and diverged. Emphases within each of these practices have oscillated between structures of similitude and of distinction, leading to the continuing interweaving of principles and strategies as defined by each domain. Thus, the meanings invoked by the terms ‘design’, ‘craft’ and ‘art’, and the relationships between them, have changed across time and place. Discussions of a linguistic bent, such as Paul Greenhalgh’s account of the etymology of the word ‘craft’ and the development of the terms ‘fine art’ and ‘vernacular’, illustrate their fluidity.²⁴

The development of the history of design within the wider ideological developments of modernism has ensured the significance of the Arts and Crafts Movement as a touchstone of the attempt to integrate design, the crafts and art.²⁵ Among its principles, a belief in craft as an antidote to industrialization (allied to the Romantic faith in the cathartic power of nature) has extensively influenced contemporary attitudes. The current situation arose from the persistent nineteenth-century Arts and Crafts Movement concern for the hand-made in an increasingly (post-)industrialized Britain. For at least the last 150 years, craft has been written about as an antidote to increasing industrialization. Even in 2000, the *Guardian* was seen reassuring readers that art glass had survived nineteenth-century industrialization.²⁶ From Pugin’s didactic *True Principles*, through Ruskin’s homily to the spiritually uplifting value of the hand made in ‘On the Nature of the Gothic’, to

Morris's Arts and Crafts approach to valuing the lesser arts within a holistic approach to the improving capacity of creative manufacture, the design theorists of the mid-nineteenth century were concerned to promote craft practices rooted in centuries of tradition as a necessary correlative of industrial society.²⁷ Just as design and the crafts of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have continued to wrestle with their nineteenth-century formations, so fine art has inherited a nineteenth-century legacy of commodification which has withstood repeated attempts to undermine it, through such phenomena as performance and process arts, to name but two.

Such attitudes, in modified form, underpin the work and reception of the Bauhaus, with its related set of principles, including the insistence that design, craft and fine art be taught, practised and seen together, rather than separated in a hierarchy. The Bauhaus declared one of its aims to be the elevation of the status of design and the crafts to that enjoyed by fine art, painting and sculpture. Retrospectively, with recourse to the continuing nature of these arguments, we might question the success of this endeavour. British art education and training can be seen as the hot house in which the interplay of relationships between disciplines is cultivated.²⁸ Martina Margetts has stressed the importance of art-school training, as opposed to apprenticeships, for the increasingly blurred boundaries of the craft/art debate: 'mantras such as the "new ceramics" and "new jewellery" suggest changed priorities, in which conceptual ideas flourish alongside, sometimes instead of, considerations of use.'²⁹ Institutional categorizations have played a significant role in constructing and maintaining taxonomies of people, which in turn have affected the classifications of objects and their disciplinary discourses. Consequently this special issue offers examinations of the sites of intersection which occur in objects, practices and materials; sites at which the production, reception and consumption of objects are intrinsic to an understanding of their polyvalent meanings.

This introduction does not seek to replicate the work already published on the historical antecedents of the present debate, but rather to acknowledge the place of this work. The history of design has documented the role of craft and art in its accounts of the production and consumption of material culture.³⁰ As Martina Margetts writes in this special issue, in her

review of Paul Greenhalgh's recent edited collection of essays, what is needed is:

carefully researched analyses and theoretical engagement to achieve a more sophisticated context for discussing and understanding the crafts . . . we do not want a regurgitation of the Progressive Line . . . the Industrial Revolution begat the Arts and Crafts Movement which begat Modernism and Anti-Ornament which begat revisionist Post-modernism which begat Global Hybridity.³¹

Writing about the crafts continues to exemplify the historical, and historicist, appeal of craft to consumers as a way of accessing nostalgic, pre-industrial ideals.³² This is the case whether the artefacts are hand-made or use the latest technological innovations, although, of course, the former are especially potent, as heard in Peter Fuller's lament:³³

Whatever our society may, or may not, have gained through its technological, political and social advances, when we are confronted with craftsmanship as superlative as this [Medici Mamluk carpet] we are compelled to admit what it is that we have *lost*.³⁴ [Fuller's italics]

A contemporary example is found in the reverent presentation of the consumption of Shaker objects, both antique and newly manufactured, and in the repeated heralding, seen in consumer publications, of the crafts as fashion's improver.³⁵ Despite a pervasive cultural preoccupation with media and digital technology, the earlier enthusiasms and fears that characterized the machine age, and continuing discussion about the role of CAD in the crafts,³⁶ contemporary visual culture displays a continuing concern for spiritual enlightenment through consumption:³⁷

In a perplexing cultural context of violence and decay (Cronenberg and Hirst), what is offered by the crafts? They, too, give an image of society, perhaps more rooted in delight and enrichment, but there is also provocation and philosophical enquiry.³⁸

Traditional craft values of permanence and of personal investment are presented as desirable qualities in recent lifestyle media.³⁹ It has been argued that, for the consumer, it hardly matters that 'romanticism masks the reality of hard graft inherent in the work of craftspeople'.⁴⁰ We may see this as a continuation of Roger Coleman's defence of manual creative work in an increasingly technological society.⁴¹

In the post-industrial era, craft can still mean the skilled production by hand or machine of utilitarian

and vernacular designs. However, interwoven with this is the principle by which ‘craft’ can also, increasingly, refer to an elite classification of hand or machine production displayed and sold through galleries such as Contemporary Applied Arts and the Crafts Council. In the face of experimental challenges to traditions of skill, Peter Fuller articulated in 1983 his conservative belief that:

The achievement of excellence is only possible through acceptance of the specific traditions and limitations of any given pursuit. Originality, as Donald Winnicott once put it, is only possible on the basis of tradition . . . the hand-made vessel exemplifies the union of man’s functional skills and his aesthetic and symbolic intents.⁴²

At the same time, Fuller used the exhibitions *Jewellery Redefined* and *The Jewellery Project* in an acidic derogation of technical innovation and the use of everyday materials in jewellery practice of the early 1980s.⁴³ Adopting Fuller’s mantle, the late Peter Dormer, in his 1994 book *The Art of the Maker*, lamented an emphasis upon individuality of expression that had led makers to neglect skill:

The modern orthodoxy is that conception and execution are separate activities and that execution—mere making—can take care of itself. Skills are regarded as technical constraints upon self-expression and they are not recognised as being the content as well as the means of expression.⁴⁴

A shift away from the conventions of craft skills and the primacy of function to iconoclastic aesthetic experimentation mirrors cultural theorist Pierre Bourdieu’s delineation of the increasing bid on the part of the artist for autonomy. The consumption of elite artefacts offers the promise of distinction articulated by Bourdieu,⁴⁵ and elaborated by Mary Butcher in her analysis of an eel-trap by David Drew. Drew’s eel-trap exemplifies the traditions of vernacular production but simultaneously undermines those traditions by being displayed as the product of a named maker at the Crafts Council, with a label alerting the visitor to its ‘sculptural beauty’.⁴⁶ Fine art’s symbolic value has consistently outstripped the cultural capital of craft and design, both of which have been conventionally invested with use-value rather than conceptual distinction, based on the Western cultural primacy of the intellectual over the manual, content over form.⁴⁷ Bourdieu’s writings, and subsequent post-structural developments by Jean Baudrillard,

are helpful in understanding the interleaved roles of producer and consumer in making meaning and value for objects. This has usefully illuminated yet another dynamic to be considered—the extent to which artefacts are conceived, made and consumed within the ordinance of consistent principles.⁴⁸ Moira Vincentelli’s discussion of Oaxacan wood carving in her review of Michael Chibnik’s work on the subject in this special issue offers a compelling example of this. The articles here—and notably Jo Turney’s study of amateur craft and Melanie Unwin’s work on Mary Watts—also imply the importance of acknowledging that the principles informing the work of the design historian are distinct from those underpinning the production of the artefacts which form the subject of study.

Rosemary Hill has pointed out that the history of the reception of fine art has a ‘place in an historical process’ significant in perpetuating the ‘art-craft divide’.⁴⁹ That is why Antony Gormley, sculptor of Gateshead’s ‘Angel of the North’, has received so much more media attention than his brother, the wood carver John Gormley.⁵⁰ At the turn of this century, however, it is less accurate to lament the fact that the crafts are insufficiently discussed.⁵¹ The recent flurry of texts and events interrogating craft has provided a necessary response to the shared engagement by artists, designers and craftspeople with a plethora of materials and techniques. Within art history, increasing attention to the use of demotic objects or processes for gallery consumption has mirrored the debate within craft discourse.⁵²

The ‘institutionalization’ of craft discourse as a historical and theoretical discipline in itself was aided by the Crafts Council’s remit to promote the crafts since its inception in 1971 as the Crafts Advisory Committee, which had an additional concern for professionalizing the crafts. With the support of the Council’s magazine, exhibition programme and conferences, craft began to stake out its disciplinary boundaries, structured around its relationship to design and art.⁵³ Inevitably, craft historians and writers debated the definition, function and meaning of craft, focusing particularly on late-twentieth-century practices.⁵⁴ Discussion of specific genres in craft was somewhat less embroiled in status agony, but exhibitions often took up the debate exploring the continuing relevance of the hand-made and/or its situation in the broader context of visual culture.⁵⁵

The Crafts Council provided, and can be seen to continue to provide, an official platform for ‘establishment’ craft, which has continually engaged with shifting definitions and practices from the artist-craftsperson to the designer-maker.⁵⁶ The advent of design groups such as Droog, Jam and El Ultimo Grito, and designers such as Carl Clerkin and Michael Marriott, who bring a combined design/craft approach to production and their aesthetic, seems to indicate a more profound interplay between craft and design processes than the material/status struggle of art and craft.

The patriarchal nature of hierarchies of visual practice, in which women have been associated with amateur and domestic practices and men with extra-domestic professionalism, remain to be thoroughly effaced.⁵⁷ Ascribed status has tended to depend upon levels of intellectual input and conditions of production, as Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock have suggested.⁵⁸ Activities requiring high levels of skill, but little in the way of equipment (and, therefore, capital investment), such as crochet, have been viewed as little more than the amusements of the hobbyist.⁵⁹ Women constitute the majority of amateur craft producers, and this emphasis feeds into expert engagement within the discipline, as evidenced by gender ratios of students across the subjects taught in art colleges and practised professionally.⁶⁰ Fine art has conventionally been gendered male while craft has been posited as a female counterpart. Such binarism has been brought under scrutiny more recently as female artists such as Sarah Lucas and Tracey Emin have appropriated the stereotype of the (male) *enfant terrible*. The contradictory and reductive nature of these stereotypes has been revealed by Pat Kirkham’s reassessment of the work of Charles and Ray Eames. The assumption that the craft elements present in the work of this modernist design partnership are Ray’s contribution alone is demolished in favour of a reading in which craft motifs, considered a feminine aberration by many design commentators, are shown to be very much the result of partnership, rather than gender.⁶¹ In this volume, Melanie Unwin, Jo Turney and Pamela Gerrish Nunn each contribute complex case studies of how discussion of such stereotypes throws light on prevailing attitudes to the gendering of visual practice.

While Greenhalgh has recently predicted that ‘the

next phase of modernity will be to do with inter-disciplinarity’, which will be ‘premised on relational rather than reductive visions of life’, his thesis represents the polemic optimism of much craft writing echoed in the pages of *Crafts* magazine.⁶² The call for the dissolution of conventional genres is less evident in the discourses of design and art, which have, rather, mapped the intersections and appropriations occurring within their realms. While the historiography of the disciplinary discourses of design and art presents an increasingly closer parallel in their concerns with the context, production and consumption of their objects of study, crafts have a nascent rather than mature historiography.⁶³ The shift to thematic studies, such as those on the body, has offered the opportunity for a meeting on common ground, presenting the illusion of interdisciplinarity rather than its achievement.⁶⁴ Works of craft history and theory have been conceived as responses to, or as following, earlier works of design and art history: Edward Lucie Smith’s *The Story of Craft* was conceived as a companion to Ernst Gombrich’s *The Story of Art*; Peter Dormer’s collection *The Culture of Craft: Status and Future* followed its stablemate *The Culture of Fashion*, by Christopher Breward; Margot Coatts’s edited collection *Pioneers of Modern Craft* borrows its title from Nikolaus Pevsner’s *Pioneers of Modern Design*.⁶⁵ As general editor of the Studies in Design and Material Culture series from which the latter two titles derive, Paul Greenhalgh invokes a much earlier work of art history, Giorgio Vasari’s *Lives of the Artists*, in introducing a group of essays that he viewed as indicative of a vital stage in the development of the literature of craft—the ‘monograph stage’.⁶⁶ Published in the same year as *Pioneers of Modern Craft*, but far beyond the monograph stage, lies Sue Rowley’s useful collection *Craft and Contemporary Theory*, which begins with the idea that the art/craft debate, situated by Rowley in the 1980s, is part of a critique of the canon of art and that the task ahead is not to create a canon of craft but rather to ‘place craft momentarily at the centre of a range of ongoing interdisciplinary investigations of contemporary culture, as one might place a fulcrum momentarily under an intransigent object’.⁶⁷ Rowley’s collection answers Peter Dormer’s resistance to theory—‘Academics prefer to write in *lingua obscura*: what they are hiding from is unclear’—with a collection of essays, including Terry Smith’s ‘Craft, mod-

ernity and postmodernity', determined to place the crafts within theoretical discourses of museology, reception theory and theories of film.⁶⁸

The *Journal of Design History* has, from its inception, offered a forum for critical engagement with the crafts. A double issue in 1989 contained a variety of perspectives on the crafts, including analyses informed by ethnographic methods and theories of post modernity and consumption, and ranged from Algeria, to Ireland, to the USA. In 1997–98, another double special issue was published, comprising volumes on *Craft, Culture and Identity* and *Craft, Modernism and Modernity*, derived from a conference *Obscure Objects of Desire: Reviewing the Crafts in the Twentieth Century*.⁶⁹ Tanya Harrod convened the conference, and was subsequently winner of the Design History Society prize for excellent scholarship for her book *The Crafts in Britain in the Twentieth Century*. Harrod's has provided a key text for mapping the historical position of the crafts and their relationship to industry in the twentieth century, and makes muted reference to the increasingly contorted relationship of craft to art in the late twentieth century.

Future

It is the aim of *Dangerous Liaisons: Relationships Between Design, Craft And Art* to offer a selection of focused, historically-situated analyses that clearly elucidate the value of reflecting on the dynamism of these categories for understanding their objects. Each of the following articles explores a distinct instance of their interplay as it is embodied in hybrid artefacts, in their conception by makers and their reception at institutional or individual levels.⁷⁰ Changes in the way that makers have situated themselves within the categories of visual and material endeavour, as well as changes in the reception of those endeavours as they have been objectified, have transformed the categories themselves. *Dangerous Liaisons* addresses an important area under-exploited in academic research. The continuing relevance of examining the historical and current interplay of design, craft and art affords an opportunity to examine the complex matrix in which visual and material culture is forged.

The selection opens with Martina Droth's analysis of the design, craft and art of sculpture within a

period heralded by the Great Exhibition of 1851—an omnivorous showcase of manufactures and decorative art—subsequent to which the popularization of Arts and Crafts Movement philosophies became increasingly pervasive. The status of the sculptor as workmanlike or imaginatively creative was contested within the context of relative commercial involvement. Droth demonstrates the radicalism of such new sculptural aesthetics based in decoration. Her concern for the significance of materials and processes is taken up by Linda Sandino's paper on materiality, which focuses on the shared expressive use of materials in current design, art and studio jewellery.

Melanie Unwin's case study of the work of Mary Watts contributes a refreshing and necessary reassessment of the role of creative partnership and the way in which personal and professional matters intersect with gender issues to shape the interplay of design, craft and art. This article acts as a counterpoint to the more pessimistic accounts of practice within marriage that have reproduced binaristic conceptions of gender, whereby women practitioners are eclipsed by their male partners. Unwin delineates the ways in which, through careful and subtle manipulation of the social codes that curtailed women's professional and creative practices, Mary Watts turned the constraints, as well as the benefits, of marriage to her advantage in a manner which not only enabled her to continue to practise but also to produce artefacts which complicate the interface of design, craft and art, and of commerce and culture. By carefully negotiating forms of practice considered to fall into the realms of design, craft and art, Watts carved out a space for her professional output. As Elizabeth Cumming has noted, while Watts 'synthesized the crafts within the fine arts, the "femininity" of the domestic studio with the "masculinity" of the public building', she was also a 'shrewd businesswoman' employing agents to sell her ceramic wares internationally.⁷¹ Unwin's original study reveals how Mary Watts' work made an important contribution to the fields of architecture, art, ceramic design and craft. A gendered analysis of the interplay between design, craft and art, underpinned by a concern to elucidate the distinctions between amateur and professional, public and private in Unwin's story, resurfaces in Jo Turney's article on home crafts.

A methodological contribution is made by art historian Pamela Gerrish Nunn's article 'Fine Art

and the Fan, 1860–1930’ which, when read within the context of design history and this journal, exemplifies the way in which fine art practices, when applied to demotic forms more commonly associated with design and craft, such as the hand-held fan, ignite a range of responses from aesthetic arbiters, commercial concerns and consumers that upset those conventional hierarchies within which Gerrish Nunn situates her analysis. Gerrish Nunn explores some implications arising from the convergence of the meaningful representations she associates with fine art, with the decorative designs more usually applied to the fan. These objects therefore embody a particular relationship between design, craft and art and as such complicate each of those terms for anyone attempting to understand them through normative categories. Gerrish Nunn’s study bridges a period, 1860 to 1930, during which the development of visual and material forms appropriate to the articulation of modernity progressed apace and she considers that development in gendered terms as both normative and liberating.

Those themes are revisited in relation to contemporary culture in Jo Turney’s exploration of making and living with home craft. The pre-designed needlework kit confounds academic classifications of design, craft and art just as it thoroughly complicates concepts of authorship, creativity and originality, production and consumption. These artefacts, when completed, are important tools in the formation and display of identity that in turn have an impact upon the home as a designed construct, and the display practices which accompany the production of home crafts similarly engage issues of public and private domesticities.

Finally, Linda Sandino’s article reminds us that the qualities invoked by a consideration of materiality are aspects of objects arguably all too often overlooked by design historians. The allusive significance of materials is here presented with reference to relevant theoretical interjections. This article offers readers a reassessment of the significance of materials, articulating meanings found within the particular objects selected for analysis as disrupting assumptions about relationships between design, craft and art. By examining the shared expressive content of substances such as rubbish and processes of decay, Sandino offers a reading of objects that highlights the commonality of visual-arts practices as ‘plastic arts’.

Clearly, the interplay between design, craft and art

is not only historically specific: it is equally determined by culture and region. Like this introduction, the group of articles that follows takes Britain as its focus. We acknowledge that a study of, for example, the production and consumption of hand-made objects in Japan and India would reveal other sets of complex practices and assumptions.⁷² In this volume, Moira Vincentelli’s review of Michael Chibnik’s study of the markets for Oaxacan wood carving explores the related issues of the significance of geographical and cultural regions in determining the meanings ascribed to various practices of production and consumption.⁷³ Such issues have been raised in an earlier issue of the *Journal of Design History*, where articles by Yuko Kikuchi, Edmund de Waal and Patricia Baker collectively illuminated mythologies of authentic indigenous cultures.⁷⁴ Each of the articles in that volume mobilized issues of identity and region. The limited range of studies of global practices of design, craft and art circulating in Britain are insufficient. We hope that this special issue will engage debates and provoke further studies sorely lacking. The *Journal of Design History* seeks to develop work in this direction.

The temporal reach of the articles frames the twentieth century. The interplay between design, craft and art is manifest in a variety of contexts and subject to historical and cultural conditions, hence the need to explore these relationships. The articles appear in this volume in chronological succession. Analysis extends from the Great Exhibition of 1851, used by Martina Droth as the starting point for her study of ‘The Ethics of Making’, through Melanie Unwin’s exploration of the complex practice of Mary Watts at the Compton Chapel, completed in 1904, and Pamela Gerrish Nunn’s narrative of the fan and modernity from 1860 to 1930, to Jo Turney’s examination of ‘home craft’ in the last quarter of the twentieth century and Linda Sandino’s *fin-de-siècle* reflection on contemporary practice. Although not specifically addressed here, the period following the Second World War is an enormously rich one for studies that focus on the interplay of design, craft and art and has been explored by Tanya Harrod in her landmark study *The Crafts in Britain in the Twentieth Century*, and by contributors to Harrod’s special issue of this journal, *Craft, Modernism and Modernity*.⁷⁵

It is hoped that readers who view scholarly liaisons between histories of design, craft and art as *dangerous*

will be convinced that there is much of mutual benefit embedded here. We hope, equally, that those readers who regard the continuing debate about relationships between design, craft and art as stale or unimportant will recognize in the following articles a useful grounding of such debate in specific examples. The intersections analysed here reveal thematic complexity, and the wider importance of an awareness of the mutability of classifications as a methodological concern. The originality of the following selection of articles resides in our demonstration of the utility of a method which elucidates the relevance and historical contingency of reciprocity between design, craft and art. Each author has identified artefacts resulting from this conjunction and has demonstrated that an analysis sensitive to that conjunction can better elucidate those objects and their perception than one which applies normative, inherited categories or refuses to acknowledge the interplay of these phenomena.

Grace Lees-Maffei and Linda Sandino
University of Hertfordshire, and the National Life Story
Collection, National Sound Archive, the British Library

Notes

- Choderlos de Laclos, *Les Liaisons dangereuses*, Paris, 1782; trans. P. W. K. Stone, Penguin, 1961. Itself an early intervention in the development of the novel, Laclos' epistolary fiction has been translated into film by a number of directors, including most notably: Stephen Frear, *Dangerous Liaisons* (1988), starring John Malkovich and Glenn Close, which was an adaptation of Christopher Hampton's play based on the novel; Milos Forman, *Valmont* (1989), starring Colin Firth and Annette Bening; and Roger Vadim, *Les Liaisons dangereuses*, starring Jeanne Moreau (1959). Roger Kumble's *Cruel Intentions* of 1999 offered a popularized and contemporary setting for the story, starring Sarah Michelle Geller, Ryan Phillippe and Reese Witherspoon. The title of this special issue, *Dangerous Liaisons: Relationships between Design, Craft And Art*, derives from a conference held at the University of Hertfordshire in 1999 on the same theme. Grace Lees-Maffei would like to thank staff and students on the BA Hons. Applied Arts for the impetus to engage with the issues broached here, including Flea Cooke, Sally Freshwater, Wendy Tuxhill, Antje Illner and Steven Adams.
- L. Sandino, 'Crafts for Crafts' Sake, 1973–1988', in J. Aynsley (ed.), *Promoting Design through Magazines*, Manchester University Press (forthcoming).
- Alessi publishes extensively about its design projects and philosophies. See, for example, A. Alessi, *The Dream Factory*, Art Books International, 2003. See also G. Lees-Maffei, 'Italianità and Internationalism: The design, production and marketing of Alessi s.p.a.', *Modem Italy*, vol. 7, no. 1 (Spring 2002), pp. 37–57; G. Lees, 'Balancing the object: the reinvention of Alessi', *things*, no. 6 (Summer 1997), pp. 74–91; M. Collins, *Alessi*, Carlton Books, 1999; F. Sweet, *Alessi: Art and Poetry*, Watson-Guption Publications, 1998; and G. Julier, *The Culture of Design*, Sage, 2000, pp. 71–5. On Droog, see I. van Zijl, *Droog Design 1991–1996*, Centraal Museum, Utrecht, 1997; *Droog and Dutch Design*, Centraal Museum, Utrecht, 2000; R. Ramakers & G. Bakker, *Droog Design: Spirit of the Nineties*, Uitgeverij 010 Publishers, 1998; and B. Walrecht, *Hand Made Holland: How Craft and Design Mix*, Crafts Council, 2002, catalogue published to accompany the exhibition of the same name at the Crafts Council Gallery, London 31 January to 24 March 2002.
- See M. Archer & G. Hilty, *Material Culture: The Object in British Art of the 1980s and '90s*, South Bank Centre, 1997, published to accompany the exhibition of the same name, Hayward Gallery, London, 3 April–18 May 1997; A. Murphy, 'Look, don't sit. Ballooning chairs, dressing tables that spout water: don't laugh, it's art', *Observer Life*, 6 April 1997, pp. 20–1; D. Sudjic, 'Art or Architecture: as it gets harder and harder to tell the difference between art and architecture, are these two disciplines really blurring?', *British Vogue*, February 2002, pp. 71–4; D. Sudjic, 'Is the future of art in their hands? Fashion has always borrowed from art for its inspiration. But not any longer. Now it's the designers who are taking over our galleries and museums', *The Observer*, 14 October 2001, <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/review/story/0,6903,5733555,00.html>.
- A. Searle, 'Have you ironed your room yet?', *The Guardian*, 23 April 2002, pp. 12–13, review of Do-Hu Suh, shown at the Serpentine Gallery, London to 26 May 2002; L. G. Corrin, *Loose Threads*, Serpentine Gallery, 1998, published to accompany the exhibition held at the Serpentine Gallery, 22 August–20 September 1998, which featured the work of, among others, Tracey Emin and Michael Raedecker, who were short-listed for the Turner Prize in 1999 and 2000 respectively. The exhibition was reviewed by R. Withers, 'Knotty but nice. Try to unravel the meaning behind *Loose Threads*, the latest show at the Serpentine, and you'll only get yourself into a tangle', *The Guardian*, 25 August 1998, pp. 10–11; 'Textiles into Art', a study day at the V&A, 27 May 2000, featured presentations by makers Sharon Ting and Carole Waller among others. Another conference, 'Unbound: Contexts, Hybrids and the Future of Textiles in Contemporary Art', Djanogly Art Gallery, University of Nottingham, 23 January 1999, heralded 'Fabrications', a Nottingham-based series of four exhibitions 'celebrating textiles in contemporary art' comprising *New Perspectives on the British Art Quilt*, at Nottingham Museum and Art Gallery (28 November 1998–24 January 1999); *Bodyscape: Caroline Broadhead*, at the Angel Row Gallery, Nottingham (9 January–20 February 1999); *Coming of Age: New Work by Heather Connelly*, at the Djanogly Art Gallery, Nottingham (16 January–14 March 1999), and *Our Time: Mary-Ann Bartlett and Jayne Devlin*, at the Bonington Gallery, Nottingham (8–28 February 1999). Also useful here is Marion Boulton Stroud's book *New Materials as New Media: The Fabric Workshop and Museum*, MIT Press, 2002.
- On Dale Chihuly, see J. Hawkins Opie (ed.), *Chihuly at the V&A*, Portland Press, 2002. A record of the exhibition, which this book accompanied, is available at <<http://www.chihuly.com>>.
- P. Greenhalgh (ed.), *The Persistence of Craft: The Applied Arts Today*, A & C Black/Rutgers University Press, 2002. See his 'Introduction—Craft in a Changing World'.
- 'Objects of our time', catalogue essay for the exhibition held at the Crafts Council Gallery, 5 December 1996–16 February 1997, Crafts Council, 1996, p. 7.

- 9 R. Hill, 'The eye of the beholder: criticism and the crafts', the 2001 Peter Dormer Lecture, Royal College of Art, 2001, p. 8.
- 10 Ibid., p. 8. *The Raw and the Cooked*, curated by Martina Margetts and Alison Britton, Museum of Modern Art, Oxford, and The Barbican Arts Centre, London, 1993.
- 11 E. Cooper, 'Makers and Shakers', *Tate* magazine, Summer 2001, p. 80.
- 12 P. Wollen & F. Bradley (eds.), *Addressing the Century: 100 Years of Art and Fashion*, Hayward Gallery Publishing, 1998, to accompany the exhibition of the same name at the Hayward Gallery which featured the work of Gilbert and George, and Caroline Broadhead among others; I. Christie & P. Dodd (eds.), *Spellbound: Art and Film*, British Film Institute, South Bank Centre, 1996, accompanied another Hayward Gallery show including the work of Terry Gilliam, Peter Greenaway and two Turner Prize winners, Douglas Gordon and Steve McQueen.
- 13 Cooper, 'Makers and Shakers', p. 80.
- 14 R. Higgins, 'A life in the day—Grayson Perry', *The Sunday Times Magazine*, 1 February 2004, p. 62.
- 15 Arts Council of England, 'New Era for Crafts Funding', <<http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/arts/visual-arts.html>>, accessed 18 May 2001.
- 16 Work on the marketable expertise obtained by art and design graduates has stressed the transferable skills common across disciplines. See for example L. Ball, *Careers in Art and Design*, Kogan Page, 1981 and subsequent editions; L. Ball (ed.), *Crafts 2000: A Future in the Making*, Crafts Council, 1997; 'Crafts City: the role and potential of the crafts to economy, employment and environment, symposium', Sheffield Hallam University, 2 March 1999.
- 17 G. Rudge, editorial, *Crafts Magazine*, no. 181, March/April 2003, p. 1. 'Inadequate' is quoted from David Revere McFadden.
- 18 G. Foden, 'All fired up', *The Guardian*, 20 October 2001, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/saturday-review/story/0,3605,57223,00.html>. This article was part of a series entitled 'Difficult Art Forms', which in addition to ceramics featured video art, electronic music, modern architecture, jazz, Surrealism and ballet, in each case followed by responses from readers. The Jerwood Applied Arts Prize 2001, for Ceramics, was awarded to Richard Slee, who exhibited work in the prize exhibition at the Crafts Council, 13 September–8 October 2001, along with fellow short-listed makers Felicity Aylieff, Alison Britton, Lubna Chowdhary, James Evans, Elizabeth Fritsch, Walter Keeler, Carol McNicoll, Nicholas Rena and Edmund de Waal.
- 19 "'This is an exciting time for potters—they should push back the boundaries': Your reactions to last week's article about pottery", *The Guardian*, 27 October 2001, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/saturday-review/story/0,3605,581482,00.html>.
- 20 G. Lees-Maffei, 'Introduction studying advice: historiography, methodology, commentary, bibliography', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2003, pp. 1–14, n. 16.
- 21 Design History Society webpages, <www.designhistorysociety.org.uk>. The first Design History Society conference was held at Brighton Polytechnic in 1977. The *DHS Newsletter* was launched in 1978. The *Journal of Design History* was launched in 1987.
- 22 *Obscure Objects of Desire: Reviewing the Crafts in the Twentieth Century*, University of East Anglia, 10–12 January 1997. See also the conference proceedings: T. Harrod (ed.), *Obscure Objects of Desire: Reviewing the Crafts in the Twentieth Century*, Crafts Council, 1997. Events relevant to the debate include: *Craft Futures*, V&A in association with Contemporary Applied Arts, to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the British Crafts Centre (now Contemporary Applied Arts), 28 November 1998; *Consuming Craft*, Buckingham Chilterns University College, 19–21 May 2000; *Craft in the Twenty-First Century: Theorising Change and Practice*, Edinburgh College of Art, 15–17 November 2002, and *Challenging Craft*, Gray's School of Art, Aberdeen, 8–10 September 2004.
- 23 Hill, 'The eye of the beholder', p. 5.
- 24 P. Greenhalgh, 'The history of craft', in P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft: Status and Future*, Manchester University Press, 1997, pp. 20–52. An interesting aspect of this linguistic emphasis is Peter Dormer's assertion that we cannot adequately discuss or write about the experience of craft production or craft consumption because craft depends on tacit knowledge; see P. Dormer, 'Craft and the Turing test for practical thinking' in the same volume, pp. 137–57 (p. 147). See also J. Evans's review of the book in the *Journal of Design History*, vol. 10, no. 4, 1997, pp. 436–8; H. Rees on the relationship between craft and design, 'Thinking and making in industrial design', in P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*, pp. 116–36. Parts of the commentary which follows are developed from G. Lees-Maffei, 'An analysis of the art craft debate with reference to the work of Chatwin:Martin', in *Ring of Fire*, University of Hertfordshire, 1998.
- 25 See for instance G. Naylor, *The Arts and Crafts Movement*, Studio Vista, 1971, and *The Bauhaus Reassessed: Sources and Design Theory*, Herbert Press, 1985.
- 26 L. Jackson, 'Clear winners: last century, art glass-making became industrialised. But, says Lesley Jackson, its unique beauty survived large scale production', *The Guardian Weekend*, 20 May 2000, pp. 64–7. Jackson's own book, *20th Century Factory Glass*, Mitchell Beazley, 2000, informed Jackson's article.
- 27 See, for example, John Ruskin, 'On the nature of the Gothic', in *The Stones of Venice*, Smith, Elder and Co., 1851. Ruskin's influence was recently reappraised in the conference 'A Great Social Movement: Ruskin and the Arts & Crafts', Central Saint Martins College of Art and Design, 15–16 September 2000. The writings of William Morris are available in, for example, *William Morris: Selected Writings and Designs*, ed. A. Briggs, Penguin Books, 1962. Morris's influence on contemporary practice was explored in the exhibition 'William Morris Revisited: Questioning the Legacy', at the Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester (26 January–7 April 1996) and the accompanying catalogue, T. Harrod & J. Harris, *William Morris Revisited: Questioning the Legacy*, Crafts Council, 1996.
- 28 C. Ashwin et al. (eds.), *Education in the Crafts*, Crafts Council, 1988; P. Hetherington (ed.), *Artists in the 1990s: Their Education and Values*, Wimbledon School of Art in association with the Tate Gallery, 1994; C. Ashwin, *A Century of Art Education 1882–1982*, Middlesex Polytechnic, 1982.
- 29 *Objects of Our Time*, pp. 10–11. Here Martina Margetts refers to such publications as the Thames and Hudson series including R. Turner & P. Dormer, *The New Jewelry: Trends and Traditions* (1985), P. Dormer, *The New Ceramics: Trends and Traditions* (1986) and idem, *The New Furniture: Trends and Traditions* (1987).
- 30 See, for example, J. A. Walker, *Design History and the History of Design*, Pluto Press, 1989; V. Margolin (ed.), *Design Discourse:*

- History, Theory, Criticism*, University of Chicago Press, 1989; J. M. Woodham, *Twentieth-Century Design*, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- 31 M. Margetts, review of Paul Greenhalgh (ed.), *The Persistence of Craft*, A&C Black, 2002, *Journal of Design History*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 307–9.
 - 32 See, for example, A. Buck & H. Clifford, *Out of This World: The Influence of Nature in Craft and Design, 1880–1995*, Crafts Council, to accompany the exhibition April–June 1995, and P. Dormer (ed.), *The Decorative Beast: The Animal Form in Craft*, Crafts Council, 1990, with essays by Peter Dormer, Andrew Harrison, William Newland, Kate Dineen, Jeremy James and Pat Halfpenny, to accompany the exhibition at the Crafts Council, 24 October–30 December 1990.
 - 33 See, in P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*, B. Metcalf's view of the importance of 'bodily intelligence' as a criterion for defining craft: 'Craft and Art, Culture and Biology' (pp. 67–82), and P. Greenhalgh's critique of craft as oppositional to mass manufacturing: 'The progress of Captain Ludd' (pp. 104–11).
 - 34 P. Fuller, 'Carpet magic', first published in *Crafts* magazine, and collected in *Images of God: The Consolation of Lost Illusions* (Chatto and Windus, 1985), Hogarth Press, 1990, pp. 246–9 (p. 247).
 - 35 A. Murphy, 'Cooler Shaker. It's a topsy-turvy world: Shaker has never had more followers (oval boxes, pegboards and ladderback chairs are de rigueur), but the Shaker religion has never had fewer', *Observer Life* magazine, 18 May 1997, pp. 12–21; N. Yusuf, 'Hard Craft. Reflecting growing concern for global conservation, fashion takes craft to its heart', *Elle* (UK), September 1989, pp. 190–1; N. Niesewand, 'Fashion Junkies: the biggest stars of the runway are recycled', *Vogue* (British edition), March 1996, p. 97; D. Hall, 'Future Imperfect. It's been beyond the pale for 20 years, but craft is back. Tired of processed perfection, style seekers are turning to handmade individuality', *Vogue* (British edition), April 1999, pp. 56–9.
 - 36 See J. Myerson, 'Tornadoes, T-squares and technology: can computing be a craft?', in P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*, pp. 176–85, and M. McCullough, *Abstracting Craft: The Practiced Digital Hand*, MIT Press, 1996. The work of Fred Baier, a furniture maker who uses CAD, is relevant here and is shown in P. Dormer (ed.), *Furniture Today—Its Design and Craft*, Crafts Council, 1995. The 'Manifesto' of this self-styled 'ambassador of furniture' can be read at <<http://www.fredbaier.com/>>.
 - 37 See P. Dormer, 'Valuing the handmade: studio crafts and the meaning of their style', in *The Meanings of Modern Design*, Thames and Hudson, 1990, p. 169.
 - 38 *Objects of Our Time*, p. 18.
 - 39 G. Hickey, 'Craft within a consuming society', in P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*, p. 85.
 - 40 *Objects of Our Time*, pp. 9–10.
 - 41 R. Coleman, 'Freely Chosen Work', in *The Art of Work: An Epitaph to Skill*, Pluto, 1988, p. 142.
 - 42 P. Fuller, 'The proper work of the potter', catalogue essay for the exhibition *Fifty Five Pots*, Orchard Gallery, 1983, reproduced in *Images of God: The Consolation of Lost Illusions* (Chatto & Windus, 1985), Hogarth Press, 1990, p. 242.
 - 43 P. Fuller 'Modern jewellery', first published in *Crafts* magazine, reproduced in *Images of God*, pp. 269–73. *Jewellery Redefined* was exhibited at the British Crafts Centre in 1982 and *The Jewellery Project* was displayed at the Crafts Council in 1983.
 - 44 P. Dormer, *The Art of the Maker: Skill and its Meaning in Art, Craft and Design*, Thames and Hudson, 1994. Dormer was here revisiting some of the ideas about skill put forward in his essay 'Beyond the dovetail: craft, skill and imagination', in C. Frayling (ed.), *Beyond the Dovetail: Craft, Skill and Imagination*, Crafts Council, 1991 (pages unnumbered), which in turn was based on 'Wishful thinking: a thesis on skill and the studio crafts', Dormer's PhD Thesis, Royal College of Art, London, 1992.
 - 45 P. Bourdieu, 'Introduction', *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. R. Nice, Routledge Kegan Paul, 1986 (originally published by Les Éditions de Minuit, 1979), pp. 4–5. See also P. Burger, 'On the problem of the autonomy of art in bourgeois society', in *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, trans. M. Shaw, University of Minnesota, 1984.
 - 46 M. Butcher, 'Eel-traps without eels', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 10, no. 4, 1997, pp. 417–29. David Drew has gained considerable recognition as a basket weaver, exemplified not least by his solo retrospective exhibition *David Drew: Baskets* at the Crafts Council Gallery, London, 1986.
 - 47 A related discussion is developed by B. Metcalf, in 'Craft and art, culture and biology', in P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*, pp. 67–82.
 - 48 J. Baudrillard, *The System of Objects*, trans. J. Benedict, Verso, 1996 (first published as *Le Système des objets*, 1968), and *For A Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, trans. C. Levin, Telos Press, 1981.
 - 49 R. Hill, 'The eye of the beholder', p. 11.
 - 50 M. Wainwright, 'Home Sweet Hone: While Antony Gormley was sculpting the giant Angel of the North, his brother John was carving out his own niche down the road in Thirsk, heart of British woodworking', *The Guardian Weekend*, 11 July 1998, pp. 52–5.
 - 51 On the historiography of craft, see N. C. M. Brown, 'Theorising the crafts: new tricks of the trades', in S. Rowley (ed.), *Craft and Contemporary Theory*, Allen & Unwin, 1997, and R. Hill, 'Writing about the studio crafts', in P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*. See also E. de Waal, 'Making time for critical reflection', *Maker's News*, no. 18, Winter 2000, p. 1, and A. Britton, 'The manipulation of skill on the outer limits of function', in Frayling (ed.), *Beyond the Dovetail*, 1991 (n.p.). Attempts to record the crafts—literally—include the National Electronic and Video Archive of the Crafts (NEVAC), hosted by the Faculty of Art, Media and Design, the University of the West of England, Bristol, and oral history audio recordings undertaken by the National Life Story Collection held at The British Library Sound Archive. See *The Crafts*, special issue of *Oral History: Journal of the Oral History Society*, vol. 18, no. 2, 1990; with thanks to Melanie Unwin for bringing this to my attention. See also P. Dormer, T. Harrod, R. Hill & B. Roscoe, *Arts and Crafts to Avant-Garde: Essays on the Crafts from 1880 to the Present*, South Bank Centre, 1992, published to accompany the exhibition *Arts & Crafts to Avant-Garde*, Royal Festival Hall, 1–31 May 1992.
 - 52 Recent moves within the discipline to address issues of 'visual culture' include J. A. Walker & S. Chaplin, *Visual Culture: An Introduction*, Manchester University Press, 1997.
 - 53 L. Sandino, 'Crafts for Crafts' Sake' (forthcoming).
 - 54 P. Fuller, *Images of God* (section 'Arts and Crafts'), 1990; P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*; Dormer, *The Art of the Maker*, T. Harrod (ed.), *Obscure Objects of Desire*; C. Frayling &

- H. Snowdon, 'Perspectives on Craft', in J. Houston (ed.), *Craft Classics since the 1940s*, Crafts Council, 1988; *2D/3D Art & Craft Made and Designed for the 20C*, Ceolfirth Press, 1987.
- 55 Exhibitions at the Crafts Council exploring the definition of craft practice(s) include *The Maker's Eye*, 1981; *Jewellery Rede-fined*, 1982; *The New Sprit in Craft and Design*, 1986, and *Objects of Our Time*, 1997. Exhibitions exploring the cultural relevance of craft include *Recycling*, 1996; *No Picnic*, 1998; *30/30 Vision: Creative Journeys in Contemporary Craft*, 2003. *Craft*, Richard Salmon Gallery/Kettle's Yard, London/Cambridge 1997/98 explored fine art's turn to craft.
- 56 Two exhibitions represent this shift: *The Craftsman's Art* (1973) held at the V&A, and *Industry of One: Designer-Makers in Britain 1981–2001* (2001) held at the Crafts Council.
- 57 Discussions of gender and status in design, craft and art are offered in L. Nochlin, 'Why have there been no great women artists?', in T. Hess & E. Baker (eds.), *Art and Sexual Politics*, Collier MacMillan, 1971, reprinted in 'Women, Art and Power' and *Other Essays*, Thames and Hudson, 1991, pp. 145–78. See also (in the same volume), 'Women, art, and power', pp. 1–36; A. Callen, *Angel in the Studio: Women in the Arts and Crafts Movement, 1870–1914*, Astragal Books, 1979; R. Parker & G. Pollock, 'Crafty women and the hierarchy of the arts', in *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology*, Pandora, 1981, pp. 50–81; C. Buckley, 'Made in patriarchy', *Design Issues*, vol. 3, no. 2, Fall 1986, reproduced in V. Margolin (ed.), *Design Discourse*, pp. 251–62; G. Elinor (ed.), *Women and Craft*, Virago, 1987; L. McQuiston, *Women in Design: A Contemporary View*, Trefoil, 1988; J. Attfield, 'FORM/female FOLLOWS FUNCTION/male: Feminist Critiques of Design', in J. A. Walker (ed.), *Design History and the History of Design*, Pluto, 1989, pp. 199–225; J. Attfield & P. Kirkham (eds.), *A View from the Interior: Feminism, Women and Design*, Women's Press, 1989; C. Buckley, *Potters and Paintresses: Women Designers in the Pottery Industry 1870–1955*, The Women's Press, 1990; J. Seddon & S. Worden, *Women Designing: Redefining Design in Britain Between the Wars*, University of Brighton, 1994; P. Sparke, *As Long as Its Pink: The Sexual Politics of Taste*, Pandora, 1995; P. Kirkham (ed.), *The Gendered Object*, Manchester University Press, 1996; V. De Grazia (ed.), *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective*, University of California Press, 1996; J. Rothschild (ed.), *Design and Feminism: Re-Visioning Spaces, Places and Everyday Things*, Rutgers University Press, 1999; F. Carson & C. Pajackowska (eds.), *Feminist Visual Culture*, Edinburgh University Press, 2000.
- 58 Parker & Pollock, 'Crafty women', pp. 50–81.
- 59 'It's not all looms and sad crochet: Yes, craftwork has changed. Forget the village hall and try Sotheby's. (Just don't ask for knitted teacosies)', *Observer Life*, 25 January 1998, p. 27. This notice for the *Contemporary Decorative Arts* selling exhibition at Sotheby's and the *Futures: Decorative Arts Today* sale at Bonhams invoked derogatory stereotypes of craft in order to efface them. Janice Blackburn is quoted as saying 'We just need to find a new way of describing it.'
- 60 See H. Cunliffe-Charlesworth, 'The RCA: its influence on education and design 1900–1950', PhD thesis, Royal College of Art, 1991, and by the same author, 'The Royal College of Art', in J. Seddon & S. Worden (eds.), *Women Designing: Redefining Design in Britain between the Wars*, University of Brighton, 1994, pp. 10–15. It is relevant here to note that the readership of *Crafts* magazine is overwhelmingly female, with a 1999 *Crafts* readership survey noting that of its readers, 81% were female and 59% were makers. Interestingly, when readers were asked to identify their interests, 56% cited textiles, 47% ceramics and 45% jewellery, in contrast to only 28% of readers who admitted interest in metalwork, 29% interested in furniture and 30% interested in wood: 'Summary of *Crafts* 1999 Readership Survey', unpublished *Crafts* magazine document circulated to advertisers.
- 61 P. Kirkham, 'Humanizing Modernism: The crafts, "functioning decoration" and the Eameses', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1998, pp. 15–29, and *Charles and Ray Eames: Designers of the Twentieth Century*, MIT Press, 1995. Kirkham is developing work on another creative partnership: Saul and Elaine Bass. See also P. Sparke, *As Long As It's Pink*.
- 62 P. Greenhalgh, *Persistence of Craft*, p. 195.
- 63 Examples of such parallels are: T. Gronberg, *Designs on Modernity: Exhibiting the City in 1920s Paris*, Manchester University Press, 1998; C. Reed (ed.), *Not At Home: The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture*, Thames & Hudson, 1996; V. de Grazia with E. Furlough (eds.), *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective*, University of California, Berkeley, 1996; C. Painter (ed.), *Contemporary Art and the Home*, Berg, 2003.
- 64 J. Stair (ed.), *Body Politic: The Role of the Body and Contemporary Craft*, Crafts Council, 2000.
- 65 E. Lucie-Smith, *The Story of Craft: The Craftsman's Role in Society*, Phaidon, 1981; E. Gombrich, *The Story of Art*, Phaidon, 1949; P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*; C. Breward, *The Culture of Fashion: A New History of Fashionable Dress*, Manchester University Press, 1995; M. Coats (ed.), *Pioneers of Modern Craft*, Manchester University Press, 1997; N. Pevsner, *Pioneers of Modern Design from William Morris to Walter Gropius*, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1949, second edition (first published as *Pioneers of the Modern Movement from William Morris to Walter Gropius*, Faber & Faber, 1936). In the case of *The Story of Craft* and *The Culture of Craft*, the titular similarity may derive from a publishing strategy that sought to replicate the success of an initial title with another on the same model for an associated field.
- 66 Georgio Vasari, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti architetti, pittori, et scultori italiani* ('The Lives of the Most Eminent Italian Architects, Painters and Sculptors'; known as *The Lives of the Artists*), 1550, revised and extended for a second edition in 1568, according to I. Chilvers & H. Osborne (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Art*, Oxford University Press, 1997; P. Greenhalgh, 'General Editor's Foreword', in Coats (ed.), *Pioneers of Modern Craft*, p. xi.
- 67 'Introduction', in S. Rowley (ed.), *Craft and Contemporary Theory*, Allen & Unwin, 1997, p. xxvi.
- 68 P. Dormer (ed.), *The Culture of Craft*, p. 186.
- 69 In publishing the proceedings of the conference which she had convened as the second University of East Anglia Fellow in the Critical Appreciation of the Crafts and Design, Tanya Harrod followed her predecessor Peter Dormer, who produced *The Culture of Craft: Status and Future* during his fellowship. Subsequent Fellows have included Pamela Johnson, who edited papers presented at a seminar 'Ideas in the Making: Practice in Theory' (Crafts Council, 1998), and Julian Stair, who edited the *Body Politic* anthology during his tenure (Crafts Council, 2000) at the University of Northumbria at Newcastle.
- 70 Another example of a method which focuses on an instance of interplay between several related factors is outlined by Ruth Schwartz Cowan in her chapter 'The consumption junction: a

- proposal for research strategies in the sociology of technology', in W. W. Bijker, T. P. Hughes & T. Pinch (eds.), *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*, MIT Press, (1987) 1993, pp. 261–80. Cowan's admirable explanation of the consumption junction (the moment in which a consumer makes a decision between a network of interrelated factors that effect purchase) is supported by communication of visual and spatial relationships between network factors described diagrammatically.
- 71 E. Cumming, 'Patterns of life: the art and design of Phoebe Anna Traquair and Mary Seton Watts', in B. Elliot & J. Helland (eds.), *Women Artists and the Decorative Arts, 1880–1935: The Gender of Ornament*, Ashgate, 2002, pp. 15–34 (pp. 16, 25).
- 72 See, for example, R. Faulkner, *Japanese Studio Crafts: Tradition and the Avant-Garde*, Lawrence King, 1995, to accompany an exhibition at the Victoria & Albert Museum, May–September 1995, and B. Winther-Tamaki, 'Yagi Kazuo: The admission of the nonfunctional object into the Japanese pottery world', *Journal of Design History*, vol. 12, no. 2, 1999, pp. 123–41; *Handmade in India: Crafts in Transition*, exhibition curated by B. Page and L. Taylor, Crafts Council, 1998; L. D. Sciama & J. B. Eicher (eds.), *Beads and Beadmakers: Gender, Material Culture and Meaning*, Berg, 1998. The need to address the global coverage of discourses about art, design and craft is exemplified by the GLAADH project (Globalising Art, Architecture and Design History), hosted by the University of Sussex and the Open University and the Fund for Development in Teaching and Learning. The web-based resources available at <<http://www.glaadh.ac.uk/about.htm>> offer a record of the work GLAADH achieved during its three-year lifespan (2001–2003).
- 73 M. Vincentelli, review of M. Chibnik, *Crafting Tradition: The Making and Marketing of Oaxacan Wood Carvings*, University of Texas Press, 2003, *Journal of Design History*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 300–2; see also Moira Vincentelli's *Women Potters: Transforming Traditions*, A&C Black, 2003.
- 74 See the following articles, all in the *Journal of Design History*, vol. 10, no. 4, 1997: Y. Kikuchi, 'Hybridity and the oriental orientalism of Mingei theory' (pp. 343–54); E. De Waal, 'Homo Orientalis: Bernard Leach and the image of the Japanese craftsman' (pp. 355–62); P. L. Baker, 'Twentieth-century myth-making: Persian tribal rugs' (pp. 363–74).
- 75 T. Harrod, *The Crafts in Britain in the Twentieth Century*, Yale University Press, 1999; T. Harrod (ed.), *Craft, Modernism and Modernity*, special issue of *Journal of Design History*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1998.

