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TASARIM TARIH YAZIMININ ARAŞTIRILMASI: TASARIMIN TARIHİNIN YAZIMI

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada hedef, tasarım tarihinin konusu, ve kendine konu olarak seçtiği nesneleri ve bu konuları çalışırken kullandığı yöntem ve yaklaşımları ‘tasarım tarih yazımı’ çerçevesinde, incelemekti.


İkinci bölümde çalışmanın içeriği ve çalışma boyunca kullanılan literatür karşılaşturma metodu açıklanmıştır. Çalışma, Tasarım Tarihi metinlerinin bir kısmını, Walker’ın belirttiği 4. söylem seviyesinden, yanı meta-meta-meta-söyleşem olan Tasarım Tarih Yazımı çerçevesinde incelemiştir.

Üçüncü bölümde Tasarım Tarihinin konusu ve sınırları üzerinde durulmuştur. Tasarım Tarihinin bir disiplin olup olmadığını ve sınırlarının tartışıldığı bir ortamda, öncelikle bazı tasarım tanımları incelenmiş ve birbirleriyle karşılaştırmıştır. Tasarım Tarihinin konusunun, üzerinde çalıştığı nesnelerin ve benimsediği yöntemler, tarihi tarafindan benimsenen tanım doğrultusunda değişiklikler gösterdiği vurgulanmıştır.


Beşinci bölümde Tasarım Tarihindeki mevcut ya da gelecekte faydali olabilecek yaklaşımlar ve metodlar ele alınmıştır. Bu yaklaşımlar genellikle disiplinler arası çalışmanın gerekliğinden doğmuşlardır ve Tasarım Tarihine özgün yöntemler içerdikleri söylenemez. Üretim yöntemleri ve malzeme ile ilgili çalışmalar, karşılaştırmacı yaklaşımlar, tipolojik Yaklaşım, ulusal Tarih yaklaşımları, antropolojik yaklaşımlar, tasarımin ve cinsiyet üzerine çalışan yaklaşımlar ve genel tarih yazımındaki yaklaşımlar incelenen başlica konulardır.

Sonuç bölümünde ise tasarım tarihinin neden disiplinler arası bir çalışma olmak durumunda olduğu ve bir disiplin olarak varolabilmesi için kendi çalışma yöntemlerini de ortaya koyması gerektiğini tartışmıştır.
RESEARCH FOR A DESIGN HISTORIOGRAPHY: WRITING THE HISTORY OF DESIGN

SUMMARY

The goal of the study was to examine the subject matter of Design History, its objects and the methods and approaches used while studying these objects, in the realm of Design Historiography.

In the first chapter, which is the introduction, the commencement of Design History as an area of study, and how it emerged is explained. The distinction between ‘Design History’ and ‘the history of design’, which is ‘being written’ and ‘having happened/existed’ respectively, is emphasized.

In the second chapter, the content and the adopted method, which is the comparison of literature, is explained. The study, by examining a part of the writings by design historians, can be accepted to be at the fourth level of design discourse, which is Design Historiography as Walker put it.

The third chapter examines the subject matter and the boundaries of Design History. Definitions of design needed to be discussed and compared with each other, in media where the disciplinary status of Design history is being discussed, since, the definition of design adopted by the historian is effective on the subject matter of Design History, the objects, methods and the approaches embraced.

In the fourth chapter, the objects of design history as pointed out by scholars studying on design historiography; Walker, Dilnot and Fry are explained and exemplified with texts. The negative and positive aspects of taking them as the object of historical study of design is discussed under the titles: Designers, designed objects, company histories, design institutions, exhibitions, styles, consumers and use.

In The fifth chapter, the methods and approaches which are either already present or are convenient to be used in Design History are examined. These approaches are mostly the result of the necessity of interdisciplinary studies in writing the history of design, and are not peculiar to Design History. The approaches are studied under the following titles: Production techniques and materials approach, the comparative approach, typological approach, national histories of design, canonization and connoisseurship, periodization of time and chronology, the structuralist, semiotic and semantic approaches to design, design history and gender, cultural anthropology and design history and new approaches in historiography.

The conclusion points out the reason why Design History has to be interdisciplinary and the necessity of developing peculiar methods of its own, in order to stand as an independent discipline of study.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction and the Aim of the Study

The goal of this study is first to figure out the realm of existing Design History, to point out the approach to the interdisciplinary studies in writing the history of design, and to examine the future realm of Design History by studying its relationship to general history and historiography.

It is important at the outset to state out what is meant by 'Design History' and to distinguish between 'design history' and the 'history of design'. Both Dilnot and Walker need to emphasize the distinction between these concepts. Dilnot (1984a) claims that the history of design should not be confused with its present institutional and academic form. Design History: the latter by no means encompasses all of what the former might eventually become. Walker (1989), in his significant book 'Design History and the History of Design' states that Design History shall be the name of a comparatively new intellectual discipline, the purpose of which is to explain design as a social and historical phenomenon and continues that 'the history of design' refers to the object of study of the discipline design history.

Conway (1987), in her 'Design History: a Students' Handbook', claims that the core of the discipline of design history concerns the search to understand particular designs in the context of the period in which they were produced. Conway's book aims to provide an introduction to the study of design history, which can be used by students in colleges, polytechnics and universities. Dress and Textiles, Ceramics, Furniture, Interior Design, Industrial Design, Graphic Design and Environmental Design are the main chapters of the book and it is also stated that such subdivisions are in many ways artificial because the basic tools necessary to any historical study on design have many points in common. Anyhow, the chapters of the book are a clue in depicting the realm of Design History, as generally accepted.

In the glossary of concepts of 'Art History and its Methods' edited by Fernie (1995), Design History is defined as:

'the study of industrially produced objects or the conditions of manufacture of any object, concentrating on the visual aspects of the subject and using the tools and methods of the history of art. Design historians consequently have a broad interest in material culture, craft
and the applied arts, which relates them to archaeologists and architectural historians on the one hand, through their interest in function, to sociologists on the other. In these terms a washing machine and the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel can be considered as members of the same class of objects. Thus far attention has on the whole been concentrated on objects produced since the Industrial Revolution, but the sphere of interest is now expanding to include all aspects of design regardless of date.

This definition puts the object of design history as the industrially produced objects and the conditions of manufacturing them which seems rather narrow when compared to the objects of Design History. Another important point is that the methods of Design History is said to be the methods of Art History, which is somehow true for the early texts but not valid for today, since Design History has been shifting into an interdisciplinary area of study as it is also claimed in the definition above which makes it contradictory in itself.

Making definitions of design in the beginning of any book on design and its history is much more preferred than of defining what Design History is. The content and the approach of the history written, change according to the definition of design accepted by the author. Since there is not a single, complete, homogeneous definition of design upon which is agreed, there have always been multiple histories, various design histories. These histories are the output of Design History. Today, many people encounter Design History in different places: students experience Design History as the main subject of a degree course, or as part of practical design or humanities courses, or as master and doctoral program, any kind of scholar involved in design come upon Design History by the nature of their profession. In each encounter various histories of design serve to various needs and inquiries, which makes this pluralistic approach attractive. Margolin (1992), claims that to think of Design History as a discipline based on firm assumptions of what design is and how we might study its past is to ignore the dynamic crossings of intellectual boundaries that are occurring elsewhere. For example, researchers outside Design History have discovered design to be a rich topic of historical investigation and among design history's early scholarly activities, some of the best have come from scholars in other fields such as art history, American Studies, and history itself.

In this study, the history of design is mostly examined through texts on industrial design. It is important to admit that there has been confusion on the extents of Design History. But this confusion can be clearly solved when the fluctuation of terms associated with design in official language is examined as MacCarthy (1979), Woodham (1997) and Balcioğlu (1999) did. The table below summarizes the shift of
terms by pointing out the foundation names and is a summary of the list assembled in detail by Balcioğlu (1999):

Table 1.1. The shift of terms in the name of design foundations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Design and Industries Association founded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>British Institute of Industrial Art founded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Society of Industrial Artists founded (SIA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>National Register of Industrial Art Designers formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Central Institute of Art and Design formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Council of Industrial Design formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Society of Industrial Artists was renamed: Society of Industrial Artists and Designers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Council of Industrial Design was renamed: Design Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Society of Industrial Artists and Designers (SIA) was renamed: Chartered Society of Designers (CSD).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balcioğlu (1999) asserts that the substitution of terms appears to be a sign of a switch from a specific and limited context to a wider spectrum. He states that although there are departments, articles, books etc. bearing the title of Industrial Design; unless there is a special emphasis like product design, textile design and so on, it is common to employ the term design and use it in order to enjoy the comfort of its vast and flexible content. The same case is valid for Design History regardless of the sub-divisions. The bulk of this study is concentrated on the examination of Industrial Design History and the term Design History is employed throughout the text.

Seeking for the commencement of Design History is not easy as Balcioğlu (1999) puts it:

'When the Design History began is not an easy question to respond to. Some early writings, texts and books have definitely included historical material, research and an understanding. For instance the "Wheelwrights Shop" by George Sturt, 1923 is one of those highly acknowledged. There are, no doubt, a few more works bearing traces of historical research and perspectives encompassing Pevaner, Read, Bertram, Banham, Gloag, etc.'
Balcioglu (1999) asserts that what it is to be of concern is not the individual efforts but a formation of continuing debate directing to the rise of Design History consciousness and its institutionalization.

The story of Design History varies from country to country. Design History as an independent area of study first came to fore in Britain. J. Walker (1989), states that Britain has more design historians than any other country and the subject is, therefore, mostly highly developed there. There have been two important determinants paving the way for the ascent of Design History in the UK: historical conditions, which were mature in the 1960s and the government policy of supporting design in general (Balcioglu, 1999). Design History as an academic subject received a strong impetus in Britain in the early 1970s as the result of a Ministry of Education report that mandated all studio-training programs in polytechnics to have historical components. This was the case for art, crafts, film and photography as well as design. Teachers of design history were drafted from other fields such as the history of art. These courses established an initial narrative for the field; particularly as course topics were translated into (Margolin, 1992). According to Balcioglu (1999), Design History has matured gradually and steadily since the beginning of the 19th Century, and the ‘institutionalization’ process started in the 1960s. Within this context, the way Balcioglu (1999) examines the last four decades can be schematized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Institutionalization of Design History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Academic debate towards institutionalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Early works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Works developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Works flourished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An international community of design historians began to come together with the establishment of the Design History Society in 1977, along with the series of conferences it has organized over the years, its newsletter, and then its journal. Today Design History Society has members from all over the world and also supports activities that take place out of Britain. Its journal 'Journal of Design
History' welcomes contributions from scholars of all nationalities as claimed in their editorial policy.

The recent developments in design practice and theory has its reflections on Design History. In the last decade of the 20th Century, the subject matter, objects and aims of Design History had to come under scrutiny with the changing situation of what design is. There had been disagreements regarding many important matters: the proper subject matter and the most fertile and productive methods of Design History, the role of design history in contributing to education and design practice, the actual contribution of history to other historical investigations of the human-made, and the appropriate audience for Design History. These disagreements also led to the debate between the incipient field of "Design Studies" and the established discipline of "Design History" in 1990s between key names like Margolin, Forty, Woodham, Whiteley and Doordan, which seem to have slowed down (see. Design Issues, vol.11 No.1, 1995).

One of the goals of this study is to investigate the negotiation on what Design History is not. As stated by Margolin (1992), design history could not only be the study of the historical location of a fixed class of things that are stabilized in categories such as industrially produced objects. Not only Design History but also any forms of history like art history once have faced the same problem of subject matter and approaches. Because that design history is relatively a young discipline and the first design historians were also the art historians, the methods and concepts in writing design history were driven from the methods and concepts of art history. So, many weaknesses of design history were explained as the weaknesses of art history which does not seem to be fair. As well as art history, all histories once have faced the same problems which is also discussed in this study.

Another goal of this study is to examine the need for interdisciplinary study in historical studies on design. Today it is obvious that any historical study including Design History and art history cannot stay far away from the critical theories in many other fields and disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, archaeology, philosophy, gender studies and cultural studies.

Last of all, this study seeks the relations between Design History and History in general, essentially focusing on the new historiographical discourses. To figure out the relation has been an objective in this study, but constructing a structure to study Design History in terms of the new historiographical developments may be a concern for another study.
2. **METHOD OF THE STUDY**

2.1. **Content and the Method of the Study**

In this study, the third level of discourse in Design History —meta-meta discourse of writings by design historians about levels one and two— has been examined which is to include this study, to the fourth level of discourse: meta-meta-meta discourse of writings about the writing of histories of design as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. The Various Levels of Discourse (Walker, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Discourse Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Meta-meta-meta-discourse of writings about the writing of histories of design</td>
<td>Design Historiography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meta-meta-discourse of writings by design historians about levels one and two</td>
<td>Histories of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meta-discourse of writings and images about design</td>
<td>Journalism about design, advertisements, consumer reports, trade magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The discourse of design</td>
<td>Designed goods, concepts, methods and theories used by designers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the methods employed throughout the study is comparison: As the definition of 'design' has been a changing issue, so has been the subject matter of Design History. Through examining and comparing definitions of design, which belong to
different decades, the subject matter of Design History has been tried to summarized

The objects of design history are investigated using either what is taken as the canonical texts in the field or texts that characterizes the object aptly. A related book or an article on the subject supports the object of study when necessary. The canonical status of these texts comes from their popular character and their significance in their approach to writing design history. Most of them are telling works that are being reference in many articles on the historiography of Design History.

Different approaches to Design History are studied by examining and comparing texts between each other belonging to different categories. Some of these texts are the same ones that are used in the previous part in order to point out that design history varies not only by its objects but also according to the approach which object is taken into account.

The problems faced in this study were not much different from any of the studies of this kind. The most difficult problem was to reach the necessary texts on the historiography of design, since the libraries, to which access has been gained, were endowed with Design History books but not historiographic studies. Another problem was about reaching the periodicals on the history of design, such as 'Block', 'Design Issues' and 'Journal of Design History', which contained crucial articles about the whole subject of the study.
3. SUBJECT OF DESIGN HISTORY

3.1. Subject Matter of Design History

An agreed upon definition of subject matter of design history has not been defined as explained by Balçin (1999). It is crucial to grasp the subject matter of Design History in the movement toward creating a discipline of the history of design. The lack of an agreed upon subject matter is not surprising since ‘design’ has acquired several different, often contradictory, meanings and associations because of its refraction through the still incompletely charted and understood industrial, economic, and cultural developments of the past two hundred years (Dilnot, 1984b).

Dilnot (1984a) claimed that it was difficult to survey or define design history and the new design history was formed around for principles and four related absences. The principles are as follows:

- Design history is the study of the history of professional design activity.
- It is not the activity itself that forms the first layer of attention of historians, but the results of that activity: designed objects and images. (This emphasis is justified on a number of aesthetic and archeological grounds, as well as on the premise that design is a practical activity that results in a new thing or image.)
- An equally natural orientation was added to design in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
- Design history emphasizes individual designers. Explicitly or implicitly, they are the focus of the majority of design history written and taught today.

Dilnot (1984a) points out that the absences, by contrast, are less specific, but equally present in the way the discipline operates:

- There is little explicit considerations of aims, methods, or roles of design history in relation to its actual or potential audiences.
- There is little consideration of design history’s origins, except in an educational and institutional sense.
- There is a lack of historical, methodological, or critical self-reflection. Whereas self-reflection might at the very least engender clear statements of position or clarification of aims, the ad hoc nature of most design history means that it is very difficult to define social, theoretical, or methodological presuppositions. This not to say they do not exist.

After about ten years from Dilnot’s seminal articles ‘The State of Design History, Part I: Mapping the Field’ and ‘The State of Design History, Part II: Problems and
Possibilities', in the introduction of a special issue of Design Issues that collected the articles on the subject matter of Design History in 1995, Buchanan, Margolin and Doordan stated out the fundamental issues in Telling the History of Design as follows:

- What is the subject matter of the history of design _ what aspect of design should be the focus of attention in a history?
- What are the important facts about that subject?
- What connections among the facts make an account reasonable and convincing?
- What purposes are served in providing a historical account of the subject, particularly for a discipline and related professions that are primarily oriented toward present and future action?
  - For whom are histories of design are written?
  - Whose interest do they serve?

When these two statements are compared, it is possible to see that in that ten years time design history was not able to gain its agreed upon subject matter. Dilnot (1984a) did not explain why he was pointing on 'new design history' and what was the difference between the new and the old one. Ten years after, the problematic of design history was still blurred. Balcoğlu (1999) portrays the reason for this problematic:

'Although the documentation and literature for manufactured objects is impressive, the Design History appears to have had a considerable struggle with the definition of its subject matter as well as suffering from the lack of an original way of dealing with it in its early years. Designing, mass production, marketing, dissemination, use, recycling, disposal and life span of objects require a different understanding and concept of history, which is not something that builds easily.'

3.2. The Need to Define Design

Designing is an activity that is constantly changing and this process of change might be the reason of this pluralistic approach to Design History. As Dilnot (1984b) claims, the ambiguity [of the definitions of design] manifests itself in a number of ways: 'the different meanings of the word design, themselves reflecting the development of different specialist design activities within industrial societies, have given rise to a considerable range of design histories'.

The word "design", has altered its meaning through time:

"During the Renaissance 'disegno' (which in practice meant drawing) was considered by art theorists such as Vasari to be the basis of all the visual arts; consequently these were often referred to as 'the arts of design'. At that time disegno was an inventive, conceptualizing
phase, which generally preceded the making of paintings, sculptures and so forth. All artists engaged in design as part of their creative activities, hence design was not yet considered the exclusive concern of a full-time professional. Designers as such only emerged later as a result of the growing specialization of functions which occurred in Europe and the United States as part of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. At least this is the accepted story." (Walker, 1989).

Today any kind of design activity cannot be restricted to the 'disegno' of Renaissance. The term design and the activity itself had been constantly changing since then in various ways. It is clear that any comprehensive history of design ought to include a history of the evolution of the concept 'design' (Walker, 1989). It seems that design historians agree that their object of study is the history of design, but there is not yet a consensus concerning the meaning and scope of the term/concept 'design'. As Balcioğlu (1999) points out, many researchers would agree that a clear definition of design would be the greatest help for design historians. It is certain that the boundary line of any discipline is fuzzy rather than sharp and that it overlaps the circles of several other disciplines, but defining the subject matter is an important issue. It can be said that the subject matter differs according to the definition of design accepted by the design historian. Many texts on design history include a definition of design. They make the assumption that the theoretical problems of specifying the discipline's object of study can be solved in this way. So the histories based on these definitions do/may have the same strengths and weaknesses of the definition that they are based on. Below is a list of definitions of 'design' existing in the nomenclature of the 20th century.

Bertram (1938) defines design as follows:

'...the very word design is a mystery to the common man, almost a clique-word. As it is used today, it implies a whole cluster of things connected with an object: its purpose and the plan of it, the object itself, its quality, material, usefulness and beauty; even the price and method of manufacture of it. Moreover it is a relative word. Though there are general principles of design, we can only judge whether any particular object is well or badly designed in relation the particular problem it tries to solve.'

In this definition Bertram points out that design is a relative word. The definition does not include anyone having design as a profession but relates design to many levels that design takes place.

Mercer (1947) defines industrial designer as a technical specialist in visual appeal:

'Industrial designer is retained by a manufacturer with one object only: to increase the demand for his products through their increased attractiveness to the consumer. The manufacturer pays him according to his success in achieving that object. The industrial designer stands or falls upon his ability to create and maintain profitable trade. He is first and
foremost an industrial technician and not primarily an educator of public taste. Under existing conditions his business must be to make profits for his employers.'

According to this definition, designers are employees who sell their mental labor-power to manufacturers. Design is limited to visual appearance and any issue on function is not cited. The employment of designers in public sector where the ethos is social rather than profit is ignored. Only men appear to be designers.

Simon (1968), a leading figure in the field of computer science, organizational development, and artificial intelligence, offered a definition of design in 1968, that has since been widely quoted:

'Everyone designs who devises courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones. The intellectual activity that produces material artifacts is no different fundamentally from the one that prescribes remedies for a sick patient or the one that devices a new sales plan for a company or a social welfare policy for a state. Design, so construed, is the core of all professional training: it is the principal mark that distinguishes the professions from the sciences.'

Mayall (1979) claims that design conceives and defines all the means we employ to satisfy our many and increasingly intricate needs and continues:

'It covers our cities, factories, hospitals, schools and houses, together with all those products we use within them. It embraces the complex system that provides us with energy and materials. It spans the ways in which we transport ourselves on land, sea and in the air. It stretches over our other means of communication, whether by speech, writing or illustration. It includes the instruments we use to discover more about our universe and ourselves. It extends to the artifacts we have developed to help us express our thoughts and emotions in the field of literature, art, music, and drama.'

Heskett (1980) defines industrial design as follows:

'Industrial design is a process of creation, invention and definition separated from the means of production, involving an eventual synthesis of contributory and often conflicting factors into a concept of three dimensional form, and its material reality, capable of multiple reproduction by mechanical means. It is distinctively linked to the development of industrialization and mechanization that began with the Industrial Revolution around 1770.'

The advent of design in this definition is located both historically and geographically. It is differentiated from craft production. The role of the consumer or the market in influencing the design process is not mentioned. The design process seems to be as an impersonal process since designers are not mentioned. Two-dimensional products such as advertisement are excluded.

Bayley (1982), defines industrial design as: 'Industrial design is what occurs when art meets industry, when people begin to make decisions about what mass-produced products should look like.' This definition locates the origin of design with
the advent of industrialization and mass production methods and does not supply a
time or place for the union. Design in this definition, is limited to issues of visual
appearance and style and function and utility are not mentioned. The use of the
word ‘people’ is vague because it does not reveal who has the power to make
design decisions.

Buchanan (1985) considers design to be an architectonic art that can unify other,
more narrowly conceived arts and crafts:

‘Design is what all forms of production for use have in common. It provides the intelligence,
the thought or idea – of course, one of the meanings of the term design is a thought or plan –
that organizes all levels of production, whether in graphic design, engineering and industrial
design, architecture, or the largest integrated systems found in urban planning.’

Maldonado (1991) defines industrial design as the planning of objects fabricated
industrially, that is, by machine, and in series. Maldonado himself notes that this
definition is not satisfactory since it fails to distinguish between the activity of the
industrial and that which traditionally belonged to the engineer. He also finds
problems with past attempts to produce a single history of modern design and
concludes that ‘Strictly speaking, it is not a question of one history but of multiple
histories.’

Sparke (1986) point to the affluent definitions of design as follows:

‘Available definitions of design are varied, complex, contradictory and in a state of permanent
flux. Most would agree, that as a cultural concept design is determined by the outside forces
that have shaped it and by the contexts within which it has manifested itself, as well as by the
numerous faces it has presented to the world...One of a designer’s major tasks in whichever
field he specializes –be it electrical products, ceramics, glass, silver or engineering structures-
is to bestow form upon an otherwise formless material or set of materials. Whether the
intention is to facilitate production or to seduce the consumer through visual sophistication,
the process of form-giving is a constant problem for the designer and has inspired many and
varied approaches through this and the last centuries.’

Buchanan and Margolin (1995) define design as the conception and planning of the
artificial, that broad domain of human made products which includes: material
objects, visual and verbal communications, organized activities and services, and
complex systems and environments for living, working, and learning. This definition
widens the subject of design that was restricted mostly to material products. It does
state the area of use of design: living, working, and learning but does not mention of
a certain professional.
The most effective attempt of ruining the idea of professionalization was of Papanek. His seminal book *Design for the Real World: Human Ecology and Social Change* (1972) begins with an embracing definition of design as follows:

‘All men are designers. All that we do, almost all the time, is design, for design is basic to all human activity. The planning and patterning of any act towards a desired, foreseeable end constitutes the design process ... Design is composing an epic poem, executing a mural, painting a masterpiece, writing a concerto. But design is also cleaning and reorganizing a desk drawer, pulling an impacted tooth, baking an apple-pie, choosing sides for a back-lot baseball game, and educating a child... Design is the conscious effort to impose meaning-full order.’

ICSID’s design definition:

‘Design is a creative activity whose aim is to establish the multi faceted qualities of objects, processes, services in whole life-cycles. Therefore, design is the central factor of innovative humanization of technologies and and the crucial factor of culture and economic exchange... Design concerns products, services and systems conceived with tools, organizations and logic introduced by industrialization – not just when produced by serial processes. The adjective “industrial” put to design must be related to the term industry or in its ancient meaning of “industrious activity”.

Fry (1988), claims that neither is it possible to fully define design by reference to:

- types of design occupations and divisions of mental labor – such as product design(er), graphic design(er), interior design(er);
- types of design objects (for instance, posters, packaging, product); or
- types of design processes (such as ergonomics, visualization, typography).

All of these observations add up to a rejection of reductivist definitions of design. Fry adds that rather than seeing design as any single object, or process, he regards it as an interactive set of variable relations between a multiplicity of objects, effects, operations and functions.

Walker (1989), maintains that among contemporary design historians the dominant definition of design is the modern one, that is, design as a specialist activity associated with the industrial revolution, mass production manufacture, the modern movement in architecture, and the consumer society which seems to be the mix of the definitions of Bayley, Heskett and Mercer. But the definition, by Margolin and Buchanan does not cite any historical events such as industrial revolution, and neither mentions any movements and ways of production. Their definition partially overlaps with the definition of design by Papanek and of by Simon, by stating out the conception and planning of the artificial domain of human made products is design.
Teymur (1981) declares that a permanent feature of design discourse has been its failure to theorize the multiple content of the term 'design'. 'Design' in general is as unhelpful a concept as 'life' in general or, indeed, 'production' in general. The concept of total design only adheres to the traditional notions of 'artistic' creation (whilst there is a world of difference between design activity and artistic activity), but by dumping whole sets of distinct activities and actions under one 'act' it obscures the immensely complex and varied division of labor at the basis of any productive activity.

Anyway to equate design solely with industrial design seems to be restrictive. The boundaries between design, art, craft, engineering and mass media are not clearly defined and some subjects, such as architecture, appear to overlap several realms. Architecture can involve art, engineering, craft methods and industrial production.

Margolin (1992) argues that design history has not developed on the basis of a well-understood subject matter or on a set of methods and principles to guide research. And he continues that design history has grown as a response to the initial literature in the field, first celebrating it then criticizing it. And gives the example of Pevsner’s, Pioneers of the Modern Design from William Morris to Walter Gropius 1960 (first published as Pioneers of the Modern Movement 1936):

“As an art historian, Pevsner sought to identify a distinctive quality of modernity in selected art, architecture and functional objects of his day. Pevsner infused his narrative with a high sense of morality. He was concerned with establishing firm grounds for aesthetic discrimination, an enterprise that he expanded from its source in connoisseurship to signify a sense of belongingness to one’s age. For Pevsner there were certain objects that were modern and others that were not. Pevsner's method is a very traditional one in German philosophy. He established a Kantian category for the sublime, which he equated with the style of the Modern Movement, and he then told the story of a quest to achieve it. The book ends in a triumph. Pevsner found the sublime in the work of Gropius and his fellow pioneers and by 1960 still believed that it embodied the true principles of design. It was Pevsner’s entanglement of morality with subject matter that still makes his book problematic. The agenda that underlies the book excludes most of what we would accept today as appropriate subject matter for design history. Not only did Pevsner establish strict geographic limits to investigation –its focus was Western Europe and Britain- but he also excluded all the objects of daily life used by ordinary people. For Pevsner, the study of design was an act of discrimination by which ordinary objects were separated from those which embodied an extraordinary quality.”

There have been efforts to broaden the subject matter of design history since Pevsner’s book was published. In England, Reyner Banham was one of the first to promote a fascination with popular culture, particularly that which originated in America. In this capacity he conveyed an enthusiasm, infused with critical
intelligence, for mass-produced objects as well as the diverse products of contemporary popular culture. So Banham gave young historians the confidence to explore the history of mass produced goods of all kinds. But Banham provided no principles for defining design as a subject with defensible boundaries (Margolin, 1992). What is of importance here is the books, which have commenced and leaded the debate on design historiography were not specially written as design histories as Renzio (1977) reproaches:

'Nearly all the books that have the word "design" in the title, like Pevsner's 'Pioneers of Modern Design' and 'Banham's Theory and Design in the First Machine Age' for all the immense value of this book, are marginal to the general history of design, and treat special or architectural aspects; others, like Anthony Bertram's admirable Penguin special 'Design' now a valuable document, or Herbert Read's 'Art and Industry' with its conceptually equivocal rhetoric, are not history.'

But as Balcoğlu (1999) points out it is also important to note that Renzio's opinion was rejected by Kinross (1988) eleven years after this statement, at least for Read's 'Art and Industry'. Anyway, Pevsner and Banham have been the key names to start main distinct kinds of history as named by Margolin (1992), 'Pevsnerian' and 'Banhamesque'.

Design History cannot be restricted to such definitions which are far away from dynamism, in contradiction with the nature of designing activity. The artificial as a category is not fixed but is changing rapidly as human invention is turned to phenomena that were once thought to be natural. To grasp the significance of new activities, the understanding design must be continually changing while its historical narrative is being established simultaneously (Margolin, 1992).

Margolin (1992) defines design studies versus design history as follows:

'the field of inquiry that addresses questions of how we make and use products in our daily lives and how we have done so in the past. These products comprise the domain of the artificial. Design studies encompass issues of product conception and planning, production, form, distribution, and use. It considers these topics in the present as well as in the past. Along with products, it also embraces the web of discourse in which production and use are embedded.'

Design History have relied on traditional categories of objects established by art history and decorative arts as powerful determinants of historical narrative because design history has not addressed the issue of subject matter boundaries. Design history has not developed a self-conscious process of questioning its subject matter and asking why the particular objects that constitute the bulk of historical research should be the primary one studied by the field (Margolin, 1992).
Margolin (1992), has also argued in the past that Design History has not been able to lay exclusive claim to things it does study because it has no distinctive methodology or methodologies that have grown from the unique experience of research in the field.

Walker (1989), claims that the agenda of Design History was set by the precedents established by art and architectural history, and, since art and architecture historians tended to construct their narratives around famous artists and masterpieces, many design historians followed suit. Hence, the assumption that the proper object of study of the discipline was either designers or designed objects, or a combination of the two.
4. OBJECTS OF DESIGN HISTORY

In this part of the study, examining books studying design historically, by concentrating on different objects, will be a tool to represent the objects of design history. The objects examined are a combination of the results derived from the studies of Fry (1988) and Walker (1989). According to Fry (1988), there are seven approaches to the historical study of design as follows:

- Connoisseurship,
- Canonization,
- The Object in Space,
- The Common Object,
- Design as Culture,
- Design and Gender,
- Design as Economy.

In this study, the approaches to design history and the objects of design history are examined under different titles since different approaches may have the same object of study. Fry includes some of the objects and some of the approaches both in the same categorization, whereas, Walker (1989) examines designers and designed goods as objects of design history, but also asks whether these were the proper objects of study. Walker (1989) has studied designers and designed goods under the titles:

- The Designer as the Object of Study,
- Anonymous Design,
- Auteur Theory,
- The Social Production of Design,
- Marketing the Designer,
- Designers as a Professional Group,
- Histories of Design Teams,
- Entrepreneurial and Company Histories,
- Designed Goods as the Object of Study,
- The Canon,
- Design Institutions as an Object of Study.
Walker studied these under different titles without pointing out the distinctions between each other and the principles of the classification system. He also claims that while design historians may agree that the central focus of their research is the designer, the design process and designed goods, other topics such as style, taste, the role of clients, management, marketing and consumers need to be investigated.

Here, while examining books studying design historically, by concentrating on different objects, a re-classification -of the titles set out both by Fry and Walker- is proposed as follows:

- The Designer- Histories of Great Individuals
  - Biographies/Monographs
  - Designers as a Professional Group
  - Histories of Design Teams
- Designed Objects
  - The Designs Without the Designer
  - The Objects With The Designer, Histories of Great Events
- Entrepreneurial and Company Histories
- The Design Process
- Design Institutions
- Design Fairs and Exhibitions
- Styles and Movements
- Consumers and Use

In this classification, the title ‘auteur theory’ is examined under the general title ‘the designer’. ‘The canon’ and ‘connoisseurship’, which both Fry and Walker included, is examined in the next chapter, not as an object of design history but rather as an approach to design history since both of them take the designer or the designed object as the object of study.

4.1. The Designer – Histories of Great Individuals

As referred to above, one of the four principles that design history is formed around, which was stated by Dilnot (1984,a), is that design history emphasizes individual designers, and explicitly or implicitly, they are the focus of the majority of design history written and taught today. There are a number of reasons for the situation. One reason is the paradigm inherited from art and architectural history that had the same method: to construct the narratives around famous artists and masterpieces. But this was also criticized by the art historians such as Hadjinicolaou (1978), as he
argued that the monographic approach to history writing entrenched two notions, both of which he rejected: first, the idea that individuals make history; and second, the idea that the history of art and design is the history of great artists and designers. So art historians themselves were also uncomfortable with the greatmen approach, which was long ago directly driven from 'history' in general. Not only art historians but also historians from every area of study once appreciated then criticized the so-called 'greatmen approach'. It is important to point out the rejection and the criticism of the 'greatmen approach' in art history and design history were not concomitant and also did not begin at the same time. For example, the greatmen approach may be said to start in the sixteenth century by Vasari's seminal text 'The Lives of the Artists' (1568), and being already rejected or criticized by the eighteenth century, whereas, design history in the 1935s was starting to use the greatmen approach: Pevsner's 'pioneers' of modern design in his text were the 'greatmen' that can be sited as the early greatmen in design history. Anyhow, 'the greatmen approach' is still a way of studying the history of art and design, but not the soul object of study. Therefore, the greatmen approach cannot be simply explained as Ashwin (1978) makes it: 'the history of design conceived as the history of 'pioneers' is, it is claimed, particularly attractive to the art historians because it allows him to account for the evolution of design in terms of the unique personal insights of individual designers, rather than in the more complex terms of technological change and socio-economic transformations'. Also Kubler (1962), criticizes this issue: 'The life of an artist is rightly a unit of study in any biographical series. But to make it the main unit of study in the history of art is like discussing the railroads of a country in terms of the experiences of a single traveler on several of them. To describe railroads accurately, we are obliged to disregard persons and states, for the railroads themselves are the elements of continuity, and not the travelers or the functionaries thereon.'

Another reason maintained, is that the designer seems to be the person wholly responsible for the form and style of a designed artifact, in other words its author. The 'authorship' is much more complicated in practice, since, large scale and highly industrialized forms of mass media and industrial design is object to different organizations, firms or social structures (Walker, 1989). Teymur (1981), asserts that even the proverbial 'gifted' individuals who are assumed to be 'creating' singular works of design have to have strong links with financial, ideological or professional apparatuses which would employ their services, and 'reward' and publicize their achievements. As Forty (1986) has pointed out, designers generally talk and write
only about what they do themselves, design has come to be regarded as belonging entirely within their realm, and, this misunderstanding has reappeared in innumerable books and in the coverage of design in the press and on television.

Even when a single person alone in a studio undertakes designing, it can be regarded as social for the following reasons (Walker, 1989):

- Most designers have the benefit of education/training in design and engineering colleges provided by society as a whole,
- Contemporary influences (few designers escape the influence of their peer group or current trends and fashions),
- The power of tradition and precedent (new design is always dependent to some degree upon the accumulated knowledge and achievements of previous generations),
- The social character of design 'languages', codes and styles (these are the product of groups and classes, they develop over many centuries),
- The dependence of the designer upon clients and consumers without whom any large-scale production would be impossible.

Taking the designer as the object of historical study of design has been criticized by some of the leading design historians. Fry (1988), says that it is not convenient to pile designers together, even as a loose fraternity. And he continues that neither should design be determined by or merely ascribed to the power of designers as agents. To do so is not to recognize that designers are located, usually with limited power, within particular social relations of production. Whereas Teymur (1981), claims that the majority of design theory and history teaching reproduce the myth of the individual by organizing the course around 'great' designers, movements and styles whilst largely ignoring the collective nature both of production and of the knowledge necessary for it.

Forty (1986), asserts:

'Much time and effort has been put into identifying often obscure people and researching their careers, although such knowledge adds relatively little to the significance of their designs. It seems odd that the biographies of individuals should be considered a satisfactory means of explaining an activity that is by nature social and not purely personal. The history of architecture and design is full of attempts to make sense of buildings and objects through the careers, ideas and theories of known designers, and the approach is to be found even in works that are not specifically biographies. For example, in Pioneers of Modern Design, which appeared in its revised form over thirty years ago, Pevser’s main purpose was to establish a historical pedigree for Modern Movement architecture and design. However, his method was based on the assumption that design could be understood satisfactorily by examining its
products with reference only to the careers and published statements of individual designers. It would be foolish to dismiss designer’s statements altogether, but we should not expect them to reveal all there is to know about design. After all, they themselves are not the cause of design having become such an important activity in modern society, and we should not assume that they hold any superior knowledge about the reasons for its importance.

Explaining the shaping of the designed world in which we live by reference, mainly to some charismatic individual designers is like explaining social change by reference to the life-styles of some ‘great’ leaders or politicians and this is an all-too-common mistake which design research can do without (Teymur, 1981). The further design research has gone into the intricacies of the design process, the further it has got away from the realities of the world in which these activities take place.

Till now, the critiques of historian’s and theoretician attempt in taking the object of study as the designer has been figured out. Most of them are to say that the object of Design History should not be the designer. What is of importance here, is studying designers has to be noted as ‘a unit in the historical study of design’, but is not the soul way of reconstruction in any kind of history.

4.1.1. Biographies and Monographs

A monograph is the study of the work of an individual, while a biography is an account of the life. Monograph and biography are extremely popular forms of presentation among art historians. Walker (1989) states that they are not quite so popular among design historians though there are, of course, many books and exhibition catalogues celebrating the achievements of such famous architects and designers as William Morris, Adolf Loos, Le Corbusier, Frank Lloyd Wright, Charles Rennie Mackintosh, Eileen Gray, Ettore Sottsass, Gordon Russel, Walter Gropius, Harley Earl, Terence Conran, Christian Dior, Mary Quant, and so on.

According to Walker (1989), writing monograph/biography is appealing to the historians since the subject matter is limited and sharply defined; the story has a clear beginning, middle and end; the hero or heroine serves as a fulcrum around which everything else revolves. But still an important problem remains to be faced concerning the relationship between the designer and the society of which he or she was a member. Texts recounting the story of design in terms of chronologically arranged summaries of the careers of individual designers can encompass longer spans of time but are similarly of limited value because they present mountain peaks without foothills.
Another reason for the insistence of the 'great designer' syndrome in the discourse of design is that the ideology of individualism and the conception of the artist remain potent in business and the mass media, amongst designers and consumers. There is no doubt that individuals do make unique contributions to design but the magnitude of this element is generally exaggerated out of all proportion as a result of the ideology of individualism. Designers are thus promoted as charismatic figures as a means of selling goods. Products are endowed with labels carrying the name of an individual 'author', which is the equivalent of the artist's signature on a series of canvases, even if the label is, in reality, a trademark, even if the products in question are the work of a team, a fashion house or a corporation (Walker, 1989). In fact there is a contradiction between the individualism and the mass produced products. Because many people drive the same type of car, wear the same type of clothes since they are produced in great numbers. People desire exclusivity incompatible with mass production and consumption. Manufacturers and designers negotiate this problem in various ways, one of which is designer-named goods. Texts on designers than become a tool for promoting designers.

4.1.2. Designers as Professional Groups

The existence of designers, as a particular occupational group is a consequence of the division of labor, and the specialization of function associated with the growth of human knowledge. Walker (1989) claims that the designer becomes the person where the power of planning and conception, which all humans possess, has been concentrated. One could say the designer has virtually monopolized this power and by so doing, has diminished the ability of the majority to influence the design of goods, services and environments as pointed out by Pacey (1992).

While there are sociological studies of artists and art students, comparable studies of designers as a social group have yet to be undertaken. One category of designers has attracted the interest of design historians, namely the consultant designer. There are a number of books written on this theme such as 'The Industrial Design Consultant' by Mercer (1947), 'Consultant Design: the History and the Practice of the Designer in Industry' by Sparke (1983), 'The Practical Idealists' by J. and A. Blake (1969).

4.1.3. Histories of Design Teams

As stated before, in the twentieth century, design has often been the result of a team effort rather than an individual achievement. Large industrial companies, predominantly motorcar manufacturers and consumer electronic companies, have
also established teams of designers. The problem with studying the design teams is
the issue of individual contributions to team projects: who did what? The chief
becomes the most known and the attributed, essentially, this is the respected skill of
connosseurship and art history: making correct attributions.

Sony Design Center' (1999) by Kunkel are examples of the recent studies on in-
house design teams. Both of the studies include many colorful products with the
designer names and their design stories, and at he end of the book, key individuals
of the company's industrial design.

4.1.4. Sampling on Designers as the Object of Study

chronologically and will be the one to be examined here as an example of collected
monographs, designer's as a professional group and the histories of design teams.
On the back cover of the book it is written as follows:

'Mass production in the 20th century has ensured that good design is available and affordable
to millions. The designer has achieved a celebrity status formerly associated with fine artists.
Charles Rennie Mackintosh, Eileen Gray, Le Corbusier, Philippe Starck - these are just some
of the names that epitomise 20th century design. Their creations, originally intended as
functional objects, have become desirable accessories and icons of style, and are now
celebrated as works of art in their own right.

A Century of Design is an invaluable overview for design students and style enthusiasts alike.
It explores the most important style movements of the last hundred years and traces their
development through profiles of the century's most influential designers. Each profile features
a designer's major works, outlines sources of inspiration and explains how his or her work has
in turn influenced other designers. A Century of Design is a celebration of the human
contribution to international design and its far-reaching effect on the everyday world around
us.'

In the front flap of the book it is asserted that the book is unique in providing a
designer by designer review within a historical context, revealing the connections
between designers and major design movements from around the world—from Art
Nouveaup to Postmodernism and beyond. Each chapter explains the background and
origins of the century's most important style movements, period by period. The most
influential internationally known designers of the 20th century are discussed, their
major works are featured and their sources of inspiration are outlined.

The introduction of the book informs that it is essentially a book about people that
are to be the greatmen as explained above and about things that would not exist,
and would certainly not look the way they do, if someone had not imagined them first—the authorship. Sparke (1998) continues:

'...We do not always realize that everything that surrounds us in our daily lives—from the knives and forks we use for breakfast, to the bus we take to work, the computer we use, the chairs we sit on and the lamp-posts we pass on our way home—has been conceived of and designed, and that someone, or a team of people has given those things the features that we see...The responsibilities of the designer are many. Not only do they include making the components of the thing in question fit together properly, they also include being the interpreters of our dreams, our aspirations and our anxieties and creating the appropriate symbols for us. We form our identities, both individual and collective, through the things with which we surround ourselves, and designers have to take this into account as well. It is a complex task that in many ways demands superhuman qualities.'

The book has seven chapters; The New Century, Conservative Modernism, Progressive Modernism, The New Modernism, Action and Reaction, Towards the Millennium and Information. There is not enough information about how the periodization of the twentieth century into six periods is decided, but it is obvious that styles was one of the key features. In each chapter there is a telling number of designers. The chapters not only include designers but also some great events of the time or a design institution, a firm, a design consultancy company, a production technique, or a new material that has changed the look belonging to the period.

The first chapter, which starts with information on The New Century is pointed as the years in which 'the modern age' was born and includes sub-titles such as Paris 1900, Wiener Werkstätte besides the designers. In the second chapter designers are piled under the title 'Conservative Modernism' and Paris 1925, Svenska Slöjdföreningen (Swedish Society of Industrial Design) and bentwood are the sub-titles other than designers that are referred to. This chapter also starts with general information on the period stated as Conservative Modernism. The third chapter is again a combination of designers and sub-titles such as Tubular Steel, Bauhaus and New York World's Fair 1939 named 'Progressive Modernism'. In the fourth chapter designers are piled under 'The New Modernism'. Moulded Plywood, Milan Triennales, Hochschule für Gestaltung-Ulm, and Sony are the sub-titles apart from the designers. In the fifth chapter, designers are piled under the title 'Action and Reaction'. Plastics, Cassina, and Modernism in Crisis are the sub-titles besides designers. In the sixth chapter, designers are piled under the title 'Towards the Millennium'. Postmodernism, Frogdesign are the sub-titles of this chapter. The last chapter of the book is the information part in which bibliography, directory of manufacturers, museum and design collections, glossary, index and acknowledgments are cited.
Each part on the designer has a photograph of the designer himself, and illustrations of their products ranging from their early work to later career. The explanations are not written in a biographic way but rather in a monographic way since the stories mostly start from the designers' educational background and include their profession as designers.

Although, most of the designer-centered books include designers either from the United States and Europe or from Far East that is mostly Japan, Sparke pays a significant attention on Scandinavian designers especially in the chapter 'Conservative Modernism'. The reason may be the explanation in the general information part as follows:

"The Modernism that emerged from Sweden, through the work of individuals such as Wilhelm Kåge, Edvard Hald, Simon Gate, Gregor Paulsson, Gunnar Asplund, Bruno Mattsson, and others, was made possible by the efforts of an organization called the Svenska Slöjdforeningen, which highlighted the importance of combining craft traditions with industrial manufacture and social reform. In Denmark, furniture featured strongly in that country's attempt to blend tradition, modernity and social idealism. Finland was equally socially oriented in its arts industries featured strongly. A sense of continuity with the national past was also important and, as in Sweden and Denmark, this was represented by a strong desire to retain the use of traditional materials. The achievement of Alvar Aalto and his pioneering work with bent plywood demonstrates one important way in which Finnish designers succeeded in looking backward and forward at the same time. This success was mirrored by other designers in the area of glass and metalwork."

As stated above, Sparke not only pays attention to designers despite the statements in the introduction of the book but also refers to institutions, exhibitions and fairs, materials, design consultancy companies, production techniques and entrepreneurial companies which are examined as the rest of objects of design history besides the designers. In the inner cover of the book a reason for the inclusion of material, techniques and exhibitions is stated: 'Many designers have worked across a wide range of materials and objects; A Century of Design covers everything from telephones to textiles, cutlery to computers. The book also considers some of the most important technical innovations of the century, for example the development of tubular steel and plastic. Special features focus on such key events in international design as the Paris Decorative Arts Exhibition of 1925 and the Milan Triennales of the 1950s.' The reason for these inclusions is obvious; for example, the introduction of Aalto in the chapter 'Conservative Modernism' makes it inevitable to mention about bent wood, or talking about Gropius makes it inevitable to refer to Bauhaus. But, then, the coherence of the elimination through the whole work needs to be examined. Isn't it also inevitable to
cite Braun as a company as well as Sony and Cassina while taking Rams and Gugelot into account, which were in house designers in Braun.

In short, the Twentieth Century Design by Sparke tends to construct a historical study of designers not only by writing their monographs but also by making periodizations, chronicles and comparisons which has the right and benefit to constitute a stone in the mosaic of pluralistic design history.

4.2. Designed Objects

There is a bulk of books studying design objects historically. The designed object is simply the nexus of a whole series of relationships, which it is the task of the design historian to explore. Heskett (1987) maintains that if the scope of the history of design is exceedingly broad, so too is the range of materials and sources relevant to its study. He continues that only one thing can be stated in this respect with any certainty: as with all other aspects of design, the central focus of any study must be the designed object, while artifacts are the focus of studies in industrial design, there are distinct limitations to the information they can in themselves provide. Walker (1989) claims that since design historians are historians, it is the history of designed objects which concerns them, that is, objects in particular periods and social contexts, objects undergoing changes through time. Taking design objects as the only focus of study in a connoisseurial way has been highly criticized, therefore, it can be asserted that the designed object is one starting point or focus for research, not its ultimate destination.

It seems possible to identify two main approaches in studying artifacts in historical research. The first is that of the history of artifacts in which; on the model of the history of art, technology, and architecture; products are seen as elements to be studied, analyzed and observed. A second approach is that of history through artifacts in which; following the example set by ethnology, anthropology, and archaeology; products become documents of historical research, intermediaries for something else. Riccini (1998) asserts that Design History represents an opportunity for an integration in which artifacts would be treated as both subjects and as documents of research.

When the texts focusing on design objects are examined they may be separated into two groups, the ones focusing mainly on anonymous design and the rest focusing on professional designer objects.
4.2.1. The Designs Without the Designer, Anonymous Design

As stated before the definition of design, accepted by the author plays an important role in setting the objects of design history, thus, design can be defined broadly and narrowly including or excluding anonymous, non-professional design. On one hand, the inclusion of the non-professional design to the realm of Design History is being taken inconvenient by such scholars like Walker, on the other, the inclusion is seen vital for scholars like Pacey and Buckley in many aspects. Any definition of design, like the one by Papanek, that does not cite the designer as a professional, invites the works of non-professional designers as an object to the historical study of design. Walker (1989) finds Papanek’s definition problematic because ‘design’, then, encompasses apparently art, poetry, music, dentistry, cooking, sports and education which will make the boundaries of Design History much more fuzzy. He adds that the truism that design is a process all human beings engage in to some extent ignores the specialized, professional character of design in modern society…” On the contrary Pacey (1992) believes that this acknowledgement can make no harm to the established profession of design but thinks of the opposite perilous:

‘The ‘specialized’ professional character of design has become so well established, its status confirmed by the cult of ‘designer’ products, by the celebration of designers as stars, and by the emergence of a design history which tells its story, that it is design as an activity practiced by all human beings which is in danger of being not merely ignored but progressively undermined and marginalized until it all but ceases to be.’

Pacey (1992) asserts that by acknowledging the truth of the concept of everyone as a designer without dismissing it as a truism, and by complementing the study of professional design with recognition of the prior and current activities of non-professional designers, can encourage the design profession radically to redefine its role vis-à-vis people at large, for the enrichment of all concerned.

Pacey (1992) also offers to include any design activity at anytime such as designing in the pre-industrial societies; metal-smithing, weaving, and constructing, and even the children’s play and art:

‘Creative play in childhood is recognized to be crucial to child development, children’s ‘art’ is readily appreciated; that there is a strong element of designing in both is undeniable. The child who sits under a table and thinks of it as his or her ‘house’; the children who convert an old hen-house into the bridge of a ship: such children are envisaging; making; designing.’

The benefits and the detriments of the inclusion of non-professional design into the historical study of design can be summarized as follows:
- Most of the historical studies of design are limited to 'good or exceptional design'. Most objects of everyday that we encounter unconsciously are seldom classified or displayed as 'good design'. But in fact these objects historically constitute the things most people make, work, and live with. These objects of design are so familiar that, as Fry (1988) puts, they are semi-invisible in the eyes of individuals. A history of such objects is a history of the material fabric which spans the entire economic and cultural life, a history which is clearly very different from a connoisseurship or canonical history of selected and validated objects Fry (1988). There are few texts which undertake the task of addressing this everyday world. One regarded as important is Giedion's 'Mechanization Takes Command', Forty's 'Objects of Desire' sets out to take Giedion's project further, and Woodham's 'Twentieth Century Design' seems to have set out a step further.

Good design histories are problematical because of the arguable issue of whose taste or preference determines good or bad.

- The inclusion of anonymous design embraces vernacular and craft design which has two important aspects: firstly, it introduces the bona fide design of the non-western world, since, products designed in the non-western world other than crafts are highly in the influence of west as pointed out by Athavankar (1997). Secondly, it welcomes women as designers who have been highly neglected in Design History because of its focus on professional design.

- The inclusion may be a means of democratization of design. Pacey (1992) maintains that to insist that designers should recognize people's needs, including the needs of the disabled and the disadvantaged, while at the same time recognizing that those people are themselves designers, is to seek far more public participation in design and in this deeper sense, of participation between professional designers working with people who they recognize to be designers too. To think in these terms is to begin to redefine the role of the professional designer, in terms of empowering people as designers, to design for themselves and actively to participate with professionals in the design process. This will also encourage the inclusion of the consumer and the user as a part of the product, which has newly being studied in Design History.
- The effect of non-professional designers is obvious in styles of fashion which derives its elements from the street as Wilson (1992) points out: 'Since the time of the French Revolution, styles (in fashion) have been likely to come from the street and the underworld as from the designers. The marginals, Bohemians and outcasts are the true innovators of style.' The inclusion may well support such studies -in areas other than fashion- focusing on the effects of non-professional design on professional designs.

- The activity of professional design exercises a kind of control while restricting individual flair with designs to be followed and rules to be obeyed and goods to be purchased. Pacey (1992) cites Alexander's (1977) advice to exemplify this designer control: 'Do not be tricked into believing that modern decorator must be slick or psychedelic, or 'natural' or 'modern art', or 'plants' or anything else that current taste-makers claim. It is most beautiful when it comes straight from your life –the things you care for, the things that tell your story.' He alleges that the professional designers are not designing for the 'real world': 'relatively few of us, I would hazard, will have dreamt in terms of steel and glass futuristic cities, unless we happen to be professional designers or children whose imaginations have been fired by our early encounters with technology, or by science fiction films or comics...'. So, the inclusion of non-professional design may also be a tool of promoting non-professional design which has always existed in tandem with professional design.

- The inclusion of non-professional design broadens the subject matter of Design History, makes it overlap with other disciplines such as archaeology and anthropology, therefore, introduce their methodology of studying artifacts in the concept of material culture embracing all the artifacts of a society. Setting up the boundaries of Design History, which is a key point in erecting it as a discipline becomes harder as the intersection of the subject matter with other disciplines increase.

4.2.2. The Designer Objects

Industrial products are presented as if they were precious works of art, isolated from people and the everyday environment, surrounded by a halo of light in a vacuum where the designed object becomes a fetish. The same can also be seen in Design History where a fetish is made of the designed object. The reasons for presenting
products in such a way are not many. Designer object centered histories can be linked to two social developments as pointed out by Walker (1989):

- the growth of design museums and exhibitions that find objects convenient things to collect and display.
- the growth in the market for second hand designed goods, especially those which can be attributed to famous designers. This tendency reproduces the connoisseurial tradition of art history, which serviced private collecting and the antique trade.

The term ‘recent antiques’ introduced by the scholars in the periodical Block, is suitable to formulate the new aspect of designerly famous products.

Another social development that can be added is the trial of creating identities by using distinguished designer products, out of a great range of products available. Forty (1986) avers that products, by recognized and acclaimed designers have attracted substantially higher prices than anonymously designed objects. The creation of a market in designed goods, and one in which the works of known designers are more highly valued, provided one motive for establishing identities.

Making a fetish of the physical object limits Design History's potential subject matter. Walker (1989) points out this limitation: 'Besides physical artifacts there exist what have been called 'mentifacts', that is, conceptual systems and structures which also involve design. Mentifacts are frequently ignored by design historians because they lack the tangibility of objects like typewriters and chairs.' Walker's point of view may be supported with Baudrillard's (1981) view:

'The empirical 'object', given in its contingency of form, color material, function and discourse...is a myth...the object is nothing. It is nothing but the different types of relations and significations that converge, contradict themselves, and twist around it, as such—the hidden logic that not only arranges this bundle of relations, but directs the manifest discourse that overlays and occludes it.'

Books such as One Hundred Great Product Design (1970), Cult Objects (1985), The Look of the Century (1997) are examples focusing on designer objects. Another suitable example is the 'Design Yearbook', which collects the designs of the year in a volume in a way that the art work were collected in catalogue raisonnées.

4.3. Entrepreneurial and Company Histories

Within the art history, patronage is an important subject. Histories of entrepreneurs and of companies who employ designers are, therefore, the equivalent in Design History of studies of patronage in Art History (Walker, 1989). The history of enterprise is a recently formed discipline which is trying to create its own identity
(Riccini, 1998). These kinds of studies may be a way of pointing out the relationship between the history of industry and the history of industrial design. It is possible to cite important cases in which the history of a company has been constructed around problems of industrial design, or on the basis of motivations or questions that arise directly from the study and the history of industrial design. Riccini (1998) cites the reconstruction of the history of Wedgwood, Thonet and AEG and continues:

'The interest shown by historians in these enterprises stemmed largely from the fact that they were seen as the pioneers of a new industrial sector, bringing with them a high degree of innovation and representing a different way of manufacturing and marketing products. The entrepreneurs themselves are represented as emblematic figures, as in the case of Wedgwood. In addition to his industrialization of the production of pottery, he is shown to have been capable of grasping that the manufacture of objects was part of a broader system comprising the phases of research, design, production, and, finally, marketing. The same factors underpin the interest in figures such as Thomas Edison and, above all, the American automobile industry in the case of Ford and General Motors, as well as in the history of transportation in general. Moreover, the attention paid by scholars to some companies rather than others certainly is influenced by the presence of important designers, as in the well-known case of Peter Behren.'

Riccini (1998) asserts that there has been an underestimation of the problems connected with the final form of the product on the part of the companies themselves. In other words, historically, the enterprise as an economic entity has not always interpreted the role and function of design within its own organization in an appropriate manner. Here, Riccini (1998) maintains that there are two points to deal with in the historical study of company and design relationship:

- The slowness of studies of the history of industrial design to realize that the enterprise offers an ideal vantage point from which to understand the history of products and of the profession of the industrial designer,

- The reluctance of the enterprise, to see the overall identity of its products as a decisive part of its own identity.

There have been numerous companies that have made industrial design a central element in their approach to the planning of products and even to the image of the company itself: Cassina, Alessi, Olivetti, Apple, Sony are the widely known among many others.

The company history is a genre of history writing, which shifts the emphasis from the individual designer to a more collective design process. Company history texts generally blend some social and economic history with the history of trade, business, management, marketing, invention and product innovation. Well-researched company histories can provide the design historian with essential
contextual information but they can suffer from two limitations as pointed out by Walker (1989):

- a lack of critical evaluation and objectivity;
- a dearth of information about the role of design in the success or failure of the company (unless, of course, the company was founded by a designer). While it is essential to establish the context within which design occurs, there is a danger in trade histories that so much attention will be given to economic, social, labor and market issues, that little space remains for questions of design and style in their own right.

People studying design management, essentially, are also studying company histories. The way they reconstruct history is usually by studying cases, in a way that concentrates upon the achievement that ‘design’ has maintained in taking part in the market. Braun, Apple are of those which have attracted the design management studies. Another point is the distinction they point out, between inventions, innovation and design, made the people studying design management concentrate on the developments of companies and their products via design.

4.4. Design Institutions and Organizations

Within the field of design several types of institutions exist and there is a small body of literature devoted to them. Writings on design institutions are relevant here because they extend the object of study beyond designers, companies and products.

Design as an activity, is also an institution as declared by Teymur (1981) as the institutional materiality of design; design and planning activities are not existing in a vacuum, rather, they are inseparably connected to a series of visible or invisible mechanisms which regulate social, technical or economic relations, which control or manage resources, behavior, movements; which facilitate, inhibit, make possible, or manipulate the exercise of certain rights and, most significant of all, which in fact regulate the very connection that binds these various mechanisms together. According to this explanation, the individuals, too, who are designers in this case, have to have strong links with financial, ideological or professional apparatuses, which would employ their services, and ‘reward’ and publicize their achievements. Teymur (1981) declares that an awareness and criticism of institutions is as important as the criticisms of products, he adds; appraisal and analysis of products could be much more useful if they could show what made certain configurations impossible as much as how certain patterns or forms were made possible by
designers and planners, but also by institutions which control both our reality and our knowledge of that reality.

The institutions of design may simply be classified as follows:

- Educational Institutions: schools of design
- Organizations concerned with the promotion of design: Design Council in Britain, Wiener Werkstaat in Austria and the Deutscher Werkbund in Germany, the Svenska Slöjdforeningen (Swedish Society of Industrial Design).

Necessarily, the historical study of institutions shifts the emphasis away from products and individuals, though this is not to deny that certain forceful individuals have a strong impact upon the directions or policies of institutions as it was in the case of Bauhaus with Gropius. Institutions are run by groups of people cooperating and/or disputing. Relations of power usually exist between them and the organizations of the state. Some carry out government policies but others pursue different ideals.

Walker points out three dangers besetting institutional histories:

- boredom – accounts of the doings of bureaucrats and officials can be very tedious;
- an uncritical identification with the assumptions and policies of the institutions under review;
- a failure to situate them in the larger context of social and economic change.

The case of Bauhaus as an educational institution is a well-situated example for the historical studies of institutions, since, the story of it is told and re-told in such studies as: The Bauhaus by H.M. Wingler (1969), Bauhaus by F. Whitford (1984), The Bauhaus Reassessed: Sources and Design Theory by G. Naylor (1985).

Naylor in her Bauhaus Reassessed: Sources and Design Theory (1985), explains the reasons for this obsession with a school of design and architecture which, like the Weimar Republic, survived for only 14 years as follows:

- the reputation of the staff who taught there,
- the nature of the program and the ideals it represented,
- the school's attempt to establish a methodology for design through what Kandinsky described as 'the new science of art'.
Therefore, it is clear that when an institution starts to play a distinguished role as Bauhaus, or Wiener Werkstaat did in the discourse of design and is innovative in its structure, then, their histories begin to be written by historians. Anyhow, historical studies of institutions are to be welcomed because they add another layer of complexity to the object of study but, even so, they only represent a step in the right direction. A comprehensive picture, Walker (1989) proposes, can only be achieved by situating studies of designers, goods and institutions within a broader field of research, one capable of displaying, systematically, the relationships between all the various elements involved.

4.5. Design Fairs and Exhibitions

There are not many historical studies of design directly focusing on design exhibitions but the subject has found its way to a telling number of studies in a recessive way: as chapters or as paragraphs devoted to them.

The International exhibitions such as The Expositions Universelles in Paris, Great Exhibitions in London and The World’s Fairs in New York and San Francisco (figure 4.1.) have been necessarily attracting to design historians because of the range of objects they assembled on a single site. Design historians cannot afford to exclude them from detailed study because they brought together disparate types of manufacture in a way that no cultural manifestation before them could ever contemplate, thus they reflected and influenced taste and attitudes in their respective times.

Figure 4.1. A poster by the American graphic artist Joseph Binder for the New York World’s Fair of 1939, Sparke, (1998).
These exhibitions also play an important role in the history of business and trade that sometimes overlap with the history of design. The potential for trade and business that the first international exhibitions had, was stated by Geddes (1900) as follows:

'A World's Fair – the idea was fresh and fascinating; for here, after the appearance of so many marvelous mechanical devices, was the device of bringing them all together. Here, after such unparalleled progress in increasing production, in extending communications, in freer and free trade, was the occasion of inventory and stock-taking; best of all, here was the greatest opportunity that the working world had ever seen of combining business with pleasure, of having the best of market-days and holidays in one. For what is better for a man than that he should enjoy the good of all his labor?'

International exhibitions did not spring into existence; rather, they evolved slowly as a cultural phenomenon for almost a century before the first event identifiable as an international exhibition actually took place, in 1851 (figure 4.2.). Through this preliminary period, in tandem with the unfolding of the industrial revolution, institutions formed in France and Britain with the specific aim of promoting the principle of display. In the first instance this was to be a device for the enhancement of trade, for the promotion of new technology, for the education of the ignorant middle classes and for the elaboration of a political stance (Greenhalgh, 1988).
Exhibitions are important with their 4 features as follows:

1. Displaying of people and companies: Greenhalgh (1988) states that since the 1890s, the exhibitions became a human showcase, when people from all over the world were brought to sites in order to be seen by others for their gratification and education. The key names such as Norman Bel Geddes, Henry Dreyfuss, Walter Darwin Teague and Raymond Loewy with their designs in the World Fairs of New York can be sited as examples of such figures. Even today, the international exhibitions spare a hall for designers themselves apart from manufacturers and enterprises where individual works are exhibited.

2. Displaying of nations: The study of international exhibitions reveals much about the designing of national identity, although the design and content of national pavilions were often constructed to portray particular facets of nation states or political regimes (Woodham, 1997).

3. Displaying of movements and styles of the time: Exhibitions are a tool in introducing and promoting new styles, fashions and trends, therefore, the event becomes a media highly attractive to the study of the design historian. It is important to note that some styles such as Art Nouveau, Art Deco were introduced to millions of people by such exhibitions (see. Sparke, 1998)

4. Displaying of innovative products: International exhibitions are places where a great number of products and their manufacturers are presented mostly in sequence. The exhibitions then become an arena for rivaling with products which makes the attendants work on new and innovative products.

The exhibitions themselves provide three types of published document of use to historians: official catalogues, official or approved guides and official reports. Guides, commentaries, special editions of journals, souvenirs and other material produced unofficially for the exhibitions and also the news in the papers are another part of the document that can be studied by the historians focusing on the exhibitions. Studying exhibitions historically may provide the historian with the social positions and relations of the attendants, the economic and cultural aspects of the exhibited, the styles and fashions of the time, the innovations and the enterprises even the popular culture etc.
There some books that directly focus on exhibitions such as: ‘The Anthropology of World's Fairs' by Benedict (1983), ‘America on Display: The World Fairs of 1876, 1893 and 1933, New York’ by Cawelti, ‘Ephemeral Vistas' by Greenhalgh (1988)

4.6. Styles and Movements

There are historians who have written histories of design in the form of a sequence of styles. Style is a distinctive manner which permits the grouping of works into related categories. The analysis of style has been one of the defining methods of the history of art and seems to be useful in any kind of visual analysis (Fernie, 1995). It is important to note that the study of style is not exclusive to art history: anthropologists, sociologists, archaeologists and sub-cultural theorists are also interested in it.

Style, in the rhetorical sense, can be viewed as a resource, as a factor in artistic production, in that once a number of styles exist, artists and designers can select which one they wish to use or rework (Walker, 1989). They can also decide to combine styles to create hybrids or create new styles criticizing the existing ones. These points become obvious when one considers the cases of stylistic revivals: neo-classicism, Victorian gothic, pop-art, post-modern or oriental, chinoiserie and so on.

Genova (1979) has argued that ‘style is created by wedding form to content in such a way that the form expresses, that is, metaphorically exemplifies the content'. When Walker (1989) drives attention to the stylistic analysis of the history of design, he raises the question: ‘can designed goods be said to have content as well as form?’ and he self-answers it:

‘In the case of products with figurative imagery or decorative ornamentation on their surfaces and buildings constructed in the shapes of animals or foodstuffs, the answer is clearly ’yes’. Even in the case of more abstract products such as cars, the style may be designed to ‘metaphorically exemplify' such content as speed or sex. The fact that styles have meanings, that they evoke connotations and associations, suggests that there is always content as well as form or that form itself is a signifying agent.'

The uses of stylistic analysis and the kinds of knowledge, which can be gained from it, can best be outlined by means of a number of examples:

Grouping: The primary use of style in art history has been to identify the character of works produced in particular places and at particular times, enabling the historian to define periods, cycles and cultures as well as the oeuvre of an individual artist.
Fashion: Style in the form of fashion constitutes one of the most important aspects of social relationships, in which people show great sensitivity to minute variations in design, from the sit of a hat (figures 4.3. and 4.4.) to an assessment of whether a coffee-table is in vogue or out of date.

Figure 4.3. Hats from the years 1939-1945, Worsley, 2000.

Figure 4.4. Hat from the years 1950s, Worsley, 2000.

Illusion: Style is powerful enough to provide an illusion of a characteristic which is not actually present. Thus objects can be made to look as if they are efficient by characteristics of design which are themselves irrelevant to efficiency or are even positively adverse to it. This can be illustrated by the Hotchkiss stapler (figure 4.5.) that had nothing to do with speed but styled like a streamlined locomotive of its time (figure 4.6.)

Figure 4.5. The Hotchkiss stapler designed by Orlo Heller, 1936, (Heskett, 1980).
Figure 4.6. Diesel railcar by Count Kruckenber for German State Railways, 1937 (Heskett, 1980).

The Effect of the Idea of Design: Awareness on the part of the designer or the company that manufactured the product falling into the category of design consciousness, can radically affect the style of a product. This can be illustrated by many of the products of Starck (figure 4.7) and Alessi (figure 4.8).

Figure 4.7. Hot Bertaa Kettle by Starck, 1990, the kettle has earned the status of an Alessi fiasco (Sweet, 1998).

Figure 4.8. Kettle with a bird shaped whistle, by Graves, 1985, produced by Alessi (Sweet, 1998).
Style has been less important to design historians than to art historians. The former have often preferred typological histories to stylistic ones. Giedion (1948) tackled the problem: 'The history of style deals with a theme by dividing it into horizontal sections, while typology divides it vertically. Both are necessary in order to see things in historical space...' Still there are a number of books studying design based on styles such as Stephen Bayley's In Good Shape: Style in Industrial Products 1900-1960 (1979), and Penny Sparke's Design Source Book (1986). The time span covered in Sparke's text is 1850s to 1980s which is divided into small ages such as 'Arts and Crafts 1850-1900', 'Art Nouveau 1890-1905', 'The Machine Aesthetic 1900-1930' etc. Bayley's text studies the products of the 60 years most of which are modernistic following the good design notion.

The most difficult theoretical issue concerning style in design is its relation to the larger social context, to social structures, groups, economic conditions, and so forth. Some scholars like have argued that great unitary styles of the past are no longer possible because of the ever-increasing complexity of modern society (Walker, 1989).

4.7. Consumer and Use

Design historians have directed their interest upon facets of production such as designers, designing and manufacturing, and the examination of products, leaving a likewise critical aspect out, which is the consumer and the user. Till the 1980s this subject has been highly neglected by most of the historians of design and there is an emergent interest in exploring the complexities of contextual influences of design, one of which is the consumers and the users (Buchanan, 1998). There is a wide range of literature touching upon the consumer and naturally the user, since in many cases they are the same person, in different aspects: Anthropological studies on consumption, economic and cultural histories, histories of shopping and company histories, materials on consumer rights, semiotic and semantic studies on the relations between product or advertisement and the user, are of the literature. The problem of the historian while studying this literature is the position of design, since a large proportion of them is written by sociologists, media and communication theorists, the role played by design stays recessive and neglected (Walker, 1989).

No precise date can be given for the birth of consumerism since it evolved over several centuries. The present consumerism, which is dating from the 1950s in Britain and America, as pointed out by Walker (1989), is of more concern to design historians, as design became a means of creating differences, creating new needs,
new desires, new tastes and dissatisfaction since then. In order to study the relationship between design and the consumer/user, the historian needs to study on different terms such as ‘consumerism’, ‘reception’, ‘pleasure’, and ‘taste’.

Consumers pass through a complex that the consumerism has created before they reach the product of any kind. Before the consumer pays and turns the product to a commodity of his own, he has to be informed what products exist and where to acquire them. Between manufacturers and consumers are the realms of distribution, marketing, advertising, mail order, shops and shopping (Walker, 1989). All of these are critically related to daily life and the historians have to take them into account when including the consumer and the user in his narrative. Advertisement plays a crucial role in consumerism by mediating between manufacturers, retailers and the public. Advertisements provide goods with a context, which is usually mythical and with an image, which is generally celebrated that the viewer may not pass over (figure 4.9.). Visual advertisements are particularly rich objects of study for design historians because not only do they promote and depict designed goods but are themselves instances of design.

Figure 4.9. The ‘stowaway’ personal stereo cassette player, 1979 (Sparke, 1998).

The same can be said for the shops where use-values are translated into exchange-values, where consumer goods are exchanged for money. Shops, especially huge department stores and shopping malls have also played an important role in the
modernization of consumption (Chaney, 1983), and the way they are designed are also of concern to design historians.

‘Reception’ is a term used mostly in literature and art, meaning the subjective responses of the readers, in the multiplicity of reading texts generated, and in the part played in the contemporary experience of a work of art of knowledge of past interpretations. Walker(1989) has asserted that ‘reception theory’ derived from literature and art may be used beneficially in the historical study of design, by arguing that interpretations and evaluations are determined not only by the nature of the goods themselves but also by the character of the consumer. He proposes methods to be employed for design historians to gather information about the process of reception as follows:

1. By self-analysis. Historians have privileged access to at least one consciousness. They can try to reflect critically upon their own responses and behavior in relation to design.

2. By examining existing critical accounts. The reviews of products, buildings and so on found in newspapers, magazines and history books. These are written by professionals – journalists, experts, critics – and consequently, while their views may be detailed and informed, they may also be unrepresentative.

3. By using existing information. Sales figures, for example, are crude indicators of popularity and consumer trends. The drawback of statistics, of course is that the information is quantitative not qualitative. Vandalism and graffiti can be considered direct signs of negative responses to advertisements and the built environment.

4. By observing how other people behave in relation to design. Such observation can be open or covert, casual or systematic.

5. By means of questionnaires and interviews.

6. A combination of the above.

Walker (1989) finds it surprising that design historians have paid little attention to pleasure although it is such a significant ingredient in the appeal of design and consumption. He claims that any study of this kind would need to review the various types and phases of pleasure which exist:

- Pleasures of desire: the daydreams and fantasies concerning the future progression of designed goods.
- Pleasures of purchase: the pleasures of shopping, spending money/buying and ownership.
- Pleasures of the object itself: its qualities of newness, of design etc.
- Pleasures of use: the satisfactions gained when the product is convenient to use and performs as well as promised.
- Pleasures in respect of others: the social impression one makes via the ownership of goods.

Walker (1989) states that ‘taste’ is a key factor in the consumption of goods and belongs more to the consumer than to the object. The term taste has been raising
questions such as: can there be good and bad taste, how can the distinction be made, is taste innate or learnt, as the common expression ‘there is no accounting for taste’ indicates, is taste beyond the reach of rational, scientific inquiry.

The most substantial and scientific contribution to the study of taste to point out its relation to social class, subcultures and lifestyles, is ‘La Distinction’ by Bourdieu (1979). Bourdieu uses questionnaires, records, statistics about the habits of French people during the 1960s to produce a taste cartography of the whole society at a particular time. His fundamental assumption is that the taste preferences of any group cannot be understood in isolation but only as an assertion of difference relative to the tastes of all other groups. Bourdieu’s mode of analysis is that it encompasses all kinds of tastes; in food, drink, clothes, interior decoration, art, sport so on. The total ensemble of tastes must, he argues, be inextricably bound up with the life-style of the group concerned.

In the cases of texts concerned with design and its history, the issue of taste is essential, since some of the design history books such as Bayley’s ‘In Good Shape’ (1979) and Sparke’s ‘Design Source Book’, are criticized by other design historians that the taste of the author or the taste of the elite group is the key feature in the selection of the designs to be constructed historically, whereas books such as Heskett’s ‘Industrial Design’ (1980) and Forty’s ‘Objects of Desire’ (1986) were celebrated by their inclusion of different tastes of the masses that govern the vast majority of goods sold.

Woodham’s ‘Twentieth Century Design’ published in 1997, is one of the best attempts in taking account the consumer and the user in Design History. With this study, Woodham signals a fundamental shift to the neglected consumer and user, positioning them in the texture of everyday life, with greater emphasis on the role and behavior of the consumer and the user. The change of focus that Woodham identifies began in the 1970s and found expression in Heskett’s ‘Industrial Design’ (1980), Design in Germany (1986) and Forty’s Objects of Desire (1986) (Buchanan, 1998).

Instead of focusing on styles, movements, certain designers, design institutions or companies, Woodham prefers to concentrate on commerce, consumerism and recessively their relation to design in the bulk of the book. The chapters of the book is as follows: Towards the Twentieth Century; Design and Modernism; Commerce, Consumerism and Design; Design and National Identity; The Second World War: Reconstruction and Affluence; Multinational Corporations and Global Products;
Design Promotion, Profession, and Management; Pop to Post-Modernism: Changing Values; Nostalgia, Heritage, and Design; Design and Social Responsibility. Woodham is careful in these chapters to avoid the generally adopted way: chronologically listed movements, designers and institutions. Nonetheless, he too is concerned with movements, in the sense of the unfolding of processes by which natural and social forces shape consumer behavior in an interplay of necessity and contingency (Buchanan, 1998).

The inclusion of the consumer and the user to the historical study of design is to be welcomed since it enlarges the subject matter of design history and shifts the focus of study. But it is still insufficient, the future of concerning the role of the consumer and the user seem to remain partial in explaining the complex of design history, if it cannot detach and differentiate itself from the similar studies focused on material culture that are done by anthropologists.
5. DIFFERENT APPROACHES IN DESIGN HISTORY

The positions of the objects of Design History, which were introduced in the previous chapter, undergoes significant shifts in relation to the approach adopted, which also determines where the focus of the analysis is placed; on the products themselves, on the organization of production, or on the ideology and culture of design. Design historians up to now have offered different ways of categorization of texts according to the approaches adopted. Here, some of the major ones will be listed and then contemporary and necessary ones according to the changing definition of design will be examined. It is important to state at the outset that not only one significant approach, rather a number of different approaches that support each other are usually adopted together in the Design History texts, therefore, some of the approaches are methodical approaches which help to articulate the rest of the approaches (appendix A.1.).


Dilnot (1984a) asserts that differences of emphasis and orientation in design work do exist, and he classifies them into for general approaches. He notes that these are only general attitudes or tendencies, not schools to which historians ally themselves, nor are they necessarily exclusive categories. This is why, in this study, his categorization needed not only be listed, but also summarized since the categories do include sub categories. Four areas of work in design history is set out by Dilnot (1984a) as follows:

1. A continuation of the traditional histories of the decorative and minor arts as applied to the subject matter of design, decoration, and ephemera of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: Design historians, collectors, museum directors, and designers became more concerned with the recent past. Until 1945, decorative arts and minor arts histories were almost confined to works of the eighteenth century. But with this new concern there has been a natural tendency in decorative arts and
minor arts histories, to extend to the decorative arts of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Dilnot states that this has taken a number of forms such as the encounter with the world of mass culture. He continues as follows: '...the orientation of the studies has shifted to a whimsical conception of popular taste and to a concern with what might be called junk antiques.'

Dilnot thinks that there is a patent problem of attempting to discuss issues of twentieth century decoration within the traditional terms of the 'high' decorative arts. The central issues in terms of the decorative, now, are issues of style, taste and fashion. Dilnot says that the ability of the tradition of writing decorative history, is to elucidate the precise provenance of an object and it is in considerable demand by the sales rooms, the antiques trade, and the new museums that emphasize nineteenth and twentieth century collections as recent antiques. What this tradition can give in terms of developing an understanding of design and decoration in the twentieth century remains to be seen.

2. A Focus on Modernism: Under this title Dilnot gives information on the history of modernism as an approach of design historians. His views may be summarized in four steps. He accepts the commencement of the study of modernism with Pevsner. The second step of studying modernism begins with Banham in Theory and Design in the First Machine Age. The third step he asserts is the one that exists almost in all texts studying the roots of design history: the Open University third level course on the history of modern architecture and design from 1890 to 1939, developed by Tim Benton and his Open University course team. He points out that this course emphasized design as a necessary and, theoretically equal element to that of architecture. But still design was considered as an extension of architecture since the major heroes of the course were architect-designers such as Henry van de Velde, Mart Stam and Gerrit Rietveld. Dilnot compares Pevsner with the Open University course and states that the course’s general concentration on the development of the work of individual designers across their careers and across a range of conditions follows and also modifies the Pevsnerian tradition and it is still Pevsnerian with its emphasis on stylistic analysis. He also points the departures from the Modernist histories that the course has by telling that the introduction contained a design case study on Norman Bel Geddes, and the units included such as British Design, the electric home, the garden cities movement, and mechanical services.
The fourth step he asserts is the American way of Modernism as follows:

'The ideological and aesthetic or theoretical history as an avant-garde phenomenon is united with a broader history of social and industrial developments. In addition, the focus shifts from Modernism per se to the unraveling of its meaning and function in the present phase of capitalist development. This is accomplished by combining the self-conscious Modernist developments with the more anonymous developments in technique, industrial production, and consumerism.'

Dilnot believes that this has begun to happen, first, with the emerging interest in the period since 1945, but more notably in the attention being given to American design, and he refers to the studies of Penny Sparke in Britain, Jeffrey Meikle and Arthur Pulos in the United States on American Design. Dilnot states that these histories challenge the notion of what it is to be modern, and compares Pevsner's modernism and the American modernism as follows:

'For Pevsner this (modernism) meant to have a self-conscious awareness of design's social role and its progression toward a rational universalism. Indeed, one was modern to the extent that one was aware of the significance of design as an ideal. For the Americans, to be modern in the aesthetic or design theoretical sense is acceptable, but of more important is to be modern in the economic and technological sense, to be in tune with the most progressive developments of American capitalism.'

Also Buckley (1986), and Pacey (1992), Woodham (1997) and Riccini (1998) are of those who emphasize the modernist approach in Design History.

3. A Focus on issues of design organization: By the term design organization, Dilnot means the fragmented and the subdivided series of specialized activities, which has increasingly become a process of conceiving rather than realizing form. Dilnot claims that 'proper' design history begins with such issues because no matter how diverse the subject, design organization deals with the changed situation of designing in the industrial world. The processes of industrial design are interlinked, but in relationships often remote and impersonal. These processes are not only questions of design but also company corporate policy, and political or legal matters.

Dilnot places design organization as core concerns of works as chronologically and methodologically diverse as John Heskett's Industrial Design, Jonathan Woodham's The Industrial Designer and the Public, and Penny Sparke's Consultant Design. Justification exists for the argument that this is the core that provides essential material for other studies. Natural extensions of this relation lead either to technological and industrial histories, to institutional studies, or the studies of the consumer or the design purchasing and design-affected public. In specific cases, design organization is also a subject that social and economic historians have
become interested in, unsurprisingly as it is quintessentially a socioeconomic relationship that is relatively unmediated by design aesthetics or design theoretical issues. Dilnot (1984a) also states the problems of focusing on design organization by design historians as follows: 'The conditions surrounding the emergence of a designed object or a particular kind of designing involve complex social relations. The fact that these relations are frequently described only in design terms obscures their social or socioeconomic aspects.' And asks the question 'To what extent, then, does the design organizational approach limit the explanations of designed phenomena to what can be explained from within design?' He does not cite the exact answer but end this part as follows: 'The issue, then, is not beginning with 'design' and working from there, but 'bracketing out' major concepts. For example rather than accepting design as a given, an attempt is made instead to understand how and why design has developed and whose interests it serves.'

4. A Focus on the social relations of various kinds of design: Dilnot claims that the fourth area is a natural outgrowth of the focus on issues of design organization. He alleges that Heskett’s book ‘Industrial Design’ dealt with both the organizational and social strands of history writing. And he cites Heskett’s works on Germany such as his ‘Modernism and Archaism in Design in the Third Reich’ in Block (1980), and ‘Art and Design in Nazi Germany’ in History Workshop (1979), as implying the need for a fundamental re-assessment of the relation of societies to types of design practice. According to Dilnot (1984a), Heskett asserts the need for a complex of modes, performing specific functions and responding to a particular set of circumstances rather than a single mode of designing as characterizing a period. Dilnot (1984a) maintains that design’s role and functioning in capitalism is a vital issue, and has had little direct expression in design history. He refers to Sparke’s and Woodham’s books quoted above, as having this issue as the real subject matter but not having it discussed in detail. However, Dilnot states that design historical research and analytical developments in Europe have directly confronted this issue. Here, firstly he cites Haug’s (1986) theory of commodity aesthetics –Warenästhetik– as addressing the role of design in commodity production, by differentiating between production, which is identified with needs, and consumption, which are the artificially created wants, and by exploring the imagery of products and advertisements and their role in capitalist production and consumption. Secondly, he refers to Selle (1968, 1978) as formulating a theory of design as an expression of social relations from a comparable perspective.
Dilnot mentions Baudrillard (1981) as making an incisive analysis of design’s socio-economic role in late capitalism from a semiotic perspective and adopting a cultural approach in his attempt to break with some of the illusions of functionalism. Dilnot (1984a) positions Italian design history as cultural rather than social as follows: ‘related to dominance of high-level quasi-Marxist architectural history and criticism, design history and criticism in Italy attempt to grasp the difficult connection of designed material to sociocultural forms and relations.’ He argues that the emphasis on cultural aspects of design meaning rather than design production or reception, connects Italian work to some of the new English design history, which falls on the axis between the Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies and a group at Middlesex Polytechnic that were producing the journal Block. Dilnot positions the study of representations as the primary emphasis of this work which owes its origins to semiotic cultural criticism pioneered by Barthes.

Finally he refers to design and gender, feminist analysis of design and material culture which was inevitable as a result of the work done by the thrust of the Middlesex-Birmingham work by people like Lisa Tickner, Jon Bird, John Walker, Tony Fry, Phil Goodall, and Dick Hebdige.

To sum up, as a focus on the social relations of various kind of design, Dilnot refers to ‘design’s role and functioning in capitalism’, ‘semiotics’, ‘cultural studies’, ‘material culture’ and ‘design and gender’.

According to Walker (1989), histories of design vary not only because they treat different facets of the subject but also because different scholars adopt different methods and approaches. Although he lists these approaches separately he also says that in most of texts a mix of these approaches can be employed. And if a writer combines ideas and methods promiscuously, then one may be compelled to characterize the text as ‘eclectic’. His argument on the categorization of texts is as follows:

1. According to the level and audience. Every text presumes an ideal reader or group of readers. There are specialists, academic books on design and there are also popular, journalistic ones.

2. According to the political perspective informing the text. For example, liberal, anarchist, feminist, socialist.

3. According to the underlying philosophical assumptions, for example, idealist, materialist, realist, Hegelian.
4. According to the principal academic or scientific mode of analysis employed, for example, structuralist, semiotic, functionalist, stylistic, comparative, typological, de-constructive.

5. According to the kind or school of history writing employed, for example humanist, social, cultural, history of ideas, Braudelian.

6. According to time or place, for example, histories of twentieth-century design, the design of particular nations or larger geographical units such as Europe.

7. According to the extrinsic discipline employed, for example, anthropology, sociology, economics, archaeology, and psychology.

8. According to a materials/techniques emphasis.

After having listed the categories, Walker (1989) gives information on a few of the approaches without stating how he eliminated the categories that he doesn't refer to or why he has chosen the ones that are being considered in more detail such as the materials/techniques approach, the comparative method, content analysis, the typological approach, national histories of design, anthropology and design history, the social history approach, structuralist approach and semiotic approaches.

Fry (1988) lists the approaches to the historical study of design as follows:

1. Connoisseurship
2. Canonization
3. The Object in Space
4. The Common Object
5. Design as Culture
6. Design and Gender
7. Design as Economy

Fry exemplifies each of these approaches by examining canonical texts in the field that he has considered suitable to explain the approach. He also declares that the history of design has been approached in a variety of ways and the ones studied in his text are the dominant perspectives.

The following approaches that are used in constructing the history of design are selected for their convenience to the ever-changing definition of design. It is obvious that there are many approaches used and so many will be used in the future as the interdisciplinary studies are being more welcomed day by day. What is of importance here is, the following approaches are mostly used supporting each
other, and some of them like 'semantics' have not made any significant contribution to Design History in comparison it did to the design activity. Neither of the approaches has been developed distinctively for the sake of Design History, but they are rather driven from other disciplines such as History, Art History, and Sociology.

5.1. Production Techniques and Materials Approach

Arranging the objects of study on the basis of physical materials and their associated techniques and processes, is one of the approaches that design historians and museum curators adopt (Walker, 1989). It is obvious that the artifacts in a telling number of museums including the Victoria and Albert, are classified such as: ceramics and glass; woodwork, furniture, leather; textiles; paintings; metalwork etc.

There are some advantages and disadvantages of studying design in the 'Production Techniques and Materials' approach as follows:

- The materials/techniques approach serves less well for complex artifacts. Although, a wide variety of artifacts can be classified according to their materials, many products are constructed from a combination of different materials and different production techniques. This becomes a significant problem when the artifacts being studied are complex products of industry. In these cases, texts tend to be organized according to social function and type; for example, a book on furniture, a book on electrical appliances, a book on household products; or the material that constructs most of the design is chosen as the main material.

- Histories of design emphasizing materials and techniques are closely related to histories of science, technology and invention. They are heavily dependent upon the latter for much of their information unless it is derived directly from the laboratory and industry.

- Description of materials and processes can easily result in a highly technical, quasi-scientific textbook. It is difficult, therefore, to combine the materials approach with a socio-historical study arranged chronologically.

- It enables the writer to transcend conventional divisions, thereby broadening the scope of the text. Examples include the medical aids, transportation, engineering, architecture and works of art, toys, besides furniture and consumer goods (figure 5.1.)
- The aim of adopting this approach may be ‘a logical scheme illustrating the technical and artistic development of the particular industry represented’.

Figure 5.1. Tenite cellulose acetate, blow moulded doll, 1947 (Katz, 1984).

- Technological progress, in particular the invention of new materials such as synthetic plastics, concrete and chipboard, stimulates designers to reinterpret old products and devise original ones. Since new materials with special properties can solve design problems, the search for them is, in fact, often deliberate, especially in wartime when certain familiar materials suddenly becomes unavailable or are in short supply.

- If the historian is concerned directly with the form, the materials and production techniques has an important role in the shapes of the final products.


A book which is convenient to examine this approach, organized in terms of a specific material regarded as typically modern, is Katz’s ‘Classic Plastics: from Bakelite to High-Tech’ (1984). The Introduction of the book gives information about the evolution of plastics starting from the natural plastics and ending with high
technology plastics and the entrance of plastics to the everyday life as consumer goods are exemplified:

'The most important plastics to emerge after the war were PVC, melamine, polyethylene, polystyrene and nylon. Styrene in particular had been overproduced. Nylon was the first totally man-made fiber, discovered in 1938 in the Du Pont laboratories in America by Waldece Carothers. It was swiftly made into bristles and brushes under the trade name 'Exton', while nylons became a valuable fashion accessory. Nylon was even used as a hair lacquer! War-surplus nylon inspired all manner of uses...Throughout the 1940s decorative laminates made great progress in America, and Formica, Roanoid and Micarta surfaces beautified kitchens, trains, airliners, hotel bars and cinemas...It is virtually impossible to salvage historical examples of decorative laminates, but molded melamine tableware produced some valuable designs, many of which are still in everyday use. As a competitor to china, it offered much richer colors as well as being unbreakable, but it was more expensive. America led Europe, and by the late 1950s as much as 50 per cent of all dinnerware sold was molded in melamine.'

The information given on materials is not of a kind that can be found in books on the chemistry of materials, since its focus of attention is the final products and their characteristics according to their materials rather than the chemical characteristics. The most specific visual characteristics of kinds of plastics are given. The limitations and necessities that the material has on the designer and his product are also of concern:

'Each molding bears the scars of its manufacture: flow lines, witness marks, flash and ejection marks. The designer has shrinkage and creep-resistance to consider, and the material must be warp-resistant, and must possess appropriate electrical properties. Appearance is maybe only fifty per cent aesthetic. The fact that, until recently, plastics products invariably had rounded corners was not due to the designers' stylistic preferences but to the structural weakness of sharp edges, prone to chip. Newer polymers are becoming so strong that sharp angles are now no problem. Plastics designs taper because they are easier and cheaper to remove from moulds; split moulds, which allow for undercuts are expensive. Thickening the walls of a molding is not necessarily the answer to a strength problem. Curved forms are far stronger than flat shapes, as stresses are distributed; ribs can be used to stiffen a flat area and disguise flow marks, and can also be exploited aesthetically.'

The rest of the book is composed of eight chapters examining the plastics of the decades starting from the 1920s up to 1980s decade by decade, strongly endowed with visual material.

300 Hundred Years of Industrial Design is a successful attempt of approaching the history of design with a materials and production techniques basis. The authors of the book, Adrian Heath, Ditte Heath and Aage Lund Jensen are not historians but designers and architects and accept their work not only as a history book but also as a designer's notebook. The authors claim that they have laid out an industrial history
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of design by looking closely at some of the best utility artifacts used in daily life and some of the greater inventions, buildings and machines which mark out the course of industrialization. The book, as the authors claim, deals directly with the job of designing; it is not about design policy, or design as a sales factor, or even about designers. The authors aver that they regard design as a kind of craft and see the manufacturing complex as an important design development, which tells about the way human needs and activities, form and use, technique and materials each take equal parts in industrial design. Here again, there has been a need for a definition of design by the authors, just to explain what the whole text exclusively is about and the reason for the adoption of the materials and production techniques approach. The authors believe that another way of looking at the history of design which is especially essential for the industrial designers, is not only to evaluate the form of the finished product, but also to question what it is made of, and how and why, and to relate the product to other products and other industries.

As the authors claim in the introduction:

'The book breaks down design history into individual products, sorted according to the primary material of which they are made, and keeps the heavier background technology separate but connected by the progression of decades which are common to the entire contents. One of our reasons for doing this is to bring some sort of order into a highly diverse subject, and to nurture concentration. We have made a point of not expecting the reader to evaluate a water mill and a chair, or an airplane and lamp on the same page. We find that this mixing of subjects is a problem for the designer/reader — and for design — in many history books. (Heath, Jensen, 2000).'

The content of the book is as follows: A profound introduction which gives detailed information on: how the book was decided to be written, how the information throughout the book was gathered, how the book can be used etc., five parts: Background technology and innovation, Metal products, Wood products, Ceramic products, Glass products; a glossary, a list of manufacturers, a list of museums and sites, a bibliography, an index and a useful orientation chart which summarizes the whole book into a single chart. Each chapter has an introduction which goes through a few of the basic properties of the material and its manufacturing techniques. Then the images and scaled technical drawings of the sample products are exhibited with the information including the manufacturer, the designer if known, materials used, manufacturing processes, dimensions, location: where the photo was taken, related products, and an evaluation of the product.

Both of the books referred to above treat the products they examine as objects that are isolated from their environments, consumers and users, hence, they do not take
into account any social and cultural aspects of the products. The materials and techniques approach, as any other approach, needs to be supported with other approaches such as periodization and comparison, which is apparent in both of the texts.

5.2. The Comparative Approach

In the historical study of design making comparisons between products, designers, styles and so forth is one of the usual methods used by scholars to support their account of the subject. This method is mostly used as an additive method combined with many other methods used. The aim of comparing and contrasting items is to reveal similarities and differences, so it is of little value when two items are virtually identical or utterly different (Walker, 1989). The method works best when two items have some characteristics in common but varies in other respects; for example, a typewriter dated 1920 and a typewriter dated 1980.

The answer to what are to be compared differs according to the aims, objectives and the objects of the study. Comparisons may be an efficient tool especially in undergraduate design history courses, if it is used in the right sense to articulate the subject being explained. To cite an example, Heskett (1980), has used the comparative method many times through out his 'Industrial Design', in order to reinforce his narrative. Some of the comparisons are as follows:

He compares the American railway carriages with the European carriages in order to figure out the geographical effects on design:

'The American railway carriage, familiar from countless Western films, developed on a completely different pattern from the European, atypical example being a design for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad of 1865. The most notable difference was that it was not compartmented...

The Midland Railway four-wheel composite coach of 1874, by comparison, lacked the facilities of the American type and was still in the coach-building tradition, its compartmental construction, with many doors and different-sized windows, providing obstacles to rapid assembly. The Baltimore and Ohio coach was much more regular in appearance. Its windows were of a common pattern, as was the seating, both, like the open plan with access limited to two points, making for ease of construction. All was plainly designed for industrial construction, combining large quantities of a limited number of standardized parts, in comparison with the handicraft methods of the British workshops.'

He compares two locomotives, which were manufactured by different companies and he supports his comparison with visual evidence:
Comparisons of locomotive design practice in the United States and Britain are equally revealing. The 4 4 0 locomotive built by the Baldwin Company from 1874 was representative of a type and form produced in large numbers in the United States in the late nineteenth century, and can be compared with Johnson 4 4 0 for the Midland Railway. The function of the two engines is the same, but their form is very dissimilar. The openness of the Baldwin engine layout is a marked feature, giving clear access for maintenance, a vital necessity when running repairs might be required at points far from any workshop. The title of the man on the footplate in America reflected the need to repair the locomotive: he became known as an 'engineer'. In Britain he remained simply a 'driver'...

After making comparisons he needs to clarify the result of the comparison as: 'What emerges from the comparison is that, in this instance, generalized equations between designed form and mechanical function cannot be sustained. In the two examples considered, a relationship certainly exists, but needs to be qualified...' Heskett (1980), also makes comparisons between the attitudes of different nations as follows:

The difference between Europe and America was not limited, however, to production systems, but applied in a much wider sense to general cultural and social values. This was remarked on in the Official Catalogue of the Great Exhibition: "The expenditure of months or years of labor upon a single article, not to increase its intrinsic value, but solely to augment its cost or its estimation as an object of virtu, is not common in the United States. On the contrary, both manual and mechanical labor are applied with direct reference to increasing the number or the quantity of articles suited to the wants of a whole people, and adapted to promote the enjoyment of that moderate competency which prevails upon them." The comparison was between European attitudes, based on craft traditions, in which the value of a product, both economically and aesthetically, resided in the extent of skilled work it embodied, and the American approach, based on industrial methods, which emphasizes quantity and utility for wider sections of the population.'

Figure 5.2. Singers first sewing machine (on the left) and the Singer 'New Family' of 1870 (Heskett, 1980).
Heskett (1980) compares the same products of different dates: 'His (Singer’s) first machine of 1851 was a very plain, functional mechanism, but an appreciation of the importance of appearance led to the mechanism being shrouded in a pressed, japanned-metal casing, decorated with stenciled floral patterns.' (figure 5.2.) Again Heskett compares the visual appearances of three radios by Telefunken showing the progression of radio-housing design within a decade (figure 5.3.).
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Figure 5.3. Three radios by Telefunken: 'Alpha', 1927 and 'Wiking', 1933' and T644W, 1936-7 (Heskett, 1980).

There are some kinds of historical studies where making comparative studies are inevitable such as studying movements, styles, and periods. Another area of study that refers to comparison is the historical classification of product batches according to diachronic and synchronic analysis which will be examined in the typological approach below.

To end up with, Saussure (1974) maintains that comparison is required for any historical reconstruction, but by itself it cannot be conclusive. And he adds that the sole means of reconstructing is by comparing, and the only aim of comparison is a reconstruction.

5.3. The Typological Approach

The designed goods are generally manufactured in batches, with the result that there are many sets of identical objects and series of objects with minor variations. Given this, it is more sensible and economic for design historians to base their
analyses and generalizations upon groups and series of products (Walker, 1989). One way of grouping objects is according to the concept 'type'. Tiryakian (1968) has defined a type has recurrent, general distinctive features which are not the properties of the individual as such. Typological classification, he adds, is a subdivision of taxonomy closely related to morphology, the study of forms. Walker (1989), asserts that when the totality of artifacts are considered they appear to fall 'naturally' into types; they are 'inductively arrived at rather than formally deduced a priori'.

Clarke (1978), in his book 'Analytical Archaeology', the chapter entitled 'Artifact and Type' analyzes the problem of defining types. For Clarke, the type is a level in a hierarchy of archaeological entities. The levels he figures out are: attribute, artifact, type, assemblage, culture and culture group. According to these, to go a step further in questioning the need and usefulness of typological approach, it may be stated that the appearance of a new product type in a society is important and needs to be studied. Because it marks a noteworthy shift in the way a society organizes its needs.

As Walker (1989) points out sorting objects into types can be a complex operation because major types always seem to include a host of subtypes; a genus/species situation. As societies have developed and human culture has become more specialized and differentiated, the number and variety of types of artifact has increased exponentially.

There are design histories which lock up themselves to a single type of artifact, for example, the sewing machine, the kettle, the chair, the shoes etc. So far the examples of types cited tended to be artifacts. In fact, there are different conception of types such as: human types according to their social behaviors which were examined in detail by Hebdige (1979) in 'Subcultures', or types of action in the daily life such as bathing, cooking as Giedion (1948) put it in his 'Mechanization Takes Command'.

The nature of typological studies enhances two ways of analyzing type: synchronic and diachronic. Walker (1989), explains synchronic and diachronic analyses as follows:

'...all washing machines share a common function. Today, most of them are also similar in form and appearance. The connection between a single machine and the whole class is a token/type relationship. If all the makes of washing machine now being manufactured were to be grouped together and compared, then certain variations of form, color, quality, mechanism and price, due to differences within product ranges and differences between manufacturing
companies, would become obvious. These differences would then need explaining. This would be an exercise in synchronic analysis. A diachronic analysis of the washing machine would consider the evolution of the type from its invention and early, primitive forms to its current sophisticated state.

There is a great number of books having typological approach as one of its adopted approaches, some of which are: 'Electrical Appliance' (1987) by Sparke, 'the Pencil' (1992) and by Petroski, 'Furniture' (1993) by Lucie-Smith, 'Auto Opium: A Social History of American Automobile Design (1994) by Gartman, '397 Chairs' edited by Danto etc.

Tiryakian (1968) has argued that this approach lacks the flexibility to deal with individual items on their own merits; typological classification, he continues, is rarely contextual and tends to exclude temporal and spatial factors. In spite of this, as Walker claims (1989), providing scholars take note of the dangers and ensure that the social context and historical development of types are explained, there seems no reason why they should not continue to find the approach fruitful. He maintains that the classification of artifacts is anyhow burdensome but has to be undertaken if the subject matter of design history is to remain manageable.

5.4. National Histories of Design

Designed goods are often promoted by reference to their nation of origin and some histories of design are written in terms of national achievements or characteristics (Walker, 1989). Nation based approaches to Design History are rare although they provide invaluable material and insight (Balcıoğlu, 1999). Here, the relationship between design and nation will be summarized and examples of national histories of design will be given.

There are those who like to think that national differences belong to the past, but the evidence of the present strongly suggests that they don't (Aldersey-Williams, 1992) National differences in design reflect important cultural, economic and geographical differences. These differences are not easy to formulate but they surely exist despite the inexorable growth in travel, population movement and international communication systems. Walker (1989) believes that 'nation' serves well to account for these differences.

As Walker (1989) puts it, some of the early designers sought to go beyond nationalism. Their aim was to solve design problems in a rational manner using new materials and technologies. Such solutions, they thought, would be universally valid, hence the origin of the label 'international style'. The concept 'Universal Design'
which has tried to develop designs for a certain kind of consumer accepted as
universal, one of the ideas that globalization has formed, has also collapsed
because of its failure in commercial success (Bayrakçi, 1996). Universal design was
not successful because it denied the difference between nations and the cultures.
This collapse had a significant role in the awareness that national identity was an aid
of selling goods in the global market where the term ‘otherness’ was of great
importance. National identities could be used as diversity artificially maintained by
manufacturers in order to sell goods. The awareness that consumers wanted
diversity caused a shift from large-scale mass production to small-scale batch
production, where goods could be tailor-made for specific groups of consumers.
Markets are no longer mass markets, they are plural and fragmented, hence the
need for ‘niche’ design and marketing to reflect and reinforce the differences. And
designs serving to show off national identities became a part of the rival.

Internationalism in trade and manufacture has created an increasing homogeneity
and standardization of design. As firms become conscious of the homogenizing
trend, they seek to revive the idea of national identity through design and advertising
in order to give their products a distinctive character however fake it is in reality. The
ideological construction of nation is thus streamlined and mobilized for use as a
marketing strategy. Here, the mythical nature of national identity becomes a tool of
marketing.

The problems facing the historian while reconstructing a history based on nations
need to be considered. First of all, the complexity of the issue of national identity in
relation to design is not an easy task to deal with, since the distinctions and the
similarities between nations are mostly characterized by the same material realities
such as economic capability, geographic similarities and cultural distinctions. Sparke
(1983) observes: ‘While Germany sells design in the name of science, Italy in the
name of art, Scandinavia in the name of craft and the USA in the name of business,
all these nations’ images of design were necessary strategies in the highly
competitive world market of the immediate post-war years.’ Walker (1989) claims
that the way Sparke talks about national identities is reducing them to a single
characteristic which is indefensible: ‘nations are too complex and diverse to be
capsulated in this way; they possess manifold characteristics, many of which are
shared by other nations. What could distinguish nations is not any one characteristic
but a particular configuration of characteristics, which achieves dominance at a
certain time.’
Secondly, nations and countries, which are not identical in all cases, are not fixed by nature: they come into being and disappear; their boundaries and names change over time. Most countries have a mixture of races, regions, languages and cultures, so the idea that a nation’s essence is the culture of one homogeneous race of people who occupy a specific area of land is untenable (Walker, 1989). So, studying national histories of design has to address and question why it does take nation as the unit of study but not the local, the regional or the ethnical. This question is of more importance within the discourse of globalization and Design History today. Some of the recent works are focusing on the issue of cultural identities free from nations but in touch with local and regional cultures.

As a third difficulty, the difficulty of the observing distinct characteristics caused by national identities in products, can be cited. The roots of identical elements are to be chased in order to understand the nation of origin, and in many cases this of little value. As an example Horne (1984) points out that even relatively universal forms can seem national: ‘in England, architectural styles from romaneseque to regency were derived from other cultures, yet they can be presented as distinctlyively English.’


5.5. Canonization and Connoisseurship

Canonization and connoisseurship are terms that are directly driven from the discourse of art history. These two concepts are accepted as one of the methods of art historiography (Fernie, 1995). In this part of the study these terms will be explained and examined respectively, with the help of texts exemplifying them. According to Bloomsbury Guide to Art (1996), ‘Canon’ is the name given to a list of works of art accepted as authentic or superior. Most recently it has come to refer to those works or artists which are considered ‘great’, although the very idea of a canon of ‘great’ artists has also been attacked by theorists who see it as a limited approach to the history of art (Fernie, 1995). Both Walker (1989) and Fry (1988)
have articulated 'canonization' to design history. In design history, two types of canonization according to the level of discourses may be stated:

- The canonization of designs and designers in design history,
- The canonization of design historians and their texts in design historiography.

Fry (1988), maintains canonization as one of the approaches to the historical study of design and states it as a problematic category as two drifts impact: a history which is generative of design heroes and movements as the primary agents of the evolution of design; and a history which takes the canon as given knowledge and as the foundation upon which to elaborate or criticize. He makes two further observations:

"The history of design produced by the connoisseur or canonizer is the history of the leadership of style. Design in these formations of knowledge progresses by the assumed asserted power of exemplary objects. Design objects are generated by a driving dynamic by designers of influence, or their movements. Two problems follow and echo other tendencies within 'the field': What of all the other designed objects, the vast majority, which evolve and are used but are excluded from such a history? What of the relation between validated design and the popular taste?"

Dilnot (1984b) also point to the same problems:

'... a canonical list of important designs and designers is rapidly being established, despite that the critical arguments for their inclusion in such a list remain almost unstated. We are seeing this sharp differentiation into 'important' and 'unimportant' design works, which is tending to exclude the unimportant works from the definition of design and to restrict the material we actually discuss. Therefore, the history of design in this sense is approaching a recitation of such 'important' works, with the consequences that the historical processes that gave rise to them are gradually disappearing. The values that the 'important works possess are increasingly being tacitly accepted as lying outside the realm of history'.

Canonization accepts a received object as 'cultured' culture, working within a 'high/low culture' framework, which includes 'low' objects as cultureless (Fry, 1988). Fry gives two examples of texts, which are canonical in the way they are written; Pevsner's Pioneers of Modern Design (1936) and Banham's 'Theory and Design in the First Machine Age'. He asserts that both of the historians are promoters of the canon and of the modern movement. Fry explains two conceptual motors Pevsner was driven by which are also evident in many canonical texts: The idealistic notion that the major force in the creation of most important objects belongs to the 'artistic personalities' of certain key designers, and, his construction of a linear history—a line of men from William Morris to Walter Gropius—put together in order to establish
facts of relative positions natural. The latter one is an important example of the problem of causality in writing canonical texts on history.

When a number of histories exist which celebrate more or less the same set of 'great' or 'pioneer' designers and their 'classic' or 'cult' objects, it is fair to say that a canon has been established. It can't be denied that there are qualitative differences between designers and between products, but the geography of a mountain range cannot be understood in terms of peaks alone (Walker, 1989). But this celebration tends to turn into myths as put by Dilnot (1984b): '...in professional design practice and design education, and now possibly in design history, a mystique of design, an almost mythic and artificial set of largely aesthetic values, is being created. In history, this development has the very real possibility of turning the writing into the writing of myth.' Contemporary myth is defined by Barthes (1972) as making the contingency appear eternal, by giving an historical intention a natural justification.

There are two stages in the canonization process of products and designers (Walker, 1989):

'...the first stage is pre-canonical: the product or the designer is increasingly mentioned, praised and predictions are made in the professional literature as to its future canonical status. When a single positive interpretation/evaluation crystallizes within the scholarly community, the work attains canonical status. Once the work is fixed in the canon initial insights tend to be lost or blurred as commentators at some distance from the original restate them. Works that fail to achieve canonical status are weeded out and forgotten; then they become invisible.

Canonization is followed by a dissemination phase in which the authoritative interpretation of the specialist is conveyed to a wider public via popular articles and textbooks. After this there are three possibilities: the work may be a cultural monument beyond the reach of criticism, or it may suffer a decline in reputation and be forgotten, or it may be subject to re-interpretation and re-evaluation by a younger generation of critics examining it from new perspectives.'

The same may be interpreted to the canonization of design historians and their texts in design historiography. In the pre-canonical stage, texts, especially books are increasingly mentioned and cited as references in professional literature as schematized in (figure 5.4.). There are a number of books that are canons in the design history, which have already been mentioned in this study such as Pevsner's Pioneers, Banham's The First Machine Age and Giedion's Mechanization Takes Command where as Forty's Objects of Desire and Woodham's 20th Century Design seem to be in their pre-canonical status.
According to the Thames and Hudson Dictionary of Art Terms (1984), 'Connoisseurship' is a term coined by the art historian Bernard Berenson (1865-1959) to mean the ability to deduce from the work of art alone, without additional supporting evidence, its period, its aesthetic merits or lack of them, and its possible relationships to other similar works, which the connoisseur has seen in the past. Connoisseurship involves the acquisition of an extensive first-hand experience of works of art with the aim, first, of attributing works to artists and schools, identifying styles and establishing sources and influences, and second, of judging their quality and hence their place in a canon. So it won't be a mistake to argue that the canon and the connoisseur exist mostly together.

As many art historiographical methods, connoisseurship has taken its place in design history, too. Fry (1988), claims that connoisseurship has particular relevance as modern capitalism's major way of presenting design history. From the connoisseurship perspective, the central concern of a history of design is aesthetic where design may be asserted as 'good' or defined as 'bad' which have created the notion of 'good design'. Connoisseurship leaves products stranded in a historical location, which negates any recognition of their place in the social relations of their production and consumption.

There are a number of books that can be cited to illustrate connoisseurship some of them which are 'In Good Shape – Style in Industrial Products 1900-1960' (1979) by Bayley and 'Classic Plastics' (1984) by Katz.

The title itself, 'In Good Shape – Style in Industrial Products', is predicated on an assumption that style is a posited quality and, as such, forms part of the essence inherent in the object (Fry, 1988). The book includes extracts of texts written by famous designers and pundits such as Behrens, Loewy, van Doren etc., each with a short introduction of Bayley, the bulk of the book is full of products to represent 'the
best of the year' and ends with a mini-biography of the famous designers. These kinds of books seek an exhibition mode of content organization supported with both the intent and the format (Fry, 1988). They are bestowed with artistic photos of the products which transform the objects they represent like the ones used in advertisements where products seem to exist in a vacuum, away from any reality that exist within the environment (figure 5.5. and 5.6) The objects are put on display for display as Fry (1988) puts it.

Figure 5.5. Hymonophon Gramophone designed by Holzweissig, 1909 scratched from its environment (Bayley, 1979).

Figure 5.6. IBM executive electric typewriter, designed by Eliot Noyes, 1959 (Bayley, 1979).

What Bayley has done is, leave products stranded in an historical location which negates any recognition of their place in the social relations of their production and consumption. Fry (1988) claims that style and the century industrial design as an object worthy of serious study has not been treated as such by Bayley since his approach is connoisseurial.
Katz's 'Classic Plastics' is also connoisseurial apparently that have such statements:

'The fact that there are plastic antiques comes as a shock to most people. How can a material that seems so essentially 20th century, and one that is so much associated with cheap, disposable products, have a history at all? It is a young technology, and a great part of the fun of collecting plastics is that beautiful pieces of historical interest can still be found very cheaply.'

'What is certain in the 1980s is that there will be more and more emphasis on improving the properties of existing plastics so that they can replace other materials to greater advantage. Collectors should take note of these take-overs as they happen.'

The book ends with the part 'A collector's Guide' which includes information on looking after plastic and simple tests for identification as appearance test, feel test, function test, smell test, float test and heat test. The book is indeed connoisseurial.

The problem with connoisseurship is the way that they construct design history, which is extremely partial. Values always shift across cultural boundaries. Re-modernizing connoisseurship as design history is an inappropriate way of studying design.

5.6. Periodization of Time and Chronology

Before segmenting time into periods the concept of time that the historians study has to be examined. What is time – whether past, present or future? This question is central on many different levels, to the understanding of what history is. The historian who fails to conceptualize time, its variable speeds in different contexts, and its varying impact upon past or present societies, will be somewhat disadvantaged (Black and MacRaild, 1997). Time must not be viewed as an inflexible or unchanging entity but as relative phenomenon (Tekeli, 1998). Certain things about time do remain static, however, when historians concern themselves with time it is not to ask: has the number of hours changed over time? Time has to be focused on in a relative perspective: the relationship between past time and present time; the number of things, for example, that historical and contemporary actors could do in the same time; our time versus theirs (Black and MacRaild, 1997).

Time should not be thought of as an element of causality. It should not be accounted as an explanatory variant since it does not have an absolute existence, and using 'time' as an explanatory variant causes the superficial 'historicism' (Tekeli, 1998). But, in history, it is important to put the relations of causality in an order of time. Periodization and chronology help to form this order of relations of causality.

Periodization serves to limit the extent of time studied since most of the historians focus on a segment of time. Periodization and chronology are approaches used as
support to other approaches. There are questions that periodization raises. Can a period of time have a specific beginning and an end? No matter if a period has a beginning and an end, there is a strong temptation to impose a neat storyline. Most historians find it necessary to review what preceded and what followed their chosen period. But how backwards and forwards should they range? The search for origins can be highly problematic since there always seem to be an earlier cause, which could be cited (Walker, 1989, Black and MacRaild, 1997).

Historians periodize history according to important events such as natural disasters, wars, revolutions, economic crises, technological changes, political reforms etc. Walker (1989) claims that the design historian can elect either to use general economic/technological/political segments such as ‘the era of capitalism’, ‘the epoch of the industrial revolution’, ‘the Victorian age’, or to use boundaries more specific to design itself, for example, the lifespan of a particular style: Art Nouveau, the Machine Age.

The historian periodizes the time section he is studying according to the detail and importance of changes he wants to focus on. If the historian wants to study the time section he has chosen in a macro level, then the periods he determines will be of longer time. But if he wants to chase the changes in detail say micro level, then, the periods he determines has to be of shorter time. The importance of a change or event differs according to the extents of the period being studied (Tekeli, 1998). So, the historians have to periodize the time section he wants to study coherent with the aims and objectives of the study in order to make reasoned inclusions and exclusions. Each branch of history writing tends to periodize the past differently according to the relative autonomy of their chosen subject. One notable point on periodizing time is the concept of long duration that Braudel has pointed out. His concept of time ‘la longue durée’ alleges that it is not efficient to study past in short terms (Braudel, 1980). But the periods of time seem to get shorter in the twentieth century, as the developments of any kind in the realm of design have gained acceleration. Most of the design historical works periodize the time section into decades. Walker (1989) find this ‘decades’ approach problematical since the historians feel compelled to detect a unique style or spirit of the age in each decade whether there was one or not.

Chronologies are the arrangement of events, dates, etc. in the order of their occurrence and they are another way of segmenting time. In Design History, it is mostly the products which are chronologically ordered with few exceptions like the chronology in the back of the ‘Twentieth Century Design’ (1997) by Woodham or the
chronologies in the 'Industrial Design: Reflection of a Century' (1993) edited by de Noblet. Noblet's chronology forms the backbone of the historical section of the work, linking developments in design to significant social, cultural and political events.

Now, some of the periodization types that have taken place in Design History will be epitomized. Two books, which were also referred to in the Production Techniques and Materials Approach, are good examples of the 'decades' periodization type: Katz's 'Classic Plastics' (1984) and Heath and Jensen's '300 Hundred Years of Industrial Design' (2000). Katz examines seven decades starting from the 1920s. She entitles each decade with a phrase and explains it with a sentence as follows:

- Artistic and useful – the 1920s – The first synthetics: entirely new colors and shapes appear in the home.
- Mass-produced glamour – the 1930s – Plastics lend themselves to ultra-modern living, and also to flashy design.
- Economy of effort – the 1940s – war technology and labor-saving for the consumer: plastics as growth industry.
- The sheerer area – the 1950s – Slick packaging: new discoveries by the minute, as plastics invade every area of life.
- Good-time gloss – the 1960s – From fun furniture to cast acrylic candy: inflatables, disposables and the wet look.
- A transitory presence – the 1970s – An end to abundance: cynical sophistication and the rise of structural foams.
- Function and beyond – the 1980s – Solid engineering and ornamental riot: new metaphors and utopias for the plastic future.

The reason why Katz chooses decades may be as follows: every decade has a distinct or significant type of plastic or a new production technique, in every decade plastic has played a different role in the everyday life. Anyhow, the way that Katz explains the decades is quasi-convincing. In other words, Katz seems to have felt compelled to detect a unique style, spirit of the decade or another discrete feature in order to segment time into decades.

The case with the '300 Hundred Years of Industrial Design' seems rather different. The authors, in the introduction, profess that the book is not an attempt to systematize the history of industrial design since it would be unmanageable. What they have done is to break the subject into types of manufacturing and superimpose it onto the decades of time. It is obvious that the 'decades' are used in order to manage the work done, but not to point out the distinctions between the decades as it was in the Katz's study. The placing of the products in the book is chronological,
but the authors note that the chronology of objects produced in large quantities which have been made over a long period, or dropped and later resumed, naturally has to be flexible (Heath and Jensen, 2000). The products studied are sometimes placed in the decade of their invention, sometimes when they were at the height of their popularity. The first is of historical interest; the second informs of the success of the product. The authors also admits that instead of the exact placement of the object in the chronology, the extent to which one can learn something about design from them was of more importance through out the study. This is a question of the aim of the design history, and the authors explained well of their attempts.

In the end of the book, there is a well-constructed chronological orientation chart that segments the time into decades (figure 5.7.). The chronology moves from left to right horizontally in decades; materials are placed vertically. The chart allows the reader to examine the products of different materials and compare them with each other, in each decade which are on different pages through out the book. The authors claim that the eighteenth century is divided not into decades but, because of the difficulty in finding and recording products of this age with the same degree of detail as the later ones, into three periods only. So, although the authors used the ‘decades’ as periods throughout the book, they were not compelled the first chapter into decades since it was not convenient.

![Chronological Orientation Chart]

Figure 5.7. A part of the orientation chart in the 300 Hundred Years of I.D. (Heath and Jensen, 2000).
In 'Industrial Design: Reflection of a Century' edited by de Noblet (1993), the evolution of industrial design is separated into five periods: 1851-1879, 1880-1917, 1918-1945, 1946-1973 and 1974-1993. The periods of time have specific beginnings and ends that raises the question of how the periodization could be positioned such specifically? The editor does not give the exact reason for this but one can try to answer this question by examining the chronologies that take place throughout the historical part of the work, but still cannot reach a satisfactory answer.

In 'A Century of Design: Design Pioneers of the 20th Century' (1998), Sparke also uses her own segmentation of the Twentieth Century into six periods such as The New Century, Conservative Modernism, Progressive Modernism, The New Modernism, Action and Reaction and Towards the Millennium which are also the names of the chapters forming the book. Sparke periodizes the time she studies according to the ideas and style adopted.

5.7. The Structuralist, Semiotic and Semantic Approaches to Design

Modern structuralism is closely associated with the discipline of anthropology, in particular the work of Lévi-Strauss. Structuralist anthropologists demonstrate their debt to linguistics by treating human culture, myth and behavior as if they were 'articulated like a language' and by employing terms derived from linguistics. During the 1960s, structuralism was one of the most fashionable and influential schools of thought emanating from Paris. Its impact on British scholars was most marked, therefore, in the 1970s (Walker, 1989).

Structuralism is described as follows by Walker (1989):

'Structuralism is interested in structures, especially unconscious ones. People obey the social rules of kinship without being taught them in any systematic way; similarly people speak languages based on systems of grammatical rules without consciously understanding them: it is these deep, hidden structures which the analyst seek to identify. A structure is a whole or totality consisting of various parts or elements which are systematically related to one another and to the whole... Structures are dynamic: they are capable of change, or rather, transformation. Structures are governed by sets of intrinsic laws which enable transformations to take place, hence they are capable of structuring.'

There are several varieties of structuralism and several definitions of 'structure'. Lévi-Strauss (1963) believes that structures are not directly observable, empirical phenomena but models devised by the analyst as a means of understanding reality. However, he maintains that the best models are 'true', hence a correspondence
between model and reality is presumed. Lévi-Strauss discussed the problem of the relationship between structuralism and history. His conclusion was that they are complementary, not opposed, activities. Whereas structuralists are concerned with the ability of systems to transform themselves while still retaining the same structure, historians are concerned with how such systems originate, reproduce themselves, change and decay (Lévi-Strauss, 1963). Structuralism had profound effects on History and historiography which turned out to Structuralist history later named the New History, which is also studied as a separate chapter below.

Walker (1989) maintains that structuralism was a radical intellectual force for a period:

'It's claim that human behavior is governed by unconscious structures undermined the traditional humanist faith in the will and genius of individual subjects but it was equally disturbing for left-wing thinkers because the assumption that structures were innate dispositions of the human mind implied a fatalism which threatened their belief in the powers of human beings to transform themselves and society by means of revolution or political reforms.'

Semiotics has been described as 'the general science of signs, the science that studies the life of signs in society'. Like structuralism, this science became extremely fashionable in France and Italy among cultural and mass communication theorists during the 1960s, though its origins can be traced back several centuries. Various scholars are regarded as its founding fathers and leading contributors include U.Eco, R.Barthes, C.W.Morris, R.Jakobson, A.J.Greimas, T.Todorov, J.Kristeva, V.Propp, T.Sebeok and L.Hjelmslev.

Charles W.Morris, an American theorist, once proposed to divide semiotics into three branches (Walker, 1989):

- Syntactics, concerned with the formal relations between signs
- Semantics, concerned with the meanings of signs, the relations between signs and referents, signs and truth
- Pragmatics, concerned with the relations between signs and those who produce them and those who receive and understand them.

Walker (1989) says that historians are to deal with pragmatics precisely because they are interested in questions like: who in the 1950s found Paris fashion meaningful? Who actually bought and wore it? What did it mean to French society as a whole and to other foreign cultures? Krippendorf (1992) defines pragmatics as the description of how human respond to a reality that is the same for every one within a community. Pragmatics necessitates a widening of the field of view to
include not only texts and messages but also addressers and addressees (or senders and receivers, or encoders and decoders) and the particular context in which communication takes place as shown in figure 5.8.
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Figure 5.8. Six elements pragmatics necessitates, (Walker, 1989)

As Walker (1989) put it Jakobson argued that while all these elements may be involved in any message, in many one predominates. This led him to identify six kind of language function, one for each element:

1. Context: the referential function (the message refers to context or reality).
2. Addresser: the emotive function (the message calls attention to speaker’s mood or feelings).
3. Addressee: the conative or imperative function (the message, e.g. an order, refers mainly to the listener’s response).
4. Contact or Channel: the phatic function (the message, e.g. remarks about the weather, is simply a way of keeping contact).
5. Code: the poetic function (the message is self-focusing, it foregrounds the codes of language itself for aesthetic reasons).
6. Message: the metalingual function (the message is about itself or other messages).

Although designed goods, fashions and buildings are perhaps not messages in the same sense as speech acts and letters, they can and do communicate ideas. And advertisements are certainly a form of design which delivers messages. So, in so far as designed artifacts can be said to be acts of communication, then Jakobson’s six functions will prove of value to design historians in understanding them more systematically (Walker, 1989). Baudrillard (1968) has also pointed to the products: ‘Today every desire, plan, need, every passion and relation is abstracted or materialized as sign and as object to be purchased and consumed.’

There are a considerable number of semiotic analyses of visual/material culture including: C.Metz and P.Wollen on cinema, C.Jencks on architecture, R.Barthes on photography, advertising and fashion, J. Williamson and G. Bonsiepe on advertising,
J. Bertin on diagrams, J. Baudrillard and M. Bense on design, U. Eco on comics, architecture and television, D. Preziosi on the built environment, D. Hebdige on subcultures, P. Bogatyrev on costume and folk theatre. As is evident from the list, aspects of graphic design and media have received more attention from semioticians than industrial design. Maldonado and Gui Bonsiepe were among the first to look at design from a semantic point of view, and Maldonado taught one of the first semiotics courses offered in a design school (Margolin, 1989). Reinhard Butter and Klaus Krippendorf have taken on a prominent role in the development of product semantics, the application of theories of communication to the design of product forms (Margolin, 1989). Since then many studies have been done especially in UIAH on these issues, but none of them has acted between semantics and design history.

Walker (1989) states that semiotics is relevant to design historians:

'because some designers, keen to increase their mastery of communication processes, are incorporating the science into their design methods. Designers, after all, rework existing signs and construct new ones. Their control or freedom in this respect is, however, a matter of debate because of the social nature of signification: without shared codes and bodies of knowledge communication between people would be impossible.'

Figure 5.9. The diachronic and synchronic analysis, (Walker, 1989)

Another important issue that semiotics raised for history is a new conception of time. Historians have been characterized as those concerned with developments taking place through time. But now the historians tend to alternate between two terms introduced by the linguist Saussure (1974): the dia-chronic and the synchronic. A language, Saussure (1974) maintained, can be studied in two ways: first, by looking at changes taking place through time; and secondly, by looking at a language as a logical system. The two modes of analysis are different ways of dissecting the same
object of study. They are generally visualized in terms of a diagram with two axes as shown in figure 5.9.

Saussure (1974) asserted that the two perspectives were radically different: 'One a relation between simultaneous elements' (the synchronic); and 'the other the substitution of one element for another in time, an event' (the diachronic). Each approach, Saussure believed, generated different truths and therefore demanded different disciplines; scientific rigor would be lost if the two approaches were conflated or confused. It can be argued that the two modes of analysis are interdependent. Walker (1989) claims that books about design with a diachronic emphasis are common enough, less common are synchronic ones.

5.8. Design History and Gender

Design and gender has been a subject to some of the design historians since the 1980s. Not only design history but also history in general, art history and architectural history has been affected by kinds of gender studies. The aim of this part of the study is to examine the view which alleges that design history constructed till the 1980s is a gendered design history and needs to be reconstructed taking account of feminist theory. To understand the effects and to assume the future effects of feminism on the historical study of design, first, feminism and some of the concepts that feminism has raised to attention need to be examined. Then, feminist interventions in art historical platform will be summarized since the ones who links design history to feminism were again historians of art. Lastly, the entrance of feminist thought to the historical study of design will be pointed out.

Feminism has highly been interested in gender issues since the two genders are masculine and feminine. It is important to stress that the feminists did not consider gender in isolation from other forms of power relationships such as race and class, because all of them are parts of the construction of social, political and economic power. Pollock (1988) states that women studies are not just about women —but about the social systems and ideological schemata which sustain the domination of men over women within the other mutually inflecting regimes of power in the world, namely those of class, those of race.

In order to go further, the first term to be defined is 'gender'. In the Penguin Dictionary of Sociology, (Abercrombie, N., Hill, S., Turner, B.S., 1994), gender is defined as follows:
'If the sex of a person is biologically determined, the gender of a person is culturally and socially constructed. There are thus two sexes (male and female) and two genders (masculine and feminine). The principal theoretical and political issue is whether gender as a socially constructed phenomenon is related to or determined by biology. For example, in the nineteenth century various medical theories suggested that the female personality was determined by anatomy and women's reproductive functions. These views have been challenged by feminism. Anthropological research has also shown the cultural specificity of notions about gender, sexuality and sex-roles. For example, M. Mead showed in a number of cross-cultural studies that, while gender differentiation is wide spread, the social tasks undertaken by men and women are highly variable. There is no general relationship across societies between social roles and biological sex. Social psychologists have treated gender-identity as the product of child training rather than as biologically given.

More recently, critics have challenged these interpretations, because while sociologists distinguish between sex and gender, they often treat the latter as an expression of the former, thereby giving biology a determining significance, and they fail to provide the connection between the economic subordination of women and its expression through the family and personal life. In the radical critique, it is the place of women in relation to economic production which ultimately determines male/female differences. In this sense, it can be argued that 'gender' is analogous to class relationships. The task of establishing systematic, causal connections between capitalism, class and patriarchy has, however, proved to be highly problematic. Theoretical attempts to develop a sociological perspective on biological sex, gender, sex-roles and personality have nevertheless transformed many taken-for-granted assumptions in a number of sociological topics. For example, feminists within the psychoanalytic tradition have challenged the basic ideas of Freud by showing that the Oedipus complex, penis envy and castration complex should be interpreted as features of the symbolic world of patriarchal power.'

In Bloomsbury Guide to Human Thought (1993), feminism is defined as 'advocacy of the right of women to equality with men in all spheres of life' and 'women's struggle to gain that right'. The distinction reflects its dual nature: it is at once a socio-political theory and a social movement. Feminists have used many different methods to enable the vision of equality to be realized, and feminists do not always agree on the causes for women's oppression. Consequently, many contemporary feminists prefer to use the plural 'feminisms' to reflect the different perspectives that must, necessarily, be given voice (Beasley, 1999).

According to Offen (1988) the term 'feminism' barely existed before the twentieth century, and originating in France, it only began to be employed in the 1890s. In other words, it is a relatively new term within the long history of western social and political theory and in this sense suggests a new framework or new frameworks. Moreover, the meaning of feminism has varied over time and its present multiple meanings are rather different from those in use in the 1890s. Delmar (1986) suggests in this context that there is no set 'ideal' or vision in feminism. She also
distinguishes between the practical politics of women’s movement and a history of ideas. Delmar (1986) considers that feminism may exist only in the form of an intellectual tendency with or without the benefit of a social movement. However, many feminist writers do not accept a conception of feminism as simply a set of ideas existing in the absence of a movement. In other words, there are both broad and narrow definitions of feminism which affect how feminist thought is seen and what it might be said to offer. Delmar (1986) notes that in contrast to this lack of uniformity in response to the question of ‘what is feminism?’ there has often been a considerable degree of consistency in the images said to represent feminism and feminists. When images are considered to refer to styles of dress, haircuts, ways of behaving, attitudes and so on, graphic pictures probably can be conjured up. It is interesting that these easily evoked images are more often associated with pejorative views of feminism. However, the images also suggest an impulse to tie feminism down to something and to ignore considerable differences over the characteristics of feminism.

Beasley (1999) asserts that although many authors have considered feminist thought, existing writers rarely attend to the issue of what it is they are discussing. The meaning of the term ‘feminism’ is almost invariably assumed and/or evaded. Beasley (1999) states that: ‘Some writers adopt the view that feminism should not be conceived in terms of ideas alone, since it also refers to political struggles. Others suggest feminism could be described even more broadly. Braidotti, for instance, talks of ‘the means chosen by certain women to situate themselves in reality so as to redesign their feminine condition.’

Although a precise definition of feminism does not exist, all kinds of feminist thought offer a critique of mainstream thought in any area of study. Mainstream social and political theory today is characteristically generated at a distance from feminist thought. However, feminists have argued that this is simply a part of three ongoing processes: excluding, marginalizing and trivializing women and their accounts of social and political life (Beasley, 1999).

What clearly links ‘feminist’ as against other theoretical frameworks is a particular view of traditional social and political thought (Beasley, 1999). That view involves a critique. It is a critique of misogyny, the assumption of male superiority and centrality. It is common knowledge among feminists that social and political theory was, and for the most part still is, written by men and about men. There have been several different feminist responses to the perceived inadequacy of the mainstream thought. Beasley (1999), summarizes these responses as follows:
1. Inclusion/Addition Approach: The first response involves a view that women and women theorists have been omitted from Western social and political theory and that therefore the task of feminist thinkers is to put them back in.

2. Critique, Reject and Start Again Approach: This view declares that traditional political theory is utterly bankrupt in the light of present perspectives. Such an approach expresses doubts about the success of any agenda to ‘fix’ traditional thought since that thought is conceived as built upon assumptions regarding sexual hierarchy.

3. Deconstruct and Transform Approach: This is the view that declares that it would be impossible to develop a theoretical framework completely uncontaminated by past perspectives or by the history of male domination. Such a perspective argues that one cannot escape from his/her social and intellectual context and ironically, that traditional thought might be seen as a means to elaborate feminist theory itself, since the more the sexual politics of culture and intellectual heritage is understood, the better it is able to comment on and transform it. Feminist thought here is regarded as revealing the partial and sexualized character of existing theoretical knowledge. As Beasley puts it, if traditional thought is seen as a sweater, the above viewpoint might be described in the following terms: ‘don’t throw away the wool, but rather unravel and re-stitch the jumper, perhaps several times’.

5.8.1. Feminism and Art History

The effect of feminism on art history is an important issue before examining the effects of feminism on design history since they are not concomitant but parallel in some ways. Since the 1970s feminists have interacted with the history of art in a large number of ways. Most straightforwardly first generation feminists have added to the corpus of known artists by conducting research into work that has been ignored by previous art historians. They have also examined and assessed the effects of the division between the arts and crafts on the reputations of artists. Because women were generally restricted to making artifacts such as quilts and clothing which were classified as crafts, arts historians considered that what they made was marginal to the discipline and their makers therefore not eligible for inclusion in the canon of great artists. These approaches may be explained as parallel to the inclusion/addition approach stated by Beasley above.
For about a decade after Linda Nochlin's article "Why Are There No Great Women Artists?" (1971), which is considered as the commencement of feminist inquiry in art history, most feminist art history was still devoted to biographical and expository studies on neglected women artists (Atfield, 1989). The objective of the biographical studies was to prove that women have been accomplished artists, even if not as "great" as men, and to place women artists within the canonical framework of art history. Then it became clear that there had been no point in then looking for 'great' women artists since the criteria for greatness has been laid down by men. That approach has been criticized since the end of 1970s. The new generation was not to be satisfied with what it considered an additive process, and they challenged the categories and values of art history in patriarchal culture. The feminist contributors to art history also criticized conventional feminist art history as ultimately self-defeating, for it fixes women within pre-existing structures without questioning the validity of structures. Tickner especially resisted the old feminist approaches which provide information about women artists and their work without attention to social, political, and cultural phenomena (Kim, 1999).

The approach of the second generation feminists is parallel to the approach 'Critique, Reject and Start Again' stated by Beasley above. They are interested in feminist art historical methodologies rather than the existing historical study of art. They needed to study the imagery using a variety of methods such as psychoanalysis, semiotics and structuralism (Fernie, 1995). Concerning psychoanalysis, for example, many feminists are cautious of accepting Freud's version because it appears to presuppose a patriarchally structured world and a form of sexual identification in which differences between male and female are natural and biologically determined (Beasley, 1999). In order to understand this approach, the concept 'patriarchy' raised by feminism need to be scrutinized. In the Bloomsbury Guide to Human Thought (1993) patriarchy is defined and discussed as follows:

"Patriarchy is a family or society dominated by men. Feminists have sought to identify the mechanisms that support patriarchal structures. Different feminisms look at different areas of patriarchal ideologies. Feminist anthropologists and sociologists have challenged the analysis of social structures based on men as head as families. Feminist economists have looked at the way in which economics has not accounted for invisible and unpaid work by women. Feminist literary critics have rewritten the patriarchal canon of male authors by rediscovering and republishing forgotten women writers, giving a new criterion for assessing the importance of popular literary genres. Some feminist theorists have used socialist analysis of class structure and psychoanalytic theories of gender construction as methodological tools to help uncover invisible patriarchal structures. Juliet Mitchell, for example, in her influential book
Women's Estate, uses both these methodologies to identify four main areas in which patriarchy exercises its power: production, reproduction, socialization and sexuality.

Many feminists contend that the central mechanism of patriarchy is the way in which male domination is disguised as a 'natural' phenomenon. For many women patriarchy is experienced in the form of the father beyond whose authority there can be no further appeal. Patriarchy is often characterized by some feminists as being linear, monolithic and unable to tolerate divergent viewpoints. Feminists have shown that the patriarchal construction of femininity has relied upon a male-defined biological view. Jacqueline Rose describes the female experience of femininity as an injury, because in a patriarchy femininity is used to disable women to secure male power. The power of patriarchy has been identified by feminism in (amongst many areas of life) politics, economics, religion, science, education and academe, and in all of these areas the male point of view is invisibly privileged and is taken to be universal. One of the more recent debates that has emerged in feminism concerns the possibility of women's participation in these fields without the necessity of adopting a masculinized role.

Pollock and her concomitants, belonging to the second generation of feminism, analyzed women's historical and ideological position in relation to art, art production, and artistic ideology as a means to question the traditional historical framework, as well as the methodologies of previous feminist art history. Central to this project are the writings of Griselda Pollock and Lisa Tickner, along with Tamar Garb, Joan Copjec, Mary Kelly, Martha Fleming, Mitra Tabrizian, and Lucy Lippard in Block magazine published between 1979-1989. Pollock and Tickner especially criticized the attempt to integrate the names and works of women artists into the traditional art historical canon. Other contributors also confronted the values and interests produced within art history, and especially the function of culture in the formation of patriarchy. Using theories such as the construction of gender, psychoanalytic theory, semiotics, and post-structuralism, they deconstructed the methods of mainstream art history, the concept of women's art and artists, the role of art and the artist within society and the male fascination with the female body, as well as male-defined notions of greatness and artistic achievement.

The problems of defining an object of study appropriate to design history have been fraught by precedents set by art history. Although feminist art history does present us with an excellent body of critique and methodology, it cannot be appropriated and applied directly to design unless we treat design as if it were art. There is some measure of agreement that it need not just be about the appreciation of something called 'good design' nor the attribution of authorship to particular designers of certain cult objects, lest the whole exercise deteriorate into one of connoisseurship.
5.8.2. Issue of Gender in Design History

The issue of gender has many times been referred to by many design historians some of which are Margolin (1992), Dilnot (1984a,b), Fry (1988), Buckley (1986) and Attfield (1989). There are two levels of discourse that design and gender are mainly construed by:

- the statements and texts about the 'gendered design history consciousness' when writing design history and writing about the effects of this consciousness and unconsciousness about design history.
- the texts attempting to write design history extending beyond gendered issues.

As it was the case for art history and gender, design history and gender has again feminism in the core of its studies. In the 1980s, a feminist approach to design history has been placed tightly on the agenda. Feminist design historians, theorists, and practitioners have attempted to coordinate their activities through teaching strategies, the organization of conferences, and in publications, because, as Pollock has stated, a feminist approach is neither a side-issue nor a novel historical perspective—it is a central concern of contemporary design history (Buckley, 1986).

Margolin (1992) claims that feminism is the most powerful critique of design history thus far, although feminist historians are divided among those who have maintained a static definition of 'design' and history's relation to it and those who are interested in using history to explore what a feminist design practice may be like. Despite these differences, however, feminists have had to break down the distinction between history, theory, and criticism in order to establish a different vantage point from which to view design and design history.

In one of the four areas of work in design history declared by Dilnot (1984a), one of which was focusing on the social relations of various kinds of design, he also cited feminism as follows:

'...so, too, is the emerging feminist analysis of design. The feminist analysis is particularly important to architectural history and criticism, especially in the United States, and to the analysis of images in the mass media, ranging from the study of cosmetics packaging to visual pornography. In addition, feminist design history possesses the supreme virtue of refusing the distinction between design and social life that characterizes so much design thinking, practice, and historical work. Purists who reject feminist design history on the grounds that it is insufficiently concerned with design are ignoring one of its important aspects. It is precisely the feminist analysis that relates the design of things intimately and concretely to
the ways in which objects and images affect us. This should not be surprising; after all, it is the place in people's lives that design in general would claim for itself.'

Although women have been involved with design in a variety of ways such as practitioners, theorists, consumers, historians and objects of representation; a survey of the literature of design history, theory and practice would lead one to believe otherwise. Buckley (1986), by giving examples of books such as Pevsner's Pioneers (1936), Banham's Theory and Design in the First Machine Age (1960), Heskett's Industrial Design (1980), maintains that the interventions of women into design are consistently ignored both in the past and present. She asserts that the omissions are not accidental and haphazard, but are the direct consequence of specific historiographic methods. She claims that the methods used which involve selection, classification, and prioritization of types of design, categories of designers, distinct styles and movements, and different modes of production, are biased against women, and serve to exclude them from history. She also states that the few women who make it into the literature of design are accounted for within the framework of patriarchy; they are either defined by their gender as designers or users of feminine products, or they are subsumed under the name of their husbands, lover, father or brother.

Feminist perspectives offer design history a range of historical/critical methods which challenge the mainstream about how it defines design as a practice, about the parameters of what type of designed objects it should examine, about what values are given priority in assessing it, and even who it calls designers. The Feminist input to Design History may be examined as shown in the figure 5.10.
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**Figure 5.10. Feminist Input to Design History**

### 5.8.2.1. Women Designers Approach

'Women-designers' approach concerns itself with adding the names of women designers to the conventional account of the history of design (Attfield, 1989). This approach may be explained as parallel to the one claimed by Beasley (1999) as the
Addition/Inclusion approach. It is obvious that any area feminism introduces itself, first starts with trying to include women to the established norms and then starts to criticize the norms and the deviations of the patriarchal culture.

Attfield (1989) asserts that 'women designers' approach does little except confirm the prejudice that women are inferior designers except in the so-called 'feminine' areas such as the decorative arts, textiles, interior design and fashion. She cites other problems to looking at women designers as the main focus. For instance, the restrictions of method in the conventional biography place them in a preset, hierarchical framework in which, 'great', usually male, designers appear. A considerable body of work has built up around an object-based study of the history of design, which avoids some of the more overtly sexist problems by not focusing on designers. As Attfield (1989) put it this is not to say that object-based study is innocent and neutral in matters of gender. On the contrary, a hierarchy has built up around types of objects which gives importance to industrial design and the machine aesthetic while considering areas such as fashion as trivial and synonymous with 'feminine'.

A feminist critique makes it possible to look at women designers in a new light and to assess their work in the context of the history of a profession, which has consistently marginalized them. It also suggests a methodology for design history, which is not based upon aesthetics or connoisseurship, but upon a concern for people.

5.8.2.2. Feminist Critique of Design

Attfield (1989) believes that it is symptomatic of the postmodern condition that it should be considered important to include a feminist critique of design. A fundamental starting point for feminist design historians that Attfield (1989) stresses is the fact that women experience the designed world different from men. Another important point is, feminists criticize every structure of design history since it is constructed in a patriarchal way and each category below has to be examined with the consciousness of patriarchy.

1. The Role and Place of Women in the Social Division of Labor

The role of design in forming our ideas about gender power relations often remains invisible, while at the same time it makes them concrete in the everyday world of material goods(Buckley, 1986). Feminist analysis, examining the role and place of women in the social division of labor has taken two main directions. One has concentrated on the domestic sphere as a site of the construction of femininity and
studied patterns of socialization. The other has been the study of the work-home divide in order to understand the articulation of patriarchy and capitalism and the material, social and economic effects. As Goodall (1983) put it, feminists have identified the home and the social relations of domestic and personal life as a primary site of the subordination of women. It is a significant sphere of the construction of gender difference, of the division of domestic and paid labor, which under capitalist patriarchal relations, coincides to a marked degree with the division of labor by gender.

Women face domestic appliances with formulated ideas (figure 5.11.), desires and wants about their relation to these machines as gendered users, mediated by socialization, education, training and practical use. As workers in the home they may face the same machine with a different perspective than when working outside. The machine in office or factory represents labor in exchange for pay; at home it represents the complex pleasure and drudgery of caring, of performing tasks in exchange for material support in kind, or ascribed social status as female (Goodall, 1983).

Figure 5.11. 'Battle of the Centuries' dishwashing contest between Mrs. Drudge and Mrs. Modern at the New York World's Fair, 1939 (Woodham, 1997). The modernization of women was taking place in house again.

Buckley (1986) thinks of patriarchy, central to a feminist analysis of women's role in design. She alleges that patriarch has circumscribed women's opportunities to participate fully in all areas of society and, more specifically, in all sectors of design,
through a variety of means—institutional, social, economic, psychological, and historical:

'Women are considered to possess sex-specific skills that determine their design abilities; they are apparently dexterous, decorative and meticulous. These skills mean that women are considered to be naturally suited to certain areas of design production, namely, the so-called decorative arts, including such works as jewelry, embroidery, graphic illustration, weaving, knitting, pottery, and dressmaking.

Dressmaking, for example, has been seen as a natural area for women to work in. It is viewed as an obvious vehicle for their femininity, their desire to decorate, and their obsession with their appearances. Fashion design, however, has been appropriated by male designers who have assumed the persona of genius—Christian Dior, Yves Saint Laurent, and, more recently, Karl Lagerfeld. Fashion as design process is thought to transcend the sex-specific skills of dexterity, patience, and decorativeness associated with dressmaking. Instead, it involves creative imagination, and the aggressive business and marketing skills that are part of the male stereotype.'

2. Use-value

A feminist perspective can be quite specific in its focus on use-value. By providing historical explanations for women's lack of visibility at the production stage, it is possible to understand better why dominant masculine values are constantly reproduced in the material world.

Design historians who examine women's role in design must acknowledge that women in the past and women today are placed within the context of patriarchy, and that ideas about women's design abilities and design needs originate in patriarchy. In a patriarchy, men's activities are valued more highly than women's. For example, industrial design has been given higher status than knitted textiles (Buckley, 1986). The reasons for this valuation are complex. In an advanced industrial society in which culture is valued above nature, male roles are seen as being more cultural than natural; female roles are seen as the reverse of this. This practice of defining women's design skills in terms of their biology is reinforced by socially constructed notions of masculine and feminine, which assign different characteristics to male and female.

As pointed out by Attfield (1989) and Buckley (1986), designs produced by women in the domestic environment are seen to represent use-value rather than exchange-value. The design produced by women designers in a domestic environment are used by the family in the home rather than exchanged for profit within the capitalist marketplace. At this point capitalism and patriarchy interact to devalue this type of
design; essentially, it has been made in wrong place—the home, and for the wrong market—the family.

3. Redefinition of Design

Central to a feminist critique of design history is a redefinition of design. To date design historians have esteemed more highly and deemed more worthy of analysis the creators of mass-produced objects. Subsequently, they have argued that ‘design history...is a study of mass-produced objects’. Feminists have challenged this definition as prejudging the nature of design by emphasizing only one mode of production and thereby excluding craft production. This challenge is complicated by the development of craft history as an academic discipline distinct from design history, although, to date, craft historians have not dealt adequately with women’s craft work.

If a feminist approach to women’s design production is to be articulated, it must cut across these exclusive definitions of design and craft to show that women used craft modes of production for specific reasons, not merely because they were biologically predisposed toward them. To exclude craft from design history is, in effect, to exclude from design much of what women designed. For women, craft modes of production were the only means of production available, because they had access neither to the factories of the new industrial system nor to the training offered by the new design schools. Indeed, craft allowed women an opportunity to express their creative and artistic skills outside of the male-dominated design profession. As a mode of production, it was easily adapted to the domestic setting and therefore compatible with traditional female roles.

An example of mainstream history of design, Penny Sparke’s ‘An Introduction to Design and Culture in the Twentieth Century (1986)’, avoids defining design because ‘available definitions are varied, complex, contradictory and in a state of permanent flux.’ But by devoting her attention to industrial, mass-produced goods and the education and practice of professional designers, Sparke represents the conventional high ground of design history, traditionally associated with the mechanized and male-dominated areas of design where women only appear as passive consumers (Atfield, 1989).

4. Women as consumers and objects

Banham (1960), identifies two sexes in his history of the first machine age: men and housewives. Just as we have seen that women’s place was assumed to be in the home, so the division of labor in our society has traditionally assumed that
production is men's work while women are natural consumers. But women are not born with a natural ability to be consumers. It is a skill which is learnt together with the formation of taste through a process which starts in the home and goes through life.

To date, most historical analysis has dealt solely with the role of women designers, even though women interact with design in a variety of ways. Feminist design historians have thereby adopted the methodologies of mainstream design history, which esteems the activities of designers and emphasizes their role as agents of history. Probably the most historically neglected group is the consumer; indeed, it can be no accident that the consumer is often perceived by design organizations, retailers, and advertisers, to be female. Just as patriarchy informs the historian's assumptions about women designers' skills, so it defines the designer's perceptions of women's needs as consumers.

Buckley (1986) maintains that Feminist design historians must advance on two fronts.

1. They must analyze the material and ideological operation of patriarchy in relation to women and design. This effort must be combined with an examination of the relationship between capitalism and patriarchy at specific historical conjunctures to reveal how women's role in design is defined.

2. They must critically assess 'the rules of the game' to understand why design historians have excluded women from the history books, and then to enable us to develop a history that does not automatically exclude women.

Design history has also neglected class and race issues, which has newly being studies in the second half of the 1990s and the 2000s, which was firmly offered to be in the agenda by feminists. To cite an example; Margolin (2001) asserts that people of color have been ignored in the mainstream design histories. He gives the example of African-American designers who were never written into the history and he explains this with their failure in conforming the mainstream values of good design. His argument is that when African-American designers are included in the history of design in the United States, the narrative paradigm has to be changed from one that has been focused on the production of quality products to one that involves issues of race, social exclusion, economic opportunity, and labor justice.
5.9. Cultural Anthropology and Design History

When history turns to the forces of nature and human nature, tracing thin lines of casual influence and interconnection, it is appropriate to draw on the scientific investigation of those forces, and social anthropology is perhaps the most important science for characterizing the type of consumer behavior (Buchanan, 1998).

Anthropology is the classification and analysis of humans and their society, descriptively, culturally, historically, and physically. Its unique contribution to studying the bonds of human social relations has been the distinctive concept of culture. It has also differed from other sciences concerned with human social behavior, especially sociology, in its emphasis on data from non-literate peoples and archaeological exploration. Emerging as an independent science in the mid-19th century, anthropology was associated from the beginning with various other emergent sciences, notably biology, geology, linguistics, psychology, and archaeology. Its development is also linked with the philosophical speculations of the Enlightenment about the origins of human society and the sources of myth. A unifying science, anthropology has not lost its connections with any of these branches, but has incorporated all or part of them and often employs their techniques.

Anthropology is divided primarily into physical anthropology and cultural/social anthropology. Physical anthropology focuses basically on the problems of human evolution, including human palaeontology and the study of race and of body build or constitution: somatology. It uses the methods of anthropometrics, as well as those of genetics, physiology, and ecology. Cultural anthropology is the comparative study of human nature and culture. It is thereby a comprehensive subject; from traditionally to be concentrated on simpler, non-european cultures it has developed to include all variations of human cultures - and forms of society. The subject particularly emphasizes how societies are organised and how different organisational forms can be determinant on the content and form of cultures. Fieldwork and observation is necessary for the anthropologist in order to learn about people's actual life situation.

Cultural anthropology includes archaeology, which studies the material remains of prehistoric and extinct cultures; ethnography, the descriptive study of living cultures; ethnology, which utilizes the data furnished by ethnography, the recording of living cultures, and archaeology, to analyse and compare the various cultures of humanity; social anthropology, which evolves broader generalizations based partly on the findings of the other social sciences; and linguistics, the science of language.
Anthropologists set out to answer the basic questions: ‘why do people want goods?’, ‘Why do they acquire goods they do?’. Anthropologists Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood states in their text ‘The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption’ dated 1979, that goods are desired and selected not merely for their particular use-values but as markers within larger communication systems and as a way of imposing identity and sense on the environment: ‘Goods assembled together in ownership make physical, visible statements about the hierarchy of values to which their choosers subscribes.’ Any light, which can be thrown on the behavior of consumers and the question of taste is clearly of importance to design historians.

In anthropology, it was largely due to Bronislaw Malinowski that the notion of artifact became a systematic part of the fund of human culture Riccini (1998):

‘Culture comprises the artifacts, goods, technical processes, ideas, habits and values that are transmitted socially.’ In this way, the simultaneous presence of elements belonging to the ‘complex of reactions and activities that characterize the behavior of individuals’ is sanctioned. So the decisive importance of artifacts in defining the functioning and organization of a society, the patterns of behavior and distribution of roles of its members, and even its problems—in other words, in defining culture—has begun to be acknowledged. Yet there still is a lack of enthusiasm to give due weight to the concrete role that artifacts have played in society. Notwithstanding the explicit recognition of the material aspects of human culture, anthropology ‘has continued, for its part, to attribute a secondary importance to material phenomena in the proper sense’ in the conduct of its own researches, preferring to concentrate on the symbolic aspects of the material conditions of the society under investigation.’

Anthropology broadened its subject matter and the modern times are also being studied. What is of importance for the historians of design is the special methods like fieldwork and observation that can be driven from anthropology. Anthropology studies the consumers and consumption; therefore, it is necessary for the kind of design history including the consumer and the user. Mary Douglas, Grant McCraken, Daniel Miller and other cultural anthropologists have written extensively about consumption although they focus on it as a symbolic act while ignoring questions of how products are designed and made as well as how they are actually incorporated into the daily activities of the users (Margolin, 1992).

In his important book, Material Culture and Mass Consumption, published in 1987, Miller was particularly critical of the kind of design history that is ‘intended to be a pseudo art history, in which the task is to locate great individuals such as Raymond Loewy or Norman Bel Geddes and portray them as the creators of modern mass culture.’ Miller, a cultural anthropologist, has focused his attention on the consumer and asserted, along with other anthropologists, that consumption is not a passive
act but a creative project through which people put products to use in the ways that were not necessarily intended by those who designed and produced them. Miller has thus broadened the context within which to study products in contemporary culture. The difference between the anthropological study of the design historian and the anthropologists might be the positioning of design through out the study.

5.10. New Approaches in Historiography

If design history today can be thought as a branch of the 'History', the History today, therefore, the New History should also be studied. As Balçin (1999) points out this has been a neglected area of study in the historical study of design:

'...connection of two disciplines were initially neglected, later recognized, and in the end began to be studied...it appears that one of the important 'sins' of omission of industrial design literature is not being fully aware of the problems of the discipline of History. What that history is, is the question that never appears in the overwhelming majority of design books.'

He reasons this negligence in the early literature as follows:

'The reason for this negligence is most likely to be found in the direct co-operation of art and architecture. Since Design History developed mostly under the aegis of these two disciplines, it was not in need of further methods, techniques and theories to fulfill expectations in its early years of formation. What art and architecture offered was sufficient to solve most of the problems faced in lecture halls, in design courses and in limited textual works.'
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**Figure 5.12. Historiographic Classification of History Texts**

After the early literature of Design History was written, in the 1980s, there had been scholars like Dilnot and Walker pointing out the relationship to History: Dilnot (1984a) was asking: 'What is its (Design History) relationship to history in general and to the specialist histories of technology, economy, and business that impinge on the subject?' while Walker (1989) in Design History and History of Design, was pointing out the general problems and methods of historiography and alllying it to the writing of the design history. It is obvious that studying the methods and approaches of History will be useful to design historians but anyhow Design History needs to develop its own approaches and methods in order to study design efficiently. Since
the period that Design History studies, is mostly the 20th Century, the following examination of Historiography also focuses on this period called ‘the New History’ (see. Burke, 1992, Black and MacRaid, 2000) which is schematized in figure 5.12.

In the last twenty-years the assumptions upon which historical research and writing have been based since the emergence of history as a professional discipline in the nineteenth century have been questioned (Iggers, 1997). Central to the process of professionalization was the firm belief in the scientific status of history (see. Tekeli, 1998, Iggers, 1997). The self-definition of history as a scientific discipline implied for the work of the historian a sharp division between professional historians and amateurs. Although the history was transformed into an institutionalized discipline, the older forms of historical writing were not overlooked. The narrative history was again used as well as pointing out the distinction between myth and truth. The problem with historical narrative is that, while it proceeds from empirically validated facts or events, it necessarily requires imaginative steps to place them in a coherent story. Therefore a fictional element enters into all historical discourse (Iggers, 1997), however, the difference between the ‘scientific’ history of the nineteenth century and the older literary traditions of history was not great. Both the ‘scientific’ orientation since Leopold von Ranke and the literary tradition shared three basic assumptions (Iggers, 1997):

- They accepted a correspondence theory of truth holding that history portrays people who really existed and actions that really took place.

- They presupposed that human actions mirror the intentions of the actors and that it is the task of the historian to comprehend these intentions in order to construct a coherent historical story.

- They operated with a one-dimensional, diachronical conception of time, in which later events follow earlier ones in a coherent sequence. These assumptions have gradually been questioned in recent historical thought.

By the time in the late nineteenth century, when Rankean paradigm became the model for professional historiography: ‘simply tell it how it was’, the social and political conditions it presupposed had already been fundamentally transformed. This paradigm is also the common-sense view of history, that it has often been assumed to be the way of doing history, rather than being perceived as one among various possible approaches to the past (Iggers, 1997). So by the turn of the century, historians all over the world began to criticize the Rankean paradigm and to call for a history that accounted for social and economic factors which led the way to the ‘New History’ (Burke, 1992b). What is the so-called new history? How new is it?
Is it a temporary fashion or a long-term trend? Will it, or should it replace traditional history, or can the rivals coexist in peace? What aspects did it bring to design history? It is to answer these questions that this chapter has been designed: a comprehensive survey of the varieties of contemporary history with its effects on the writing of design history. For this reason the decision was taken to concentrate attention on a few relatively more used and had better been used movements: social history and cultural history.

The phrase 'the new history' is best known in France. La nouvelle histoire is the title of a collection of essays edited by the distinguished French medievalist Jacques Le Goff (Burke, 1992a). Le Goff has also helped edit a massive three-volume collection of essays, concerned with 'new problems', new approaches' and 'new objects'. it is the history associated with the so-called école des Annales, grouped around the journal Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations (Burke, 1992a). A positive definition of 'the new history' is not easy; the movement is united only in what it opposes. It is therefore difficult to offer more than a vague description, characterizing the new history as total history or as structural history. Defining the new history in terms of what it is not seems easier. For the sake of simplicity and clarity, Burke (1992b) sums up the contrast between old and new history in seven points as follows:

1. According to the traditional paradigm, history is essentially concerned with politics. In the confident Victorian phrase of Sir John Seeley, Regius Professor of History at Cambridge, 'History is past politics: politics is present history.' Politics was assumed to be essentially concerned with the state; in other words it was national and international rather than local. However, it did include the history of the Church as an institution and also what the military theorist Karl von Clausewitz defined as 'the continuation of policies by other means', that is, war. Although other kinds of history, the history of art, for example, or the history of science were not altogether excluded by the traditional paradigm, they were marginalized in the sense of being considered peripheral to the interests of 'real' historians. The new history, on the other hand, has come to be concerned with virtually every human activity. This means that anyway did the human acted and thought was a concern of history, which made the historians apply to other disciplines in order to ask and answer the right questions. 'Everything has a history,' as the scientist J. B. S. Haldane once wrote; that is, everything has a past which can in principle be reconstructed and related to the rest of the past.
The first half of the century witnessed the rise of the history of ideas. In the last thirty years a number of remarkable histories of topics can be seen which had not previously been thought to possess a history, for example; childhood, death, madness, the climate, the furniture, transportation, smells, dirt and cleanliness, gestures, femininity, speaking, and even silence. What had previously been considered as unchanging is now viewed as a 'cultural construction', subject to variation over time as well as in space.

The cultural relativism implicit here deserves to be emphasized. The philosophical foundation of 'the new history' is the idea that reality is socially or culturally constituted. The sharing of this idea, or assumption, by many social historians and social anthropologists helps explain the recent convergence between these two disciplines. This relativism also undermines the traditional distinction between what is central in history and what is peripheral.

2. Traditional historians 'think of history as essentially a narrative of events, while the new history is more concerned with the analysis of structures.'

3. 'Traditional history offers a view from above, in the sense that it has always concentrated on the great deeds of great men, statesmen, generals, or occasionally churchmen. The rest of humanity was allocated a minor role in the drama of history.'

This was the same case in design history as stated before. It was said that the reason for this 'great man approach' is because the first design historians were art historians and art historians used the 'great man approach'. Sure it was used but it was not an approach only adopted by art historians -the periphery-, but also by the historians -the center-. 'When the great Russian writer Alexander Pushkin was working on an account of a peasant revolt and its leader Pugachev, Tsar Nicholas's comment was that "such a man has no history" '. And while Pevsner (1936), in his book Pioneers of Modern Design from William Morris to Walter Gropius 1960 (first published as Pioneers of Modern Movement 1936) was informing us about the modern designers, he did not need to tell about what was going on and being used in the daily lives of people at that time. He was of a small group of historians who sought to identify a distinctive quality of modernity in selected art, architecture and products of their day.

On the other hand, 'a number of the new historians are concerned with "history from below" which is the views of ordinary people and with their experience of social change. The history of popular culture has received a great deal of attention. Intellectual historians too have shifted their attention away from great books, or
great ideas or their equivalent of great men, to the history of collective mentalities or to the history of discourses or "languages". Banham in England was the one to introduce popular culture to design history in the 1960s, as Margolin (1992) points out: 'Banham was the one to give young historians the confidence to explore the history of mass produced goods of all kinds. This meant that every object designed and used also by the below could be the proper subject of design history. Still Banham provided no principles for defining design as a subject with defensible boundaries.'

4. According to the traditional paradigm, history should be based on the documents. 'One of Ranke's greatest achievements was his exposure of the limitations of narrative sources, chronicles, and his stress on the need to base written history on official records, emanating from governments and preserved in archives. The price of this achievement was the neglect of other kinds of evidence. The period before the invention of writing was dismissed as prehistory'. However, the "history from below" movement in its turn exposed the limitations of this kind of document. Official records generally express the official point of view. To reconstruct the attitudes of heretics and rebels, such records need to be supplemented by other kinds of source.' On the contrary, official sources were not usually used in Design History, since most of the work is devoted to Modernism. Turner (1991), in an attack on what he characterized as the narrow geopolitical and aesthetic base on which design history was established, proposed the exploration of registered design as a means of escaping from the tyranny of 'an extremely limited range of Western Cult Objects'.

He stated that: 'Designs of an altogether humbler nature occupy the bulk of the registers, and accordingly manmade world as it is encountered by most of us, most of the time. Overlooked, if not despised by mainstream design historians, this is the world of vegetable peelers, candy dispensers, coffin handles, and ballpoint pens...Those who cleave to Modern Design principles may regret that so many lampshades and Christmas trees have survived in graphic detail, while addicts might be delighted to reconstruct that missing piece 1930s tableware. But for the historian of design the registers, representations and statistics of design will provide valuable additional source material, and may suggest new lines of inquiry'.

'In any case, if historians are concerned with a greater variety of human activities than their predecessors, they must examine a greater variety of evidence. Some of this evidence is visual, some of it oral. There is also statistical evidence: trade figures, population figures, voting figures, and so on. The heyday of quantitative history was probably the 1950s and 1960s, when some enthusiasts claimed that only quantitative methods were reliable. There has been a reaction against such
claims, and to some extent against the methods as well, but interest in a more modest quantitative history continues to grow'.

5. Traditional approaches fail to account for the variety of questions which historians must ask, whereas the new history does not. 'According to the traditional paradigm, memorably articulated by the historian Collingwood (1946), 'When an historian asks "Why did Brutus stab Caesar?" he means "What did Brutus think, which made him decide to stab Caesar?". This model of historical explanation has been criticized by more recent historians on a number of grounds, principally because it fails to take account of the variety of historians' questions, often concerned with collective movements as well as individual actions, with trends as well as events.' The same is valid for design historians since the designers is not the only author of the final product as Bridget Wilkins wrote in 1976:

'There can be no one person who can be called a designer, as there can be no one function of an artifact; for a 'designer' acts within his historical environment, his social situation. Many of the criteria for an artifact have already been decided for him, for example the availability and nature of materials, the social and economic circumstances. Even the decision to produce that category of artifact may have already been formulated. Such limitations do indeed form an important part of the design.'

6. The traditional paradigm posits that history is objective, and focuses upon the all-powerful voice of the author in articulating the past. The traditional historian's task was to give readers the facts, or as Ranke put it 'how it actually happened'.

'Today, this ideal is generally considered to be unrealistic. However hard it is to struggle to avoid the prejudices associated with color, creed, class or gender, looking at the past from a particular point of view cannot be avoided. Cultural relativism obviously applies as much to historical writing itself as to its so-called objects. Minds do not reflect reality directly. The world is perceived only through a network of conventions, schemata and stereotypes, a network that varies from one culture to another. In this situation new historians are concerned less with objectivity, while the range of approaches and needs covered in a move from 'The Voice of History' to one of 'Heteroglossia': 'varied and opposing voices'.

A telling number of historians arrived at the conviction that history is connected more closely literature than to science, in contrast with the modern historical scholarship, according to the historians, the idea of objectivity in historical research is impossible because there is no object of history that has gained increasing currency. In the 1960s, Roland Barthes and in the 1970s Hayden White stressed the literary character of historical texts and the fictional elements they inevitably contained
(Igers, 1997). The historian works with texts, but these texts do not refer to an outside world, and literary theorist Derrida (1976) states that there is nothing outside of the text. The text does not have to have a written or a verbal form. Cultures, as anthropologists such as Geertz (1973) would maintain, are also texts. It can be said that texts are independent from their authors since different readers in different times read them. So the intention of the author no longer seems to matter. In this context, at the end every historical work is also a literary work which has to be judged by categories of literary criticism (Igers, 1997). The proponents of the movement that defined itself as 'New Historicism' dealt more directly with literature and culture in a historical context. But the new historicists rejected the notion of the autonomy of texts and rather saw texts as part of complex symbolic negotiations that reflected power relations.

7. 'Rankean history was the territory of the professionals. The nineteenth century was the time when history became professionalized, with its departments in universities and its trade journals like the Historische Zeitschrift and the English Historical Review. Most of the leading new historians are also professionals. One way to describe the achievements of the Annales group is to say that they have shown that economic, social and cultural history can meet the exacting professional standards set by Ranke for political history.

All the same, their concern with the whole range of human activity encourages them to be inter-disciplinary in the sense of learning from and collaborating with social anthropologists, economists, literary critics, psychologists, sociologists, and so on. Historians of art, literature and science, who used to pursue their interests more or less in isolation from the main body of historians, are now making more regular contact with them. The history-from-below movement also reflects a new determination to take ordinary people's views of their own past more seriously than professional historians used to do. In this sense too heteroglossia is essential to the new history.'

5.10.1. The Social History

Social history became independent of economic history only to fragment, like some new nation, into historical demography (Burke, 1992b). Again, economic history has split into old and new. There has also been a shift among economic historians from a concern with production to a concern with consumption, a shift that makes it increasingly difficult to separate economic from social and cultural history (Black and MacRaid, 2000). This consumer-oriented approach in the new economic history
also had influences in design history. 'Design' itself, attracted the attention of economic historians because of its distinguishability among consumer taste and choices. Another specialization, the history of advertising, straddles economic history and the history of communication.

Social history is one of the key schools of contemporary history writing. According to Hobsbawm (1972), the term 'social history' was in the past used in three, sometimes overlapping senses:

1. the history of the poor or lower classes, and more specifically to the history of the movements of the poor ('social movements')

2. the history of the manners and customs of everyday life; This kind of social history was not particularly oriented toward the lower classes indeed rather the opposite.

3. the history of society with a strong emphasis on the economy (socioeconomic histories).

Since the total object of study of social historians is the history of societies, their subject matter is potentially infinite—it includes every thing that exists and happens within society. Instead of focusing upon the actions of governments and ruling elites, social history concerned itself with the experience of the mass of ordinary people, with the routine happenings of everyday life, and with material and popular culture as against constitutional and administrative issues (Walker, 1989). Attention also shifted from the will and personalities of individual actors to impersonal forces like the economic. In the 1980s, social history has come to be regarded as the appropriate way of writing histories of design. The social history approach has been entrenched within the discipline of art history for a number of decades. Design historians interested in social history have tended to take their cue from social art historians such as Hauser and Clark and their works with the same name 'the Social History of Art' rather than from other social historians.

Swenarton (1981) claims that 'historians and sociologists deal with politics and society but leave out design' while 'design historians look at design and ignore everything else - or at best relegate it to what is called "the social background" which, by its name, implies that design and society are not involved in a single process but are separate and distinct.'

The product/society relation can be read in both directions: much is learned about a society by studying its products, and about products by studying the society in which they occur. The popular formulation of 'design and society' is unsatisfactory because
it implies that design is separate from society; diagrammatically, it produces two vertical columns with a list of design events in one and more general historical events in the other; what connects the two remains unexplained. The challenge to design historian is to demonstrate how the design process is embedded within particular social relations which it helps to reproduce or to alter (Walker, 1989).

5.10.2. Cultural History

The greatest development of the third generation of the Annales School can be seen with the advent of 'l'histoire des mentalité' (the history of mentalities) which is named as cultural history in Britain (Black and MacRaild, 2000). Cultural history is the study of people's cultures; their individual and collective ideas whereas the social history is more related to the changing structures of the society. Burke (1992a) points out that some cultural historians suggest that the really deep structures are not economic and social arrangements but mental categories. Some historians still use 'cultural history' related to the narrow definition of 'culture' referring to the artistic artifacts, whereas the cultural history which emerged in the Annales School is much more broader in subject matter.

Burke (1986) argues that there are three main features of the cultural history:

- It stresses collective attitudes,
- It concerns unconscious assumptions and everyday thought: practical reason as seen by groups,
- It focuses on the structure of belief.

Cultural history is thus the history of popular ideas, and therefore different from the classical history of ideas, that of Hobbes and Locke, because it concentrates on the ideas which influence everyday actions (Black and MacRaild, 2000). Burke (1992a) claims that the cultural history grew up to fill a conscious gap between narrow definitions of the history of ideas and social history, and adds that its development prevented historians from having to make a choice between 'an intellectual history with the society left out and a social history with the thought left out'.

A problem that faces cultural historians is a crisis of identity, as they turn away from a narrow but precise definition of culture in terms of art, literature, music etc, towards a more anthropological definition of the field. If culture is everywhere, 'is there any need for cultural history?' remains to be answered.
5.10.3. Problems of The New History

To celebrate the new history is not the purpose here but to assess its strengths, weaknesses, and what it might offer to take Design History one-step further. The movement for change has arisen from a widespread sense of the inadequacy of the traditional paradigm. For internal and external reasons alike, it is not unreasonable to speak of the crisis of the traditional paradigm of historical writing, however, the new paradigm also has its problems: problems of definition, problems of sources, problems of method, problems of explanation.

Problems of definition occur because the new historians are pushing into unfamiliar territory. They begin, as explorers of other cultures usually do, with a sort of negative image of what they are looking for. The history of the Orient has been perceived by occidental historians as the opposite of their own, eliminating differences between the Middle and Far East, China and Japan, and so on (Said, 1978). Westerners have often viewed world history, as the study of the relations between ‘the west and the rest’, ignoring interactions between Asia and Africa, Asia and America, and so on (Burke, 1992b). Again, history from below was originally conceptualized as the inversion of history from above, with ‘low’ culture in place of high culture. In the course of their research, however, scholars have become increasingly aware of the problems inherent in this dichotomy.

If popular culture, for example, is the culture of ‘the people’, who are the people then? Are they everyone? Are they the illiterate or the uneducated? It cannot be assumed that economic, political and cultural divisions in a given society necessarily overlap. Are ordinary people uneducated or do they simply have a different education, a different culture from elites? One reason for the difficulty of defining the history of popular culture is that the notion of ‘culture’ is if anything even more difficult to pin down than the notion of ‘popular’. The so-called definition of culture as high art, literature, music and so on, was narrow but at least it was precise. A wide notion of culture is central to the new history (Hunt, 1989). The state, social groups, and even gender or society itself are considered to be culturally constructed. If the term is used in a wide sense, the question of ‘what does not count as culture?’ is to be raised.

Another example of a new approach which has run into problems of definition is the history of everyday life, Alltagsgeschichte as the Germans call it. The phrase itself is not new: ‘la vie quotidienne’ was the title of a series launched by the French
publishers Hachette in the 1930s (Burke, 1992a). What is new is the importance
given to everyday life in contemporary historical writing. Once dismissed as trivial,
some historians now view the history of everyday life as the only real history, the
center to which everything else must be related.

What these approaches have in common, is their concern with the world of ordinary
experience as their point of departure, together with an attempt to view daily life as
problematique, in the sense of showing that behavior or values which are taken for
granted in one society are dismissed as self-evidently absurd in another. Historians,
like social anthropologists, now try to uncover the latent rules of daily life and to
show their readers how to be a father or a daughter, a ruler or a saint, in a given
culture (Burke, 1992b). At this point social and cultural histories seem to be
dissolving into one another. Some practitioners describe themselves as 'new'
cultural historians, others as 'socio-cultural' historians (Hunt, 1989). In any case, the
impact of cultural relativism on historical writing seems inescapable. And design
history is now trying to derive as much as it can, without thinking if it is from social
history or cultural history. But if we look at the design history discourse between
1970-1980 we can say that a new approach, which can be called socio-economic
has become favorite. This approach neglected the cultural aspects of design while
stressing the economic factors affecting it (see. Fry, 1988). In the 1990s the
negligence of culture has been taken into account with such studies like the one by

The greatest problems for the new historians, however, are surely those of sources
and methods. It has already been suggested that when historians began to ask new
kinds of questions about the past, to choose new objects of research, they had to
look for new kinds of sources to supplement official documents. Some turned to oral
history, others to the evidence of images, others to statistics. It has also proved
possible to re-read certain kinds of official records such as patents and registrations
in new ways.

A good deal of attention has been given to oral evidence. The problem of the
influence of the historian-interviewer and of the interview situation on the testimony
of the witness has been discussed (Samuel and Thompson, 1990). Yet it is only fair
to admit that the criticism of oral testimonies has not yet reached the sophistication
of the critique of documents, which historians have been practicing for centuries.
The situation is rather similar in the case of photographs, images and more
generally the evidence of material culture. Like historians, photographers offer not
reflections of reality but representations of it. Some important steps have been taken toward the source-criticism of photographic images, but here too there is still a long way to go (Smith, 1976).

Ironically enough, the history of material culture, an area which has attracted a great deal of interest in the last few years, is based less on the study of the artifacts themselves than on literary sources. Historians concerned with what has been called 'the social life of things' or more exactly with the social life of groups as revealed by their use of things, rely heavily on such evidence as descriptions by travellers which tell much about the location and the functions of particular objects or inventories of possessions, which are amenable to analysis by quantitative methods (Appadurai, 1986).

Although the expansion of the historian's universe and the increasing dialogue with other disciplines, from geography to literary theory, are surely to be welcomed, these developments have their price. The discipline of history is now more fragmented than ever before. Economic historians are able to speak the language of economists, intellectual historians the language of philosophers, and social historians the dialects of sociologists and social anthropologists, but these groups of historians are finding it harder and harder to talk to one another. Non-communication between disciplines or sub-disciplines is not inevitable. In the specific case of history, there are some encouraging signs of rapprochement, if not of synthesis.
6. CONCLUSION

After having examined the subject matter, objects and the approaches in Design History, this study raises new questions rather than answering the existing ones, concerning the future realm of Design History:

In tandem with the introduction of new historical studies on design, which adopt new objects of study and different approaches, the discussion on the subject matter of design history led by the historians have been continuing. Design is being defined and over-defined by almost anyone involved in design; definitions are being designed which triggers the plurality of histories. Since design is an activity that is ever changing by its nature, brackets of definitions that are agreed upon do not seem to be realistic.

It is evident that the early forms of Design History, which had placed the designer as an individual at the heart of the object of study still continues but it has become only one of the objects of study. Studying ‘design’ historically now includes the study of design thinking which involves more complicated studies supported by other disciplines.

Orientation is necessary for design history among the input of numerous methods and ideas driven from other disciplines precipitating into the way the history of design is being studied. Design History is at the dawn of important decisions: what to take in from interdisciplinary studies and what to leave out in order not to make the same failure of the early works when the methods of art and architectural history were directly employed without the necessary modifications.

The formation of the discipline of Design History is beyond the conclusions of this study and the answer to the question ‘What makes Design History a discipline?’ remains unrequited. But two future directions for Design History can be assumed:

1. Design History as a history of the profession of Industrial Design which seems to turn out to be an independent area of study,

2. Design History under the aegis of Cultural History embracing any kind of design activity including the non-professional, which is to be taken as an element of cultural structures. It is, then, necessary to draw on different
traditions of research: in the first place material culture, in which the idea of artifact has been developed.

The first one engages concentration on the analysis of artifact that makes it possible to take in most aspects of the entire system: design, manufacture, distribution and use; use, perception, social organization and interaction with the artifact and its functions. The task of a historian of design, then, involves investigation and communication among the wealth of production, distribution and consumption and use, whereas the existing works of design history overlap only with a minute part of the entire system. This task of the historian implicates a conception very close to the idea of the artifact as an 'interface' between the internal environment -the material from which the artifact is made and the methods used to do so- and the external environment -conditions in which the artifact operates- put by Simon (1981).

Considered in terms of cultural awareness, design history has been written through a tunnel vision, which is sentenced to breakdown. The second direction can include the first one, but also offers to embrace many subjects of study that have been neglected by the tunnel vision such as non-professional design, craft design which is to include design in the rest of the world not only the west, and the environment of culture where product operate and circulate. The relationship between culture and tactile product, which has been studied by cultural anthropologists, requires the attention of design historians and needs to be studied constructing the relation between culture, product and its design, where the product need not to be tactile artifacts. The problem with placing design history under cultural history is that the unclear boundaries of design history face getting even worse, which again redirects us to the question of design history as a discipline.

Design history has to develop its peculiar methods in studying design while it embraces the wealth offered by interdisciplinary studies in order to stand as a discipline.
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# Appendix A.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Anonymous Design</th>
<th>Designer Obj.</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Exhibition</th>
<th>Consumer and User</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prod. Tech. &amp; Material</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typological</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonical, Connoisseurial</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodization</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structuralist, Semiotics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Designers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminist Critique</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural anthropology</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social History</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural History</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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