ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct821

Impact on Visual Arts & Cultural Expressions: Motifs & Symbolic Significance of the Colonial Building in Delhi

Moumita Sarker Moon[1]; Rajiv Mandal[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Applied Arts, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, History of Visual Art & Design, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, India.

Publication Date: 2025/10/27

Abstract: This paper examines the Indo-Saracenic architectural style, specifically as utilised by Sir Edwin Lutyens in the development of New Delhi (1912–1931), to elucidate its role as a deliberate political and symbolic instrument for asserting British imperial supremacy and establishing a visual assertion of historical Indian authority. The research investigates how the architecture, exemplified by the Viceroy's House (Rashtrapati Bhavan), established a manifestation of "hegemonic hybridity".

The primary argument claims that Lutyens' design was fundamentally a Western classical structure, with indigenous features—specifically the chhajja, chhatri, and jali—integrated mostly as "superficial ornamentation" or "political concession". This method systematically removed the intricate cultural significances of native aspects, reinterpreting them as generic "Indian touches" to disguise a claim of logical, Western authority. The outcome was an aesthetic domination, characterised by a European structural framework complemented by Indian artistic adornment. Additionally, significant elements such as the Jaipur Column conveyed a distinct sense of "narrative subjugation" within the imperial environment.

Keywords*: Colonial Architecture, Symbolic Significance, Visual Arts Narrative.*

How to Cite: Moumita Sarker Moon; Rajiv Mandal (2025) Impact on Visual Arts & Cultural Expressions: Motifs & Symbolic Significance of the Colonial Building in Delhi. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(10), 1257-1260. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct821

I. INTRODUCTION

The establishment of New Delhi as the capital of British India marked a profound moment in the history of global imperial urban planning and architecture. The decision to shift the administrative center from Calcutta (Kolkata) to Delhi in 1911 was fundamentally a symbolic and political maneuver intended to assert imperial dominance by visually aligning the British Raj with Delhi's centuries-old legacy as the seat of previous Indian empires, particularly the Mughals. This relocation necessitated the creation of an entirely new administrative city, known as Lutyens' Delhi, overseen predominantly by Sir Edwin Lutyens, alongside key figures like Herbert Baker and Robert Tor Russell, between 1912 and 1931. The core objective of the New Delhi plan was not merely construction but the creation of an architectural vocabulary that could articulate British imperial power while demonstrating respect for—and symbolic succession to—Indian historical authority. Sir Edwin Lutyens was selected for his renowned mastery of classical proportion and grandeur, skills deemed essential for giving tangible architectural form to the aspirations of the British Empire. The project culminated in the vast central administrative district housing important buildings and residences, the most monumental of which was the Viceroy's House (now Rashtrapati Bhavan). This new construction phase (1918–1931) represented the culmination and "last flowering" of a controversial stylistic movement known as Indo-Saracenic architecture.

II. DEFINING THE INDO-SARACENIC COMPROMISE

Indo-Saracenic architecture originated in the late 19th century, primarily used by British architects for public and government buildings across the Raj. The style was revivalist, drawing stylistic and decorative elements from native Indo-Islamic traditions, particularly Mughal architecture, which the British conventionally regarded as the classic Indian style. While the basic layout and structure of these buildings often mirrored contemporary European revivalist styles like Neo-Classical or Gothic Revival, specific Indian features and ornamentation were incorporated. Examples included structures like the Madras High Court or the Chhatrapati

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct821

Shivaji Maharaj Terminus in Mumbai, which blended Romanesque, Gothic, and Indian elements.

Lutyens' interpretation in New Delhi, however, was fundamentally a strategic political tool for *legitimization*, rather than solely an aesthetic revival. After the post-Mutiny era, colonial administrators mandated that sensitivity must be shown to the local surroundings to better integrate the imperial structures within the political context. This resulted in Lutyens conceding to incorporate local Indo-Saracenic motifs, albeit often as superficial decoration overlaid upon an essentially Western classical frame. Thus, the hybridity employed in the capital was less a genuine cultural fusion and more a calculated imperial semiotic operation—using recognizable Indian symbols to cloak an assertion of rational, Western authority.

➢ *The Urban Plan: Hierarchy and Control*

The deliberate layout of New Delhi served as a physical manifestation of imperial hierarchy. Lutyens developed a city plan in the 1920s that sought to connect crucial landmarks and nodes through sweeping road axes and visual corridors. This design aimed to visually showcase Delhi's entire political history, from the medieval period onward, while forcefully marking the transition to British colonial governance. The most prominent feature of this plan was the ceremonial axis, connecting the historic core of Old Delhi, the heart of the Mughal Empire (e.g., Juma Masjid), with the new imperial seat along the Rajpath (now Kartavya Path), leading up to Rashtrapati Bhavan and India Gate. This geometry established a rigid visual grid of control. This foundational ideological intent means the resulting motifs must be critically analyzed not merely as decorative additions, but as essential elements in a calculated cultural appropriation designed to cement political power.

III. DECONSTRUCTING THE COLONIAL MOTIFS: SEMANTICS OF POWER IN RASHTRAPATI BHAVAN

Rashtrapati Bhavan, originally the Viceroy's House, stands as the paramount expression of Lutyens' deliberate architectural synthesis. Its design is a complex dialectic between classical monumentality, intended to emphasize Western power, and the integration of Indian motifs, intended to provide political and historical context.

➢ *The Classical Framework and Imperial Scale*

The overall organization and dominant architectural influence of the building are unmistakably classical. Designed in the period of the Edwardian Baroque, the architecture uses "heavy classical motifs to emphasize power," featuring a massive layout of 340 rooms, four floors, and an immense structure built primarily of stone (Dholpur stone). The classical bias is evident in the Corinthian columns, which subtly emphasize concepts of nobleness and are reminiscent of Greek democracy and the republic, thereby aligning the British regime with Western ideals of governance.

➢ *Ornamentation as Political Concession: Jalis, Chhatris, and Chhajjas*

The strategic integration of indigenous ornamental features was crucial for adhering to the mandate of local sensitivity. These elements, however, were adopted sparingly and, as architectural criticism suggests, were often relegated to "superficial decoration".

- The *Chhajja* (Eave): This traditional Indian element, a sharp, thin, protruding feature, extends approximately 8 feet (2.4 meters) from the building. Functionally essential, it blocks harsh sunlight and shields windows from monsoon rain. Aesthetically, Lutyens positioned the *chhajja* to occupy the place of a frieze in classical architecture, successfully translating a vital indigenous climate control element into a formal, structural location within the European composition.
- The *Chhatri* (Pavilion): These semi-open, elevated, dome-shaped pavilions, derived from Indo-Islamic and Rajasthani architecture, are prevalent across Mughal structures such as Humayun's Tomb. In Rashtrapati Bhavan, *chhatris* were positioned on the roofline to "break up the flatness", contributing to the skyline. While highly recognizable locally, they primarily served a decorative, visual purpose rather than a functional, structural one within Lutyens' scheme.
- The *Jali* (Pierced Screen): Inspired by Rajasthani designs, pierced screens of red sandstone were used along stairwells. These screens, providing shade and allowing air circulation, are beautiful textural elements, varying from floral to geometric patterns. Their incorporation provided an aesthetically pleasing orientalist texture, but critics observed that Lutyens' reliance on the classical idiom meant these elements were deployed largely on the "skin" of the building, confirming that integration was often surface-level.

The tension between the Classical structure and the Indian ornamentation results in an aesthetic framework where the native elements were stripped of their original, complex cultural meanings and re-coded as generic "Indian touches". The resulting hybrid is structurally European but stylistically Indian, clearly demonstrating aesthetic subjugation—a core imperial goal.

➢ *The Jaipur Column: The Narrative of Imperial Virtue*

Further cementing the political narrative is the Jaipur Column, a monumental 145-foot structure standing in the Forecourt, symbolizing cooperation as its cost was borne by the Maharaja of Jaipur. The column is topped by a bronze lotus supporting a six-pointed glass star. Crucially, the base bears an inscription, composed by Lutyens himself, instructing Indians to "endow your thoughts with faith your deeds with courage your life with sacrifice so all men may know the greatness of india". The column functions as a physical narrative device: the star, symbolizing the Raj, rises directly from the Indian lotus, explicitly linking British political order with the moral and intellectual future of India, framed entirely by the colonial architect's prescriptive text. This is a clear manifestation of narrative subjugation embedded into monumental form.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct821

IV. IMPACT ON VISUAL ARTS AND POST-COLONIAL ARCHITECTURE

The architectural choices codified by Lutyens in Delhi set the stage for a critical cleavage in post-1947 Indian artistic and architectural discourse. The political quest for a unique national identity found itself struggling against the aesthetic boundaries established by the colonial critique.

➢ *The Post-Independence Architectural Cleavage*

Following India's independence, the architectural direction veered sharply away from the historical eclecticism of the Raj. The intellectual establishment, recognizing the highly ornamented colonial style as an architectural expression of past subjugation, sought an antithesis. This was found in Modernism, characterized by stark geometric forms and stripped-down aesthetics.

The introduction of Modernism, championed by figures like Le Corbusier in Chandigarh and further developed by Indian architects like B.V. Doshi, was seen as a deliberate break—an "architectural result of the changing politics of the nation". The idolization of the lack of ornamentation served as a conceptual antithesis to the heavily ornamented architecture of the British Raj. Proponents sought a "separation of identity to an architectural style," aiming for a universal, non-regional, modern Indian identity.

However, the transition was fraught with irony. The post-colonial adoption of an aesthetic (Modernism) that functionally aligned with the colonial critique of indigenous ornamentation led to a curious paradox. The architectural freedom sought after 1947 was still defined by the boundaries of the colonial criticism of "excessive" ornament. Consequently, many post-independence architects, educated in modernist principles, continued to hold onto architectural values derived from the colonial period, leading to the assertion that architectural expression often remained conceptually "colonized" despite political independence.

➢ *Reinterpreting Monumentality in Fine Arts*

The visual vocabulary of the colonial period also spurred major shifts in fine arts. The modern Indian sculpture movement underwent a significant evolution from the early 20th century awakening, marked by a "sharp departure from sacred to experimental, bold modern forms". This conscious divergence occurred during the "upheavals of colonialism, independence" and signaled an effort by artists like Ramkinkar Baij to define a sculptural identity independent of both traditional religious iconography and the formal classicism imposed by Lutyens.

In contemporary Delhi, the colonial architecture has become the backdrop for a new kind of artistic interaction. Recent initiatives are transforming key areas of the Lutyens Zone, such as the stretch from Mandi House to Copernicus Marg, into a dedicated sculpture art district.[24] This project involves installing large-scale, non-religious contemporary sculptures (10–15 feet in height, made of bronze, stone, or stainless steel) by distinguished Indian artists.[24] This marks a crucial phase of post-colonial re-appropriation of scale. Artists are asserting contemporary Indian artistic sovereignty by integrating new works into the previously controlled visual landscape, forcing a dialogue between the monumental imperial framework and the modern national narrative.

➢ *Archival Photography and the Colonial Gaze*

The foundation for this critical artistic response lies partly in the historical photographic record. Nineteenth-century European photographs, created for social, economic, and political purposes, documented Indian architecture. Native artists, such as Sita Ram and Mazhar Ali Khan, were employed by Company officials to record topographical views in albums, creating richly layered visual itineraries that captured successive Hindu, Muslim, and European landscapes. These images, although often embodying the "presuppositions and prejudices of the colonial world," remain enduring records that defined and contained Indian culture within the colonial visual framework, solidifying the imperial interpretation of architectural heritage for a global audience.

V. CONCLUSION

The colonial architecture of New Delhi, epitomized by the calculated Indo-Saracenic hybridity of Rashtrapati Bhavan, stands as a uniquely significant case study in the semiotics of power and the formation of post-colonial visual culture.

The analysis confirms three dominant conclusions regarding the impact of these motifs and their symbolic significance:

- Hegemonic Hybridity: The Indo-Saracenic style in Lutyens' Delhi functioned primarily as a form of architectural containment. Indigenous motifs—such as the *chhatri*, *jali*, and even the Ashokan details in the Delhi Order—were integrated but structurally subjugated to a dominant Western classical framework. This allowed the colonial power to project an image of historical legitimacy (by claiming Indian heritage) while normalizing European architectural language as the standard for political authority.
- The Anti-Ornamentation Paradox: The colonial project's rhetorical dismissal of intricate Indian ornamentation as "excessive" established an aesthetic critique that was subsequently internalized by the newly independent nation. The post-1947 embrace of unadorned Modernism, intended as a radical break from colonial and traditional styles, inadvertently validated the core colonial aesthetic judgment against indigenous architectural narrative.
- The Stage of Sovereignty: Lutyens' city planning created a monumental physical infrastructure that was exceptionally well-suited for state performance. The durability and strategic layout of the Ceremonial Axis (Rajpath/India Gate) ensured that these core physical symbols of colonialism were successfully re-inscribed as monuments of national sovereignty and democratic memory. This transformation provides them with a political utility that transcends their historical origin, making the architecture exceptionally resistant to radical alteration in the public sphere.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25oct821

The enduring challenge posed by Lutyens' legacy lies in defining contemporary Indian identity against a backdrop deliberately engineered to assert foreign dominance. Future research should focus on the ongoing spatial re-negotiation represented by contemporary public art and urban planning efforts. These initiatives demonstrate a current cultural imperative to reclaim and assert contemporary Indian expression within the rigidly controlled imperial landscape, testing the limits of how architectural and decorative motifs, once tools of subjugation, can be fully absorbed into the evolving, pluralistic aesthetic vocabulary of the Republic.

REFERENCES

[1]. Irving, R. G. (1981). *Indian Summer: Lutyens, Baker, and Imperial Delhi*. Yale University Press.
[2]. Volwahsen, A. (2007). *Imperial Delhi: The End of History.* Prestel.
[3]. Metcalf, T. R. (1989). *An Imperial Vision: Indian Architecture and Britain's Raj.* University of California Press.
[4]. Davies, P. (1989). *Splendours of the Raj: British Architecture in India, 1660-1947*. Penguin Books.
[5]. King, A. D. (1976). *Colonial Urban Development: Culture, Social Power and Environment.* Routledge & Kegan Paul.
[6]. Kalia, R. (1987). *Chandigarh: In Search of an Identity.* Southern Illinois University Press.
[7]. Guha Thakurta, T. (1992). *The Making of a New 'Indian' Art: Artists, Aesthetics and Nationalism in Bengal, c. 1850–1920.* Cambridge University Press.
[8]. Frampton, K. (1980). *Modern Architecture: A Critical History.* Thames and Hudson.
[9]. Evenson, N. (1989). *The Indian Metropolis: A View Toward the West.* Yale University Press.
[10]. Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories.* Princeton University Press.
[11]. Guha-Thakurta, T. (2004). *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India.* Columbia University Press.
[12]. Mitter, P. (1994). *Art and Nationalism in Colonial India, 1850-1922: Occidental Orientations.* Cambridge University Press.
[13]. Jaja, M. A. (2013). A Passage to India: The Colonial Discourse and The Representation of India and Indians as stereotypes. *Gomal University Journal of Research* 29.1.
[14]. Loomba, A. (2015). *Colonialism / Postcolonialism*. Ed. 3rd, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, London and New York.