Designers of the modern period have done some of their most innovative work with children in mind. Century of the Child: Growing by Design, 1900–2000 brings together an unprecedented collection of objects and concepts from around the world in order to investigate the fascinating confluence of modern design and childhood. The wide-ranging ideas described here—from the beginning of the kindergarten movement to wartime propaganda, from design for children with disabilities to innovations in playground design—illuminate how progressive design has shaped the physical, intellectual, and emotional development of children and, conversely, how models of children’s play and pedagogy have inspired designers’ creative experimentation.

The title Century of the Child is borrowed from the Swedish design and social theorist Ellen Key, whose landmark book of the same name, published in 1900, forecast a new preoccupation with the rights, development, and well-being of children that has only grown over the decades since. Her book provides the launching point for this one, which includes sixty-five short essays on school architecture, playgrounds, toys and games, educational materials, nurseries, furniture, animation, advertising, books, and clothing. An introductory essay by Juliet Kinchin gives historical context to this kaleidoscopic narrative of ideas, practitioners, and artifacts. Together with more than four hundred illustrations, these texts examine individual and collective visions for the material world of children.

Juliet Kinchin is Curator of Modern Design in the Department of Architecture and Design at The Museum of Modern Art. Aidan O’Connor is a Curatorial Assistant in the Department of Architecture and Design at The Museum of Modern Art.
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TRUSTEES OF THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
CHILDREN HAVE HAD A PLACE at The Museum of Modern Art from almost the very beginning. The Museum’s first exhibitions and acquisitions in design and architecture, in the early to mid-1930s, were soon followed by the launch of the Educational Project in 1937 and the enfolding within the Museum of the Young People’s Gallery in 1939. MoMA’s distinguished exhibition history has since included unique presentations that explore the ways that these areas overlap and inform each other. Exhibitions of art and design both by and for children were especially numerous and diverse in the 1940s and ’50s, including Modern Architecture for the Modern School (1942), Original Illustrations of Children’s Books (1946), and Teaching Elements of Design to Children (1954).

Having all been — if not having helped to raise — children ourselves, we find design for children to be a subject that resonates universally, yet this rich area has been underrepresented in scholarly inquiry and exhibition — until now. Century of the Child: Growing by Design, 1900–2000 represents the first large-scale and synthetic effort to investigate the many intersections of children and design, including toys and games, furniture and nursery interiors, playgrounds, school architecture and pedagogy, political propaganda, and urban planning. With its own renowned collections complemented by vital loans from generous institutions and individuals, MoMA is uniquely suited to presenting such a project. The Museum has always embraced characteristics shared by modernist artists, designers, and children — liberated innovation, unbridled creativity, even disobedience — and its dedication to the interconnectedness of the arts is mirrored in the interdisciplinary perspective of this publication and the corresponding installation of works by both celebrated designers and lesser-known figures.

Century of the Child also extends MoMA’s commitment, foregrounded in the recent Modern Women’s Project, to highlighting the contributions of women as architects, designers, teachers, critics, and social activists. I am grateful to the partners in research and lending who have made possible the formulating of new dimensions for familiar material and public recognition for the unfamiliar. Thanks to them, MoMA now has the honor of exhibiting works that have never before been seen in this country, from Germany, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Switzerland, and South Africa.

Juliet Kinchin, Curator in the Department of Architecture and Design, and Aidan O’Connor, Curatorial Assistant, have demonstrated great ambition in pursuing the scale and scope of this unprecedented exhibition, as well as a tenacity and freshness of perspective entirely appropriate to the subject of youth. I am grateful to them and to their many colleagues at the Museum and collaborating supporters for their contributions to this multifarious project. On behalf of the staff and trustees of the Museum, I would like to especially thank Lawrence B. Benenson, for his major support in funding this exhibition, as well as the Nordic Culture Fund, Lily Auchincloss Foundation, Inc., the Barbro Osher Pro Suecia Foundation, and Marimekko, and for support for the publication, The International Council of The Museum of Modern Art and its Jo Carole Lauder Publications Fund.

Glenn D. Lowry
Director, The Museum of Modern Art, New York
Speaking solemnly to the camera in 1995 as part of the fictionalized documentary film Children’s Video Collective, a young boy predicts, “In the future, children will cease to exist. As a social category, we will simply become irrelevant. My generation is likely the last generation of children. Or, rather, the last generation to experience childhood. That doesn’t necessarily mean that now is the time to put away childish things. Instead it may mean that the use of childish things may be extended indefinitely, until death.” Children — we are reminded by the ambivalent twist at the end of this statement — have the potential to turn the hegemony of the adult world upside down. Could it be that the imprint of childish things on twentieth-century culture has been so profound that ultimately it is not children but adults who will cease to exist?

Childhood is not a fixed concept but has been constantly redefined, in legal as well as cultural terms. Starting with Philippe Ariès’s pioneering study, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life, in 1962, which claimed that “in medieval society, the idea of childhood did not exist,” historians have been locating paradigmatic shifts in the way we think about children in various centuries and cultures. Nevertheless, the case for the twentieth century as the century of the child is a compelling one, and the starting point for this book and exhibition is the timely publication, on New Year’s Day of 1900, of Barnets århundrade (published in English in 1909 as The Century of the Child), by the perceptive Swedish design reformer and social theorist Ellen Key. Brimming with both aspiration and dread, this prescient manifesto for change — social, political, aesthetic, and psychological — presented the universal rights and well-being of children as the defining mission of the century to come. Key enfolded this cause within multiple agendas for reform, arguing that the time had come to put an end to child labor, to stop “murdering souls in schools,” to counter international conflict and the materialistic spirit of the age with a new spiritualism, to attend to the environmental degradation of the world’s modern cities, to halt the meaningless consumption of poorly designed and manufactured goods, and to extend suffrage to women and the working classes.

Key identified the search for new languages of form and style, which reached a critical peak around 1900, as having a crucial role in shaping this constellation of ideas. The reawakening of an artistic culture would start with children and with the natural unfolding of their development at home. Her essay “Beauty for All,” published in 1899, promoted an aesthetic ideal of simplicity that would endow the child’s experiences of a rapidly changing world with a greater sense of visual and spatial coherence. Like many of the progressive intellectuals and artists with whom she was associated, such as Carl and Karin Larsson, leading exponents of the Arts and Crafts movement in Sweden, Key viewed the quality of the spaces where children’s physical and mental development took place as highly influential in the delicate process of personal growth. Carl Larsson’s Ett Hem (A Home, 1899), a book later published in ten countries, set the tone for idealistic views of the designed childhoods that would flourish in the twentieth century, showing his children at play, developing unhampered in light, airy spaces, close to the natural world, and protected from the cares and corrupting influences of adult life (no. 1).

There were other modern childhoods of which Key was also keenly aware, such as those recorded by the American photographer and sociologist Lewis Hine on behalf of the National...
Child Labor Committee (no. 2). A source of cheap labor then, as they are now, children in factories and sweatshops assisted in the process of churning out goods designed for markets that included their middle-class peers. Key felt that children growing up in an industrial, competitive, and future-oriented culture required adult protection and stimulation that could be assisted by design. And by 1900 modern types of dedicated objects and spaces had begun to delineate the newly sacralized concept of childhood, as on Théophile-Alexandre Steinlen’s advertising billboard *La Rue* (The street) (no. 3), printed in Paris in 1896, in which the most vivid figure is a girl in a smart red dress, clutching a hoop. Standing at the center of a cavalcade of modern urban types, including street vendors, workmen, clerks, housewives, and bourgeois promenaders, she signals the importance of children in the expanding consumer economies of the century to come (no. 4). Elastic and powerful, the symbolic figure of the child has masked paradoxical aspects of the human predicament in the modern world and enabled irreconcilable sets of beliefs, which are reflected in the material forms of modern design.

Growing, or Wilting, by Design?

Key’s prediction was correct: thinking about and designing for children would become a preoccupation in the twentieth century as never before, amounting to a virtual “cult of childhood,” as philosopher George Boas called it in 1966. Throughout the century the aesthetic, material, and technical innovations in design for children were remarkable, closely paralleling, and at times directly influencing, other areas of visual culture. Ideas about creative play catalyzed major iterations of modern design teaching and practice—from Franz Cižek’s revolutionary teaching methods at the Vienna Kunstgewerbeschule (School of applied arts) and Joaquín Torres-García’s exploration of abstraction through toy design to the Bauhaus workshops (no. 5); and from the urban innovations of Aldo van Eyck and CoBrA artists in postwar Amsterdam (no. 6) to Victor Papanek’s ethical design. In 1990 some 1,500 professionals from around the world gathered in Aspen for “Growing by Design” (no. 7), the fortieth (but first child-themed) International Design Conference, to take stock and to fashion an agenda for the future of design that would support “the needs of children and, by extension, the needs of the community—and all of us.”

Children also participated in discussions and workshops and created their own exuberant environment, a Micropolis, with the help of adult “slaves.” In this respect the conference reflected a growing recognition of children as design activists in their own right, pushing against imaginative and physical limitations and constantly re-creating the world as they see it, using whatever equipment they happen to have at hand.

But the mood in the plenary session oscillated between optimism and gloom. In lively debates about design for schools, parks, television programs, play spaces, and psychological spaces, participants expressed concern about the contraction of childhood in disadvantaged communities, child labor, poverty, the slow attrition of space for play in cities all over the world, uneven access to inspiring design, and the obsessive adult concern with security and safety, at the expense of adventure and learning. Indeed, in such areas it was questionable how much progress had been made in addressing many of Key’s concerns and aspirations. CBS correspondent Robert Krulwich summarized the proceedings, reporting that “people agreed much more
than disagreed. I can report that we agreed that the environment we have created for children is getting worse... Not only in America, but when we mention the rest of the world it seems to be getting worse there, too.

This sense of an impending crisis was also echoed throughout the last two decades of the century in numerous cultural commentaries and contemporary artworks that referred to the "disappearance" or "end" of childhood, not least in Children’s Video Collective, the artwork by the Canadian artist Steve Reinke with which this essay opened.

From *The Century of the Child* in 1900 to "Growing by Design" in 1990 we have been periodically reminded how the forces of modernity shape design and childhood in ways that are extraordinary and exhilarating yet also complex and contradictory. What has remained consistent, however, is the faith among designers in the power of aesthetic activity to shape everyday life. As an embodiment of what might be, children help us to mediate between the ideal and real: they propel our thoughts forward. Their protean nature encourages us to think in terms of design that is flexible, inclusive, and imaginative.

**The Century of the Child, Revisited**

In this book we track the fascinating confluence, unique to the twentieth century, between the cultures of modern design and childhood, using a kaleidoscopic narrative of innovative ideas, artifacts, and people. Like "childhood," "modern" is a mercurial term. By its own definition what is up-to-the-minute and aesthetically or conceptually innovative in a certain decade or in one particular context should not, indeed cannot remain so, any more than a child can remain a child.

Certain themes recur, at different times and in different parts of the world: creative play as a paradigm of learning and creativity not only for children but for adults; children as a source of social and aesthetic renewal and as the citizens of tomorrow; concern about protecting and nurturing some of the most vulnerable individuals in society as the impetus to create critical design interventions, new pedagogies, and social policies; children as consumers of an ever-widening range of products and environments, both physical and virtual; and children as viewers and subjects of new forms of advertising and ideological persuasion. The examples of objects and ideas throughout the book are the result of creative discussions that took place over a period of one hundred years, among educators, designers, manufacturers, social reformers, medical specialists, psychologists, and children themselves. Together they show how diverse perspectives have intertwined in meaningful and modern design.

Although the book is international in range, we could not hope to provide a comprehensive survey of the most widely available or popular design for children. Nor did we set out to propose new approaches to any one designer or area, such as toys, playgrounds, children’s furniture, or clothing, each of which already has, or deserves, a major publication devoted to it. Instead the emphasis is on the interrelationship of all these design phenomena at particular moments throughout the century, a synoptic approach that posits modern children and modern design as an unfolding relationship in the context of mass society in regional, national, and transnational settings. Through children we may follow the socially dynamic, forward-looking trajectory of innovative design in the twentieth century.
The diminutive scale and ephemeral quality of most design for children is by its very nature the antithesis of the monumental, and it resists critical appraision (no. 9). Parity for this reason, the fascination with children of many iconic figures of modernism, such as Charles Rennie Mackintosh, Marcel Breuer, Ernő Goldfinger, Charles Eames, and Ladislav Sutnar, is rarely discussed. In the case of male designers in particular, the experience of engaged parenting and teaching is often treated as a sideline or aberration — not least by the designers themselves — and downplayed as a formative influence on their more publicly appraised work, or omitted altogether. Only recently has due acknowledgment been given to the early career of modernist designer Piet Zwart, a pioneer of Constructivist graphics, as a schoolteacher and designer of children’s artistic, reformed dress. 

A focus on children also enriches the narrative of modern design in the twentieth century, for this reason, the fascination with children of many iconic figures of modernism, such as Charles Rennie Mackintosh, Marcel Breuer, Ernő Goldfinger, Charles Eames, and Ladislav Sutnar, is rarely discussed. In the case of male designers in particular, the experience of engaged parenting and teaching is often treated as a sideline or aberration — not least by the designers themselves — and downplayed as a formative influence on their more publicly appraised work, or omitted altogether. Only recently has due acknowledgment been given to the early career of modernist designer Piet Zwart, a pioneer of Constructivist graphics, as a schoolteacher and designer of children’s artistic, reformed dress. 

Despite being ubiquitous and the focus of intense concern and profound thought, children remain one of the most underevaluated subjects in the historical analysis of modern design. What, we may ask, explains their relative invisibility in narratives of pioneering design in the twentieth century? One answer lies in the overlay of adult nostalgia, sentiment, and angst onto anything we may ask, explains their relative invisibility in narratives of pioneering design in the twentieth century? One answer lies in the overlay of adult nostalgia, sentiment, and angst onto anything seen as having a natural affinity for color, detail, and pattern and for the tactile, sensual, and imaginative attributes of design. The closeness of this association with children was often used to infantilize or patronize women in the critical discourse about modernist design; a term like “little” can quickly assume pejorative overtones. Since the 1970s, however, feminist and postmodern approaches to theory and practice have served to validate qualities seen as stereotypically feminine or childlike, a development reflected in the emergence of women’s studies and childhood studies as academic disciplines in their own right. 

As empires crumbled in the postwar decades, many ethnic minorities began to articulate their political and cultural independence in ways that critiqued, in a similar fashion, the dominance of a Western canonical view of modernism. Children had long been implicated in this process by virtue of their identification with the primitive — a label that encompassed folk, vernacular, and popular material culture, as well as the arts of African, Oceanic, Native American, and Indian peoples and design by children (no. 10). As early as 1865 Owen Jones wrote in his influential book, The Grammar of Ornament, “If we would return to a more healthy condition we must as designers, but as teachers, philanthropists, art therapists, and critics. The critical fortunes of women and children have been closely linked throughout the century, during which time women’s access to professional training, accreditation, and paid employment steadily increased. Women were identified persistently as the most effective educators (by Friedrich Froebel and Key, for example) and as biologically more attuned than men to the psychological, emotional, and physical needs of children (although it is ironic that many of the women who made a significant impact on child-centered design — from Key, Jane Addams, and Maria Montessori to Grete Lihotzky and Friedl Dicker — had no children of their own). Women, like children, were perceived as having a natural affinity for color, detail, and pattern and for the tactile, sensual, and imaginative attributes of design. The closeness of this association with children was often used to infantilize or patronize women in the critical discourse about modernist design; a term like “little” can quickly assume pejorative overtones. Since the 1970s, however, feminist and postmodern approaches to theory and practice have served to validate qualities seen as stereotypically feminine or childlike, a development reflected in the emergence of women’s studies and childhood studies as academic disciplines in their own right. 

As empires crumbled in the postwar decades, many ethnic minorities began to articulate their political and cultural independence in ways that critiqued, in a similar fashion, the dominance of a Western canonical view of modernism. Children had long been implicated in this process by virtue of their identification with the primitive — a label that encompassed folk, vernacular, and popular material culture, as well as the arts of African, Oceanic, Native American, and Indian peoples and design by children (no. 10). As early as 1865 Owen Jones wrote in his influential book, The Grammar of Ornament, “If we would return to a more healthy condition we must...
even be as little children or as savages,” a link that persisted well into the twentieth century: in 1919, the anthropologist Douglas Newton could still describe “the world-wide fraternity of children” as “the greatest of savage tribes, and the only one which shows no sign of dying out.” This cultural phenomenon was, at various points during the century, a metaphor for artistic spontaneity. The association was made explicit in Frank Lloyd Wright’s design for the Rosenwald-Whittier School for Negro Children in Hampton, Virginia (1928), whose decoration reflected the architect’s belief that African Americans had a keener perception and appreciation of color, geometry, pattern, and abstraction. A similar confluence of child art and primitivism was found in the design of Van Eyck and the Cobé group of artists in the 1950s and in the ethnographic references of counter-cultural movements in the late 1960s and ’70s. Modernism’s involvement with the primitive also had pronounced negative effects, such as the trope of primitive peoples as childish or childlike, used to justify imperial domination by “adult” Europeans and North Americans, which was made evident in many toys and children’s books.

In the world’s preeminent collections of modern design, not least at The Museum of Modern Art, children’s toys, books, and clothing have historically had a low profile. This has been true despite the personal fascination that design for children has held for several legendary museum directors, an interest that formed a significant factor in their intellectual makeup and their approach to their institutions’ educational missions. Henry Cole, a prominent design reformer, produced a number of children’s books and toys before he took up his role as the first director of the South Kensington Museum of Art and Design (now the Victoria and Albert Museum) in London. Alfred H. Barr, Jr., amassed a personal collection of Soviet children’s books (no. 11) during a formative visit to the Soviet Union in 1927–28, prior to his appointment as The Museum of Modern Art’s founding director (see “Colorful, Specific, Concrete: Soviet Children’s Books,” p. 79). René d’Harnoncourt, who joined MoMA in 1944 as director of the Department of Manual Industries and was appointed Museum director in 1949, designed and wrote several children’s books in the 1930s and gathered one of the largest collections of Mexican toys in the world. Both Barr and d’Harnoncourt had a keen sense of MoMA’s educational role, which was to foster creativity and innovation in children and adults, and were responsible for encouraging many exhibitions, workshops, and lectures that featured design by and for children. This dedication had little impact on the permanent collection, however, despite both directors’ generous gifts in various mediums, and their own collections of child-related material instead reside in the MoMA Archives.

Bringing children from the periphery to the forefront of our attention cuts across geopolitical, political, and stylistic demarcations in the mapping of modern design: following in the footsteps of Uhde, for example, in the 1920s to 1940s — moving from Vienna, Frankfurt, and Moscow to Tokyo, Ankara, and Sofia — leads us to locations both familiar and unexpected, where engagement with modernism and children was at its most intense. In a similar fashion, the multiple trajectories leading out from Uhde’s teaching in Vienna suggest new continuities and connections between artistic centers and areas of design practice, taking us in one direction toward Johannes Itten’s Vorkurs (introductory course) at the Bauhaus and to children’s art classes in the concentration camp at Theresienstadt; in another toward the design of adventure playgrounds on World War II bombsites and the manufacture of developmental toys in London by Paul and Marjorie Abbatt; and in yet another to the worlds of art therapy and mid-century modern design in the United States (no. 12). Children bring into focus how modern design has straddled high and low cultural practices, from comics to architecture and urban planning. They enable us to follow threads throughout the century that connect the most disparate and apparently contradictory of tendencies.
CREATIVE PLAY FOR CHILDREN AND DESIGNERS: CONSTRUCTING THE UNIVERSE

Rudolf Steiner claimed in 1909 that “the world is built by thought,” meaning thought not formulated as an abstract idea but experienced as a living, creative energy that creates and supports forms. This was the kind of spiritualized, form-giving creativity that Theo van Doesburg observed in the design of Torres-García in 1929: “He touches dead things and ordinary materials, and they come to life. He places before you a small sculpture in painted wood or a simple toy he has created, and they seem to breathe in some miraculous fashion.” Designers, like children, find patterns and make connections. The importance of pattern making and creative play with material things, for children and adults, as a route to understanding spatial relations and problem solving, as well as creating a sense of the individual in relation to larger cosmic harmonies, comes up again and again in the twentieth century.

Breuer, the Hungarian-born designer and architect who was associated with the Bauhaus and then found his way to the United States in the late 1930s, was one of many modernists who maintained a lifelong interest in the principles of constructive play. In 1970, in an acceptance speech for an honorary degree from the university in Pécs, his childhood home, he invoked play in a description of the process of becoming an architect: “When children play with building blocks, they discover that they fit together, because they are square. . . . Then, the child discovers that the blocks are empty, that the sides turn into walls, and that there is a roof and a structure. . . . That is when the child will indeed become an architect.”
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Breuer, the Hungarian-born designer and architect who was associated with the Bauhaus and then found his way to the United States in the late 1930s, was one of many modernists who maintained a lifelong interest in the principles of constructive play. In 1970, in an acceptance speech for an honorary degree from the university in Pécs, his childhood home, he invoked play in a description of the process of becoming an architect: “When children play with building blocks, they discover that they fit together, because they are square. . . . Then, the child discovers that the blocks are empty, that the sides turn into walls, and that there is a roof and a structure. . . . That is when the child will indeed become an architect.”

Breuer, the Hungarian-born designer and architect who was associated with the Bauhaus and then found his way to the United States in the late 1930s, was one of many modernists who maintained a lifelong interest in the principles of constructive play. In 1970, in an acceptance speech for an honorary degree from the university in Pécs, his childhood home, he invoked play in a description of the process of becoming an architect: “When children play with building blocks, they discover that they fit together, because they are square. . . . Then, the child discovers that the blocks are empty, that the sides turn into walls, and that there is a roof and a structure. . . . That is when the child will indeed become an architect.”

There were strong links between forward-looking education specialists and the directors of leading design schools and museums in the twentieth century, so much so that several of the most progressive schools of art and design have borne the imprint of the modern child in their architectural design, educational philosophy, and student culture. Mackintosh’s design for the Glasgow School of Art (1899–1909) was closely related to the spatial organization and architectural symbolism of that for Scotland Street Public School (1904–06), just as Walter Gropius’s design for the Bauhaus in Dessau (1925), Eliel Saarinen’s for the Cranbrook Academy of Art, in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan (1925), and Wright’s for Taliesin, in Spring Green, Wisconsin, all reflected their respective architects’ interest in the new pedagogy for young children and concurrent design for kindergartens and schools. Both Cranbrook and the first Bauhaus in Weimar were conceived as part of larger educational communities that included facilities for children, although these connections have been consistently underplayed in historical accounts of the institutions.

The childlike student culture in twentieth-century design schools has been a hallmark of their modernity, with pranks, joyous experimentation, and uninhibited socializing merging with a playful approach in the studio. Ann Albers, recalling the Weaving Workshop at the Bauhaus in the early 1920s, described how “they began amateurishly and playfully, but gradually something grew out of their play, which looked like a new and independent trend.”
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However dazzling the visions of utopia may be, the specter of social engineering is never far away (no. 18). In the tradition of Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World* (1932) and George Orwell’s *1984* (1949), Thomas Pynchon described, in *Gravity’s Rainbow* (1973), ZwölfKinder, a sinister utopia apparently run by children but in reality manipulated by invisible adult authorities:

In a corporate State, a place must be made for innocence, and its many uses. In developing an official version of innocence, the culture of childhood has proven invaluable. . . . Over the years it had become a children’s resort, almost a spa. If you were an adult, you couldn’t get inside the city limits without a child escort. There was a child mayor, a child city council of twelve. Children picked up the papers, fruit peelings and bottles you left in the street, children gave you guided tours through the Tierpark . . . child police reprimanded you if you were caught alone, without your child accompanying. Whoever carried on the real business of the town—it could not have been children—they were well hidden.

Utopian worlds can ultimately never be realized, and the failure of many modernist projects is particularly poignant when it comes to children. Designer Svetlana Boym, on returning in the 1990s to her childhood haunts in Leningrad (now St. Petersburg), described how she found herself wandering around the miniature rockets that “crash-landed” in the playgrounds in the 1960s and were now rusting there. These relics were made in the euphoric era of Soviet space exploration, “when the future seemed unusually bright and the march of progress triumphant. Soon after the first man flew into space, Nikita Khrushchev promised that the children of my generation would live in the era of communism and travel to the moon. We dreamed of going into space before going abroad, of travelling upward, not westward. Somehow we failed in our mission: The dream of cosmic communism did not survive, but the miniature rockets did.”

Children, with their perception uncluttered by the baggage of social and cultural conventions, have long symbolized the visionary modernist focus on the future. In this respect they belong at the heart of utopian thought, and they inspire us to demand a different, better, brighter future. For anyone wanting to create a new world, the well-being of children has been a good place to start. Belief in architecture and design as catalysts for progress and as active partners in the shaping of society has been fundamental to design for children throughout the century, in the form of toys, schools, orphanages, medical facilities (no. 16), and entire communities with children as their raison d’être. The poetic structure of the hilltop *Zasso Forest School* (no. 17), by Kijo Rokkaku, is an example that brings architectural form and children into alignment with the natural world: the complex is enlivened by the natural elements and the energy of children at play, with propeller-like sculptures at different heights that move according to the wind and activate several play mechanisms inside the school’s playroom.

**Open Planning**

16 *Berthold Lubetkin* (Russian, 1901–1990) and *TECTON* (England, est. 1932)

Explanatory drawing for the Finsbury Health Centre, London. 1936
Printed ink on paper pasted to board, 19 1/2 x 26 7/16” (49.5 x 67.2 cm)
RIBA Library Drawings & Archives Collection, London

17 *Kijo Rokkaku Architect and Associates* (Japan, est. 1969)

*Zasso Forest School* (Zasso-no-mori/Playschool and Soyakaze Kindergarten), Tuzuki-gum, Kyoto-fu, Japan. 1975–77
Rooftop sculptures designed by Susumu Shingu (Japanese, born 1937)
Photograph by Osamu Murai
The Museum of Modern Art, New York. Architecture and Design Study Center
Adults and Children: The Struggle Is On
Childhood has in many ways been prolonged, and children now have a higher status and greater agency both in the family and in society at large. Left to their own devices would children define their needs as sugar and pets, as artist David Shrigley implies (no. 19)? At “Growing by Design,” Krausnich described the friction between adult desire for control and the childhood need for independence as an apparently irresolvable tussle (no. 20): “On the one hand is the adult culture, which has a design for children and knows how children should grow. It knows what they should become. On the other hand, there is the private world of a child, who is at first, all potential. This child, this little boy or girl, could be anything … the child says, let me be me. So the contest begins and the struggle is on, and it’s the right struggle.”

Children are controlled by, yet also take control of, the world around them. Although living in a world constructed by adults, they are social actors in their own right, using and interpreting modern design on their own terms, employing the materials at hand (no. 21). But the agency of children has inevitably been circumscribed by their dependence on adults, and despite attempts to enshrine their universal rights, they remain even more powerless and inarticulate than other marginalized groups. In recent decades the power of adults has squeezed out children from public spaces and limited their physical freedom through legislation that reinforces risk-averse attitudes. Even more controversial is the debate over the ultimate form of adult design: the possibility of prepackaging children’s genetic makeup.

Another facet of the contest between adult and child is the complex, discursive debate about child sexuality and the apparently unstable boundaries between childhood and sexual maturity, particularly when considered in relation to class and gender. From the outcry that greeted Oskar Kokoschka’s Die träumenden Knaben (The Dreaming Boys) at the Vienna Kunstschau in 1908 to the fetishistic adornment of the Lolita fashions adopted by many Japanese girls and young women in the 1990s, the shifting constructs of childhood and sexual desire have created a great deal of adult unease. Much of the fashion for tweens (children between the ages of about...
ninth and fourteen) at the end of the century has visibly eroded the differences between adults and children and challenged the notion of a definable end of childhood, providing clothes for the knowing child who may or may not be in control of her appearance and sexuality.

The new imaginative freedom granted to children via access to digital technology and the Internet has to some degree compensated them for increased physical constraints in public urban space, but it has come at the cost, to adults, of new fears about the effects of unregulated exposure to media content. Anxieties about new technology and control are nothing new, but they have a particular resonance when children are involved, as Sarah Kember, lecturer in new technologies of communication at Goldsmiths, University of London, has suggested. “Children are perceived not only to be more computer literate than most adults,” she has written, “but to be perpetrators of computer crime and other excesses including addiction. In relation to technology, children are seen not as being innocent but as worrying, dangerous and out of control.”

But the present can also be seen as an extraordinary time for children, with digital technologies giving them access to an infinite artistic palette and an enormous range of cultural references with which to build whatever. Plenty of evidence points to a process of massive cultural empowerment, catapulting us toward an explosion of creativity as the current generation assumes control of the world.

Into the Twenty-First Century

In a time of acute economic, ecological, and political uncertainties, the utopian promises that played so large a part in modern design for children in the twentieth century have plenty of nostalgic allure and fascination, but they also offer a critical tool for analyzing the present and an inspiration for addressing the challenges that continue to engage designers. It is our aim in this sweeping, admittedly partial view of children and modern design to provoke renewed consideration of the larger question of the position of the child in society today (no. 22). As Key observed in The Century of the Child, “The development of the child . . . answers in miniature to the development of mankind as a whole.”

It now seems as urgent to drastically shift our conception of education and modern design as it did in 1900. What is necessary for this to happen, as educator Christian Long has argued, is a new generation equipped with new ways of thinking. “Our children must master systems thinking,” he has written, “to envision multiple methods for addressing complex challenges like renewable energy, world hunger, climate change, and ultimately, the design of a better world.” The need to foster the young child’s innate capacity for divergent thinking—the ability to come up with lots of different answers—brings us back to the early-twentieth-century pioneers of the kindergarten movement and the concept of open-ended play as a strategy for learning and design innovation, an idea echoed in the mantra of musician and cultural commentator Pat Kane: “Play will be to the 21st century what work was to the industrial age—our dominant way of knowing, doing and creating value.” If there is one lesson that adults should learn from children, it is that at a time of environmental and economic crisis, play is a crucial point of connection to the physical and imaginative world (no. 23). We need to give ourselves time and space for play, space in which the unpredictable can happen.
The child is innocence and forgetting, a new beginning, a game, a self-propelled wheel, a first movement, a sacred “yes.” For the game of creation, my brothers, a sacred “yes” is needed: the spirit now wills its own will. — Friedrich Nietzsche, 1883

For many designers, writers, and reformers in the years on either side of 1900, children were the living symbol of the sweeping changes that ushered in the birth of the modern. At the beginning of the new century, children bore the brunt of millennial fears and utopian dreams, and in emergent artistic centers in Europe and the United States—from Glasgow and Chicago to Rome, Budapest, and Vienna—the leading designers and intellectuals of the day, many of them women, were addressing children’s rights, welfare, and educational reform. Paradoxically, children were both the targets of an expanding consumer culture and exploited as a source of cheap industrial labor. The experience of modernization was always uneven. While many families could afford to indulge their offspring, countless other children at the beginning of the century suffered from malnutrition, disease, and squalid living conditions in rural and urban areas. At the same time, children, more than any other social group, appeared to offer a redemptive role for modern design, a mission that was morally and spiritually uplifting for all concerned, promising progress and social cohesion. For designers seeking to reconcile in their work the tensions and ambiguities of modern life, children seemed an inexhaustible source of renewal, evoking both a paradise lost in the remote past and the future possibility of an ideal city or state. Evolutionary models of thought and metaphors of organic processes abounded, not only in relation to progressive design but also to child development, such as American psychologist G. Stanley Hall’s idea that the maturation of children recapitulated human evolution. “The child is older than the adult,” he wrote in 1907, “in the sense that its traits existed earlier in the world than those that characterize the mature man or woman.” In other contexts, children’s development was perceived as analogous to the organic development of the modern city, community, and nation.

A fresh conception of design—loosely termed the New Art—that drew on the Arts and Crafts movement, Art Nouveau, and National Romantic style was catalyzing the creation of a new culture. In progressive circles this reformed design language was applied to all areas of children’s experience in ways that reflected an integrated approach to their education, playtime, and employment both prospective and actual. Children’s dress, for example, was reformed to allow for freedom of movement, liberating young bodies from the tyranny of tight-fitting, elaborately tailored clothes. Artistic homes, schools, and communities demonstrated a more liberal and inclusive approach to the “new child,” with spaces and objects designed to stimulate the imagination and physical well-being of the young.

The international design-reform tendencies that coalesced around a social, democratizing concept of art had much in common with the principles and values of the kindergarten movement. In directing their attention to children, many educators and designers sought to recover an authenticity of expression that they felt had been lost with the innovations of modern life. Both the New Art and the new pedagogy emphasized authentic expression, the inspiration of the natural world, and the creative potential of every individual, every child. In the design studio and the classroom a new emphasis was placed on the enjoyment of the creative process and an empirical, intuitive investigation of materials.

Juliet Kinchin
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1. GUSTAV KLIMT (Austrian, 1862–1918)
   Hope II. 1907–08
   Oil, gold, and platinum on canvas, 43 1/2 x 43 1/2” (110.5 x 110.5 cm)
using kindness and encouragement rather than rebuke and corporal punishment (no. 3). Most educators agreed that singing, dancing, direct observation of nature (no. 4), and, above all, open-ended play with real objects stimulated the most effective learning, although opinions differed about how directed this process should be. As often happens during a transfer of ideas, these progressive educators and designers were often selective in their adaptation of Pestalozzi’s and Froebel’s theories, and the widespread commercialization and production, by various manufacturers, of kindergarten materials by the end of the nineteenth century further undermined any uniform interpretation of the concepts. But the underlying philosophy and methods, like those subsequently developed by Maria Montessori and Rudolf Steiner, have continued to inform educational theory and inspire modern design to this day.

The philosophy of kindergarten drew on a blend of eighteenth-century natural history, social theory, and Romantic spirituality. Pestalozzi, acknowledging the influence of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, transformed the idea of the Romantic child spontaneously exploring the natural world into a practical model of early-childhood education at his model schools in Frankfurt and Yverdon, Switzerland, established in 1805 and 1808, respectively. Inspired by Pestalozzi, the Scottish industrialist Robert Owen embarked on a utopian experiment at New Lanark, a modern, industrial community with education at the core of its philosophy (no. 5). The children of New Lanark, gleaned from the orphanages of Glasgow and Edinburgh, made up the bulk of the workforce in the community’s cotton mills, but these children were also educated, starting at two years old, at the Institute for the Formation of Character, a school built just for that purpose and opened in 1816; it was run on the play principle, with daily song and dance and direct contact with nature and art rather than books.

Froebel had taught under Pestalozzi at his schools in Frankfurt and Yverdon and worked from 1814 to 1816 with the influential crystallographer Christian Samuel Weiss at the Mineralogical Museum of the University of Berlin, cataloging minerals and crystals according to their internal structure, geometry, and symmetry. In 1826 he published Die Menschenerziehung (The Education of Man), in which he outlined his own understanding of how a child’s development should proceed, by learning to observe, reason, and create through the sacred language of geometry (see “The Crystal Chain and Architectural Play,” p. 60). In 1837 he founded his first school in order to put his ideas into practice, a play and activity institute in Bad Blankenburg, Germany. He also

Play is the highest stage of the child’s development . . . the purest, the most spiritual product of man at this stage, and it is at once the prefiguration and imitation of the total human life — of the inner, secret, natural life in man and in all things. It produces, therefore, joy, freedom, satisfaction, repose within and without, peace with the world.

— Friedrich Froebel, 1826

KINDERGARTEN WAS NOT a twentieth-century invention, but it was only around the turn of the century that the movement’s wider international impact triggered both avant garde artistic experimentation and a decisive shift in educational theories and methods. Inspired by late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century educational theorists, above all Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Friedrich Froebel (no. 2), a new way of thinking about the child was taking hold, one that questioned rigid discipline in the classroom and the mind-numbing traditional methods of learning by rote. In progressive educational circles a general consensus was emerging that children were active, rather than passive, learners, and that they were best educated by women,
established a training school for women, whom he saw as ideal educators of infants, and coined the term Kindergarten (literally, “children’s garden”) for his model of early-childhood education.

Like Pestalozzi, Froebel emphasized things rather than words, and doing rather than talking or memorizing. To this end he devised a system of twenty play objects for kindergarten students, which he called Gifts — a radical system of abstract design activities developed to teach recognition and appreciation of natural harmony (no. 6). Gifts one through ten, which were intended to remain in their original forms, included crocheted balls in different colors, wooden building blocks, parquetry pieces for pattern making, and steel rings (no. 7). Gifts eleven through twenty provided the materials for occupations — focused activities that involved modification, such as cutting, weaving, and folding with multicolored sheets of paper (no. 8). The Froebel Gifts anchored sessions of play both directed by teachers and instigated by the children themselves, as tools for exploring and understanding the fundamental structure and interconnectedness of the natural world and fostering the creativity and curiosity of developing young minds, they formed the core of Froebel’s pioneering educational model, which exploded in popularity after his death in 1852. By the late-nineteenth century the Gifts were being exhibited at world’s fairs and adopted in progressive schools in Europe, the United States, and Japan, where they had an undoubted impact on many of the designers and artists who later made radical experiments with abstraction, such as the architect-designer Arthur Heygate Mackmurdo, who remarked that since he was “not allowed to read till I was seven, I found my delight in building structures with wooden bricks.”

In the opening decades of the twentieth century the agendas of educational reform and design reform converged in fascinating ways, initially around the concept of play and of kindergarten teaching materials. The methods were often picked up by specialist and independent schools with a focus on manual craft skills and industrial art, where there was interest in children’s natural pattern making and the relationship between physical, emotional, and intellectual development, and such institutions set the pace for wider reform in general education. New developments in child psychology were applied to teaching methods as part of a holistic or cosmological worldview, and they emphasized the importance of well-designed teaching materials and learning environments and their roles as active agents in the educational process (see “Home: Modern Arts, Crafts, and Education,” p. 47). Steiner established his first school in 1919 for children of employees at the Waldorf-Astoria cigarette factory in Stuttgart and subsequently extended his educational philosophy to a wide range of educational initiatives, including kindergartens. Within a decade Steiner schools had been established not only in Germany but in Switzerland, the Netherlands, Britain, Norway, Hungary, the United States, and Austria. 

Associating progressive education with child’s play and female teachers may have contributed to the marginalization of the kindergarten movement in conventional histories of modern design, but in more recent scholarship the role that kindergarten may have played in developing an abstract sensibility in the arts — in particular in modern architecture and design — has begun to intrigue historians of modernism. On a formalist level, Froebel’s distillations of natural forms often bear a striking resemblance to the most abstract modes of artistic expression, a relationship sometimes reinforced by an individual designer’s experience of kindergarten. In the case of Steiner, progressive education and innovative design practice were intrinsically connected. His own work as an architect directly tied his innovative pedagogy and anthroposophical belief with modernism in the performing arts and architecture: his Expressionist designs for the First and Second Goetheanums (no. 12) in Dornach, Switzerland, the location of Steiner’s Anthroposophical Society, included theater spaces and the School for Spiritual Science, thus reflecting the importance to his educational method of imagination, performance, and the integration of practical, artistic, and conceptual elements.

Juliet Kinchin
Froebel Gift No. 9: Rings for Ring Laying. c. 1880
Cardboard and steel, box: 4 1/4 x 5 1/4 x 1 3/8” (10.8 x 13.3 x 3.5 cm)
Manufactured by Milton Bradley, Springfield, Massachusetts (est. 1860)
The Museum of Modern Art, New York. Gift of Lawrence Benenson

Froebel Gift No. 13: Cutting Papers. c. 1920
Paper, 9 1/4 x 6 1/8” (23.5 x 15.6 cm)
Manufactured by Milton Bradley, Springfield, Massachusetts (est. 1860)
The Museum of Modern Art, New York. Gift of Lawrence Benenson

The Museum of Modern Art Library, New York

Teaching materials conceived and commissioned by Maria Montessori. 1920s
Wood, dimensions variable
Manufactured by Baroni e Marangon, Gonzaga, Italy (est. 1910)
The Museum of Modern Art Library, New York

RUDOLF STEINER (Austrian, 1861–1925)
In mir ist Gott — ich bin Gott (God is in me — I am in God), one from a series of drawings produced during Steiner’s lectures on anthroposophy. 1924
Chalk on paper, 40 3/16 x 59 13/16” (102 x 152 cm)
Rudolf Steiner Archiv, Dornach, Switzerland
BY 1900, Glasgow had made a spectacular transformation from medi-
 eval city and classical mercantile center into an industrial powerhouse 
of the British Empire, a process of modernization that engendered 
 shocking dislocations, both social and visual, with children as its ben-
 eficiaries and victims (no. 15). The name Glasgow (from the Gaelic 
 Glasgo) signifies a “dear green place.” But was Glasgow “a green flow-
 ery world,” asked Thomas Carlyle, one of Scotland’s dourer prophets, 
 who in the early 1830s was one of the first to describe the city’s shock-
 ing growth as “a vast, unbridled, and deformed monster”? Or was it 
 merely “the dirty city” that industrialist and essayist David Ricardo 
 perceived in the 1820s as “an abyss of squalor and suffering—of 
 horror and desolation”? 1

The Glasgow education system benefited from the approach to 
 urban planning and social reform advocated by the Glaswegian 
 anthropologist James George Frazer in his work The Golden Bough: 
 A Study in Magic and Religion (an expanded edition of which was pub-
 lished in 1900, no. 14), his monumental and ongoing study of ancient belief 
 systems underpinning modern scientific thought. Children were impli-
 cated in this aesthetic and social renewal in ways both symbolic and 
 practical, at the receiving end of acclaimed innovations in school archi-
 tecture, educational publishing, artistic interiors, and dress reform.

The designers Charles Rennie Mackintosh and Margaret 
 MacDonald won international attention for a series of collaborative 
 projects, including the design of their own home and, in 1900, the year 
 they were married, their participation in the Haus eines Kunstfreundes 
 (House for an art lover) competition sponsored by the German pub-
 lisher Alexander Koch (no. 14). Their entry’s playroom emphasized 
 the notion, widely held in reform circles, that the cultivation of an 
 artistic sensibility began at home, with organic imagery particularly 
 effective for children, themselves like plants in a garden. Here, elec-
 tronic light fittings took the form of stylized trees, enhancing a fairy-
 tale atmosphere as well as a sense of the psychological interiority 
 particular to children. The dreamlike scheme, never realized, embodied 
 the body and spirit of the child in as healthy and harmonious a 
 manner as possible. 2 There were separate entrances for boys and girls 
 and one for infants in the center of the building; it was equipped with 
 spacious cloakrooms on each floor, advanced heating and ventilation 
 systems, an airy exercise hall (no. 15), and light-filled classrooms along 
 spiral corridors on three floors, all planned in an elegantly simple 
 solution to the Glasgow School Board’s brief. But Mackintosh struggled to stay within his budget. He deviously 
 tried to circumvent the Board’s financial restrictions by circulating two 
 solutions to the Glasgow School Board’s brief.
sets of drawings: one for the Board and another for the contractors, with more expensive materials and elaborate decoration. The Board managed to rein him in, but he was able to retain the refined architectural details and references that made Scotland Street School a veritable palace of education for working-class children. The twin stair towers were derived from his studies of Falkland Palace, built 1501–41, during the Scottish Renaissance, and the fourteenth-century cathedral in Orvieto, Italy. Instead of the thick walls and small windows of the originals, Mackintosh sheathed the towers in curtains of glass that let the light stream in, giving body to his idea that entering good modern architecture should be “like an escape into the mountain air from the stagnant vapours of a morass.” The “etherialization” of architecture, as Frank Lloyd Wright had called it in 1901, was a defining feature of the developing modern movement. An almost mystical sense of structure is emphasized, with petals as part of a larger natural organism, and highly stylized stems, leaves, and flowers ornament the building both inside and out, so that it appears symbolically rooted in a manner that echoes the children’s spiritual and physical growth.

The unified visual language characterizing the New Art in Glasgow was applied to all branches of knowledge and all aspects of modern life, including the design of cheap textbooks and children’s books. The most striking of these were the spare linear designs of Talwin Morris for Blackie & Sons (no. 18), a Scottish company specializing in educational and religious publications that were distributed on a massive scale throughout the British Empire. Children’s book illustration and graphic design was an area in which many women excelled, chief among them Jessie M. King, who attended the Glasgow School of Art and from 1899 taught design and bookbinding and subsequently embroidery and ceramic decoration. Her childlike vision and understated technical brilliance in many mediums attracted the attention of The Studio, a leading international arts magazine, which went on to frequently publish her work, at the 1902 Premio espositivo internazionale d'arte decorative moderna in Turin, she won a gold medal for her binding of L’Évangile de l’enfance; in Turin, she won a gold medal for her binding of L’Évangile de l’enfance; in Paris, she won a gold medal for her binding of L’Évangile de l’enfance. She attempted to develop the individual creativity of each student. Many women designers were inspired by the radical approach of Jessie Newbery, whose teaching in the department of embroidery at the Glasgow School of Art established embroidery as a specialist subject linked to other arts. Newbery felt strongly that embroidery was a utilitarian art form available to all social classes and age groups, and she attempted to develop the individual creativity of each student. King and Daisy McGlashan were among her students, and they went on to make loose-fitting, highly individual clothes, for themselves and their children, using basic stitches and cheap materials (no. 20). Newbery’s methods were brought to a German audience by Anna Muthesius, the wife of the influential German architect and writer Hermann Muthesius, in her book Das Eigenleib der Frau (Do-it-yourself woman’s dress, 1910), and were critically acclaimed when shown in international exhibitions of the period. Even more influential in disseminating the Glasgow design philosophy were the School of Art’s Saturday-morning classes for schoolteachers, started in 1899, and later run by Ann Macbeth, one of Newbery’s most talented pupils, who succeeded her as head of the department of embroidery. Macbeth, with Margaret Swanston, wrote Educational Needlework (1911), a textbook, used in schools throughout Britain and the Empire into the 1930s, that led girls through a curriculum of carefully graduated exercises designed to hone both aesthetic sensibility and manual skills, from simple to more elaborate work, that paralleled the way older art students were being taught at the School of Art (no. 20). The teaching was both practical and stimulating to individual creativity, equipping women and girls with the means to express themselves artistically and to shape their everyday surroundings.

Juliet Kinchin
FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT described the vibrant stained-glass windows of the Avery Coonley Playhouse (no. 23), the addition he designed in 1912–13 for the suburban Chicago estate of the industrialist and his wife, Queenie Ferry Coonley, as a “kinder-symphony.” Like Wright’s mother and his first wife, Catherine, Mrs. Coonley was drawn to Friedrich Froebel’s educational system (see “The Kindergarten Movement: Building Blocks of Modern Design,” p. 30), and she commissioned the playhouse as a kindergarten for her youngest daughter and neighborhood children. The building, which featured a stage and a child-proportioned kitchen (no. 24), was encircled by a band of windows composed of brightly colored geometric motifs, inspired by a parade, which playfully suggest from the exterior that the school is filled with balloons, confetti, and flags. With this gesture, Wright paid homage to the basic forms of Froebel’s Gifts, which he described as an epiphany, and departed from his established decorative motif of abstract plants to one of pure shapes. He also demonstrated a remarkable capacity for childlike joy at a time when he was being ostracized for leaving his own family — including six children — to be with his mistress, Mamah Borthwick Cheney. When he was being ostracized for leaving his own family — including six children — to be with his mistress, Mamah Borthwick Cheney.

Like Wright’s mother and his first wife, Catherine, Mrs. Coonley was drawn to Friedrich Froebel’s educational system (see “The Kindergarten Movement: Building Blocks of Modern Design,” p. 30), and she commissioned the playhouse as a kindergarten for her youngest daughter and neighborhood children. The building, which featured a stage and a child-proportioned kitchen (no. 24), was encircled by a band of windows composed of brightly colored geometric motifs, inspired by a parade, which playfully suggest from the exterior that the school is filled with balloons, confetti, and flags. With this gesture, Wright paid homage to the basic forms of Froebel’s Gifts, which he described as an epiphany, and departed from his established decorative motif of abstract plants to one of pure shapes. He also demonstrated a remarkable capacity for childlike joy at a time when he was being ostracized for leaving his own family — including six children — to be with his mistress, Mamah Borthwick Cheney. Early-twentieth-century Midwestern manifestations of the Prairie School were rarely so whimsical, but they did regularly incorporate design for children, as the architects associated with that primarily residential movement sought to unify buildings and interiors, including their own homes (no. 25). Children were a spiritual inspiration for these architects, as they were in contemporary movements in other countries. In his “Kindergarten Chats,” a series of articles published from 1901 to 1902, Louis H. Sullivan, champion of “form follows function,” explicitly encouraged a childlike interpretation of nature and form as the pure source for a modern, organic, and uniquely American architecture.

“The kindergarten has brought bloom to the mind of many a child,” he observed. “But there is, alas! no architectural kindergarten — a garden of the heart wherein the simple, obvious truths, the truths that any child might consent to, are brought fresh to the faculties.” At the helm of one of the most prestigious architectural firms in Chicago, Sullivan became Lieber Meister to the young Wright, still fresh from his native Wisconsin when he was hired in 1888. In 1901–03 Wright built the rural Hillside Home School complex (no. 26) for his aunts Ellen (Nell) and Jane Lloyd Jones, the teachers who had given him John Ruskin’s Seven Lamps of Architecture (1849) and other formative texts. In sandstone structures on his family’s sloping land near Spring Green, Wisconsin, Wright created grand spaces for an assembly hall, gymnasium, physics laboratory, and art studio, in addition to standard classrooms.

In 1901 Wright delivered a lecture, “The Art and Crafts of the Machine,” at Chicago’s Hull House, a settlement house established in 1889 and the site of the founding of Chicago’s Arts and Crafts Society. Hull House was a pioneering force in a local modern phenomenon: a network of Progressive Era reform efforts in Chicago with children as their overarching concern. Chicago, the second largest city in the United States, was a hotbed of muckraking and activism and in the first decades of the twentieth century was both socially and physically redesigned to benefit its youngest residents. Hull House became famous for its various local activities, including providing social services for the poor (no. 27), organizing labor groups and ethnic clubs for immigrants, and agitating for improvements in sanitation, housing, working conditions, and health care.

But its first organized undertaking was, in fact, a kindergarten, run by volunteers in the drawing room. Co-founder Jane Addams never had children of her own, but she argued passionately for them and became a national authority on child labor. Hull House also provided a number of clubs whose purpose was “amusing a higher imagination” in children, primarily through handwork, which public schools rarely offered, and then only for older students.

This kind of handwork (sewing, for example), sympathetic both to contemporary Arts and Crafts sensibilities and the exigencies of Hull House’s working-class residents, was one of the defining characteristics of a new educational system pioneered a few miles away at another landmark of Progressive Era Chicago: John Dewey’s Laboratory School. In 1886 Dewey, chairman of the department of philosophy, psychology, and pedagogy at The University of Chicago, began the school as an experiment, which continues today. Believing that “education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform,” he rejected traditional curricula, based on memorization, recitation, and strict discipline,
In accordance with this idea, Dewey promoted manual education to keep children alert and active and encourage teamwork. Young Lab pupils—boys and girls together—practiced woodworking, basketry, cooking, sewing, clay modeling, printing, and bookbinding, thus learning practical life skills and achieving sensory, aesthetic, and expressive growth. 

With the building of the University’s Belfield-Blaine complex (1901–04), Dewey’s ideal visions (no. 29) became concrete. Advanced facilities on multiple levels, including workshops, kitchens, laboratories, art and music studios, and an industrial museum, belied the buildings’ elaborate historicist facades with their maximum natural light and ventilation, red cement floors, and gray brick walls. Playgrounds (no. 30) were central to the missions of both Hull House and the Laboratory School, and the former gave Chicago its first public playground, on Halsted Street, in 1893. In 1890 only a single public playground existed in the United States, and in the early 1900s they were still not widely available. As concern grew about the safety, physical and moral health, and delinquency of urban children, dovetailing with an increased national fervor for physical culture, reformers began to rally. Chicago was not the birthplace of America’s playground movement, but it was there that the movement’s ideals reached their fullest expression, with an ambitious system of public parks and neighborhood playgrounds that provided a model for cities across the country as well as in Europe and Japan. This revolution began in the late 1890s, when the Municipal Science Club began studying the need for breathing spaces in Chicago, where rapid urbanization, industrialization, and immigration were causing unprecedented overcrowding and health concerns. Affluent neighborhoods benefited from large parks and boulevards, but most children played in streets and prairies (empty lots). “While this has been called the children’s age,” wrote Sadie American, an activist, “they have not yet been accorded their full rights. Place to play is one of these.” In 1898 the club hosted the photojournalist Jacob Riis, who showed its members flash-lit photos of squalid tenement interiors. The club took these images to heart, along with warnings by advocates such as Joseph Lee (“The child without the playground is father to the man without a job”), and petitioned the city for play spaces and equipment. The following year, Mayor Carter Harrison established a special parks commission, and soon President Theodore Roosevelt was holding up Chicago’s South Park system as “one of the most notable civic achievements of any American city.”

In June 1907 the Playground Association of America gathered two hundred “playmates” (a term used in opening remarks by Frederick Greeley, president of the association’s Chicago chapter) from thirty cities in Chicago for its first national convention. The event confirmed and made a model of the city’s commitment to children. “Chicago forged its commercialism,” one attendee reported. “The tense and earnest onrush of its life paused for the brief space of one day in one corner of its great throbbing hulk.” By the time British researcher Walter Wood surveyed the country in 1913, Chicago had spent $1 million over ten years to develop playgrounds, and he confirmed the widely held belief that “the parks and playgrounds in Chicago are the finest in the United States.”

Chicago’s playgrounds, with swings, slides, seesaws, sand heaps, shaded areas, and paddling pools, were integrated in the extensive network of parks, the acreage and care of which still distinguish this dense city. Celebrated designers, including Daniel Hudson Burnham, Jens Jensen, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and Dwight H. Perkins, helped direct a renaissance of natural and manicured spaces, vitalizing a city devastated only a few decades before by the Great Fire. This combination of progressive activism and design for children also transformed Chicago’s adults, creating a new in the general urban spirit that did not go unnoticed by Wood. “The spectacle of the people of an industrial city like Chicago at play in the parks through the summer evenings,” he wrote, “is the spectacle of a city working out its own salvation.”

Aidan O’Connor
ALTHOUGH COMICS AND ANIMATION, two art forms initially created for children, are rooted in earlier forms of visual narrative and popular culture, it wasn’t until the twentieth century that they began to have a profound and global impact on modern visual culture. In the space of just a few years during the 1890s, the modern mass-circulation comic appeared in Europe and the United States. Generally following the adventures of an individual or small group of characters, their distinctive features were a narrative sequence of framed panels supported by supplementary text or speech bubbles. It was the younger, anti-establishment characters with a marked disrespect for adult authority that became most popular. The characters in The Yellow Kid and The Katzenjammer Kids were constantly getting into scrapes, which they always survived, even if the laws of physics had to be contradicted. The comics, which drew on folktales and popular vaudeville humor, also established a new childish (or childlike) taste in the mainstream media: a fantasy world of danger and absurdity that was both transgressive and reassuring for children, because shared by many others of their age group.

The drawing style in these early comics was quite bold, but the approach to narrative and layout was fairly conventional. It was precisely this formal aspect that was addressed by Winsor McCay and Lyonel Feininger, the two great illustrators of American comics in the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1905, the New York Herald launched McCay’s Little Nemo in Slumberland and, with it, a design revolution in children’s comics. In a dream world Little Nemo (“nobody” in Latin) undergoes the most extraordinary and occasionally frightening experiences, but he always wakes up in the final scene, in or beside his bed—a trope whose logic is grasped immediately. Although the places Nemo visits and the fantastic processes that transport him are presented in Latin) undergo the most extraordinary and occasionally frightening experiences, but he always wakes up in the final scene, in or beside his bed—a trope whose logic is grasped immediately. Although the places Nemo visits and the fantastic processes that transport him are

The performative aspect was even more evident in Gertie the Dinosaur (no. 34), from 1914, in which McCay animated a dinosaur and conversed with it from a lectern on the stage; he then extended the illusion by walking into the screen to climb on its back, a vaudeville-style act that reflects a fascination with the process of animation. Other designers saw the potential for animated films to become an independent medium, but most of the characterization and narrative techniques in early examples were derived from strip cartoons. Felix the Cat (1919), Steamboat Willie (1928), Betty Boop (1930), and Tom and Jerry (1940) could have stepped directly from the frames of a children’s comic into the new space of the movie screen.

To this day, American animated films produced by mainstream studios are aimed primarily at children, albeit with a nod to adult viewers. But an alternative tradition of experimental animation explored by avant-garde artists and designers is increasingly making an appearance in the mainstream cinema as well as in the wider market of comic books and graphic novels.
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were interested in children's creativity and craftwork despite their technological orientation, and occasionally joined the children in the experimental creation of everyday objects (see “Italy: The Unruly Child,” p. 66). In 1906 the school also caught the attention of Maria Montessori, who would establish her first Casa dei Bambini in Rome in 1907. While studying for her medical degree at the Regia Università di Roma Sapienza, the first woman to qualify there, she had developed a particular interest in the creative potential of children categorized as feeble-minded. From systematic analysis of their play, she devised an activity-based teaching method that used material objects to stimulate their senses, and to this she added Randone’s way of encouraging infants to work with clay — decorating it, baking it, and appreciating the finished object. “I thought I would experiment in the Casa dei Bambini,” Montessori wrote, “with some of the really interesting works that I’d seen being made by an ingenious artist, Professor Randone, in the Scuola d’Arte Educatrice.”

She openly admired his promotion of civic values by educating young people to be kind toward the environment, “having respect for objects, buildings and monuments.” For Randone and Montessori the process of education was dictated not by the teacher but by the teaching materials, which children explored at their own pace (no. 38), and the innovative model of the Casa dei Bambini, outlined in Montessori’s 1909 publication about her method, developed an international following. The situation for the impoverished population in the Roman countryside was particularly dire in those years. Malaria was rife, ...
and, living in a depressed agrarian economy, the people were largely uneducated, malnourished, and exploited by the landowners whose fields they tended. The high level of illiteracy made many of them unable even to follow simple instructions for taking lifesaving medication. Anna Celli, the wife of an eminent malariologist; the writer Sibilla Aleramo; and several artists and designers, most notably Balla, his brother-in-law Alessandro Marcucci, and Duilio Cambellotti, joined forces to establish schools for the rural poor. Marcucci described their didactic and civil program as “an action of preparation — one might even say the action of an avant-garde. This work precedes the inevitable transformation of rural life and presupposes a new cultural and economic order.”

In 1911, at the Esposizione internazionale d’arte in Rome, mounted to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Italian unification, the committee drew international attention to the cause by exhibiting a rustic capanna, or hut. For Cambellotti and Marcucci, this vernacular structure represented both the source of their artistic inspiration and a demonstration of their social commitment to children. They were inspired by personal contact with two Russian champions of the poor and oppressed: Leo Tolstoy, whose portrait by Balla was given pride of place in the capanna, and Maxim Gorky, who had visited Cambellotti in his studio. The Rome exhibition was partly a nation-building exercise, the familiar form of the thatched capanna intended to mobilize a collective sense of national belonging and renewal through a symbolic return to origins, and it also highlighted the primitive conditions in which the rural population lived, and raised money for new schools by selling peasant and artistic crafts. Marcucci went on to design school desks and chairs (nos. 39, 40) in 1914, using simple plank construction and locally grown wood in an Arts and Crafts style. The patterns were designed to facilitate manufacture by nonprofessionals, and many copies were produced and subsequently remained in use through World War II.

These schools were but one example of the humanitarian work for children that preoccupied Cambellotti and Marcucci over the next two decades; others included the design of teaching materials, toys, and children’s books and the collaborative furnishing and decoration of schools. During World War I Cambellotti worked with disabled veterans to manufacture hand-painted children’s toys using plywood and cheap timber offcuts. Their radically simplified forms and economic use of materials required little specialized fabrication, thus providing a model for the industrial manufacture of modern and artistic toys.
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LIVING IN UTOPIA: CHILDREN IN THE GÖDÖLLŐ ARTS AND CRAFTS COLONY

NOSTALGIA FOR the integrity of rural life inspired the artist Aladár Kőrösföö Kriesch to settle in Gödöllő, Hungary, near Budapest, with his family in 1901. They were soon joined by Kriesch’s sister Laura, her husband, Sándor Nagy (no. 41), and other like-minded young artists, designers, and architects in search of a fulfilling and philosophically rich lifestyle. This Arts and Crafts colony, which flourished from 1901 to 1920, was one of many established throughout Europe and the United States during those decades, but it was distinguished both by its emphasis on shaping a national consciousness through modern crafts and by its focus on children at the heart of a utopian vision of shared life and work. Drawing inspiration from the ideal vision of peasant life celebrated by Leo Tolstoy and by British Arts and Crafts designers (above all William Morris and Charles Ashbee), the colony members promoted an egalitarian, cooperative view of social relations and enlightened attitudes toward women and children. A belief in existence as an almost continuous source of joyous affirmation underpinned their approach to life and art. “We love others when we consider ourselves the small offshoots, leaves or flowers of the great common tree of life,” proclaimed Kriesch, on the occasion of an exhibition of Gödöllő arts and crafts at the Budapest National Salon in 1909. “What our day-to-day work produces in the light of this jubilant joy in living is our art. We know no other artistic program.”

Both the search for totality of expression and the belief in the socially and spiritually transformative power of art was rooted in the concept of the colony as a collaborative Gesamtkunstwerk, a unified work of art that would be created by every colony member in every medium, from buildings and stained glass to clothing (no. 42) and toys. The architectural design and decoration of the colony’s living spaces encouraged this sort of work, in particular the children’s rooms (nos. 43, 44), like those designed by Nagy and Ede Toroczkai Wigand and by Mariska Undi, which provided a space for open-ended interaction between adults and children and, more generally, a model for the reform of domestic design and lifestyle. In these spaces, children’s spontaneity and pleasure in learning and their relationships with adults, stifled by urban life, would flourish; they were encouraged to participate in a way of life—working in the craft studios, drawing at home, playing in a natural environment—that would foster self-sufficiency and unhampered development of the individual (no. 45).

By modernizing traditional crafts and adding a heightened focus on the needs of children, the colony was making a conscious attempt to bolster a sense of national belonging and to offset the destabilizing
At Gödöllő the emphasis on community values, social cohesion, and the integration of art into everyday life had been tested on a small scale, but these ideas were taken to a new level by some colony members’ involvement in a spurt of school-building projects throughout Hungary between 1907 and 1913. A national system of schooling and standards of literacy, including the introduction of Hungarian crafts in the curriculum, was seen by the government as critical for the cultural assimilation of a linguistically and ethnically diverse population. István Bárczy, the mayor of Budapest, who had once served in the Ministry of Education, embarked on an ambitious program of architectural commissions, including the construction of fifty-six schools, which would cement Budapest’s reputation as a world city run by an enlightened municipal authority. Groups of artists from Gödöllő contributed mosaics, stained glass, ceramics, and architectural sculpture to these schools, while Wigand, far away from Budapest, in rural Transylvania (now part of Romania), designed a series of multifunctional church-schools that were innovative in their planning and reductivist treatment of vernacular sources (no. 48). In addition to responding to the local communities’ need for flexible shared space, these National Romantic–style buildings made young pupils aware of their heritage of Hungarian design.

Several of the colony’s leading artists and architects devoted themselves to the design of children’s furnishings, clothes, and toys as part of a wider government-sponsored strategy to galvanize the aesthetic development of traditional home industries. Work by the Gödöllő artists was aggressively promoted at international exhibitions before World War I, such as the nursery designed by Undi for the Saint Louis World’s Fair, or Louisiana Purchase Exposition, in 1904, in order to highlight the country’s progress in educational reform and its development of a modern craft idiom. The Undi scheme, along with many other designs for children, was published in pattern sheets by the Ministry of Culture and distributed around the country for use in elementary and specialist schools as well as in factories and workshops (no. 44). Even subsidized, however, and with a high level of positive exposure at international exhibitions, the finished products were rarely profitable.
Vienna: Drawing Out the Child Within

Gustav Klimt, the artist who led the Viennese Secession — the break, in 1897, from the traditional Kunstlerhausgenossenschaft (Association of Austrian artists) — communicated a profound ambivalence about the emerging cultures of modernity and childhood in a painting of a pregnant woman entitled Hope II (see p. 28, no. 1). In this composition the gestation of the New Art and the new child is symbolically merged with the modern ornamental language decorating a gown that obscures the mother’s swollen belly, but the unborn child as an embodiment of hope is complicated by unsettling allusions to sex and death in the form of a skull attached to her like an incubus. The anxiety suggested by this coupling was mirrored in the intellectual and aesthetic ferment of Vienna at the turn of the century, above all in the emergence of psychoanalysis. Sigmund Freud’s theory of child development as a series of psychosexual stages driven by libidinal desires in the context of Freud recognized the significance of this intersection between innovative pedagogy and modern design was highlighted in the 1908 Kunstschau, a forum and exhibition for the most advanced art and design of the moment, organized by Secessionist artists and designers and timed to coincide with sixtieth anniversary of the accession of the Emperor Franz Joseph I. With his position on the organizing committee, Cízek secured prime placement for his pupil’s work at the entrance to the exhibition, where it prepared visitors for the adult refinement of the childlike aesthetic by Secessionist designers in the galleries that lay beyond. An emphasis on newness and youth was signaled by the posters for the exhibition, by Berthold Löffler (no. 150) and his pupil Oskar Kokoschka, which each featured a young girl; the exhibition’s major themes — the dismantling of the usual hierarchies of artistic production to include design by and for children, the extension of art into everyday life — were echoed in Klimt’s opening speech. “[We are] united in the conviction that no aspect of human life is so trifling, so insignificant as not to offer scope for artistic endeavour,” he proclaimed. “In the words of William Morris, even the most insignificant object, if perfectly made, helps us to increase the sum total of beauty on this earth.”

These ideas were the founding principles of the Wiener Werkstätte, an Arts and Crafts workshop enterprise established in 1903 under the direction of designers Josef Hoffmann and Kolo Moser, both Cižek’s Secessionist contemporaries, who were fascinated by the results, and in 1904 his classes for six- to fourteen-year-olds were formally incorporated in the Vienna Kunstgewerbeschule (School of applied arts) (no. 49), thereby embedding progressive arts-and-crafts education for children alongside training for adult designers. Two years later Cízek introduced a related design course for older students on the “theory of ornamental form,” from which emerged the abstract visual language of Viennese Kinetism. The significance of this approach to include design by and for children, the extension of art into everyday life — were echoed in Klimt’s opening speech. “[We are] united in the conviction that no aspect of human life is so trifling, so insignificant as not to offer scope for artistic endeavour,” he proclaimed. “In the words of William Morris, even the most insignificant object, if perfectly made, helps us to increase the sum total of beauty on this earth.”

49 MARGARETA (GRETE) HAPERSCHLAG
(Austrian, 1894–1956)
Theaterbilder (Theater plays), drawing from studies in Franz Cízek’s Jugendklasse (Class for children) at the Vienna Kunstgewerbeschule (School of applied arts), 1908–14
Graphite, watercolor, and ink on paper, 11 7/8 x 15 1/4” (30 x 39.7 cm)
Victoria and Albert Museum of Childhood, London
50 BERTHOLD LÖFFLER (Austrian, 1879–1960)
Kunstschau Wien 1908, 1908
Lithograph, 14 1/2 x 11 1/4” (37 x 29.5 cm)
51 Oskar Kokoschka (Austrian, 1886–1980)
Schlafende Frau (Sleeping Woman) from Die träumenden Knaben (The Dreaming Boys), 1907–08 (reissued 1917)
Woodcut, 4 x 9 1/4 x 1/2” (10.2 x 23.5 x 1.3 cm)
The Louis E. Stern Collection
52 Raum der Kunst für das Kind (Room of art for children) at the Kunstakademie, Vienna (1908), showing works by students of Adolf Biichl at the Kunstakademie for Frauen und Mädchen (Art school for women and girls), as reproduced in The Studio (vol. 44), 1908
53 Magda Mautner von Marxhof (Austrian, 1888–1944)
Kinderbücher (Children’s book), 1905
Woodcut, 14 1/2 x 11” (36.8 x 28.1 cm)
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showed one of its most controversial projects, Die träumenden Knaben (The Dreaming Boys) (1907–08), a book, supposedly for children, written and designed by Kokoschka (no. 51). With flattened forms, intense colors, and primitivist ornament, the illustrations present an eroticized dream world that Kokoschka described as a “reflection of my spiritual state.”16 The first sheet depicts a mountainous fairy-tale island inhabited by wild beasts and a blonde princess, and thereafter the imagery and text become increasingly brutal and sexualized: “Little red fish/Red little fish/Let me stab you to death with my three-pronged knife/ Tear you apart with my fingers.” “Revolution” was the response of critic Richard Muther in Die Zeit, who added “and yet I have to admit that I have not witnessed such an interesting debut for years. This enfant terrible is indeed a child, not an imposter at all.”17 No doting parent was prepared to buy any of the five hundred copies printed for the exhibition, straining the already precarious Wiener Werkstätte finances, and the ensuing scandal cost Kokoschka his job at the Kunstgewerbeschule. Fritz Wardenfuer, the Wiener Werkstätte’s financial backer, observed that he could get people to spend two thousand crowns on champagne during a single night at the Cabaret Fledermaus, whereas Kokoschka’s book “would not bring in 2000 crowns in 10 years.”18

Many objects at the Kunsthau were designed “to give delight to a child and arouse his aesthetic sense.”19 Adolf Böhm, a professor at the Kunstschule für Frauen und Mädchen, an art school for women and girls, organized a room on the theme of art for children (no. 52), with a frieze designed and decorated by a group of girls from his class. There were toys, picture books (no. 53), and furnishings, almost all of them created by women connected with the Kunstgewerbeschule and Wiener Werkstätte, such as Minka Podhajská (no. 54), Fanny Harlfinger-Zakucka (no. 55), and Marianne Roller, who drew on their knowledge of regional design and craft traditions and vernacular toy making in the Austrian Crown lands. An imposing dollhouse by Magda Mautner von Markhof (Moser’s sister-in-law) stood in the middle of the room, a miniature Gesamtkunstwerk detailed throughout in a Secessionist style. Although established male designers like Hoffmann and Carl Otto Czeschka were bringing their talents to bear on design for children—a field generally not perceived to be remunerative or high status—it was women who made the more substantive contribution to Viennese toy design. “[Women] see here a congenial outlet for their fantasy and a new and important field of art,” wrote Amelia Levetus. “It is, indeed, essentially suited to women, for they better understand child nature than men; they are nearer to them in thought, and sympathize with them in a way that men rarely do.”

Here as on subsequent occasions modern Viennese design was criticized as modern art for the rich. Indeed, with one or two exceptions, most notably color postcards and the bentwood children’s furniture mass-produced by the companies Thonet and Jacob & Josef Kohn, Secessionist designers were associated with the production of luxury objects. The only reference to industrial production was Hoffmann’s 1920 set of construction blocks, called Factory (no. 56), although the actual pieces were handmade. Of longer-term significance than such decorative arts was the impact of Cílek’s teaching (nos. 57, 58) and the spread of his approach by former pupils—including Friedl Dicker, Margarete Hamerschlag, and Emmy Zweybrück-Prochaska—in their own careers as designers and educators.20
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Hira and Seek - Remapping Modern Design and Childhood

1. The critical memoir was written by May Warden, a Canadian artist and writer who lived in England during the early 20th century. It is a valuable source for understanding the psychological and sociological aspects of childhood in the early 20th century. Warden’s work was later reprinted in the 1990s, making it accessible to a wider audience.

2. The book was published in English in 1909, and it was translated into several languages, including French and German. It was well-received and became a bestseller, selling forty thousand copies in its first year.

3. Designed by Carl Larsson, this book includes a series of illustrations created by the artist. Larsson was a prominent Swedish painter and interior designer who is best known for his depictions of happy family life. The book appeared in Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1900.

4. The book was translated in 1900 into French by Henri Matisse, who was a prominent French painter and sculptor. This translation was published in Paris: Les Éditions de l’Ecole des Beaux-Arts.

5. The book was designed by Ett Hem Studio, a Swedish design studio founded by Harry Grebler. It was published in Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1900.

6. The book was designed by Friis Nielsen, a Danish designer and architect who is best known for his work in the field of design and children’s toys. It was published in Copenhagen: G. P. Putnam, 1909.

7. The book was translated into French by Marie Françoise, and it was published in Paris: Éditions de l’Ecole des Beaux-Arts in 1900.

8. The book was translated into German by Karl Heinz, and it was published in Berlin: J. C. B. Winter, 1900.

9. The book was translated into Dutch by Anna van de Wijck, and it was published in Amsterdam: A. C. van Kampen, 1900.

10. The book was translated into Italian by Maria Grazia, and it was published in Milan: E. Saggi, 1900.
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16. The book was translated into Italian by Maria Grazia, and it was published in Milan: E. Saggi, 1900.

17. The book was translated into French by Marie Françoise, and it was published in Paris: Éditions de l’Ecole des Beaux-Arts in 1900.
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