

Oldenburg, Veena Talwar. *The Making of Colonial Lucknow, 1856-1877*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. Pp. xxv, 287. Maps, tables, index. \$32.50

Edward C. Moulton

Volume 14, numéro 3, february 1986

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1018097ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1018097ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Moulton, E. C. (1986). Compte rendu de [Oldenburg, Veena Talwar. *The Making of Colonial Lucknow, 1856-1877*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. Pp. xxv, 287. Maps, tables, index. \$32.50]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 14(3), 298–299. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1018097ar>

the ethos of privatization, and the principle that the user should pay" (p. 246).

Similarly the nature of local revenue, specifically the proportions allocated to local taxes, charges for goods and services, and transfer grants, "say quite a lot about underlying political ideologies as well as indicating where the locus of power lies in the government superstructure" (p. 247). In Australia, for example, the "overshadowing of local government by the states has left an indelible imprint on Australian cities. Urban investment undertaken by the states has always favoured the core of the metropolitan primates at the expense of the proliferating suburbs" (pp. 251-2).

Finally, the extent to which urban governments must borrow on the private capital market, in order to supply collective goods and services, can have "a lasting impact on the quality of life within their jurisdictions" (p. 253). "At the least, the private market can put a stop very quickly to any city's efforts to redistribute resources from the haves to the have-nots by refusing to purchase its bonds and securities" (p. 253), though one could argue, similarly, that capital funding from senior levels of government could hamstring cities just as much, though probably in different ways. At any rate, the source of loans can account for different social outcomes.

One other comparative insight, among many, is worth a comment. When the state does intervene on behalf of capital, on behalf of whose capital does it intervene? Given the many types of capital identified today — commercial, industrial, property and so forth — and given the rather different patterns of intergovernmental relations from nation to nation, which part of the state sides with which part of capital?

An overall assessment of the utility of *Unfairly Structured Cities* is difficult. Badcock has, admittedly and inevitably, left much out. He is primarily concerned with the distributive impacts of advanced capital in cities. He is not much concerned with the generative relationship of cities and capital and has not asked all the appropriate questions. For example, is the making of capital also space contingent and state contingent? Have cities been autonomous actors in the distribution of services?

Perhaps what is more disturbing, though, is the implication in this volume that both space and state have undergone little change while capital, in its odyssey to a global and corporate form, has. Urban space obviously has as well. For example, owners are rather more restricted in their use of it than they were 100 years ago, or at least the mechanisms of restriction are different. Our perceptions of space are also changed. And certainly intra-state relationships have, *de facto* if not *de jure*, undergone change. These changes *may* have a fairly direct relationship with the evolution of capital, but this is an unproven assumption.

And finally, the relationship of capital to space may well have been altered. It seems a reasonable hypothesis that 100 years ago, in the heyday of industrial capital, that capital necessarily had an identification with space, as did the local state. An identification between capital and the local state was both possible and inevitable, though perhaps the city was only an interim, corporate surrogate for early and simpler modes of capitalist production. In the past 100 years, however, corporate capital has become less identified with local space and with the local state. Certainly a characteristic of corporate capital is its footloose nature.

Badcock's work poses some tantalizing questions for urban scholars. To what degree has corporate capital taken over the distributive functions and the generative functions of the "local" state? Can corporations (private or government) innovate sufficiently to be creators of wealth? Can they distribute sufficiently well to be socially just? Or are they merely vast machines to appropriate the value created by the innovative context outside their walls and in the process leave urban structures even more impoverished and even more unfair?

John H. Taylor
Department of History
Carleton University

Notes

1. Among many, see M. Castells, *The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977); D.W. Harvey, "The Urban Process Under Capitalism: A Framework for Analysis," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 2, 1 (1978): 101-131.
2. D. Gregory, *Ideology, Science and Human Geography* (London: Hutchinson, 1978).
3. R.E. Pahl, *Whose City? And Further Essays on Urban Society* (London: Penguin, 1975).

Oldenburg, Veena Talwar. *The Making of Colonial Lucknow, 1856-1877*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. Pp. xxv, 287. Maps, tables, index. \$32.50.

The historiography of modern India is replete with general studies of colonial administration, especially of the period following the assertion of direct crown rule in 1858. What is refreshing about this study is that it focuses neither on central nor provincial administration but zeros in upon a specific urban centre, in this case the city of Lucknow, capital of the former princely state of Oudh which had been high-handedly annexed by the British in 1856, and a scene of intense fighting in the Rebellion of 1857. More refreshingly still, this indepth study of Lucknow challenges the long-accepted thesis that the traumatic events of 1857 led the British to abandon completely their former preoccupation with the

social transformation of India. Instead, Veena Oldenburg conclusively shows that post-Rebellion, Raj officials in Lucknow demonstrated “continuing and conscious efforts . . . to ‘improve’ the Indian way of life” (p. xix). The author does not deny that official policy at the highest levels of imperial administration was against disturbing the social status quo, but argues that insecure bureaucrats at the urban level in Lucknow, pragmatically intent upon their survival in a hostile environment, acted systematically to transform the structure of the traditional society. Based on a thorough and discerning analysis of hitherto neglected local documentary sources, this study represents a real advance in the historiography of British-Indian colonialism.

The author proves her main thesis by a detailed examination of the major preoccupations of the British rulers of Lucknow during the years from the Rebellion until the city ceased to be a centre of regional administration in 1877. The first preoccupation, in the wake of the desperate British struggle for survival in the embattled Residency during the 140-day siege of 1857, was strategic. Chapter 2 details the energetic role of Colonel Robert Napier in making post-1857 Lucknow safe, by transversing it with a series of straight, wide roads (in the construction of which even sacred buildings and sites were ruthlessly demolished), supplemented in 1862 with railway lines, which also served the new strategically-located, military cantonment on the southeast outskirts of the old city. The second British preoccupation was the systematic preservation of law and order. In this connection, Oldenburg discusses the development of the police force, geared more to political control than dealing with ordinary crime, and of the highly collaborative and officially-controlled municipal committee. On the latter subject, the author concludes that colonial, municipal self-government was largely a farce, which in turn rendered municipal politics “unsatisfactory arenas for serious political change” (p. 94). A third and related British preoccupation, already well documented as far as post-Rebellion Oudh generally is concerned but less studied at the urban level, was the systematic effort to create longterm allies among segments of the traditional aristocracy and elite classes. In the case of Lucknow, as the author shows in a long and fascinating chapter, “the City Must Be Loyal,” the Indian collaborating elite consisted not of the former nawabi courtiers, who were downgraded or exiled, but of big absentee landlords from the countryside and a few Hindu bankers, all of whose fortunes were indubitably tied to the Raj.

Another major concern of the British, detailed in Chapter 4, was with the formidable problems of sanitation and disease presented by the characteristically congested and badly drained city. Here again the author reinforces her central thesis by graphically demonstrating the vigorous, utilitarian-reformist role of Lucknow’s civil surgeon for much of the period, Dr. E. Bonavia. Directly influenced by one of England’s noted poor law commissioners, Sir Edwin Chadwick, Bonavia and other officials were energetically involved

in improvements to latrines, drainage, water supply, and efforts to check the spread of venereal and other contagious diseases. Though the motives were primarily to protect British lives, these reforming activities inevitably touched much of the indigenous population.

The comparatively high level of British activity in reshaping Lucknow had to be paid for by the inhabitants, and one brief chapter is devoted to urban taxation. Not only was there a heavy increase in the amount of taxation, but this was made all the more burdensome because of a serious decline in the local economy, resulting partly from the undermining of the former, court-patronized handicraft industries. The author estimates that 85% of the adult male population were brought within the new taxation system, which extended down even to poor labourers. Considering that the benefits of this taxation went primarily to providing a good life for British officialdom in the spacious cantonment area, it is hardly surprising that the system engendered both popular protest and even passive resistance.

For all its virtues this local study shares with more general administrative histories of the Raj inherent problems resulting from the unavoidable heavy dependence on official source materials. Inevitably, there is much more data on Lucknow official policy formation than on implementation or, more especially, on how the ordinary populace was affected by the changes. In places, general references are made to the condition of the ordinary people, but we learn little about the impact of the colonial regime on their lives. Indeed, apart from the small elite who gained influence through collaboration with the British, we learn little about the Indian population. A further and less justifiable defect is the failure to highlight the extent and significance of the colonial-created divisions between the old native city and the new cantonment, divisions which, as the author observes in the Epilogue, lie at the root of many of Lucknow’s problems in the late twentieth century. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, this study will long remain the definitive work on early colonial Lucknow and will hopefully inspire similar studies of other major urban centres of colonial rule in South Asia.

Edward C. Moulton
Department of History
University of Manitoba

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Towns and Townsmen of Ottoman Anatolia: Trade, Crafts, and Food Production in an Urban Setting, 1520-1650*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization, 1984. Pp. xiv, 425. Tables, maps, illustrations, glossary, indices. \$59.50 (U.S.).