

## 82. Indian Subcontinent, 1750–1947

Tania Sengupta

[CHAPTER KEYWORDS: India; Pakistan; Bangladesh; Burma; Ceylon (Sri Lanka); Britain; France; British Raj; prison; railway station; market (bazaar); bungalow; veranda; cutcherry (office); zilla sadar; cantonment; Neoclassicism; Indo-Saracenic; New Delhi; Edwin Lutyens]

[CHAPTER ABSTRACT:

The Indian subcontinent under colonial rule from the mid-eighteenth to mid-twentieth centuries witnessed the establishment of British economic and political dominance, suppressing other European powers, and consequently creating a long-term negative balance of the subcontinent's trade with Europe and loss of its political sovereignty to Britain. Starting with Bengal around the mid-eighteenth century, the British gained territories across India, Ceylon and Burma over the nineteenth century. British colonial rule consisted of creating a 'military fiscal' state with agricultural revenues used to fund British wars worldwide. It also exploited cash cropping and plantation economies along with political control. In the full-blown imperial era (starting in 1858, following the Indian Mutiny of 1857), the colonial administration developed major institutions and other forms of infrastructure, accompanied by Victorian health and sanitary regimes, to organise and control its subjects' lives. Following numerous peasant uprisings and increasingly including the middle classes, Nationalist resistance to British rule had intensified by the early twentieth century. This opposition, along with the war-impooverished British economy, finally led to the independence of the nations of the Indian subcontinent in the late 1940s.

Colonial sociocultural encounter from the late eighteenth century involved the confrontation of European Enlightenment ideals with those prevalent in the Indian subcontinent. Early colonial travellers and Orientalists engaged in the study of Eastern cultures viewed the East as an exotic but decaying civilisation. From the early nineteenth century, colonial ideas of racial superiority led to 'civilising missions' through Western education and social reform. Key figures of the indigenous middle classes also initiated social reforms such as the education of women and the 'untouchables'. On both sides, colonialism created a range of new social groups and relationships, including indigenous elites close to the ruling colonists. Above all, colonial social life was demarcated by boundaries and inequalities of race and class, with social distances inscribed such as through dress codes, lifestyles, buildings or settlements. However, due to the deep dependence of the British colonisers on the local population, such boundaries were most often compromised.

Colonial architecture in the Indian subcontinent transformed from defensive into more porous forms from the early nineteenth century onwards, pressed by the demands of

revenue-driven governance. Initially, architectural culture was contingent, responding variously to realities on the ground. British colonists increasingly pursued spatial hierarchy and racial segregation from the early nineteenth century onwards. However, due to India's tropical climate and dependence on native staff at home and work, these could often not be preserved within buildings and settlements. Many new and hybrid building types emerged: colonial offices and houses, educational and knowledge institutions, prisons, clubs, racecourses, town halls, post offices, markets, railway stations and so on. After the 1857 Mutiny, the imperial Raj era was marked by grand institutions and urban interventions that sought to control the colonial subjects' lives and to represent the Raj's authority. Equally, in response, there emerged early twentieth-century indigenous Nationalist architectures. As such, buildings were produced by colonists and locals alike, and different types or styles – European, native, or their hybrids – were used across racial categories. A key architectural characteristic was also the use of generic and versatile spatial types across different functions.]

## *History and Geography*

### [ABSTRACT:

The Indian subcontinent under colonial rule from the mid-eighteenth to mid-twentieth centuries witnessed the establishment of British economic and political dominance, suppressing other European powers, and consequently creating a long-term negative balance of the subcontinent's trade with Europe and loss of its political sovereignty to Britain. Starting with Bengal around the mid-eighteenth century, the British gained territories across India, Ceylon and Burma over the nineteenth century. British colonial rule consisted of creating a 'military fiscal' state with agricultural revenues used to fund British wars worldwide. It also exploited cash cropping and plantation economies along with political control. In the full-blown imperial era (starting in 1858, following the Indian Mutiny of 1857), the colonial administration developed major institutions and other forms of infrastructure, accompanied by Victorian health and sanitary regimes, to organise and control its subjects' lives. Following numerous peasant uprisings and increasingly including the middle classes, Nationalist resistance to British rule had intensified by the early twentieth century. This opposition, along with the war-impooverished British economy, finally led to the independence of the nations of the Indian subcontinent in the late 1940s.]

The Indian subcontinent under British colonial rule – comprising present-day India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Burma (the first three of which constituted India prior to its partition in 1947) – was part of a broader history that earlier saw the arrival of competing

European trading companies, with Britain eventually gaining supremacy. Key consequences were a long-term negative shift in the subcontinent's balance of trade with continental Europe, and a loss of political sovereignty to Britain.

[MAP 67 Indian Subcontinent c. 1860]

Since the late fifteenth century, and focused on trade in spices, textiles and china, European states like Portugal, Spain, Holland, France, Denmark and Britain launched conquests of wide swathes of the world, often accompanied by Christian proselytising. The British East India Company acquired its Asian trade monopoly through a Royal Charter in 1600. It established several enclaves along India's western and eastern coastline, in Masulipatnam (1611), Surat (1613), Madras (1639, starting work on Fort St George there from 1640, today Chennai), Bombay (1661, today Mumbai) and slightly later Calcutta (1690, now Kolkata). These last three settlements became the Company's main trading ports (and are still India's largest coastal cities today). The term 'factory' was invented to describe colonial trading posts comprising warehouse, market and customs, where locals worked for a colonial 'factor'. The British East India Company's first factory in Bengal was at Hooghly [METADATA: ] (1651), which then moved nearby to Calcutta in 1690.

The Mughal Empire's decline from the early eighteenth century created a power vacuum in the Indian subcontinent, leaving the region highly contested. The Dutch, French and British as well as powerful regional rulers – for example the Marathas in central and western India; Nizam of Hyderabad; Haidar Ali (r. 1761–82) and Tipu Sultan (r. 1782–99) in Mysore; and the Nawabs of Bengal – were locked in economic, political and military rivalry. One practice was for Europeans to fight proxy wars. In the Carnatic Wars (1746–63), British and French forces allied with rival regional states to push for dominance in India. The British, operating through their East India Company, emerged as the pre-eminent European power from the 1760s onwards, supplanting the French by the late 1790s.

The British forces also defeated the Nawabs of Bengal in the battles of Plassey (1757) and Buxar (1764), and the Mughal Emperor, gaining political control over Bengal, one of the richest Mughal provinces. In 1765, the British East India Company received from Mughal Emperor Shah Alam II (r. 1759–1806) the agricultural revenue rights (*diwani*) for Bengal province, resulting in their headquarters being established in Calcutta.

Bengal's conquest was followed by expansion of control over the rest of India, Ceylon (modern Sri Lanka), Burma and Afghanistan through wars and advantageous treaties with regional rulers. Examples of these wars include those against Mysore (1767–99), the Marathas (1775–1819), Sikh Punjab (1849), the princely state of Awadh (1856), and the Afghan tribes beyond India's northwest frontier (1839–80). Subsidiary alliances for indirect rule were forged with the Princely States. Dutch Ceylon and the Kandyan kingdom were acquired in 1802 and 1817 respectively. Following three Anglo-Burmese wars between 1824 and 1885, Burma was annexed.

Colonial territorial control necessitated its own mechanisms. The East India Company employed 'military fiscalism' and profit maximisation, using its revenues to finance Britain's imperial wars and its trade with China. Initially the *de-facto* puppet Nawab was left to maintain law and order. However, after the disastrous Bengal famine (1770–72), stemming from revenue exploitation and corruption among East India Company officers, the British Parliament forced the Company to assume direct responsibility for Indian governance, albeit under Parliamentary oversight.

Headed by a Governor-General and his Council, and by a Board of Control in London, the East India Company's governmental focus was economic. Hence the colonised territory was divided into revenue districts. Systems ranged from the Permanent Settlement in Bengal, whereby property rights were vested in gentleman-farmer intermediaries (*zemindars*), with contributions fixed in perpetuity, to more direct arrangements in Madras and parts of Bombay Presidencies (*ryotwari*), Awadh and the Northwest Provinces (*mahalwari*). The former often led to absentee landlordism, with rural estates left to managers by landlords seeking the pleasures of urban life. All systems were coercive and caused intense cash-cropping pressures, peasant suffering, repeated famines, and rural insurgencies.

Geographical location and terrain was crucial. British colonial settlements expanded from the subcontinent's coastal fringes gradually inland, mapping the transition from mercantile to political/industrial colonisation. Throughout India, cash-cropping centres, industrial factories and military cantonments could be found strung along the fertile River Ganges plains; Bengal's alluvial soil also meant high yields and revenues. Black cotton soil in Bombay, along with the new **Suez Canal** [METADATA: ] – constructed in the 1860s – aided its emergence as a major industrial and commercial centre in the late nineteenth century.

In Ceylon, the agricultural economy expanded from cinnamon trading via coastal ports to interior plantation crops such as coffee (1830s onwards) and tea, rubber and coconut (1870s onwards). Its earlier cultural-ethnic divisions (such as lowland Sinhalese, upland Kandyan Sinhalese and the Tamil north) were superimposed with new colonial administrative provinces. The pre-eminence of coastal Colombo, the new colonial capital, marginalised the inland Kandyan kingdom. The Colebrooke–Cameron reforms of 1833 brought Kandy under British control, with *rajakriya* (service to the monarch) being abolished and court-based legal systems imposed in place of customary law. Britain also brought free trade and the civil service to Ceylon.

In Burma (parts annexed in 1824 and 1852, British Indian province 1862–1937, independent colony 1937–48), British capture of the lower Irrawaddy basin was crucial to economic colonialism, with rice production shifting there from the upper basin (around Mandalay) after the 1850s, and coastal Rangoon (now Yangon) the new colonial capital. Burma's single-crop export was dominated by the British, Indian moneylenders, and Indian and Chinese

merchants, increasingly marginalising indigenous people. Burma was divided into lowland Burma under direct colonial administration (dismantling earlier monarchic and Buddhist structures) and the upland 'frontier' areas indirectly ruled through native rulers.

To understand and control these new lands, the British colonial state pursued large-scale knowledge projects like the Asiatic Society of Bengal (founded 1784) for 'Oriental' learning, which studied ancient Sanskrit texts and involved indigenous scholars. Such efforts were however underpinned by ideas of racial superiority – emblematised by James Mill's book, *The History of British India* (1817).

The watershed Indian Mutiny of 1857 against rule by the British East India Company rule was triggered by a number of causes: too much interference over local rulers, discontent among soldiers (*sepoys*) in the British-Indian army, cash cropping, harsh taxation and enforced sociocultural reforms. The revolt began in Meerut and spread across northern India, incorporating strategic Mughal and Company centres like Delhi, Agra, Kanpur and Lucknow.

Once the revolt was crushed, the East India Company was replaced by direct rule by the British Crown in India from 1858. Administrative reforms included converting the 'Governor-General' to a 'Viceroy', inclusion of non-official members in his council, creating the Indian Civil Service, and its superior in Britain, the India Office. Departments were formed for sanitation, health, education, forestry, military, policing and finance, forming a gigantic bureaucratic state. Large-scale investments, notably a railway system across the subcontinent, facilitated imperial trade and resource extraction.

Meanwhile, state-sponsored knowledge projects intensified to support governance – including W.W. Hunter's Statistical Survey from 1869; Census of India from 1871; Survey of India from 1878; Linguistic Survey of India from 1898 – accompanied by an official 'ordering' of Indian society into immutable religious (e.g. Hindu and Muslim), caste and tribal groups.

British rule after 1858 ostensibly attempted not to interfere in local sociocultural practices while simultaneously 'indigenising' itself by adopting ritual practices and symbols of Indian princes, such as styling itself as the British 'Raj' (Sanskrit for rule). In theory, the Raj espoused Liberalism and parliamentary democracy. In practice, however, exploitative colonial policies, practices and racial attitudes hardened. Rising aspirations of educated Indians for self-government from the 1860s were repeatedly repressed (e.g. the 1878 Vernacular Press Act and 1883 Ilbert Bill). Oppression by plantation owners enjoying state protection resulted in numerous peasant uprisings. Famines became recurrent, exacerbated by *laissez-faire* policies that saw inadequate state action taken towards famine relief.

From the 1880s, there emerged organised but varied forms of nationalist resistance to colonial rule, aimed at greater Indian governmental representation. The Indian National

Congress (founded 1885) – comprising middle-class, Western-educated men – led the way. Despite its secular foundations, younger members increasingly harked back to a glorious pre-Islamic Hindu past, demanding self-rule (*swaraj*): this culminated in the Swadeshi movement after Bengal was partitioned in 1905. Seen as a device to suppress the spread of Indian Nationalism, partition led to large-scale protests, boycotting and burning of British products, and the promotion of indigenous goods. These boycotts caused suffering to the largely Muslim poorer communities, while protesters' use of Hindu imagery alienated Muslims. In 1906, the Muslim League was founded in reaction.

The Swadeshi movement ended in 1908 but ideals of economic nationalism, independence from Britain, and Indian modernity based on traditional economic self-sufficiency had taken root. One focus was a revival of hand-spun fabric alongside traditional arts and crafts. Another – exemplified by the teaching experiments of renowned Bengali author Rabindranath Tagore, from 1901 – was the revival of Indian spiritual traditions that criticised Western modernity while sometimes also embracing internationalist values. Unrest in Bengal led to the Raj's decision in 1911 to transfer its capital from Calcutta to far-away (New) Delhi [METADATA: ], also symbolic as it was the former Mughal capital.

Nationalist protests nonetheless influenced the British colonial government. The central and provincial legislative councils now incorporated a small proportion of Indian voters (Indian Councils Acts of 1892 and 1909), further increased through successor acts. Yet, pressured by the Muslim League, and setting a precedent for separate representation, the 1909 legislation introduced separate council electorates for Muslims. But in truth, Indian demands for self-government, or Home Rule, were still unrecognised when the First World War broke out in 1914.

Many historians see the two World Wars as the main factors behind the decline and eventual ending of British rule in India in 1947. However, the decisive shift in India's anti-imperialist struggles came through the figure of Mohandas (Mahatma) Gandhi. Trained as a barrister in England and having mobilised civil resistance in South Africa, Gandhi, after returning to India in 1914, led a series of non-violent agrarian protests. With support from both the Indian National Congress and Indian Muslims, he emerged as the unifying leader.

Gandhi's peaceful resistance against the use of military force at a rally in Punjab (the 1919 Jalianwala Bagh Massacres) led to renewed calls for self-determination. His movement's philosophical basis was a spiritual, economic nationalism built around the self-sufficient village, rejecting foreign manufactures and adopting homespun cloth (*khadi*). Gandhi's Dandi march against the Salt Tax in 1930 and other civil disobedience strategies based on idioms of everyday life resonated strongly with ordinary Indians. It enjoyed a far wider base – including women in numbers – than the Indian National Congress, placing great pressure upon the colonial government.

Events in India also influenced Ceylon and Burma. Yet Burmese nationalism also stemmed from preferential treatment for Indians in colonial employment and delayed reforms (1923) for governmental representation. From the early twentieth century, its flag-bearers were British-educated Burmese barristers, the Young Men's Buddhist Association, university students, monks, and the Thakin movement led eventually by Aung San. Ceylon's nationalism involved a cultural politics of 'modern-indigenisation' and the demand by regional and community associations for Ceylonese representation in governance, partially granted in the constitutional reforms of 1910.

In India in 1930, Gandhi and Congress declared full independence (*Purna Swaraj*) as their goal, yet the colonial administration refused all such demands. In 1935, the Government of India Act came close to granting Dominion status, but fell short of the aspirations of Indian Nationalists. It allowed greater autonomy with free elections to provincial legislatures, laying the foundations for India's post-independence federalist constitution. There were separate electorates for Muslims led by the Muslim League, and reserved seats for 'backward' and 'untouchable' lower castes led by B.R. Ambedkar. The 1937 elections yielded resounding victories for Congress, while the Muslim League was marginalised within a majority rule system. When India was dragged into the Second World War without consulting its recently elected governments, Congress members resigned in protest. Meanwhile, the Muslim League remained loyal to the colonial government for tactical reasons, and in 1940 declared its demand for a separate, independent state named Pakistan.

Indian soldiers joined the war effort but Gandhi and Congress leaders continued their civil disobedience, and were jailed for lengthy periods. The 1940s were marked by industrial strikes, naval mutinies, and riots in the face of a colonial state seemingly indifferent to Indian concerns. A 1943 famine saw two million people die of starvation and disease, due partly to an inadequate response from a colonial government preoccupied with the threat of Japanese forces invading India. After the war, Indian independence was announced in 1946. At midnight on 15 August 1947 the republics of Pakistan and India were born amidst a bloodbath of sectarian violence and one of the largest displacements of population in history, as Muslims from India moved across the border to Pakistan, and Hindus and Sikhs there moved to India. In 1948, Ceylon and Burma were declared free nations.

## ***Culture and Society***

### **[ABSTRACT:**

Colonial sociocultural encounter from the late eighteenth century involved the confrontation of European Enlightenment ideals with those prevalent in the Indian subcontinent. Early

colonial travellers and Orientalists engaged in the study of Eastern cultures viewed the East as an exotic but decaying civilisation. From the early nineteenth century, colonial ideas of racial superiority led to 'civilising missions' through Western education and social reform. Key figures of the indigenous middle classes also initiated social reforms such as the education of women and the 'untouchables'. On both sides, colonialism created a range of new social groups and relationships, including indigenous elites close to the ruling colonists. Above all, colonial social life was demarcated by boundaries and inequalities of race and class, with social distances inscribed such as through dress codes, lifestyles, buildings or settlements. However, due to the deep dependence of the British colonisers on the local population, such boundaries were most often compromised.]

Cultural encounter between British colonists and the indigenous populations from the 1750s was framed by confrontations between eighteenth-century Enlightenment thought (see Chapter 60) and prevailing ideas and practices in the Indian subcontinent. European travellers, missionaries and artists long depicted the region as a collage of exotic peoples, buildings, landscapes and customs, but also as an ancient civilisation now in ruin.

From the 1770s, Enlightenment Rationalism – and later Liberalism, Evangelical Christianity and Utilitarianism – combined to form a 'civilising' ideology of British rule centred upon educating and uplifting the subcontinent's peoples from political, social and moral degeneration. This early 'Orientalist' phase, marked by a desire to learn about indigenous history and culture, and promote the Sanskrit and Arabic languages, was replaced from the 1810s by the notion of imparting Western-style, liberal education – in English – to selected Indian elites who could then diffuse such values to the masses. This 'Anglicist' school of thought was encapsulated in an 1835 'Minute' by Thomas Babington Macaulay that spurred substantial state investment across India in urban schools; rural and primary education were still left to Christian missionaries or indigenous religious schools. Similar patterns were legible in Ceylon and Burma. In 1857, universities were founded in Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, focusing on the humanities, yet with little attention to scientific and technical education.

Colonists also promoted social reforms for 'moral improvement'. These included, for instance, Governor-General William Bentinck's 1829 abolition of the (rarely practised) self-immolation (*sati*) of upper-caste Hindu widows, and through the Indian reformer Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar's efforts, the 1856 Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act. However, widespread practices like female infanticide were scarcely addressed. This reformist agenda, waning in importance after the Indian Mutiny, was revived in 1891 by raising the consenting-age for sexual intercourse for girls from 10 to 12 years, with support from Indian progressives but against opposition from orthodox Hindus. Such reforms were piecemeal, ever caught between liberal/religious values and the racial ideology of imperialism.



Colonial reforms and Enlightenment ideals of progress and reason drew complex and often contradictory engagements from India's middle classes, ranging from acceptance to stout resistance. The 'Bengal Renaissance', a progressive cultural, artistic and intellectual movement from the 1820s until the early twentieth century, which included Ram Mohan Roy and Debendranath Tagore, initiated the Hindu-reformist Brahmo-Samaj (1828) and Henry Derozio's radical-atheist Young Bengal movements. In Punjab, Dayanand Saraswati's tradition-based Arya Samaj (founded 1875) and its Vedic schools (*gurukuls*) focused on educating women and 'untouchables'; in Maharashtra Jyotirao Phule and Savitribai Phule did similar. Syed Ahmed Khan's Aligarh movement initiated Western education for Muslims, epitomised in the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College, founded in 1875. Rabindranath Tagore's pioneering experiments from 1901 in Bengal fostered universal learning in a natural setting in Santiniketan [METADATA: ] (Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.40) and rural regeneration through handicrafts training at Sriniketan.

Indian social life was demarcated by the colonial conceptions of race and class. Many eighteenth-century British East India Company officials – *nabobs* – embraced Indian culture and attire, took Indian wives or companions, and had mixed-race children. Yet from the early nineteenth century, British rulers established social distance and racial superiority through dress, social codes, lifestyles and buildings. Social distance became a distinguishing feature of the Raj, particularly due to the panic caused by the 1857 Mutiny. This was intensified by the arrival of British women in India, facilitated by the reduced journey time after the Suez Canal [METADATA: ] was opened in 1869. Division and racial distinction were also inscribed spatially in early colonial forts and 'factories', in garden suburbs and bungalows of the hinterland, in Neo-Palladian mansions in Madras and Calcutta (beyond which lay the Indian quarters of so-called 'black towns'), and in the army cantonments, hill stations and towns needed for local administration.

Importantly, India was never a settler colony, so ties back to Britain remained strong. Boys were sent to boarding schools and British colonial officials usually retired back home. Contact with Indians was either through administrative or military structures, or via domestic servants (such as the Indian nanny). Willy-nilly, however, cultural transfers between colonists and natives did ensue, including in built space – with, as noted, the colonists' dependence on natives meaning that spatial boundaries were routinely compromised. British society also consisted of businessmen such as indigo or tea plantation owners (*boxwallahs*) and sailors, soldiers, dancers and European prostitutes, whose boisterous behaviour were seen as threatening the 'superiority' of white rule. Christian missionaries from the 1830s had significant presence in cities and rural areas.

Imperial realities also affected Indians to varying extents. India's Princely States nurtured Anglicised elites. Colonial land-revenue settlements considerably disrupted the existing social order; Bengal's class of absentee landlords (*zamindars*) were an affluent urban-bourgeois elite engaged in artistic and cultural patronage, conspicuous consumption and

erecting grand mansions. Their nineteenth-century drawing-room political discourse paved the way for anti-colonial nationalism. In Bombay, Parsi (Zoroastrian) entrepreneurs and philanthropists were active in civic, cultural and architectural realms.

British colonial administration also required Indian-born, English-speaking clerks and created a new professional class of journalists and lawyers, often in conflict with traditional elites. One example was the middle-class, western-educated Bengali *bhadralok* and his consort, the *bhadramahila*. While Indian women were usually confined to house interiors, Nationalist movements drew them out into public space. Late nineteenth-century jute and cotton mills in Calcutta and Bombay spawned an industrial labourer class. Tribal and peasant groups in less direct contact with colonial rule were less socially transformed, although were often the target of Christian proselytisers and also waged political insurgencies.

Similar patterns affected other parts of the Indian subcontinent. British forces brutally suppressed the Burmese monarchy. Its rice fields were serviced by cheap Burmese and imported Indian labourers, and small farmers often reduced to mere tenants. Rangoon's new cosmopolitan society comprised British officials, Indians in higher clerical positions, and a mercantile economy dominated by Indians, Eurasians and Chinese. Despite evangelical missionaries, resurgent Buddhist monks in the twentieth century founded 'national schools' and, along with Western-returned professionals, students and peasants, mounted protests against colonial rule.

British domination of Ceylon also fundamentally changed its society. Kandyan royal courtiers (Radalas) were replaced by a previous lowland elite (Goyigamas). Many Goyigamas became Christians and, like the Tamil Vellalas, enjoyed colonial alliances. Radalas were scattered, with indigenous governance confined to Kandy and rural headmen. Goyigamas slowly distanced themselves from urban colonial culture, engendering a rural–metropolitan cultural split. After 1833, indentured Indian labour was imported for plantations. A Ceylonese middle class emerged by the mid-nineteenth century. Burghers (mixed-race descendants of early Dutch and Portuguese settlers) enjoyed privileged places in the civil services or the Public Works Department. By the late nineteenth century, Ceylon's caste-based society became more democratic. To challenge Christian cultural dominance, indigenous institutions were modernised (as with the Buddhist Revival) and metropolitan discourse and cultures were indigenised, as in the art historian and nationalist ideologue Ananda Coomaraswamy's espousal of artistic revivalism, and the eclectic folk-based literature and theatre of Martin Wickramasinghe, Piyadasa Sirisena and Gunadasa Amarasekara. It signalled the new cultural politics of Ceylonese Nationalism.

## **Architecture**

[ABSTRACT:

Colonial architecture in the Indian subcontinent transformed from defensive into more porous forms from the early nineteenth century onwards, pressed by the demands of revenue-driven governance. Initially, architectural culture was contingent, responding variously to realities on the ground. British colonists increasingly pursued spatial hierarchy and racial segregation from the early nineteenth century onwards. However, due to India's tropical climate and dependence on native staff at home and work, these could often not be preserved within buildings and settlements. Many new and hybrid building types emerged: colonial offices and houses, educational and knowledge institutions, prisons, clubs, racecourses, town halls, post offices, markets, railway stations and so on. After the 1857 Mutiny, the imperial Raj era was marked by grand institutions and urban interventions that sought to control the colonial subjects' lives and to represent the Raj's authority. Equally, in response, there emerged early twentieth-century indigenous Nationalist architectures. As such, buildings were produced by colonists and locals alike, and different types or styles – European, native, or their hybrids – were used across racial categories. A key architectural characteristic was also the use of generic and versatile spatial types across different functions.]

Our imagination of colonial architecture and urban landscapes in South Asia, including the Indian subcontinent, is populated with grand city designs, distinct 'black' (native) and 'white' (European) towns, and iconic buildings and infrastructures such as government offices, bridges, railway stations and other colonial institutions – whether as signs of heroic achievement or oppressive power. Often, these architectures and cityscapes seem to follow predominantly European paradigms, as 'localised' or 'tropicalised' forms developed by colonists. However, the designs drew as much from local contextual imperatives, evolving their own logic, and were more complex than mere 'localisation' or 'black-and-white' models suggest. Co-produced and acted upon by particular histories, politics, trade, commerce, resources, social relationships and ranges of players, they represent the interplay between South Asian and European patterns.

As such, the conceptual basis for writing about these built landscapes has moved away from traditional histories of 'glorious' imperialism, to the post-colonial theories from the 1970s of Edward Said and others – which foregrounded the oppressive power structures that shaped how colonists regarded their 'selves' as contrasting and superior to the colonised 'other' – and then, by the 1990s, in the texts of Homi Bhabha, Partha Chatterjee and Dipesh Chakrabarty, to viewing colonisers/colonised as interdependent and entangled in more complex power relations, and paying close attention to colonised people's contributions to such phenomena.

Colonial encounter cannot therefore be seen as producing isolated artefacts, but rather as larger landscapes of buildings within cities and settlements, as part of local/global political networks, and representing myriad relationships. This involved specific forms of urban space and building types, and of civic and architectural management. As well as being co-produced by indigenous people, such landscapes included ordinary and everyday buildings that often reveal more about colonial worldviews, experiences and ways of life. Hence it is essential to understand these buildings not merely as physical objects, but as part of colonial processes: economics, politics, governance, cultural attitudes, health, crime, and knowledge production. Colonial architecture in South Asia was on one hand functional, constructional, technological and aesthetic: on the other, its significance lies equally in its value as *sites* of actions, events, exchange, memory, power, resistance or collaboration.

### Architectures of European trade and the British East India Company

Until around 1750, European powers had mainly focused on trade, although the lines between economic, military and political power were fuzzy. Reflecting a global pattern of protecting ports and trading routes, this led to forts and defensive commercial establishments termed 'factories', which as noted were trading posts on coasts or river harbours whose role was to move goods to and from the interior hinterland, and also to process them and then export the items overseas to Europe. After the various forts and 'factories' created by Portuguese, Dutch, French and Danish (fig. 82.1) traders in India and Ceylon from the fifteenth century onwards (see Chapter 66), British colonists founded their own. Among others, these included Surat [METADATA: ] (1613), Chinsurah [METADATA: ] (1656), Madras's Fort St George [METADATA: ] (1640–53; fig. 82.2), and Calcutta's first Fort William [METADATA: ] (begun 1696).

[FIG 82.1 Tranquebar and Fort Dansborg]

[FIG 82.2 Fort St. George]

The Dutch had followed the Portuguese in erecting churches, as seen in Jaffna [METADATA: ] (1706, by Martinus Leusekam), Galle [METADATA: ] (1755; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.27) and Wolvendaal [METADATA: ] (1757) in Ceylon. Dutch warehouses – using modular vaulted ceilings and thick masonry walls – were emulated by British settlers for security. European forts and 'factories' were therefore defensive, introverted and varied from simple, unadorned, stockaded or masonry enclosures through to single- and multiple-bastion star-shaped forts, the last of these fashioned along the designs of the great French military engineer Sébastien Le Prestre de Vauban (see Chapter 60) and his Dutch counterpart Menno Van Coehoorn (see Chapter 62). However, they also owed much to local paradigms. The aforementioned Dutch 'factory' in Chinsurah [METADATA: ] (1656; fig. 82.3), for example, resembled Mughal architecture with its mixed-use buildings around interconnected

courtyards, pavilion-gateways and gardens. As a classic mercantile-colonial architectural type, the 'factory' was actually a quasi-settlement comprising residences, trading, customs and accounting spaces, workshops, entertainment halls, leisure gardens and terraces. It had a clear hierarchy and a functional mix, yet no strict spatial separation – a feature probably shaped by indigenous custom. The tendency to imbibe local spatial patterns was also legible in the **second French Government House** [METADATA: ] in Pondicherry (1768, today Puducherry; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.28), where, behind a Neo-Palladian building, were found introverted kitchen and staff areas around traditional courtyards.

[INSERT FIG 82.3 Dutch Factory ABOUT HERE]

European trading architecture, however, was rapidly transformed after the British East India Company acquired the revenue rights of Bengal in 1765. Its 'military-fiscal' rule over the Bengal province was subsequently extended to the entire British subcontinental territory, divided into revenue 'districts', each with a headquarters town (in India called the *zilla sadar*). Imperatives of governance and control demanded different physical types and scales – firstly, grand formal governmental establishments in headquarters towns and major 'Presidency towns' like Calcutta, Madras or Bombay; secondly, buildings for British representatives or 'Residents' in British Protectorates under local rulers (as in the Princely States); thirdly, official buildings for revenue administration in *zilla sadar* towns and their 'civil stations'; and fourthly, 'military cantonments' as permanent army bases. Added to these were the cooler 'hill stations' that acted as summer capitals for government, or as 'getaway' places for British colonists, offering a more salubrious climate than the busy heat and humidity of India's tropical plains.

**Fort St George** [METADATA: ] (1640–53; fig. 82.2) in Madras was the first full-blown British base in India, developing into a 'Presidency town'. As its early nucleus, the fort had a rectangular walled enclosure with triangular corner bastions, containing the 'factory'. It was surrounded by a walled European settlement, or 'white town', of one- or two-storey white brick houses with flat roofs, colonnades, open porticoes and terraces, offering a Grecian appearance from the sea; rare Tuscan granite columns marked its sea entrance. This enclave opened on its north to the native 'black town' of Madrasapatnam (renamed Georgetown in 1906), a result of a large influx of Indians. The two settlements shared similar grid layouts but were starkly segregated. After incremental re-construction of the **'white town' wall** [METADATA: ] (1746–83) into a semicircular enclosure with pointed bastions, during a brief French and then British re-occupation, the Indian settlement was razed and moved further north, creating a buffer zone between (a typical pattern in 'Presidency towns'). Despite its compact core, Madras felt semi-rural, and a gradual move to peripheral country houses saw British colonists traversing substantial distances between their homes, clubs, churches and workplaces. By the nineteenth century, the fort was no longer a residential area, with colonists preferring houses with gardens on the outskirts.

Bombay was a Portuguese possession from 1534, with a dramatic harbour view, but in 1661 was bequeathed to the British. It then consisted of seven islands, with the Malabar Hills to the west and Colaba on the southernmost end. The nucleus of Bombay was the Fort, a walled settlement on the east with a central green space and the **Apollo** [METADATA: ], **Church** [METADATA: ] and **Bazaar Gates** [METADATA: ] on its other sides. Bombay grew organically, with the southern portion containing European houses, barracks and offices and the northern part housing Indian (Parsi, Bohra and Banian) dwellings and shops. Following a fire in 1803, the fort area was reserved only for wealthy merchants who could ensure safe upkeep. The city later expanded into the countryside areas of Parel, Byculla and the Malabar Hills. However, being constrained by geography and very high migration from adjoining areas, Bombay experienced high land prices and acute housing shortages by the 1830s, leading to the reclamation of adjoining islands (such as Colaba in 1838), now linked through causeways and roadways. There were also important civic buildings like the Bombay Town Hall [METADATA: ] (1825) and **Bombay Mint** [METADATA: ] (1829), by architects like Thomas Cowper, John Hawkins and others.

Calcutta, the East India Company's base, expressed vital attributes of colonial urban form. Here, in a marshy yet commercially lucrative river-harbour location in Lower Bengal, the British founded an outpost in 1690 with the Mughal Emperor's permission. The **first Fort William** [METADATA: ] (begun 1696) was an irregular tetragon containing the government house or 'factory', workshops, warehouses and employees' lodgings. The Company's stability was severely challenged in 1756 by the Bengal *nawab* Siraj-ud-Daulah's siege of Fort William, necessitating more robust defences. After the Battle of Plassey (1757) and the granting of *diwani* rights in the mid-1760s, substantial buildings were required for the Company's commercial and revenue activities, and to mark its economic and political prowess.

[MAP 68]

By 1773 a **second version of Fort William** [METADATA: ] (Map 68) was erected, initiated by General Robert Clive, on an irregular star-shaped French Vauban-style plan with dry moat. It used Indian masonry technique in local brick and wet lime-mortar (made of brick-dust, lime, molasses and cut hemp), and was supervised by Captain Brohier and then James Mace. The fort contained barracks, St Peter's church, training and entertainment zones, demonstrating an increasing distinction between military and commercial functions. Around the moat was the *maidan*, a huge open space – both military and aesthetic – to provide visibility, firing range, and views of buildings beyond. The prime space abutting the *maidan*, the Esplanade (Map 68) was lined with magnificent two-to-four-storey mercantile and residential Italianate and Neoclassical buildings with pediments, porticoes and loggias, of brick and plastered in local *chunar*.

With the fort now primarily a military base, 'Tank Square' (later Dalhousie Square, now B.B.D. Bagh) emerged as its new commercial and administrative locus. It was lined with edifices like the **Writers' Building** [METADATA: ] (1780; Key Buildings, p. xxx, Map 68) – as a consequence of the East India Company's expanding clerical establishment ('writers'), along with attempts by the first Governor-General of India, Warren Hastings, to ensure ostensibly fair and systematic governance and to legitimise colonisation. British imperial ambitions were shifting eastwards in these years before the 1776 American Revolution. In Calcutta, its Indian seat of power, **Government House** [METADATA: ] (Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.29 and Map 68), designed by Captain Charles Wyatt, appeared in 1803, accompanied by **Calcutta Town Hall** [METADATA: ] by John Garstin in 1813 and the **Calcutta Mint** [METADATA: ] in 1824. The native settlement lay mainly to the north, but as Swati Chattopadhyay observes in her 2005 book, *Representing Calcutta*, boundaries were blurred, with many natives owning houses in the European zone from the early nineteenth century.

### Early eclectic architectures

Alongside European colonial settlements, Indian districts like Chitpore Road (fig. 82.4) in Calcutta grew into ethnically mixed and architecturally eclectic ensembles where a vibrant bazaar economy thrived. Here, in the dense urban quarters of houses and huts, natives and less privileged Europeans, merchants and businessmen freely fused vernacular urban courtyard buildings with Islamic foliated arched balconies and Neo-Greek features from British buildings in Calcutta. Pre-colonial architectural traditions were being translated into newer idioms also very much by Indians. Lucknow, capital of Oudh (Avadh) in Northern India, was one such site of architectural experimentation in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Although sometimes regarded as bastardisation of both Oriental and European colonial idioms, the famous **Lucknow Residency** [METADATA: ] (1780) and even more exuberant **Constantia** [METADATA: ] (1800; fig. 82.5) – built by the French adventurer and East India Company and *nawab's* servant, Claude Martin – reflected the cross-flows of paradigms (see SPOTLIGHT BOX: BUILDING AGENCY AND KNOWLEDGE, p. xxx), with Indian artisans as the vital conduits.

[FIG 82.4 View in the Bazaar, leading to Chitpore Road]

[FIG 82.5 Constantia]

### [SPOTLIGHT BOX]

#### **Building agency and knowledge**

Up to the mid-1850s, the main colonial building agency was the Military Board. Its officers and engineers trained in Britain at the royal military engineering schools at Chatham and Woolwich, which explain the military character of their designs: robust, pragmatic and

contingent, responding to on-the-ground realities. An 1826 handbook by Major Charles William Pasley, head of the Royal Engineers at Chatham, contained architectural instructions specifically for junior colonial military officers. Alongside James Gibbs's *A Book of Architecture* (1728), such manuals were used by engineers as well as non-experts. Locally, the surveying school at Madras (founded in 1794) supplied draftsmen. Governor-Generals such as Richard Colley Wellesley or the Danish governor of Singapore, Ole Bie, and district officers and colonists like Claude Martin or James Kirkpatrick, were actively involved in design, with some even making sketches and drawings. Carpenters and bricklayers were recruited from Britain, while Indian workers were also trained in European systems; some made maps, drawings and models and executed their own commissions. The vast majority of native buildings were still erected by indigenous builders and *mistris* (Indian artisans) who adopted European features and also fed local knowledge back into colonial building practices like lime processing and terraced roofing techniques.[BOX ENDS]

British officers lived commonly in residential bungalows, a house form whose name reveals its Bengali origins. Anthony King's seminal 1976 book *Colonial Urban Development* and 1984 book *The Bungalow* chart how the colonial bungalow originated from Bengal's rural peasant huts, developing into multiple variants across the subcontinent (and globally, as a product of world capitalism). In marking social status, bungalows were produced and occupied by both European and indigenous elites. The original Bengal type had a core space surrounded by a veranda, built of mud and bamboo, with a sloping thatched roof. While colonial bungalows from the early eighteenth century retained this spatial arrangement, their core typically expanded to a three-bay matrix (3 by 3 or 3 by 4) with a main central space surrounded by smaller generic spaces – often bedrooms, living rooms or home-offices – with the veranda corners often closed in to form toilets or service stores (figs 82.6 and 82.7). Each room had multiple louvred doors and windows for cross-ventilation in the tropical heat and humidity. This, however, also meant a low-privacy environment, with the busy presence of servants on whom British families relied. Some bungalows showed close affinity to vernacular prototypes (single-storey, using *cutcha* construction), while others were more elaborate, in *pucca* construction, and of two to three storeys high (see SPOTLIGHT BOX: CONSTRUCTION GRADES, MATERIALS AND TECHNIQUES, p. xxx). Over time, elaborate variants emerged through further hybridisation. The veranda, usually hung with split-bamboo screens (*tatties*), offered climatic protection for interior rooms, but was also multipurpose in that it could be used for sleeping, accommodating servants, entertaining guests, or informal transactions (fig. 82.8). The residential bungalow was typically set within – and allowed control over – large open grounds: the enclosed 'bungalow compound'. It thus acted as a key site for colonists' visual experience of their power over the land and its people.

[FIG 82.6 Typical bungalow plan (Bankura Circuit House)]

[FIG 82.7 View of bungalow at Abbottabad]



Crucially, despite its domestic origins, the bungalow became a generic spatial format for many colonial functions: houses, offices, courts, clubs, churches and other institutions. Another recurrent format was the pavilion consisting of a linear chain of rooms with front and rear verandas. East India Company officers' urban homes in Calcutta (fig. 82.9) were typically three-bay-pattern mansions set within gardens, with a southern veranda and a northern *porte cochère*. Chattopadhyay argues that these distinct colonial types drew on Indian courtyard types and contained generic (speculation-amenable), porous and low-privacy spaces.

[FIG 82.8 India Rajasthan: views]

### [SPOTLIGHT BOX]

#### Construction grades, materials and techniques

While early colonial buildings freely combined the constructional grades known as *pucca* (durable, usually more expensive materials such as brick and mortar) and *cutcha* (provisional, usually cheaper materials like mud, thatch and bamboo), these became starkly distinguished from the 1850s during the 'improvement' era of the Public Works Department (see SPOTLIGHT BOX: PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, p. xxx). Important buildings typically consisted of bricks and lime mortar faced with white- or light-ochre-painted lime plaster, or after the 1850s of red brick or stone, or timber structures. Above were flat or sloping timber joists/rafters and purlin roofs, finished with terraced roofing (terracotta tile layers with lime and brick-dust waterproofing) – or else, in coastal and hilly areas, sloped clay tiles or slates. *Cutcha* additions and annexes using rough country tiles or thatched roofs were initially common, shifting increasingly to *pucca* forms such as Mangalore factory tiles (widely used and also exported to East Africa). To feed this intensive building activity, governmental brick factories were established early on, including at Accra near Calcutta.

Due to the subcontinent's varied climates and building practices, however, building materials and techniques always remained hybrid and diverse – for example, granite and laterite in southern India and Ceylon; sandstone in western India; rubble, kabbok (clay ironstone) or coral in Ceylon; teak from Burma, or other hardwoods generally from the hills and tropical rainforests. Added were the import economies such as Bangor slate or steel joists from Liverpool, although these were increasingly replaced by local products.[BOX ENDS]

[FIG 82.9 Chowringhee Road]

Antidotes to urban life were larger 'country houses' of European (and gradually even native) elites, usually in urban peripheries. Often these involved a combination of older structures

and new additions. The French Governor's residence of Ghiretty House [METADATA: ] (1750s onwards) outside Chandernagore (now Chandannagar), the British Governor's country seat at Guindy [METADATA: ] near Madras, the Governor-General's Belvedere House [METADATA: ] (1772) and then Barrackpore House [METADATA: ] (1801 onwards, by Captain Thomas Anbury; fig. 82.10) as a summer residence outside Calcutta, as well as many garden houses in Madras and Calcutta, were all classic examples. They were single- or double-storey bungalow-form homes with verandas, lifted sometimes on a basement (echoing the Mughal *tykhana* type) to counter dampness and pests, and designed in Italianate or Neo-Palladian style – often with a grand front staircase, flat or sloping tiled roofs, smaller annexes, and expansive grounds. The garden houses of Madras – which by the nineteenth century had been turned from weekend retreats into full-time dwellings, leading to the abandonment of the fort for living purposes – ranged from diminutive to very elaborate dwellings, either square or rectangular, with flat roofs, impressive staircases, entrance porticoes, broad passages, entrance halls and verandas. The interiors contained large and lofty drawing and dining rooms up to 15.2 metres (50 feet) long and 6 metres (20 feet) high, allowing also for ceiling-hung *punkhas* or fan-panels, operated by native servants to cool down the British owners. There were large bathrooms for colonial bathing rituals, and, following native customs in such a hot climate, separate cookhouses. As Chattopadhyay argues, while for British colonists these country houses represented idyllic and improved rural – as against city – life, for Bengalis in Calcutta, for instance, the *bagan bari* (literally, house in a garden) signified a site of conspicuous consumption and illicit pleasures like drinking, merry-making and prostitutes. They typically contained a fish pond, orchard, vegetable patches, cattle sheds and grain storage (fig. 82.11). The buildings followed European aesthetic codes for landed privilege in their architectural style, pleasure-rooms and location with expansive views.

[FIG 82.10 Government House, Madras]

[FIG 82.11 Calcutta house surrounded by a garden]

Reflecting *nabob* lifestyles and a highly eclectic and contingent architectural culture, British Residencies (dwellings for British representatives in the capitals of Indian principalities) were routinely in rented or adapted buildings from earlier European, Mughal or provincial rulers. These, too, eclectically mixed European and Indian types within the same building, or grafted new layers onto pre-colonial structures. The Residency in Hyderabad [METADATA: ] (1800, by the military architect Samuel Russell) contained, behind its fine Neoclassical mansion, a Mughal-style *zenana* or women's quarters for the Resident's Indian wife, Noor Un-nissa. Another Delhi Resident, Thomas Theophilus Metcalfe, possessed a garden house or retreat called 'Dilkhusha' [METADATA: ] (1830s; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.30), which was actually the refurbished sixteenth-century tomb of Mohammad Quli Khan, with its original Mughal gardens restyled with English follies, some emulating Islamic elements. This, along with his Neoclassical town house [METADATA: ] (1844), allowed Metcalfe to perform different identities in different domestic sites.

From the early nineteenth century – that is, after Governor-General Wellesley – such free assimilation of Indian culture was strongly discouraged. Yet the contingent nature of colonial rule meant their continuity. As William Glover notes of Lahore (following the Punjab's annexation in 1849) in his 2008 book *Making Lahore Modern*, the tomb of the Mughal emperor Jahangir's (r. 1605–28) lady-love Anarkali, was converted into **St James's Church** [METADATA: ] (1857), while the **Governor's House** [METADATA: ] (1859) was fashioned around the tomb of the Mughal Emperor Akbar's cousin Muhammad Kasim. Even in the late 1860s, older Indian *havelis* (courtyard mansions) with characteristic gateways and delineations of public and private domains were converted – indeed hybridised – into bungalows.

### *The architecture of colonial governance*

The first lavish colonial gestures (much disapproved of by East India Company directors in London) were administrative houses erected in the early nineteenth century in Calcutta and Madras. While they referenced English country mansions, they represented distinctive colonial entities. An existing garden house in Madras was reworked and expanded by a Danish architect, John Goldingham, for the new version of **Government House** [METADATA: (Madras)] (1800). It comprised a spacious two-storey dwelling wrapped with colonnaded verandas, in an English-style garden, and abutted by an even grander Tuscan-Doric temple for a banqueting hall. Even grander, **Government House** [METADATA: (Calcutta)] in Calcutta (1803; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.29 and Map 68) closely imitated the plan for **Kedleston Hall** [METADATA: ] in Derbyshire, England (1759–65), in having a central block with four curved limbs connecting to four wings, here expressing expansionist power. Chattopadhyay however observes that in actuality it encoded rather different social relationships because of its imposing front staircase, fluid circulation patterns, spatial porosity, and absence of separate servants' spaces.

Day-to-day colonial revenue administration was performed through provincial district headquarters – *zilla sadar* towns – established from the 1780s. These consisted of a European 'civil station' plus a native settlement. The former evoked orderly, sanitary, low-density leafy green enclaves of officers' bungalows and institutions, while the latter was a dense urban fabric of narrow, winding lanes, traditional courtyard dwellings and seemingly insanitary filth, stench and disease. But again, neither remained exclusive. Located usually at the junction between European and native settlements was the *zilla sadar's* nerve-centre, the *cutcherry* (office) complex. It comprised revenue office and law courts for tax and land litigation, land record rooms, treasuries, jails and police stations. The erection of revenue *cutcherries* and judicial courts gained particular intensity after the Permanent Settlement of Bengal in 1793, geared to maximise the East India Company's gains. Such buildings became more extroverted and porous. Built by the Military Board, early *cutcherries* were often

mixed-use bungalow-residencies-cum-offices: later, pavilion-type *cutcherries* and courts were designed from the 1820s onwards, as seen later in the **Dacca (now Dhaka) Courthouse** [METADATA:] (1860–75; fig. 82.12). They came to consist of a row of generic spaces measuring 12.2–15.2 metres by 5.5–6 metres (40–50 feet by 18–20 feet) plus verandas, with a central records room – most precious for land-revenue governance – and courtrooms on the sides, and offices between. In time, *cutcherry* complexes became ever more symbolic spaces of governance. The *zilla sadar* main street also held other important colonial institutions like the town hall, club, library, college, schools – many built through native patronage. As the author’s own detailed research into these towns has shown, all of these elements were serviced by the bazaar, which, despite its marginalisation within the formal colonial economy, remained lively spaces for indigenous enterprise.

[INSERT FIG 82.12 Old Dacca College (left) and Old Court Building (right) ABOUT HERE]

Unlike in Britain, military ‘cantonments’ increasingly turned into long-term establishments, often upgraded from earlier camps or forts. Starting with **Berhampore** [METADATA:] (1768, now Baharampur; Map 69), many cantonments were upgraded or built – often on pre-colonial transportation routes – including Dinapore (Danapur), Dum Dum, Kanpur, Meerut, Pune, Secunderabad, Rawalpindi, Lahore, Ferozepore, plus also in Burma (Rangoon, Mandalay, Maymyo (Pyin Oo Lwin) and so on) and Ceylon (Panagoda). Berhampore was erected at a typical riverside location by the British to keep an eye on the Nawab of Bengal based at nearby Murshidabad. Shaped around a ‘Barrack Square’, it had two-storey barracks for British troops on one side and single-storey barracks for Indian soldiers on two other sides. The top officers’ bungalows occupied prime land on the River Bhagirathi. Native *sepoys*, the lowest ranks, were located separately, across a racecourse, furthest from the officers – privilege being graded in receding layers from the riverfront. Space standards and building materials (*pucca* for officers and *cutcha* for *sepoys*) likewise reflected racial and rank hierarchy. Berhampore was fully self-sufficient, with its own church, military and (separate) *sepoys* hospitals, jail, arsenal and magazines, library, club and bazaar. Such concentric planning transformed in later cantonments into more layered arrangements, although Christopher Cowell has shown (in a journal article in December 2016) how ideals of order and self-sufficiency in cantonments were challenged by their irregular interface with adjoining native settlements.

[MAP 69 The Cantonment and Civil Station of Berhampore Cantonment and its Environs]

Nestled within the Himalayas, Neelgiris, Pidurutalagala or other mountain ranges – and offering a climate more akin to Britain – were colonial hill stations such as Simla, Mussoorie, Darjeeling and Ootacamund in India, Maymyo in Burma, and Nuwara Eliya in Ceylon, to name only a few. They occupied a privileged place within British mid-nineteenth-century notions of ‘medical topography’ founded on dividing ‘healthy’ from ‘unhealthy’ areas. Equally, they were sites of plantation economies of tea, coffee and *cinchona* (a malaria remedy). Hill stations were distinctive typologies; about eighty were established in India

between 1815 and the ending of colonial rule. Typically, these were formed according to descending privilege, with a higher-level 'mall' on the ridge with panoramic view largely for British use (with church, club, town hall, racecourse and bungalows) and a lower-level *bazaar* within the native area. In their 1983 book *Stones of Empire*, Jan Morris and Simon Winchester note the speculative eclectic styles varying from Gothic pleasure villas to Georgian spas to Swiss and German chalets experienced through the European 'Grand Tour' (see Chapter 63). Added were ornamental woodwork, verandas and porches, gutters and downpipes – all within hybridised 'bungalow' formats.

If hill stations represented an elite fantasy, the realities of imperialism were all too harsh. Indigo factories, emblematic of exploitative cash-cropping, for example, dotted eastern and northern India, with distinctive architectural features such as open stepped vats for processing and enclosed chimneys for distillation or straining. Indian labourers would work inside these vats, watched over by British supervisors on elevated platforms. Such labour exploitation later triggered the 1859 Indigo Rebellion. Another cash crop for British transnational trade was opium, being grown in vast fields in Bengal Province and exchanged with China for tea. The accompanying architecture could be seen for instance in the **Patna opium plant** [METADATA: ] (Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.31).

### Educational institutions and churches

William Bentinck and Thomas Macaulay's 'civilising' mission for social reform and Western education – aided by evangelist groups like the Baptist Missionary Society, London Missionary Society and Christian Missionary Society, and indigenous liberal organisations such as the Brahma Sabha – resulted in many new or converted schools and colleges. These included the **Presidency College** [METADATA: ] in Calcutta (1855); **Dacca Collegiate School** [METADATA: ] (1835); **Elphinstone College** [METADATA: ], Bombay (1856); **Royal College** [METADATA: ], Colombo (1835); **Thomason Engineering College** [METADATA: ], Roorkee (1847); and **Rangoon College** [METADATA: ] (1874). Native elite patronage also supported modern and traditional institutions.

Architecturally, educational institutions were varied: the more substantial Anglicist institutions were often pavilion-type buildings – with large playgrounds for Western sports regimes – in Neoclassical, Gothic Revival or eclectic styles, located in leafy areas with extensive sports fields. One of Amritsar's **District Schools** [METADATA: ] (fig. 82.13), built between 1850–70, had a linear central bay with two rows of classrooms on either side, opening onto long verandas. Its main entrance was via a grand portico on the shorter side. The volumes stepped up from the verandas to the central bay, enabling clerestories in the classrooms and common spaces. Due to the Evangelists' requirement for direct contact with Indians, missionary schools like in **Colombo** [METADATA: ] (1816; fig. 82.14) were often

existing buildings or echoed local architectural idioms, such as compact courtyard plans. The **Mohsania Madrassah** in Dacca [METADATA: ] (1880; fig. 82.15), designed by one Major Mann and built by the engineer Vivian Scott through native patronage, integrated highly articulated Islamic elements to express its socio-religious identity.

[FIG 82.13 District School, Amritsar]

[FIG 82.14 Mission chapel and school, Colombo]

[FIG 82.15 Madrassah, Dacca]

Up to the mid-nineteenth century, many new churches followed the fashionably popular archetype for the Anglican church, James Gibbs's **St Martin-in-the-Fields** [METADATA: ] in London (1726; see Chapter 63), with its three-bay nave, simple chancel, columned/pilastered side elevations, portico and vertical tower. Echoes could be found in James Agg's **St John's Church** [METADATA: ] in Calcutta (1787; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.32); Messrs Burn, Currie and Co.'s **St Andrew's** [METADATA: ], Calcutta (1815); Ole Bie (guided), John Chambers and Robert Armstrong's (built) the Danish **St Olav's** [METADATA: ], Serampore (1806); **St John's**, Meerut (1822) [METADATA: ]; Colonel J.L. Caldwell's **St George's** [METADATA: ], Madras (1815); and Thomas De Havilland's exuberant **St Andrew's Presbyterian Church** [METADATA: ], Madras (1818). They variously adapted Gibbs's prototype by adding verandas, galleries for congregations, and ornamental details, and modifying shapes and proportions. In his 2016 book *Architecture and Urbanism in the British Empire*, Alex Bremner shows that Picturesque Gothic Revival churches – exemplified by W.N. Forbes's **St Paul's** [METADATA: ], Calcutta (1847), as the 'mother church', plus High Victorian examples like William Emerson's **All Saints'** [METADATA: ], Allahabad (1887) – were the result of the Gothic Revival's eighteenth- to nineteenth-century emergence as a scholarly discourse around 'propriety' and 'truth' and the Church of England's search for appropriate Neo-Gothic forms to apply throughout the empire.

Local adaptation was also imperative because of the different climate and natural resources, and the need for a recognisable architectural language to aid acceptance of Christianity. Indian Christians often built their own churches: the **John Nagar Baptist Chapel** [METADATA: ] (1820s) was built by Serampore Baptist Mission workers as a bungalow with a Bengali vernacular *dochala* (double-tier roof) and gable-end porch. Architectural styles also cut across patronage. In response to racial segregation within churches, Sinhalese Anglicans in Ceylon erected their own Neo-Gothic **All Saints Church** [METADATA: ] in Hulftsdorp, Colombo (1860), designed by J.F. Churchill. Critiquing the usual stereotyped designs, the British architect Frederick Salmon Growse designed the **Church of the Sacred Heart** [METADATA: ] in Mathura (1878; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.36), adventurously fusing a Latin-cross plan with a Hindu-temple-spire-meets-Russian-style dome in place of a tower, in collaboration with Indian artisans. The early twentieth century also witnessed unadorned designs such as **St Martin's Garrison Church** [METADATA: ] in Delhi (1931; fig. 82.16) by Arthur Gordon Shoosmith.

### [FIG 82.16 St Martin's Garrison Church, New Delhi]

Native religious structures adapted to and assimilated Western paradigms within the colonial public realm. Examples were the Parsi Agiaris (fire temples) in Bombay and the **Dharmatala Tipu Sultan Mosque** [METADATA: ] (1832) and **Gopalji Temple** [METADATA: ] (1845) at Calcutta. Continuing a tradition of Hindu migrants in Bombay, the **Kalbadevi Monkey Temple** (1875) [METADATA: ] (fig. 82.17) grafted profuse Rajasthani and Gujarati decorative features and Hindu temple spaces onto a Italianate composition. Calcutta's **Dharmatala Mosque** [METADATA: ] possessed a simple rectangular plan, multiple Islamic domes and minarets, plus Neo-Palladian (Doric) pilasters, frieze, semicircular fan-framed plasterwork openings, and colonial louvred windows with fanlights. These versatile assimilations freed Indian religions from their fixed formal canons, heralding a 'modern' sacred architecture.

### [FIG 82.17 Monkey Temple, Kalabadevi]

### Architecture after the 1857 Indian Mutiny

The British Crown's assumption of power in India by 1858 transformed the subcontinent in fundamental ways. After the Mutiny, there was a systematic 'memorialisation' of sites associated with massacres of British citizens by Indian soldiers, in order to evoke affect among audiences back home and internationally. Sites were left as melancholic picturesque ruins and became subject matter for picture postcards circulating across the globe. A pilgrimage route now connected the **Lucknow Residency** [METADATA: ] (1780), the **Mutiny Memorial** [METADATA: ] (1863) in Delhi, and the **Memorial Well and Gardens** [METADATA: ] (1850s onwards, surrounded by Henry Yule's Gothic screen) and Walter Granville's **Memorial Church** [METADATA: ] (1875) in Kanpur. There were also proposals to erect defensive walls around *cutcherries*, railway stations and other colonial establishments, although most did not materialise. **Lahore Railway Station** [METADATA: ], built shortly after the 1857 Mutiny, evoked the imagery of a medieval castle with its thick walls, turrets and cannon slits. It is probably no coincidence that many British buildings erected in late nineteenth-century India, even ordinary houses, used similar imagery.

In Delhi, British forces had been besieged, with the mutineers rallying around the Mughal emperor, Bahadur Shah Zafar (r. 1837–57). The city was reconquered; the **Red Fort** [METADATA: ], seat of Mughal rule, was taken over by the British army, and the emperor imprisoned there. Buildings within 410 metres (1,350 feet) of the fort and right up to the main **Friday Mosque** [METADATA: ] (1656, known as the Jama Masjid) were razed to create a militarised *cordon sanitaire*, and the eastern parts of the old city were completely consumed by British military establishments.

The post-1857 Mutiny transition to full-blown imperial rule consolidated a second era of British 'civilising' zeal, was marked by major 'improvement' projects already initiated during Governor-General Dalhousie's tenure (1848–56). The key agency was the Public Works Department, formed in India in 1854 and in Ceylon in 1867 (see SPOTLIGHT BOX: THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, p. xxx). As Peter Scriver points out, the Department's mandate was to create a seemingly unified infrastructure of imperial governance out of what was in reality a patchwork of architectural pluralities. The Public Works Department embarked on a massive building programme by creating new railways, government offices, residences, institutions, jails and so on. Clear separation was also attempted now both between the military and civil arms of governmental construction, and between 'imperial' (or central) and 'provincial' buildings.

### [SPOTLIGHT BOX]

#### The Public Works Department

Formed in 1854, the surveyors and civil engineers of the Indian Public Works Department were also attached to local municipalities. Its staff members were drawn largely drawn from the civil engineering schools at Roorkee (1847), Howrah (1856) and Madras (1858). Later, the Royal Indian Engineering College at Cooper Hill in Surrey in England, founded in 1872, trained civil engineers specifically for the department, which became the main building agency for the British Raj and also a mechanism for the diffusion of cultural ideas and values. By the late nineteenth century, for example, native engineers began to erect their own projects, with some of them also writing handbooks that amalgamated Western and local systems. Indigenous social structures fed into building practices. India's hierarchy of building labourers involved specific castes performing particular jobs and, as Arindam Dutta notes in his 2006 book *The Bureaucracy of Beauty*, the Public Works Department utilised these established categories to realise its projects. In Ceylon, its department privileged Europeans or mixed-race Burghers, with only the lesser posts available to native engineers.[BOX ENDS]

Historians such as David Arnold have noted that by the mid-nineteenth century, British colonists' views of Oriental exoticism had transformed into that of the 'tropics': wild, uncivilised and unhealthy. The Municipal Act for all of India was passed in the early 1850s, with its town councils becoming laboratories to explore Victorian ideas of the sanitised city. Expressing civic identities were the new markets and exhibition halls that emulated British covered markets but also drew upon local culture. The Punjab Exhibition Hall [METADATA: ] in Lahore (1864; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.34) and Old Town Hall [METADATA: ] in Colombo (1873, by the Public Works architect J.G. Smither) were two classic examples. Also prominent was William Emerson's Crawford Market [METADATA: ] (1871; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.35) in Bombay's Fort district, erected with Parsi patronage and flamboyantly combining eclectic Victorian styling with a Greco-Indic frieze by John Lockwood Kipling and his students.



Such examples of colonial agency existed alongside native bazaars (fig. 82.4), which with the social and ritual spaces of their temples and mosques could be seen for instance in Baroda, used on occasions for the Muslim *Muharram* procession with its decorative religious *tazias* (floats). But within the British imagination, these bazaars were congested, chaotic and unhygienic, and so in 'Presidency towns' like Calcutta they were often identified as priority areas for Victorian road clearances.

Given the increasing professionalisation in Britain of architects, surveyors and civil engineers by the mid-nineteenth century, the first official architect (whose name sadly remains obscure) was sent to India in 1858. The Late Victorian period also witnessed an influx of gentleman-architects from Britain. The trope of 'tropical architecture' emerged to mark the colony as different from Europe, later permeating into Africa and elsewhere in the twentieth century. Yet equally there were Indian architects, patrons and architectural firms – for example the plethora of Parsi architects in Bombay, such as Mucherji Cowasji Murzban and Jameshetji Mistri, or the Sompuras (hereditary temple builders) of Gujarat.

The variety of domestic architecture from the mid-nineteenth century onwards also resulted from different impacts of and responses to colonialism. Anoma Pieris in her 2012 book *Architecture and Nationalism in Sri Lanka* refers to Arosh Perera's BSc. dissertation (1991) identifying the marginalisation of the Kandyan Radala elites under British rule in Ceylon, and how by the late nineteenth century, in the traditional *walavvas* (Kandyan mansions), the central courtyard moved to the back of the dwelling, where native customs were now confined to women's spaces. The Burmese (ex-)foreign minister U Kaung built a villa/monastery in Mandalay fusing Neoclassicism with Burmese stilt construction. Jyoti Hosagrahar in *Indigenous Modernities* (2005) observes that, in India in the post-Mutiny years, and with the rise in mercantile activity, Delhi's traditional *havelis* were fragmented into numerous smaller dwellings and workshop spaces, while also assimilating Western-style public front rooms. Likewise, Chattopadhyay demonstrates how outer layers of Calcutta's native elite *zamindari* (feudal-bourgeois) mansions and middle-class houses became more externally oriented by the later nineteenth century, while the author's research analyses how provincial Bengali residences like the Sahana House (1871; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.39) also in their own layouts reflected the city-country and exterior-interior relationships of the British Raj.

In Bombay by the early twentieth century, private and public bodies erected a large number of distinctive multistorey dwellings called *chawls* (fig. 82.18), to deal with a housing shortage mainly for single male migrant labourers. Typically around five to seven storeys tall and formed around courtyards, these contained multiple single-room tenements measuring commonly 3 by 3 metres (10 by 10 feet), all in a row, connected by a shared balcony. Privately built *chawls* tended to be two storeys in height with shops or offices on the ground floor, primitive sanitary facilities, and usually a single source of water. The Bombay

Improvement Trust (founded in 1898) built more robust brick and concrete blocks, three to five storeys high with rooms of 3.7 by 3 metres (12 by 10 feet), and a decent veranda space sometimes housing a stove and bathing area. Generally these had improved sanitation but were aesthetically rather forbidding. In contrast, the private ones often incorporated distinctive gateways and decorative wooden louvres, trims and cast-iron railings, aiming to express a communal identity.

[FIG 82.18 Chawl]

An important key collective domain for colonial leisure and socialisation were exclusive clubs where Indians were rarely allowed: these ranged from social clubs, sports clubs, yacht clubs and services clubs to gymkhana clubs for horse riding. Architecturally, as in the eclectic Neo-Vernacular **Karachi Gymkhana** [METADATA: ] (1886; fig. 82.19), they often played upon the bungalow type, with sloping roofs, deep eaves and dormers to evoke rural English imagery as an idealisation of colonists' original homes in this unfamiliar colony. In her 2001 *Journal of British Studies* article 'Britishness, Clubbability and the Colonial Public Sphere', Mrinalini Sinha however argues that clubs also represented a colonial *public* sphere, as seen in the grand design of the **Bengal Club** [METADATA: ] (1830s) and the **Madras Club** [METADATA: ] (1831, additions 1865; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.33) with their monumental Neoclassical colonnades and staircases. Native patrons also built clubs such as the separate **Hindu** [METADATA: ], **Muslim** [METADATA: ] and **Parsi Gymkhanas** [METADATA: ] in Bombay.

[FIG 82.19 Karachi Gymkhana]

The British administration tried to assume ever-greater control over its Indian subjects from the 1860s via what the French philosopher Michel Foucault terms 'bio-politics' (the state's exertion of social and political power over human life). Colonists' association of dirt, filth and disease with the 'native body' and the tropical environment ushered in municipal cleansing, medical dispensaries and specialised hospitals. The latter could range from rudimentary, as in the simple ward-plus-veranda for the missionary-run **Leper Clinic** [METADATA: ] built around 1926 in Sankra (fig. 82.20), through to substantial metropolitan hospitals, mostly using a pavilion layout. A further iconic realm of colonial power, control and knowledge was prison architecture, regarded as the dividing line between rational, humane colonial rule and native barbarism. By the mid-nineteenth century, colonial officials such as the Inspector of Prisons in Madras were proposing the philosopher Jeremy Bentham's 'Panopticon' model (1791; see Chapter 79) whereby every prisoner was watched, or believed they were watched, from a jailer sitting in the centre. After the 1857 Mutiny, the Public Works Department issued standard 'Panopticon'-inspired designs with a central watchtower, radiating cells and high walled enclosure, such as **Rampur Jail** [METADATA: ] (fig. 82.21), dating from the turn of the twentieth century. Yet often the department's design intentions were subverted: solitary cells ended up with many inmates, and prisoners' lifestyles had to be accommodated (such as with open cooking areas). Rather than envisaging penal reform, Indian prisons were actually medical-industrial sites with designated spaces where the colonial authorities

exploited prison labour for construction work, tested out treatments and manufactured goods.

[FIG 82.20 Leper clinic]

[FIG 82.21 Rampur Jail]

### Bombay's Gothic Revival civic imagery

The American Civil War (1861–65) prompted the British Crown to grow and import cotton from Bombay instead, fuelling the 'cotton boom'. Land speculation and urban development flourished, aided by the spread of railways from the mid-1850s and the opening of the **Suez Canal** [METADATA: ] in 1869. Bombay became a municipal corporation (1872), dominated by the Port Trust, founded in 1873, with its docks being constructed in the 1880s and 1890s. Initiated by Lord Elphinstone, Governor Henry Barle Frere pulled down the Bombay Fort walls to create the Esplanade and free up land for new buildings along the Back Bay. In parallel, a row of governmental and institutional buildings now faced the Oval Maidan. Within the Fort the earlier Cotton Green was fashioned into the **Elphinstone Circle** [METADATA: ] (begun 1864) and lined with an arcade and architecturally unified commercial buildings with façades designed by James Scott. The dominant style for these urban additions was the High Gothic Revival. Back in Britain, Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin and John Ruskin (see Chapter 79) had already made a passionate case for medieval architecture's ability to lend dignity to society, as a critique of the industrialisation of aesthetic practices. For the British colonists, Bombay's public buildings could now become cultural calibrators that helped shape the identities of their colonial subjects through the architectural values that the latter were now compelled to experience.

Most magnificent and emblematic of this new Gothic colonial identity was the **Victoria Terminus railway station** (now the Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus) [METADATA: ] (1888; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.38), anchoring the Esplanade at its northeastern end. It also housed the offices of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company. Designed by Frederick William Stevens, it was inspired by Sir George Gilbert Scott's **Midland Grand Hotel frontage to St Pancras Station** [METADATA: Midland Grand Hotel (now St Pancras Renaissance Hotel) / 1874 / London, England, UK / geolocation / George Gilbert Scott / NA / hotel / Gothic Revival / NA / brick and stone] in London, completed in 1874, but also incorporated Indian details – which proved easy enough to graft onto a Neo-Gothic frame – and Western sculptures depicting progress, engineering and commerce. Preeti Chopra in her 2011 book *A Joint Enterprise* also highlights it as a sacred site for locals. Likewise typical of Bombay's newly Gothicised civic identity were the **Government Secretariat** [METADATA: ] (1867–74) and **Public Works Department** [METADATA: ] (1869–92), both by General Henry St Clair Wilkins; **Post and Telegraph Offices** [METADATA: ] (1874) by James Trubshawe; **Law Courts** [METADATA: ] (1871–78) by Colonel James Augustus Fuller; and, in fifteenth-century French

Gothic style, the **Bombay University Senate Hall** [METADATA: ] (1874) by none other than George Gilbert Scott, who then in 1878 completed the **University Library** [METADATA: ] and **Rajabai Clock Tower** [METADATA: ].

The Gothic Revival in Bombay drew equally from Indian patronage and talent. The Parsi government architect and engineer, Mucherji Cowasji Murzban, created for example the **Pestonji Hormusji Cama Hospital for Women and Children** [METADATA: ], which opened in 1886, and the **Bomanji Allbless Obstetric Hospital** [METADATA: ], which opened in 1891, both funded by a local Parsi merchant. Driven more by the imperatives of commerce than politics, Bombay developed a highly cosmopolitan society, with colonists and natives living in proximity, and Indians owning fine houses and running key cotton mills. Even the use by Indians of Victorian Neo-Gothic expressed the ability of colonial subjects to own the architectural language of their supposed 'masters'.

### *The Indo-Saracenic style and other hybrids*

As a departure from the Gothic Revival, late nineteenth-century India witnessed the search by colonists for an appropriate Anglo-Indian architectural identity, exemplified in the so-called 'Indo-Saracenic' style – as driven primarily through governmental and institutional buildings. It involved a synthetically crafted identity whereby earlier Indian features, mostly taken from the Islamic Mughal Empire (hence 'Saracenic', a now-outdated term for Islamic), were grafted onto Neoclassical or Gothic Revival to help legitimise the British as the natural inheritors of colonial rule. In this sense the Indo-Saracenic offered a better contextual response than did the Neo-Gothic allusions to English nationalism, plus it resonated well with the architectural eclecticism flourishing in Britain at the time. British scholars of Indian art and architecture such as James Fergusson and Alexander Cunningham also played key roles in the debates. Underpinning it was the trope of India having been in 'decline' before the British came to revive it, a view emphasised in England by Ruskin and in India by scholars like Fergusson. As a broad term spanning Indian revivalism and an Anglo-Indian fusion, the main purpose of the Indo-Saracenic was to represent the Raj's sovereign authority. Indian Maharajas also took it up enthusiastically, recognising the trade-off between tradition and progressiveness as also between cultural roots and British imperial sanction.

Hence the classic examples of Indo-Saracenic were usually, but not exclusively colonial structures. They included the **Albert Hall** [METADATA: ] in Jaipur (1887), by Samuel Swinton Jacob and his Indian collaborator Bhai Ram Singh; **Mubarak Mahal** [METADATA: ] (1899), also in Jaipur, by Lala Chiman Lal; **Madras University Senate House** [METADATA: ] (1870s) and **Baroda University Senate House** [METADATA: ] (1880s) both by Robert Fellowes Chisholm; **Napier Museum** [METADATA: ] in Travancore (begun 1872), also by Chisholm; the **Bombay Municipal Corporation** building [METADATA: ] (1893) by Frederick William

Stevens; Muir College Allahabad [METADATA: ] (1878) by William Emerson; Madras High Court [METADATA: ] (1892) by J.W. Brassington; the Mysore Maharaja's Amba Vilas Palace [METADATA: ] (1897–1912) and Victoria Memorial Hall [METADATA: ] (1909) by Henry Irwin; the Prince of Wales Museum [METADATA: ] in Bombay (1905–14) by George Wittet; and the Victoria Memorial Eye Hospital [METADATA: ] in Colombo (c. 1905) by Edward Skinner.

As analysed by Thomas Metcalfe, the Mayo College [METADATA: ] (1878–85; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.37) in Ajmer (close to Jaipur in Rajasthan province), designed by Charles Mant, exemplifies the characteristic issues of Indo-Saracenic discourse. It promoted an imaginary 'pure' Hindu architecture, yet derided the latter for its excessive ornamentation as a pretext to incorporate Islamic elements like the dome and arch, so as to create a grander image for British sovereignty. Indo-Saracenic thus presented a Hindu-Muslim architectural binary that had never actually existed historically. And its reduction of the complexity of colonial architectural encounters to formal aspects favoured the drawings and approaches of British architects, heralding the marginalisation of the Indian *sreni* (guild) system whereby designer and builder had hitherto been the same figure. In a patronising bid to reconnect Indian artisans with their own building traditions, and to raise awareness within the Public Works Department, Samuel Swinton Jacob – the engineer-architect for the princely state of Jaipur from 1867 to 1912 – measured and drew the famous twelve-volume *Jeypore Portfolio of Architectural Details*, published between 1890 and 1913 (fig. 82.22). The volumes contain exquisite large-scale drawings of architectural elements such as columns, brackets, plinths, parapets, *chhatris* (kiosks) and *jharokhas* (window extensions) from old Mughal buildings in Delhi, Agra and Fatehpur Sikri, as well as Jaipur's early buildings. Jacob's portfolio, similarly to British pattern books such as Owen Jones's *Grammar of Ornament* (1856), became a key source for Indo-Saracenic designs (see Chapter 79).

[FIG 82.22 *Jeypore Portfolio of Architectural Details*]

If the Indo-Saracenic style in India and Ceylon was the most overt outcome of hybridisation, it was not the only one. In Rangoon, which from 1886 was the capital of British Burma (albeit governed from Calcutta), and which possessed a 1852 urban plan by surgeon and town-planning adviser William Montgomerie for a gridded downtown, the rapid growth of its port area and a vibrant shipping industry made it one of the most cosmopolitan cities of the Indian subcontinent, combining local migrants with Chinese, Indian and Scots merchants. Its iconic 1890s administrative buildings, courthouses, trading houses, hotels and (often transnational) banks were generally in a hybrid Anglo-Burmese vernacular, as found along the wide, tree-lined Phayre Street. Rangoon's dense streets also contained numerous enterprises like the Bombay-Burma Press – which represented vibrant, transnational operations – in compact three- or four-storey townhouses.

### Early twentieth-century modernities

Contemporaneous with Patna's designation by Viceroy Lord Curzon as the Bihar province's new **state capital** [METADATA: ], designed by Joseph Munnings (completed 1918), and a consequence of the partitioning of Bengal, **New Delhi** [METADATA: ] was announced as the new national capital at the 1911 Delhi Durbar. The ostensible reason was New Delhi's central location within the subcontinent. In reality though, governing from Calcutta – by then a centre of intense nationalist resistance – had become virtually untenable for the British authorities. New Delhi also presented the opportunity to re-cast the image of the Raj in a positive light after the political damage caused by the partitioning of Bengal.

The New Delhi Town Planning Committee consisted of prestigious British appointees. Its chairman was George Swinton (Scottish politician and Chairman of the London County Council); its main designers were the architect Edwin Lutyens and Liverpool's Chief Engineer John Brodie; and these were joined by architect Herbert Baker (a South African responsible for imperial buildings in Pretoria), engineer Thomas Ward, and civil servant Geoffrey de Montmorency. A consultant architect, Henry Vaughan Lanchester, was additionally attached. Sitting next to the old Mughal capital of Shahjahnabad (Old Delhi), the location, urbanism and architecture of the new city sought to imply that British rule was a peaceful and dignified successor that respected Indian traditions. Separating, indeed segregating, the two settlements were the Ramlila festival grounds, opened in the early 1930s – which, interestingly, became a site for Nationalist political meetings held by Mahatma Gandhi, Jawarharlal Nehru and other leaders.

[\[MAP 70 A map of Lutyens' projected "Imperial Delhi"\]](#)

Although conceived during an intensive period for urban theory and practice in Britain, with the Royal Institute of British Architects in London holding its first-ever town planning conference in 1910, New Delhi's urban plan (Map 70) remained an abstract diagram. It combined axial and radial streets and vast open spaces in a language of power, modernity and order, in stark contrast to the narrow winding lanes and socially cohesive dense urban fabric of Old Delhi. Along with **Papal Rome** [METADATA: ] or the French kings' **Versailles** [METADATA: ], it echoed contemporary 'City Beautiful' plans such as Daniel Burnham's schemes for **Washington** [METADATA: ] (1902) and **Chicago** [METADATA: ] (1909) (see Chapter 89), or Walter Burley Griffin's Canberra [METADATA: ] (see Chapter 99) in Australia. The crux for New Delhi was the vast east–west axis of Rajpath (Kingsway) that connected key British and Indian sites: at its western end, on the highest point of Raisina Hill, the new **Viceroy's Palace** [METADATA: ] (1912–29; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.41) by Lutyens was flanked by two **governmental secretariat buildings** [METADATA: ] (North and South Blocks) by Baker, of the same dates. These linked down the hill to the India Gate [METADATA: ] (1921–31), an impressive memorial for the soldiers killed in the First World War, and the **Chhatri** [METADATA: ] (1936), which contained a statue of King George V, and then through to the termination of the grand axis at the eastern end at the **Purana Quilla** (Old Fort). Perpendicular to the Kingsway ran the Queensway, which held the **Central Legislative Assembly** [METADATA: ] (1912–27, today the Indian Parliament). From the latter – to

establish a symbolic lineage with past rulers – was a visual axis to the **Friday Mosque [METADATA: ]** in Old Delhi, across **Connaught Circus [METADATA: ]** (1933), the new commercial centre with curved unified façades designed by W.H. Nicholls, the Indian administration's chief architect. Hence the hierarchical arrangement for New Delhi placed the major governmental and commercial institutions on major arteries and intersections; housing quarters were also graded out by class, rank, size and building type in varying proximity. With the new focus, state investment in Old Delhi gradually dried up and it was left to decay.

In the projects by Lutyens and Baker for New Delhi's most official buildings, two different architectural discourses emerged. The first was essentially Neoclassical, with those such as John Begg arguing for an Indianised variant of it to address the political climate. The second and bolder position – as suggested by the Ceylonese nationalist ideologue Ananda Coomaraswamy and the art historian Ernest Binfield Havell and supported by figures like the Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw and the English poet Alfred Austin – called, beyond mere style, for the design and execution of New Delhi to be entrusted to Indian master builders working in the *sreni* system. As a compromise, the then Viceroy proposed the inclusion of overtly Indian motifs. Although Lutyens himself disliked Indian architecture and the Indo-Saracenic style, and Baker remained keen to retain Neoclassical integrity, the official line coerced them into creating hybrid designs.

In wake of all these pressures on the Raj, India's early twentieth-century architecture was marked by an Imperial Neoclassical revival that used modern steel-frame construction. Spanning the governmental and commercial spheres, and including British and native architects, it could be seen in Calcutta in William Emerson's **Victoria Memorial [METADATA: ]** (1905–21), commissioned by Viceroy Lord Curzon, and Sudlow, Ballardie and Thompson's **Statesman Building [METADATA: ]** (1933); in Bombay in George Wittet's **Ballard Estate [METADATA: ]** (1908–23); in Bangalore in C.F. Stevens and Co.'s **Indian Institute of Science [METADATA: ]** (1912–13); in Colombo in the Public Works Chief Architect A. Woodson's **Old Parliament [METADATA: ]** (1929); and in Rangoon in Henry Hoyne-Fox's **Secretariat [METADATA: ]** (c. 1905).

### *The architectures of nationalism and other indigenous critiques*

In the late nineteenth century, Indian nationalist sentiments stemmed from and led to various forms of middle-class resistance against colonial rule, such as the formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885 and, in the early twentieth century, the Swaraj (self-rule) and Swadeshi (indigenous economy) movements. Influenced by this as also by particular local experiences, Burma and Ceylon too witnessed their own nationalist turns.

Nationalist discourse was closely linked in India to questions of indigenous identity and modernity. While some imagined a future incorporating an outward-looking internationalism, others sought to reinterpret tradition and revive traditional arts and crafts. Nationalist architectural thought followed artistic practices such as the painter Raja Ravi Verma's fusion of traditional themes with Western perspective. Jon Lang and Miki and Madhavi Desai, in their 1997 book *Architecture and Independence*, identify four key themes underpinning architecture of Indian nationalism: first, a pan-Asian architectural language that contrasted with Western paradigms; second, a return to indigenous rural, folk and peasant architectures; third, an ethic of architectural simplicity drawn from Gandhian philosophy; and fourth, a revivalist approach that incorporated the direct use of motifs and patterns from past Indian art and architecture.

Two visionary rural architectural sites in this context were Rabindranath Tagore's **Santiniketan** [METADATA: ] (1901 onwards; Key Buildings, p. xxx, fig. 82.40) – an educational and cultural institution – and **Mahatma Gandhi's ashram at Sevagram** [METADATA: ] (1936 onwards; Key Buildings, p. xxx) – which were collective work, living and spiritual enclaves. But while **Santiniketan** [METADATA: ] represented an eclectically intellectual pan-Asian spiritual, pedagogic and architectural experiment, Gandhian architecture's focus was on promoting a moral-spiritual-economic philosophy expressed through the use of everyday vernacular precedents. In contrast with colonial institutions, both adopted de-institutionalised, non-monumental language of domestic typologies, thus combining ethics, spirituality, creativity, production and daily life. The political theorist and historian Partha Chatterjee argues that anti-colonial nationalism was legible in domestic spaces in Bengal, long before its organised institutional or political expressions, via a spatial split between the outer (material) and inner (spiritual) domains. While European influences were absorbed in the outer, public rooms such as the *baithak-khana*, in the inner rooms of the *andar-mahal* a more rooted cultural identity was developed on its own terms. Other quests for subcontinental identity included the purist revivalism (denying subcontinental cultural plurality) of Coomaraswamy and colonial figures like Havell. Sris Chandra Chatterjee's revivalist 'modern Indian architecture' movement from the 1930s tried to combine rational and cosmic geometries in urbanism with architecture employing symbolic Hindu forms. Megha Chand Inglis's 2016 doctoral study of the Sompuras, who were hereditary temple-builders of Gujarat province in western India, illustrates how this group in fact created modern illustrated manuals and building practices through a free mixing of indigenous and colonial knowledge (see SPOTLIGHT BOX: THE *SHILPARATNAKARA*, p. xxx).

#### [PERIOD DETAILS SPOTLIGHT BOX BEGINS:

##### **The *Shilparatnakara***

In 1939, at the behest of Maharaja Sayaji Rao III of Baroda (r. 1875–1939), a member of the hereditary line of temple-builders in Gujarat named Narmadashankar Muljibhai Sompura published the *Shilparatnakara*. Produced over a period of twelve years, it comprised a



densely illustrated architectural manual, meant for Gujarati temple architects, which assembled chapters from medieval Sanskrit texts, and also gave Gujarati translations. Accompanying these were numerous illustrations of the temple-parts such as *prasadas* (the main shrine including the spire), *mandapas* (pillared hallways) and *pithas* (base), drawn from imagination using the texts. But, extraordinarily, the manual also extracted several pieces from a colonial drawing archive: *The Architectural Antiquities of Northern Gujarat* (1903) by James Burgess and Henry Cousens of the Archaeological Survey of India – freely modifying them where necessary, replacing English labels with Gujarati ones, and removing the scale bars. The *Shilparatnakara* thus embodied the Sompuras' dynamic assimilation and reworking of such diverse sources of knowledge into what was clearly a modern form of architectural knowledge. It simultaneously drew upon, and also shaped, numerous temple building and renovation projects by the Sompuras ever since, both within the Indian subcontinent and then, from the 1990s, for a global diaspora. [BOX ENDS]

Despite the unavoidable influence of India, Ceylon's hybrid history of Buddhism and Portuguese and Dutch colonialism, and also its island geography, lent it relative autonomy. Its nationalist architectures were often reacting to the use of Neo-Palladian or late nineteenth-century 'Orientalist' eclecticism that lacked meaningful engagement with local indigenous forms. Anoma Pieris has studied the emergence of modernised Ceylonese architecture from the start of the twentieth century, in a period when the caste-based society transformed into a more democratic civil society, not least for an indigenised metropolitan culture that sought to defy Anglophile Christian cultural dominance. Most significant was a modern religious Buddhist Revival whose schools, temples and hospitals mimicked western institutions and moved them to urban peripheries, starting off within houses. The Young Men's Buddhist Association, in the different premises that it occupied from 1898 to 1924, increasingly incorporated modern spaces for a library, printing press, religious exams, debates, playrooms and eventually Sinhalese theatre. As Pieris notes, also significant was the cosmopolitan art of what was called the '43 Group, using new techniques while being rooted in rural Ceylonese identity, defying Buddhist religious revivalism and colonial implantation. The group's operation and many artworks were housed from 1944 onwards within the artist Harry Pieris' house (later formalised into the Sapumal Foundation in 1974) [METADATA: ] (fig. 82.23): it celebrated a culturally rooted, de-institutionalised image. The modern Buddhist architecture mentioned earlier was to also feed, after independence in 1948, the new public architecture designed by the first generation of native Ceylonese architects, grafting cultural and religious features onto buildings, albeit superficially in many cases.

[FIG 82.23 Sapumal Foundation]

In Burma, a key attribute of nationalist architecture seems to be its pursuit of distinctive syncretic Burmese styles rather than a pan-Asian idiom, since it wanted to distinguish itself

from Indian as well as British Indian references. Some fascinating examples are the tier-roofed **Rangoon Railway Station** [METADATA: ] (1877, destroyed 1943 and rebuilt later to new design), **Myoma High School** [METADATA: ] (1931) and **Rangoon City Hall** [METADATA: ] (1927; Key Buildings, p. xxx), all designed by the Burmese architect Sithu U Tin. But rather than creating any singular nationalist architecture, Burmese resistance to British rule was spatialised within the city itself through student and civil society protests in the downtown, university and **Swhedagon Pagoda** [METADATA: ] areas of Rangoon.

### Modernism, Art Deco, and Indian subcontinental modernity

By the 1920s, some of the new colonial buildings in India were displaying a legible shift towards a simplified formal language. While not Modernist as such, these showed a clear tendency towards a new rationalism. In Calcutta, an exhibition on Bauhaus art was held in 1922, at which the works of Wassily Kandinsky and Paul Klee were displayed alongside those of Indian artists such as Nandalal Bose, Sunayani Devi, and Abanindranath and Gaganendranath Tagore. Architects in the Indian subcontinent also had considerable global awareness of pioneering Modernist architects such as Frank Lloyd Wright (see Chapters 89 and 102) and Le Corbusier (see Chapter 91). Quintessential examples of this rationalised approach were **Virginia House** [METADATA: ] (1928) and **Lady Dufferin Hospital** [METADATA: ] (1937) in Calcutta, both by Ballardie, Thompson and Matthews, and the **Reserve Bank of India building** [METADATA: ] in Rangoon (1936; fig. 82.24). British architects such as Walter Sykes George in his **St Thomas's Church** [METADATA: ] (1929) and **St Stephen's College** [METADATA: ] (1941), or Arthur Gordon Shoosmith in **St Martin's Garrison Church** (1931) [METADATA: ] (fig. 82.16), all in Delhi, also produced notable designs in unadorned masonry while sensitively addressing the hot-dry northern Indian climate. Shoosmith viewed this as an ethical post-war aesthetic. A modern idiom that retained a response to the Indian context, as a new Indian architecture, was also most fervently espoused by Claude Batley of the Sir J.J. School of Art in Bombay, an active centre of architectural thought in the inter-war period (see SPOTLIGHT BOX: ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION AND TEACHING, p. xxx).

[FIG 82.24 Reserve Bank of India, Rangoon Street]

### [PERIOD DETAILS SPOTLIGHT BOX BEGINS:

#### **Architectural profession and teaching**

Building works by the British colonial government substantially reduced with the advent of the First World War. Instead, a number of Anglo-Indian private architectural firms emerged, run by Britons practising in India and exploring the specificities of Indian work. These firms initially drove the organisation of the architectural and town-planning professions and education, with then newer British or Indian-headed establishments – such as Shapoorjee

N. Chandbhoy and Company – rising to prominence in the 1920s. Two key figures straddling architectural practice and education were Claude Batley (founder of Gregson, Batley and King, Bombay and principal of the Sir J.J. School of Art from 1923 to 1943) and Walter Sykes George (who was involved in designing New Delhi and **St Stephen's College** [METADATA: ], and founder of Delhi Polytechnic's architecture department), with Sykes having many architectural collaborations with the prolific Indian building-contractor Sobha Singh. Also influential in India were the 'empire architects' such as Edwin Lutyens and Herbert Baker.

Originally founded by the Parsi philanthropist Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy Tata, the first Indian school of architecture – Sir J.J. School of Art's architectural department – had been founded in the early twentieth century by John Begg, and Batley then used it in his search for a culturally rooted modern Indian architecture. Provision expanded to other schools in Bombay, Delhi, Nagpur and Howrah by the 1950s. The Indian Institute of Architects was formed in 1929, growing membership rapidly thereafter. The nationalist political climate, greater provincial autonomy and direct elections led to loyalties been shifted, with an indigenisation of previously British-headed firms and also Indian firms challenging their dominance, such as Atmaran Gajjar and Gajanan Pathak in Ahmedabad. A similar pattern could be found in Ceylon and Burma.[BOX ENDS]

Moves towards a cosmopolitan built landscape were in part the outcome of a stark decrease in the British administration's architectural activities from the 1920s, a gap readily filled by private patrons (merchant houses, banks, insurance companies and educational institutions) who were now commissioning increasingly professionalised architectural and construction firms that operated as trained experts – yet again diminishing the continuity of Indian artisanal practices. These urban modernities were being forged around changing ideas of work, leisure, lifestyles and social values, and were reflected in new technologies and aesthetic tastes. They were typified in 1930s India through the remarkable Art Deco designs for multistorey commercial offices, apartments, houses and – perhaps most exuberantly – for entertainment facilities such as cinema theatres.

In Bombay whole chains of Art Deco buildings were built in the Back-Bay Reclamation Area, on Marine Drive, Queen's Road and Churchgate (fig. 82.25). In Madras, starting with the Parry Company's **Dare House** [METADATA: ] (1940, by Ballardie, Thompson and Matthews) in the Esplanade Road–China Bazaar Road area, many neighbouring buildings followed suit, and the style also flourished in the business and entertainment quarters of Delhi and Calcutta. Excellent examples were the **Metro Cinema** [METADATA: ] (1938, by Thomas W. Lamb and D.W. Ditchburn) and **Mayfair Apartments** [METADATA: ] (1937, by Merwanji Bana and Co.), both in Bombay; *Hindu* newspaper's **Kasturi Building** [METADATA: ] (1939, by Major Harold Fellowes Prynne) in Madras; the **Reid Building** [METADATA: ] (1942, by Ballardie, Thompson and Matthews) in Calcutta; the **Lakshmi Insurance building** [METADATA: ] (1938, by D.H. Daruwala and Co.) in Karachi; and the Moderne-style **Old**

Library [METADATA: ] (1927, by Thomas Oliphant Foster and Basil Ward) in Rangoon University.

[FIG 82.25 Art Deco Churchgate Bombay]

Art Deco structures were built typically with poured in-situ concrete frames, brick infill panels, and finished in painted stucco. They displayed enormous formal variety – angular, stepped back, curved or oval façades or façade elements like balconies and staircase towers (often accentuated like ship masts); horizontal and vertical linear elements and articulations; and assorted motifs – for instance, in Bombay, echoing its locale and industrial pre-eminence – including the sun’s rays, moon, ocean and palm trees in low-relief stucco panels, etched glass and metalwork. Art Deco plans typically contained fluid and sometimes asymmetric arrangements of rectangular or curved spaces. In buildings such as cinemas the interiors were plush and indulgent – often with wood panels, stone-finish walls and floors, decorative glass and other rich furnishings. The Elphinstone Theatre [METADATA: ] (c. 1925) in Colombo in Ceylon was built by the pioneering Calcutta-based film production house Madan Theatres, as founded by the Parsi entrepreneur Jamshedji Framji Madan. With a simplified Neoclassicism-meets-Art-Deco façade and a sensuous interior of luxurious Art Nouveau curved and coloured ceilings and fluid gallery outlines, it celebrated the new type of enclosed public entertainment. It also provided more gender-neutral notions of the public realm, for instance with mixed male-female seating and lobby areas. Hence rather than mere formal indulgences, Swati Chattopadhyay argues that such cinemas represented a public space where modern films about different kinds of domesticities could be consumed within architecture that also enabled people to imagine the potential of their new-found modernity.

Indeed it was also homes for newly affluent residents in cities like Calcutta that adopted Art Deco with relish. While the style could be read as a freewheeling Western formalistic movement with universal appeal that gave a ‘global-modern’ identity to local places, Chattopadhyay argues that in the Indian subcontinent, Art Deco held very specific contextual meanings. Chattopadhyay discusses how the Calcutta Art Deco houses from the later 1930s were deeply linked to the particular social transformations of the Bengali middle classes in the early twentieth century. As such, they represented newer forms of respectability distinct from those espoused by late nineteenth-century patriarchal nationalism (fig. 82.26). Interestingly, since the nationalist movement had already brought women out into public space through participation for instance in street protests, domestic buildings no longer needed to maintain a separation between their male (public) and female (private) spaces. With their terraces, verandas, and more open plan forms, giving greater porosity to ‘feminine’ spaces such as the kitchen, Art Deco dwellings after the Second World War had evolved to enable a more modern domestic conjugal sphere with far higher gender fluidity between spaces.

[FIG 82.26 Art Deco House, Calcutta]

By this point, and with the various subcontinental nations having gained independence in the late 1940s, Modernism's influence there was already fairly legible. It could be seen in Atmaram Gajjar's encasing of the indigenous courtyard house within a Modernist skin in the **Shodhan House** [METADATA: ] (1939) in Ahmedabad; Willem Dudok's **Lighthouse Cinema** [METADATA: ] (1938) in Calcutta; Otto Königsberger's **dining hall for the Indian Institute of Sciences** [METADATA: ] (1945) in Bangalore; or Antonin Raymond's climatically adapted **Golconde Ashram** [METADATA: ] (1942) in Pondicherry – the last also representing the older colonial notion of 'tropical architecture' now morphing into what became known as 'Tropical Modernism'. It would, however, be highly misleading to imagine subcontinental architecture as a simple evolution from pre-colonial traditions to hybrid colonial versions and then globalised Modernism. Instead, colonial architectures and urbanisms represented multiple and continuously evolving identities, as well as political and social relationships between colonising and colonised peoples. The different countries of the subcontinent also had complicated architectural relationships with each other, such as Burma or Sri Lanka with India. Colonial architectural modernity in the subcontinent involved diverse modes of assimilation, modification, rejection, collaboration, negotiation and adjustments, and even tactical copying or selective separation of indigenous and colonial domains. Rather than fixed forms, these were achieved often through pragmatic and creative openness, and the use of typological and formal flexibility, not least, building upon the very extensive history of cultural assimilation that had long characterised the Indian subcontinent.

## Key Buildings

### Groote Kerk (Dutch Reform Church), Galle, Sri Lanka (formerly Ceylon) (1755)

[METADATA: ]

Located within the Galle Fort, this Dutch Reform Church – first established in 1640 – is one of the earliest Protestant churches in Sri Lanka. The present building, whose architect is unknown, dates back to 1755. Like a previous church in **Jaffna** [METADATA: ] (1754), it too was built on a cruciform plan, with short transepts. The church contains a hall with a single nave, a high, painted and vaulted ceiling and was distinguished by its Dutch Baroque façade, double scroll moulding and flame-like finials. The interior has wooden panelling of local satinwood with pews along the sides for the Commander, Deacons and Dutch East India Company officials. After the British occupied the Dutch territories in the late eighteenth century, an Anglican community was allowed to use the church. The southern end pews were removed during this period to accommodate the altar and communion rails. As with other Dutch churches, the Groote Kerk involved a skilful use of local materials, techniques and artisanship.

[FIG 82.27 Old Dutch Church, Galle]

## New French Government House, Ponducherry (formerly Pondicherry), India (1768)

[METADATA: ]

The original French Government House in Pondicherry, commissioned by the French Governor Joseph François Dupleix and erected by his official engineer, was demolished by British forces in 1761: a new one was then built in its place, beginning in 1766, by another engineer, Jean Bourçet, once it had been returned into French possession. Less grand than Dumont's original, Bourçet's design was single-storey with a continuous southern loggia and hardly any ornamentation. An upper storey was later added to house a central drawing room, governor's office and bedrooms, with a Tuscan-Doric and Ionic combination of lower- and upper- floor colonnades and strong roof entablature. The layout has been compared by Sten Nilsson (in his 1968 book *European Architecture in India*) with the *maisons de plaisance* prevalent in France and encapsulated in the 1764 book *Architecture Moderne*, by Charles-Antoine Jombert and Charles-Étienne Briseux. But equally, the series of enclosed but interconnected courtyards housing separate enclaves for the French Governor and his family, the kitchen quarters and offices are also somewhat reminiscent of traditional living patterns in southern India.

[FIG 82.28 Palace of the Governor of Pondicherry]

## Writers' Building, Kolkata (formerly Calcutta), India (1780)

[METADATA: ]

The Writers' Building – a product of increasingly systematised colonial commerce and bureaucracy introduced by Warren Hastings, de facto Governor-General of India (r. 1772–85) – was a gigantic secretariat and training institution in Calcutta for the British East India Company's 'writers' (accountants, scribes and translators). It was three-storeyed, spanned the entire length of 'Tank Square', and was designed to maximise work efficiency through rationalised layout, lighting and windows. There were also nineteen standardised apartments. Designed by the civil architect Colonel John Fortnam, and the amateur architect and carpenter Thomas Lyon, it had a continuous, neutral Neo-Palladian façade with a central projected section, reflecting Hastings's pragmatic approach. Lecture and examination halls, hostel and libraries were added in 1800–20, continuing the initiative of training writers in Oriental languages, customs and scholarship. Characteristic of colonial architecture, there were numerous incremental architectural and programmatic alterations to accommodate offices, living quarters, shops, engineering college and so on. In 1821, the main façade was given low pediments, lined with long verandas and Ionic columns, and an even grander reworking took place in the late nineteenth century.

## Government House, Kolkata (1803)

[METADATA: ]

Commissioned by the Governor-General, Lord (Richard Colley) Wellesley and located prominently off Calcutta's Esplanade, this impressive edifice was designed by Captain Charles Wyatt of the Bengal Engineers, beginning on site in 1799. **Kedleston Hall** [METADATA: Kedleston Hall / 1759-65 / Derby, England, UK / geolocation / Matthew Brettingham the Younger, James Paine, Robert Adam / NA / country house / Neoclassical / stone] (1759–65) – a Neo-Palladian country house in Derbyshire in England designed by James Paine and Matthew Brettingham, and altered by Robert Adam – clearly served as a prototype: both employed a central rectangular block from which swung out curved passages, terminating in four wings. A closer look, however, reveals some distinctive colonial socio-spatial relationships – for instance, the interior staircase of Kedleston Hall was moved in the Government House to the front exterior, and was turned into a grand curved feature to emphasise British prowess and expansionist power. The internal rooms in the Calcutta building were directly connected to each other, without controlled access through hallways, suggesting less rigid functional segregation and privacy, aided further by the presence of numerous doors. Spaces used by the Indian servants were also not strictly separated, showing the British officers' deep dependence on these servants.

[FIG 82.29 Composite of plan of New Government House, Calcutta and Kedleston Hall, Derbyshire]

## 'Dilkhusa' (later Metcalfe House), Delhi, India (1830s)

[METADATA: ]

'Dilkhusa' (meaning 'heart's delight') was the garden retreat of the English Resident of Delhi, Sir Thomas Theophilus Metcalfe, who also owned a Neoclassical **town mansion** [METADATA: ] erected in 1835. Apparently to watch over the Mughal emperor, Bahadur Shah Zafar, who was based during the summer months at nearby Mehrauli, Metcalfe also remodelled the seventeenth-century tomb of Mohammad Quli Khan, and its grounds, into a pleasure resort suited to his British lifestyle, especially for use during the monsoon seasons. The original tomb building now became the residence (with its central hall as the dining room), and two additional wings and guesthouse, staff-quarters and stables were adapted from older structures. Dilkhusa had extensive gardens, a water tank from the Lodi period (1451–1526) repurposed for boating and swimming, and several follies, some of which emulated Mughal *chhatris* (domed pavilions) and *garhganjs* (stepped follies). Dilkhusa represented one part of a composite 'town-house-and-country-house' lifestyle that was characteristic of privileged colonial life up to the mid-nineteenth century. It also reflected, in its own way, the processes of cultural assimilation and architectural adaptation, with even its new additions developed from existing Mughal traditions. The identity of its architect is

unknown; it is thought that Metcalfe himself fashioned many of the features, probably with the help of Indian artisans.

[INSERT FIG 82.30 Dilkhusa ABOUT HERE]

### Opium factory, Patna, India (early nineteenth century)

[METADATA: ]

As seen in this plant at Patna, the processing of opium from poppy seeds required, within a large enclosure on the riverside and arranged around multiple courtyards, a series of warehouse-like factory buildings – often double-storey with direct access from the outside also to the upper floor. These contained rationalised operations in modular bays that were typically 12.2–15.2 by 6 metres (40–50 by 20 feet) on plan and 6 metres (20 feet) high, and were used as the examining room, drying room, balling room, stacking room and so on. These rooms sometimes had a central processing space and linear service spaces on the sides. Operations such as excising and sifting included female labour and were carried out in outdoor spaces that hence served as extensions to the factory, maximising the production area. The structures themselves, the identity of whose designer is not known, were built in local brick, with terraced roofing (comprising layers of terracotta finished with a lime and brick dust mixture) sitting on timber joists. The compound contained other ancillary structures for supervisors, staff and other service functions. The British Crown encouraged opium production for sale to China in exchange for tea, porcelain and other goods.

[FIG 82.31 Opium Factory]

### St John's Church, Kolkata (1787)

[METADATA: ]

A classic emulation of the prototypical design by James Gibbs for the **church of St Martin-in-the-Fields** [METADATA: ] on London's Trafalgar Square (1726; see Chapter 63) – and thereby providing the blueprint for later Anglican churches in the Indian subcontinent – was this new 'presidency church' set within ample grounds in the centre of Calcutta. The architect-engineer James Agg adapted the original plan to local conditions by omitting Gibbs's portico and pediment (owing possibly to the still low-key Christian activities in Bengal), and shifting the entrance to a rear veranda built into the building's envelop, and with the vertical tower receding to the far end. Ramps were added to the entrance steps for *palanquins* (covered litters) that carried British colonials to and from the church. The squat steeple proportions may be seen variously as a clumsy distortion of the original in Trafalgar Square, or simply the result of limited resources. The church was altered several times due to liturgical and climatic needs: for example, the entrance (now a *porte cochère*) was shifted to the western (tower) side to receive carriages, an apse created on the east, and a pair of galleries added to the longer sides.



[FIG 82.32 St John's Church, Calcutta]

### **(Old) Madras Club, Chennai (formerly Madras), India (1831, additions 1865)**

[METADATA: ]

The (Old) Madras Club was supported by the Madras Governor, Stephen Lushington, and became known as the 'Ace of Clubs'. It was privately built and adapted a typical Madras garden house (consisting of a main house and outbuildings), as such echoing the frequent beginnings of London's clubs in domestic spaces. This one in Madras, however – now demolished – was above all a classic example of how colonial clubs did not merely represent a 'home away from home' for British officials, but also became key sites of the colonial public sphere, especially during the Raj era: this included a special ball held for the 1875–76 royal visit by the Prince of Wales, Albert Edward (Bertie), the future King Edward VII. The club's sense of grandeur was expressed through elaborate provisions such as a lengthy bar – with dining and reading rooms – within its central block, accompanied by a library, bridge room, billiard room, verandas for drinking and socialising, and accommodation for singles and married couples in the ancillary buildings. Colonial abundance was also expressed formally through an assembly of Classically-styled, columned blocks, and a grand entrance staircase. Externally, the pedimented Neoclassical façade with porte cochère was added later on the northern side in 1865 – all of which gave it an even more institutional appearance, rather than one of just everyday leisure. As was customary, the designs were most probably developed in consultation with the local artisans who carried out the building work.

[FIG 82.33 Madras Club]

### **Punjab Exhibition Hall (later Tollington Market), Lahore, Pakistan (1864)**

[METADATA: ]

The Punjab Exhibition Hall was built in Lahore as a temporary venue to showcase local produce, manufacturers, machinery and craft at the Exhibition of Arts and Industry. It served as a museum thereafter; and in 1920, was remodelled by the Indian municipal engineer Rai Bahadur Ganga Ram into market-stalls for daily provisions. The original building contained a 34-metre (112-foot) long central space with a sloping tiled roof supported by timber trusses and masonry walls, rising 3.7 metres (12 feet) above two side aisles and an enveloping veranda also with sloped tiled roof, held up by wooden posts. The outer layer expressed the crafted language of wooden architecture. Circular clerestory openings with smaller gable-ended roofs and two square towers raised above the main roof brought additional light into the central section. Within a simple typological format, the building had a complex assembly of tiled roofs, clerestory windows, articulations of entrances and projecting wings, making it a highly crafted object, fitting for its exhibition purpose. The generic building type also enabled its re-use many times over.

[FIG 82.34 Exhibition Hall, Lahore]

### Crawford Market, Mumbai (formerly Bombay), India (1871)

[METADATA: ]

Named after Sir Arthur Crawford, the first Municipal Commissioner of Bombay, and located in that city's Fort area, this market was a gift by the Parsi industrialist Cowasji Jehangir and was designed by William Emerson. It has a huge footprint of 60,200 square metres (648,000 square feet) spread over a central hall and two wings. Within this basic format was a complex assembly of spaces, volumes and roofs with a clearly urban response in its curved street corner articulation and vertical clock tower. The interior contained wooden and sometimes tiered stalls, allowing the shopkeeper to sit above their produce. Stylistically an eclectic Victorian, Norman, Moorish and Flemish fusion, it was made of coarse local Kurla rubble masonry with Porbandar and Bassein redstone quoins. The market had an ornamental garden fountain representing the rivers of India, designed by William Emerson and executed by John Lockwood Kipling, along with a famous frieze, again by Kipling but working with his student assistants. This frieze, representing Indian life and market scenes in idealised Classical Greek aesthetics, has drawn both appreciation and criticism. Crawford Market marked Bombay's cosmopolitan modernity by combining Indian patronage, European and Indian design and workmanship: it employs a festive, eclectic formal and structural language, using local materials.

[FIG 82.35 Crawford Market]

### Church of the Sacred Heart, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India (1878)

[METADATA: ]

This Catholic church by Frederic Salmon Growse, an enthusiastic amateur, needs to be viewed less as a finished piece than as an experimental endeavour to find a way of working between European and Indian design paradigms, construction systems and artisanship – as well as a provocative critique of the stereotyped architecture being produced by the Public Works Department. Growse employed local craftsmen, who also made design contributions, although the selection and assemblage of elements were still clearly dominated by his wishes. The plan is a Latin cross with nave, aisles and short transepts, topped by a Russian-style dome that also looks very like a Hindu temple *shikhara* (spire) on a Hindu temple – albeit with a Christian cross atop. Growse's original intention to include a genuine *shikhara* roof was abandoned in fear of offending Roman Catholic clerics. The roof was also decorated with many Hindu *chhatris* (cupolas) and the corners articulated with already prevalent Hindu-Islamic octagonal tower elements.

[FIG 82.36 Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Mathura]

### Main Building, Mayo College, Ajmer, Rajasthan, India (1878–85)

[METADATA: ]

Initiated by Lord Mayo, who served as Viceroy of India from 1869 to 1872, Mayo College was a boarding school for the gentlemanly education of Indian princes. Still retaining its original use, its main building was erected by the British administration and the hostels by the princely states. Its architectural discourse moved away from Lord Mayo's initial preference for Greek Classicism to a more 'appropriate' Hindu design based on the eighteenth-century **Deeg Palace** [METADATA: ], near Bharatpur in Rajasthan, for this then only to be shot down by the British engineer and archaeologist Alexander Cunningham as being a Hindu-Islamic hybrid – and hence 'impure', on the basis that 'Hindu' and 'Muslim' attributes were seen to be mutually exclusive. Lord Mayo however finally settled for another 'mixed style' on grounds that Hindu architecture had already assimilated Islamic forms, and indeed the architect, Charles Mant, made a case for Indo-Saracenic's suitability to climatic and contemporary needs as against the excessive materials and ornamentation that characterised older Hindu architecture. Mant synthesised various elements such as Late Mughal plain and cusped arches, Bengali (later Rajput) drooping *chhatris* (open pavilions), pre-Mughal horizontal *chajjas* (overhangs or sunshades), octagonal corner towers with Hindu domes, as well as an eclectically styled clock tower.

[FIG 82.37 Mayo College]

### Victoria Terminus Railway Station (now Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus), Mumbai (1888)

[METADATA: ]

As a global icon of Bombay's commercial modernity during its cotton-boom years, Frederick William Stevens designed the Victoria Terminus railway station in an exuberant Gothic Revival manner. It forms a U-shape around a front garden square, topped with an impressive central dome crowned by a grand figure of Progress in Porbandar stone, and iconography of engineering and commerce on the side gable ends and in front. Within an overall Neo-Gothic aesthetic, the details were Indic, as crafted by Indian art students, making it one of the early precursors of the later Indo-Saracenic style. Interestingly, as noted by Preeti Chopra in her 2011 book *A Joint Enterprise: Indian Elites and the Making of British Bombay*, it also contained the shrine of a Muslim saint, Sayyid Bismillah Shah Baba, which drew an immense amount of religious pilgrimage as well. The building thus became a bearer of Bombay's hybridity by combining a highly cosmopolitan, eclectic, technological, commercial ethos that was forged equally through an assimilation of highly localised meanings, religious practices and rituals.

[FIG 82.38 Victoria Terminus]

## Sahana Residence, Bankura, West Bengal, India (1871)

[METADATA: ]

The Sahana Residence, located in the provincial town of Bankura, is a classic example of the hybrid villa-courtyard layout and of the new rural-urban relationships that colonialism introduced into the houses created by indigenous citizens. A well-to-do Indian mica merchant, and distinguished local civic figure, bought this property as an existing freestanding villa in the later nineteenth century by. Various additions and alterations were subsequently made to create distinct inner and outer domains within the dwelling. A *baithak khana* (drawing room) to entertain guests, a 'radio room', guest rooms with attached toilets, ornamental front gardens, a portico and a driveway for a motor car were set out to define a somewhat extroverted external domain, characteristic of British colonial urban houses. On the inside, however, were added – around interconnected courtyards – a series of cooking spaces, maternity rooms, children's study rooms, and storage for staple foods arriving from the ancestral village. The house shows that, despite the urban pull of the colonial economy, indigenous people retained active connections with their rural roots, which was expressed also within their town spaces.

[FIG 82.39 Sahana House]

## Santiniketan, Bengal, India (1901 onwards)

[METADATA: ]

Founded by the eminent Bengali author and visionary Rabindranath Tagore, Santiniketan represented a *swadeshi* (indigenous) education, while also assimilating certain progressive attributes of Western pedagogy. The architectural model referred back to ancient Indian Buddhist universities such as Nalanda or Taxila and incorporated a 'pan-Asian' vocabulary, with an emphasis on its rural setting and outdoor learning spaces in continuity with nature. Santiniketan's philosophy and architectural language were typified in five of Tagore's houses (known as the Uttarayan complex): Konarka (1912–22), Udayan (1922–35), Shyamali (c. 1935), Punashcha (c. 1936) and Udichi (c. 1939). The buildings were mostly designed by Surendranath Kar, drawing upon symbolic aesthetics from Rabindranath Tagore himself – yet sometimes also through collaboration with the latter's son, Rathindranath Tagore, and the Japanese wood-sculptor, Kintaro Kasahara. They spanned a consciously crafted folk, revivalist and hybrid architecture. Added to contemporary modern masonry building forms (such as the bungalow type) and local folk architecture (mud, bamboo and thatch huts, painted murals), was also an eclectic 'Oriental' architectural vocabulary that mixed Mughal volumetric assemblage and *chajjas* (sunshades); Buddhist *chaitya* halls, columns and sun-windows; Chinese pavilions; and a Japanese feeling of spatial fluidity.

[FIG. 82.40 Santiniketan]

## City Hall, Yangon (formerly Rangoon), Burma (1927)

[METADATA: ]

This administrative building was emblematic of a nationalist sense of modernity in early twentieth-century Burma. It was simultaneously a resistance to the British Raj's imperial architecture and to the dominance of Indian 'Orientalism' or Indo-Saracenic architecture, by forming instead a distinctive 'Burmese modern' style. Its main mobiliser was the prominent legislator U Ba Pe, who – inspired by the advocacy of Basil Ward (a New Zealand-born, London-based Modernist) of the simple language of Asian architecture – made an impassioned case for a new civic building based on the traditional Burmese architecture in the Mandalay Kingdom's capital city of Bagan, with its fine Buddhist stupas and temples. Sithu U Tin's selected design married streamlined – almost Art Deco – vertical lines with Bagan ornamentation. The building contained a linear pavilion form of spaces lined with verandas, and central and corner articulations to house the key functions. But on this was overlaid a sophisticated, palatial three-tier roof (*pyatthat*), smaller temple-like turrets and delicate elongated arches of Buddhist ancestry, plus Burmese water serpents (*naga*) as ornaments. Located on Rangoon's central axis, the building proved that traditional sacred forms could also be legitimate sources for modern secular architecture, and marked the voice of Burmese civil society in influencing their own urban landscapes.

## Viceroy's Palace (now Rashtrapati Bhavan), New Delhi, India (1912–29)

[METADATA: ]

Located on the Raisina Hill – which required the clearing away of two existing villages) – and flanked by Herbert Baker's two **secretariat buildings** [METADATA: ] on either side of the approach axis, Edwin Lutyens's powerful design for the main Viceroy's Palace was the pivot of New Delhi's urban scheme. The building was arranged around a large square with multiple courtyards and had a grand Mughal-style garden at the rear. After a long debate, its architectural style was decided upon as that of Neoclassicism with Indian elements, to which Lutyens and Baker grudgingly agreed. Thus, onto an essentially Classical structure were grafted, in beige and red sandstone, various Indian elements such as domes, *chhatris* (domed pavilions), *jalis* (fretwork screens), *chajjas* (sunshades), corbelled arches and sculptures – sourced variously from Mughal monuments, Buddhist stupas and Jain temples. The monumental central dome on the Viceroy's Palace represented the humanistic rational strands of both East and West, but the rest – especially Lutyens's 'modern Classicism' – involved a simple insertion of Indian motifs. Ateliers were established in Delhi and Lahore, but in an unprecedented distinction made between artisanship and technology, or artisan and designer, the Indian craftsman was felt to be incapable of design or adapting to modern engineering techniques, and so his contribution was confined to delivering surface ornamentation.

[FIG 82.41 Viceroy's Palace, New Delhi]

## Gandhi Ashram, Sevagram, Maharashtra, India (1936 onwards)

[METADATA: ]

Sevagram in west-central India was Mahatma Gandhi's last ashram – he lived there from 1936 to his assassination in 1948 – and it embodied his social and political philosophy, as influenced by Leo Tolstoy and John Ruskin, of extreme simplicity, truth, self-sufficiency, non-violence and human equality. The settlement consisted of buildings such as the Bapu Kuti (for Gandhi), Ba Kuti (for Gandhi's wife), Desai House, the multi-purpose Adi Nivas, and others. Arranged loosely around a central space, the buildings were extremely spare and functional vernacular huts. Bapu Kuti for instance utilised traditional mud and bamboo, a simple rectangular plan subdivided into four spaces by mud plaster walls, and small slatted windows with bamboo mats. The roof consisted of semicircular country tiles on a simple timber structure. The architectural ethic cherished traditional workmanship and natural materials, and minimised their wasteful or indulgent use (forming a reference point for much post-colonial 'sustainable architecture'). Writers like Miki and Madhavi Desai have drawn attention to Gandhian architecture's multiple sources and parallels, including Modernism. But equally, it was arguably also a critique of Western functionalism's future outlook, being rooted in India's rural built-form, lifestyle and self-sufficiency through indigenous economy – as embodied in Gandhi's famous use of his *charkha* (spinning wheel) for cotton yarn and fabric.

### Further Reading

Alwis, Lakshman, Rohan C. Aluwihare and Dayapriya B. Navaratne, *British Period Architecture in Sri Lanka* (Colombo: Vashtu Shilpa, 2000)

Arnold, David, 'The Colonial Prison', in David Arnold and David Hardiman (eds), *Subaltern Studies VII: Essays in Honour of Ranajit Guha* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994): 148–84

Bremner, Alex George (ed.), *Architecture and Urbanism in the British Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Chattopadhyay, Swati, "'Metro Pattern": Art Deco Residences and Modern Visuality in Calcutta', in Partha Chatterjee, Tapati Guha-Thakurta and Kar Bodhisattva (eds), *New Cultural Histories of India: Materiality and Practices* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014): 373–408

Chattopadhyay, Swati, *Representing Calcutta: Modernity, Nationalism and the Colonial Uncanny* (London: Routledge, 2005)

- Chopra, Preeti, *A Joint Enterprise: Indian Elites and the Making of British Bombay* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2011)
- Cowell, Christopher, 'The Kacchā-Pakkā Divide: Material, Space and Architecture in the Military Cantonments of British India (1765–1889)', *ABE Journal [Online]* 9–10, December 2016
- Dutta, Arindam, *The Bureaucracy of Beauty: Design in the Age of its Global Reproducibility* (London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2006)
- Evenson, Norma, *The Indian Metropolis: A View Towards the West* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1989)
- Glover, William J., *Making Lahore Modern: Constructing and Imagining a Colonial City* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2008)
- Irving, Robert Grant, *Indian Summer: Lutyens, Baker, and Imperial Delhi* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1981)
- King, Anthony D., *Colonial Urban Development: Culture, Social Power and Environment* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976)
- King, Anthony D., *The Bungalow: The Production of a Global Culture*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)
- Lang, Jon T., Madhavi Desai and Miki Desai, *Architecture and Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Lewis, Su Lin, *Cities in Motion: Urban Life and Cosmopolitanism in Southeast Asia 1920–1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016)
- Metcalf, Barbara D., and Thomas R. Metcalf, *A Concise History of Modern India*, 3rd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Metcalf, Thomas R., *An Imperial Vision: Indian Architecture and Britain's Raj* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989)
- Mitter, Partha, *Art and Nationalism in Colonial India, 1850–1922: Occidental Orientations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Morris, Jan, and Simon Winchester, *Stones of Empire: The Buildings of the Raj* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983)
- Nilsson, Sten, *European Architecture in India, 1750–1850* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968)
- Pieris, Anoma, *Architecture and Nationalism in Sri Lanka: The Trouser under the Cloth* (London and New York, NY: Routledge, 2013)
- Scriver, Peter, and Prakash Vikramaditya, *Colonial Modernities: Building, Dwelling and Architecture in British India and Ceylon* (London: Routledge, 2007)

Sengupta, Tania, *Colonial Margins: Spatial Cultures of Provincial Governance in Nineteenth Century Eastern India* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2019)

Sugarman, Michael, 'Building Burma: Constructing Rangoon's Urban Influence on Citizenship and Nationhood', *History Compass*, 15 (2), 2016

Tillotson, Giles Henry Rupert, *The Tradition of Indian Architecture: Continuity, Controversy and Change since 1850* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989)

**Byline:**

Tania Sengupta is a Lecturer in Architectural History and Theory at the Bartlett School of Architecture, University of London, UK.