Environment and Planning A 2008, volume 40, pages 37 – 56

DOI:10.1068/a38460

Ambivalent improvements: biography, biopolitics, and colonial Delhi

Stephen Legg
School of Geography, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, England; e-mail: Stephen.Legg@nottingham.ac.uk
Received 11 November 2005; in revised form 24 May 2006; published online 20 July 2007

Abstract. This paper explores the ambivalent feelings towards the Government of India produced in one of the government's own employees. In establishing the Delhi Improvement Trust in the 1930s, Arthur Parke Hume had to battle against governmental cost cutting in an attempt to secure the rehousing of slum evictees. The refusal of the government to accept this welfarist commitment to investment led to the stalling of the improvement projects and great emotional disquiet for Hume. This is traced through his personal correspondence with his parents. In interweaving these insights with the imperial archive, three biographical approaches are adopted. A traditional chronology is used to order the events, an analytical approach is used to outline the discursive regularities of Hume's observations, and a genealogical approach is used to suggest the influences on Hume's writings and the broader governmental rationalities that he had to negotiate.

Introduction: ambivalence, antagonism, biography

On 3 August 1935 Arthur Parke Hume (1904 – 65) was commissioned by the Government of India to write a report on the relief of urban congestion in Old Delhi. This Mughal imperial capital, constructed between 1638 and 1648, was now bordered by the British imperial capital of New Delhi, constructed between 1911 and 1931. The transfer of the capital of British India from Calcutta had led to a population influx that New Delhi was unable to accommodate, leaving the 250-year-old walled city to absorb the excess (see Legg, 2007a). The recommendations of Hume's report were accepted and on 2 March 1937 the Delhi Improvement Trust came into being. Hume served as the Chairman of the Trust until 1941 (see figure 1). In his six years of official activity in Delhi, including a prior stint as Deputy Commissioner, Hume networked at the highest level of government, working with the Viceroy and Delhi's Chief Commissioner, as well as with other notables who passed through the capital. What is more, like so many of the Indian Civil Service (ICS), Hume had been born in India and spent his early childhood there, in a family inextricably welded to government in, and to the Government of, India.

Yet, Hume was by no means a conventional bureaucrat. His relationship with the Government of India was wrought with tension and feelings, at times, of utmost disgust. This came to a peak in 1941 when the government effectively blocked Hume's plans to institute a system of conditional rehousing before slum demolition. His argument in favour of heightened governmental responsibility towards the urban poor repeatedly met with the response that the systems had to be self-financing, which effectively disabled the proposals. As such, the story of Hume in Delhi best fits into the branch of colonial historiography that charts the "tensions of empire" (Stoler and Cooper, 1997). Such studies focus on the "entangled sympathies and antipathies", and the translated and transformed principles and prejudices, that emerged in colonial careers (Lambert and Howell, 2003, page 2). These tensions could focus on colonies as places of illiberal practices such as slavery or excessive violence (Mbembe, 2001; 2003). But they could also emerge through colonies' function as places of the production of alternative sexual formations (Stoler, 1995; 2002), not simply of their release (Hyam, 1990).

Figure 1. Delhi Improvement Trust, 1940. Hume is seated, fourth from left. (Centre of South Asian Studies, Cambridge. Hume papers. Permission requested.)

What Stoler has shown is that even mundane categories of social denomination had to be made and remade to fit the colonial context, imbricating race, class, gender, and sexuality (also see Mitchell, 2000).

As such, these tensions were not just spectacular or occasional; they were often banal and everyday. Within an individual, these tensions often manifested themselves as ambivalence [described by the Oxford English Dictionary (OED 1989) as "the coexistence in one person of contradictory emotions or attitudes (as love and hatred) towards a person or thing"]. The most influential postcolonial studies of this colonial ambivalence have explained it as a reaction to the difference of *race*. Homi Bhabha (1994) has studied how desire, anxiety, and ambiguity bridged the Manichean dichotomies of what Edward Said (1978) has termed Orientalism. The confrontation of the unstable stereotypes of colonialism, those fabricated Others to a fictitious European Self, with the radical heterogeneity of the colonised was said to create an unstable European psychic sphere (Moore-Gilbert, 1997, page 118). Bhabha (1994, page 86) suggested that the native, which was supposed to be both beyond comprehension

yet completely knowable, came to embody both mimicry and mockery, the basis of colonial ambivalence. While Bhabha is an invaluable addition to the postcolonial corpus, he, like Said, dwelled on written texts, without an attendant concentration on context and material grounding. Katharyne Mitchell (1997) was right to question the whereabouts of Bhabha's 'in-between spaces' and to promote the study of the economies, histories, and geographies of hybridity and ambivalence. The racial ambivalence that will be highlighted in this paper was very much a situated ambivalence that arose from the attempt to position Indians as simultaneously governable, in terms of modern calculation, and less civilised, in terms of colonial orientalism (Legg, 2006a).

Similar qualifiers can be suggested for another prominent writer on the concept of ambivalence. Zygmunt Bauman (1991) wrote on ambivalence in relation to modernity and the holocaust, rather than colonialism and the mimicking subject. Yet, for him, ambivalence emerged through the possibility of assigning an object or event more than one category. Ambivalence was thus a product of *language*, a failure of naming that led to acute discomfort, anxiety, and indecision. Yet, this failure was posed as the norm of language, given the epistemological fallacy of modernity that suggests that the world can be classified and segregated into discrete entities. In reality, such segregation requires coercion over the discrepancies of categorisation. Yet, Bauman (1991, page 15) also claims that ambivalence relies upon the effective discovery of proper technologies of ordering, and that modern ordering must be as much about practice as about thought: what Bauman termed the 'gardening' activities of the state. It was this urban trimming, planting, and planning that Hume was interested in, and from which his tensions emerged. (For comparable work see Kothari, 2005; 2006.)

Where Hume's ambivalence differs from that of Bhabha's race orientation and Bauman's linguistic emphasis is that he was ambivalent about his own race and its practices on the ground. Hume remained committed to the idea of Empire and the practice of working for the ICS. Yet, simultaneously, he often held the embodiment of the Empire in India and the head of the ICS, the Government of India, in complete contempt. Indeed, at times his vacillating ambivalence towards the government descended into outright antagonism [defined (OED 1989) as "the mutual resistance or active opposition of two opposing forces, physical or mental; active opposition to a force"]. While Hume's general ambivalence did concern issues of race and categorisation at times, it was much more about the applied problematics and realities of rule, what Michel Foucault referred to as *governmental rationalities* (2001a [1978]; for more work on these 'governmentalities' see Dean, 1999; Foucault, 1979; Gordon, 1991; Legg, 2005; Rose, 1996; 1999).

Foucault spoke of regimes of government that displayed consistency in their attempts to encourage conduct across epistemological realms such as the social, the economic, and the biopolitical. Yet, a regime could also display its own tensions, between financial and health demands or between the competing interests of rationalities that would lead to social stability, economic profit, or secured population reproduction, for example. It is at the intersection of these competing, if ultimately reconciled, rationalities of government that I locate Hume's antagonism towards the colonial government. The governmental space of India was one of intense contradictions. These were philosophical, as in the idea of a liberal Empire (Mehta, 1999), but they were also structural, in terms of uneven development.

In her study of colonial India, Manu Goswami (2004, page 14) has insisted upon complementing the foci of the cultural turn with attention to the broader social and economic processes of the state and of international networks. At this level, the Indian colonial state emerges as a 'force field' of immanent contradictions, one that attempted to homogenise social relations while deepening socioeconomic and cultural unevenness. These sorts of contradictions were increasingly debated at the international level.

One stance on the issue of 'colonial development' suggested that it should benefit local populations in terms of a 'sacred trust', taking in economic growth, social provision, nutritional standards, and labour protection (Betts, 1985; Constantine, 1984). Alternative perspectives favoured bringing colonies into the world trade system to further benefit the British economy whilst also developing their own. Leopold Amery in the interwar period followed Joseph Chamberlain's work in the late 19th century that suggested a managed development of the Empire (Butler, 1991, page 119), while Winston Churchill and Herbert Asquith recommended a similar incorporation along free trade lines. While the interwar years would see pressure mount on Britain to adopt more welfare-centred approaches in its Empire, the economic depression also placed colonial governments under financial pressures.

As such, Goswami (2004, page 29) claimed that the issue was not just one of discursive colonial governmentality, but also of uneven development and sociocultural dependencies. In this paper, I argue that Foucault's focus on material rationalities and the conduct of conduct in governmental rationalities (not govern *mentalities*) can, and must, accommodate not only the contradictions between different rationalities but also the coercive apparatuses that resolved these contradictions in favour of the sovereign power of the state (Legg, 2007b). The focus both on the material and on conduct will be maintained by examining Hume's personal negotiation of the everyday spaces of urban development that draws on the complexity and diversity of Delhi as an 'ordinary city' (Robinson, 2005). While Hume's personal ambivalence will be framed in the material context of Delhi and the administrative structures of the Government of India, his perspectives will actually be tapped through his personal correspondence with his mother and father. As such, this paper must necessarily negotiate the complex terrain of biography.

The role of life writing is undergoing something of a renaissance amongst geographers, especially those studying the colonial period (see Blunt, 1994; Daniels and Nash, 2004 and the papers in that special issue; Lambert and Howell, 2003; Myers, 2003). However, many geographers have distanced themselves from the practice of 'biography'. Instead, lives have been used to study discursive formations, regions, and the activities of people there, or the engagements of explorers. This has been explained by biographers' traditional lack of engagement with critical theory, and the emphasis of poststructural thought on the fluidity and performance of individual identity. As Thomas (2004, page 500) has claimed, this brought about a fear of the 'spotlight' model of biographical writing, which marginalised the role of other actors, influences or structures to the shadows whilst highlighting an essential self at the centre-stage of the narrative. David Lambert and Alan Lester (2006) have reviewed the substantial literature regarding biography writing, recounting the challenges posed by psychological theory and feminist critique but also emphasising the emergence of a school of 'new biography' that emphasises discontinuity, time shifts, and subjectivity as an always shifting nexus of influences [for comparative comments on the nature of place see Doreen Massey (2005)]

One way to approach this new biography is to focus on three approaches to life writing that are by no means incompatible. This is not to suggest a radically new mode of biography writing, but to pull together preexisting traditions into a flexible schema. These approaches will be referred to as chronological, analytical, and genealogical. The *chronological* approach has structured the tradition of biography writing, recounting an individual life from start to finish, picking out those events that are thought to mark out the significant points of interest in that life. This approach has the benefit of a detailed focus on the individual that can allow evolutions in thought over time to be traced, and can be enriched by nonlinear eruptions of memory or trauma. This emphasis can,

however, undervalue the influence of context, external events, other individuals, or societal norms. As Foucault commented:

> "there are coherences that one establishes at the level of an individual—his [sic] biography, or the unique circumstances of his discourse—but one can also establish them in accordance with broader guide-lines, one can give them the collective, diachronic dimensions of a period, a general form of consciousness, a type of society, a set of traditions, an imaginary landscape common to a whole culture" (1972, page 150).

The *analytical*, or archaeological, approach focuses on discourse, whether as external to the individual or as the discursive norms that have become apparent in an individuals' conduct. Such an approach may have to eschew chronological conventions in order to draw out discursive regularities over time. For example, in terms of an emphasis on external discursive conditions, Matthew Hannah's (2000, page 107) use of the governmentality literature to examine 19th-century America emphasised the structural over the biographical in his study of Francis A Walker. These structures articulated themselves in spatial awareness and, thus, subject positions regarding the abstraction, assortment, and compilation of information. Thus, the individual was used to read Walker's career, his context, and an early discourse of governmentality, rather than his inner self.

This approach can also be traced in Gerry Kearns's (1997) comparative study of the imperial subjectivities of Mary Kingsley and Halford Mackinder. Kearns showed that geographical discourses were used in personal subjectification, but in ways specific to each individuals' self-willed conduct (Foucault, 1986a, as cited by Kearns, 1997). As such, the individual negotiation of the broader and overlapping discourses of geography, race, sexuality, and gender was traced through the life narratives of a masculine imperialist and a female explorer. This emphasis on the internalisation of discursive norms was also present in the work of David Spurr (1993), who has shown how Said's general Orientalist discourses were internalised and reconfigured through twelve rhetorical devices (surveillance, appropriation, aestheticisation, classification, debasement, negation, affirmation, idealisation, insubstantialisation, naturalisation, eroticisation, and resistance). While attuned to the social nature of the self, such an approach can, however, slip into discursive determinism, viewing the individual as the product of so many externalities, without giving sufficient leverage to free will, choice, whim, desire, or conscious resistance. While Foucault fought in his latter life to temper the image of himself as a Nietzschean madman in the academic marketplace, perpetually proclaiming the death of the subject, his emphasis on self-conduct, resistance as inseparable from power, and the rule of freedom (Foucault, 1986a; 1986b; 2001b [1982]; also see Joyce, 2003; Rose, 1999) has not always been used in conjunction with his earlier archaeological works (Foucault, 1970; 1972). As Paul Rabinow (1989, page 16) claimed in justifying his focus on individual planners, architects, and social theorists, these people should be studied not for their genius or because they represent a culture, but because they embodied a particular practice and ethos as pragmatic technicians of society.

The third perspective also draws inspiration from the second stage of Foucault's career, but addresses a mode of investigation rather than a mode of being. The *genealogical* approach seeks to provide a history of the present, working back from an event through time and across space to denaturalise a phenomenon and expose its multiple origins (Foucault, 1977; 1979; also see Dean, 1994). As an approach to an individual's life, this method bears much in common with an analytical approach, but is aligned to historical investigation and a more complicated narrative. Genealogy must tack back and forth between a present and the multiple pasts that inform it. An ideal

genealogical biography would, technically, work backwards from moments in an individual's life to the multiple and fractured origins of the influences and conditions in which those moments were made possible. Such an approach must, of course, rely upon chronological and analytical techniques. Some chronology would be required to chart the life within which actions or events occurred, which can be illuminated by a genealogical investigation, while each genealogy will be tracing an object, event, or opinion with its own discursive formations, which roams through or beyond its place-specific, and period-specific, episteme. As such, the three approaches are not mutually incompatible but, rather, can serve to highlight particular parts of an individual's life.

This paper will articulate these approaches in combination to shed light on the origins and development of Hume's antagonistic attitude towards the Government of India and its effects on the ground. Firstly, chronological and analytical approaches will be combined to examine Hume's early life and the rhetorical tropes of his personality that came to the fore when he arrived in Delhi. Secondly, chronological and genealogical analyses will be combined to frame his preparation of the report and the operation of the trust. Here, Hume will be shown to have admired the writings and work of men who argued for the broader obligations of the state to the Indian people. Thirdly, analytical and genealogical approaches will be combined to review Hume's clash with the government over the issue of rehousing the poor. This clash will show Hume relying on previously configured attitudes that had called for an embryonic welfare state (for a comparable discussion see Jones, 2002, page 288; Lal, 1994, page 37). The dilemma between welfare commitments and the financial urge for profit will also show itself to be a broader analytical one of liberal colonial governmentality in terms of social and biopolitical, versus economic, rationalities. This was a debate which had been played out in mid-19th-century England, in terms of the areas in which market forces could not be trusted and the adaptive strategies of public health and private property reform that resulted (Kearns, 1987). However, the export of private enterprise from England to India had not been followed by the collectivism that obliged the government to invest in local health.

Imperial circuits: Hume 1904 – 37

Chronology

Collection D724 of the India Office Private Papers, housed in London's British Library, contains the deposit of the Hume family. It is the stuff of which traditional biographers' dreams are made. The collection holds over 7000 items—namely, letters, diaries, personal papers, scrapbooks, news cuttings, and photographs from Andrew Parke Hume, his parents, and his sister. Yet, it is important to remember that a chronology constructed from this archive must necessarily be incomplete and open to multiple acts of interpretation, despite the relatively comprehensive coverage of Hume and his family.

The family correspondence covers the life of Arthur Henry Bliss Hume (1868 – 1960), who was born in Colombo to a Ceylonese civil servant father. He spent much of his life working for governments in India and throughout the Empire. His peripatetic career provided early motivation for his son Andrew Hume to become a regular correspondent, the product of which forms the rest of the collection. Hume was born in Mussoorie, a hill station at the base of the Himalayas, in 1904 and was educated at home. During his youth Hume toured various parts of India and was often stationed in Delhi, doing his reading in the Hardinge Library just north of Chandni Chowk, the main thoroughfare in Old Delhi. He often escaped his parents' surveillance to scour the forbidden bazaars of Chandni Chowk, as his sister would later recall.[1]

[1] British Library, London/Oriental and India Office Library/India Office Private Papers/European Manuscripts (henceforth MSS EUR)/A201.

Hume was sent to Europe in 1919 for schooling in England and the Continent, before matriculating at King's College, Cambridge, in 1923. Having completed a modern languages degree in 1926, Hume took the ICS exams at King's the following year. The exams were a crash course in imperial subject formation, conducting in advance the conduct of those men who would administer the subcontinent. Hume spent the summer 'cramming' knowledge of the Indian Penal Code, the Indian Procedure Code, and all that would be needed to fulfil the role of a district magistrate, including a knowledge of Hindi and Urdu, to which he added Sanskrit and Persian. Such skills embedded the latent ambivalence between the ICS and the Government of India within each graduate heading for India. Each civil servant was trained to the highest degree so as to be able to negotiate complex situations on the ground, which would require expertise and expense. The central finance department, however, demanded efficiency, in terms of time and cost, which often undermined and frustrated the efforts of other members of the ICS. As such, Hume's rage and ambivalence was to a degree structured and institutional, but not everyone put this structural space into voice and action.

Having passed the exam, Hume joined the ICS in 1927 and served in various Indian provinces until 1934. In 1935 he was promoted to Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, serving as the Chief Commissioner's second hand, while in 1936 he was further promoted to become an additional departmental secretary in the Department of Education, Health, and Lands. It was his experience in this department, and in Delhi, that marked him out for selection in August 1935 to compile the *Report on the Relief of Congestion in Delhi* (1936). Hume's investigations took place over the following year, with the report being submitted on 12 June 1936 and made public in March 1937.[2] On Hume's recommendation, the Delhi Improvement Trust was formed under his chairmanship later that year. The report and the trust will be dealt with in the next section.

Hume's experiences by no means crystallised an 'essential' identity that would weather the different climates and conditions of his future career. They did, however, play a role in forming the individual that confronted Delhi's congestion in the mid-1930s. This was not an abstract subject, but an impassioned individual who, his sister suggested, was prone to bouts of depression.[3] This is confirmed in his correspondence, the mode of address in which must also be borne in mind. Unless noted, the quotations below are from Hume's letters to his parents, whom he obviously loved and respected very much. These letters were not widely aired, and were thus licensed to moments of exaggeration and excess in a way that public statements or guarded correspondence with colleagues or friends might not have been. The reason why such sources can be confidently used is that the views discussed here are consonant with Hume's policies and practice as documented in the broader colonial archive (see Legg, 2007a, pages 164 – 209). It is the raw openness of Hume's letters that allows us some insight into his negotiation of the contested discursive terrain of colonial India.

Analysis: reactions to Delhi

This preliminary scout of Hume's personality covers the period from January 1935, just after his arrival in Delhi ahead of his deputy commissionership, until March 1937, when his report was issued. As such, the analytical categories adopted here seem most relevant to Hume's embodied and emplaced mode of perception and action in this period and place. It was there and then that he refamiliarised himself with Delhi, experienced his most senior negotiations to date with the Government of India, and explored himself as a single man in his early thirties. This analysis will dwell, firstly, on

[2] Delhi State Archives (henceforth DSA)/Confidential Files/Education/1937/12B.

[3] MSS EUR/A201.

Hume's ambivalence towards the government, in terms of its geographies, performances, finances, and administration. The following analysis will examine Hume's positions with regards to race and religion.

Government

One of the greatest benefits to emerge from the confluence of geography and biography is the emphasis on the formative influence of place and the often mobile connections between dwelling and identity (Blunt, 2005). Lambert and Lester (2006) have stressed how both people and places can be understood as nodes of multiple trajectories (Massey, 2005). But place can also be used as a metaphorical means of negotiating the landscape (Duncan and Barnes, 1992; Duncan and Ley, 1993) and it was in this sense that Delhi first impacted upon Hume's correspondence. He wrote on 17 January 1935 of his shock at the contrast between the new town, dress, and pavements, as compared with the fields, open air, and jungle of his previous posting. He did speak of his admiration for New Delhi's layout, squares, and towers.[4] But he also questioned whether such lavish expenditure was justifiable or desirable in the postwar years when the tax burden had been rising. Four days later he wrote home again in a foul mood, complaining of the "depressing atmosphere everywhere". The new city was written off as a "white sepulchre itself like a plaster city built up in some Hollywood studio to be knocked down by an earthquake as a scene in a master-cinema production ... a vast city of deserted streets and avenues."

After his acceptance of the report commission, Hume's position with regards to New Delhi began to solidify into a geographical critique of government policy that would recur throughout his correspondence. On August 4th 1935 Hume claimed that the old city was hemmed in on all sides and had been overcongested for years, but that the government had failed to devise a policy for Old Delhi, lavishing all its interest and money on the new city. On 18 August, Hume claimed that he would have no qualms about informing the government that Old Delhi had already waited twenty years in squalor and slums for improvement while it poured out its gold into the imperial new capital. He was further maddened when the Government refused to fund an air survey of the city for a few thousand rupees, writing on 16 February 1936 that when it came to New Delhi the government talked in terms of *crores* (tens of million) not thousands.

While we must read in this landscape critique Hume's dawning awareness of the task that lay ahead of him, his views are also consonant with a more widespread disrespect and questioning of the central government. This in part comes from his upbringing. Hume regarded a future chief commissioner's respect for the Government of India (GoI) as 'unwholesome' and claimed that: "I have never forgotten Uncle Willie's remark that the GoI are always in a state of fear, frightened of everything and everybody. There is something in that and the treatment they respond to best is mule-like kicks in the pants" (3 September 1940). Hume's father had worked at the rougher fringes of the government, serving the Royal Engineers, the Survey of India Department, and the balloon section, and probably had little time for the tasselled finery of the Raj's invented traditions (Cohn, 1983).

Andrew Hume certainly did not. He was particularly scathing of the performative aspects of government. On 23 March 1935, Hume claimed that the atmosphere created by the Viceroy at a violin concert "really sticks in my nostrils. If I go to hear an expert play the violin, I do not want my attention distracted by a lot of ridiculous old men with enamel trinkets tied around their necks bowing and scraping." When, as Deputy

[4] MSS EUR/D724. Unless noted, these references refer to Hume's correspondence with his parents in volumes 1 to 3.

Commissioner, he was forced to perform this role when the Viceroy left Delhi, he wrote home in a nonamicable mood, having been "rigged out like a bridegroom for their Excellencies departure; I had the honour (yes) and pleasure (no) to attend" (14 April 1935). Hume was glad to be rid of the governing elite as they departed Delhi for the summer "to stir up strife and violition [sic] in the four corners of India, the Govnt. of India having returned to its mountain fortress to brood over the future and regret the past, Delhi settles down to a peaceful hot weather" (14 April 1935). This fortress was Simla, the hill station to which the capital transferred each summer, also referred to sardonically as the "abode of the Gods" (18 – 19 August 1935). Hume could not restrain himself even when called to Simla itself. While participating in the birthday celebrations of King Edward VIII he derisively wrote home about his "gorgeous fancy dress of blue and gold" (27 June 1936).

Yet, as Hume came to work in closer collaboration with the central government, his disdain spread from its performance to its practice. One strand of this distaste concerned governmental finances and cost cutting. He noted in a letter of 4 August 1935 that the congestion report was not to be given any special monies and would have to be funded by cuts in Delhi's budget. Having agreed the mission he was exasperated to find that he had initially only been allotted three months to complete it. On the 6 September 1935 he wrote of a "battle royal" to secure himself some leave, which would allow the technical surveys to be completed in his absence. While he won this battle, he failed to secure an air survey, his fury at which has already been shown. Hume finally succumbed to this pressure when he gave the government the impression that the trust could reap it rich profit, whilst also being of benefit to the city. The consequences of this impression would be keenly felt in later years.

In terms of administration, Hume became increasingly disillusioned. Four months after the submission of his report, he wrote on 12 October 1936 of still making discoveries that could have aided his report had he been given more time. He did, however, claim that he "was not ill informed compared to what I might have been if this GoI had had the foresight of a woodlouse." As he tried to organise the formation of the trust he expressed his amazement, on 12 October 1936, at the irresistible temptation of the Government of India to interfere and make things as complicated as possible. Even in his own attempts to procure a house in New Delhi, he announced his usual tedious fights with "bone-headed bureaucrats" (1 December 1936).

In practice, it was these individuals that Hume encountered, not some abstract "G[overnment] o[f] I[ndia]", and he used this to his advantage. On arriving in Delhi in January 1935 he sought out an old friend from King's College, and would later call on favours from his contacts in New Delhi. Yet, in his writings it is the Government of India that figures as an emblem of what Hume felt he had to fight against, causing huge tensions within the functioning of the Delhi Improvement Trust. These tensions would certainly increase as Hume attempted to put his plans into action, but he also at times expressed contempt for his Indian colleagues and the occupants of the city he was to work on.

Race and religion

> "Is it that contact with Indians, with their evil and slipshod manners and customs, have already so far depraved our own standards? I think the red haze of the eclipse is fast setting over India."
>
> Hume (21 January 1935)

The above statement was written by Hume on his previously mentioned day of "depressing atmosphere" and represents the starkest expression of his racial emotions. Although at times incredibly similar to Bhabha's diagnosis with regards to colonial

ambivalence arising from 'native' mimicry, Hume also despaired of Indian capabilities in administration, as he also did of his superiors. Shortly after arriving in Delhi he claimed, on 3 February 1935, that the history of the Indian nationalist movement showed that Indians could not yet manage to work together. He also wrote of the customary amusement at the nationalist Congress Party members obstructing the Legislative Assembly, yet concluded that: "On the other hand, it is to creatures like this that we are working over time to hand over all our traditions & efforts to improve this land" (17 January 1935). These views seemed to be confirmed in his future dealings with the Delhi Municipal Committee (DMC).

Many of Hume's most caustic comments were committed to his personal diaries. These were daily organisers more than confessional volumes, but were occasionally scribbled in with striking prose. On 18 April 1935 Hume chaired a meeting of the DMC, of which he was automatically made President having become Deputy Commissioner the previous month. He noted in his diary that the meeting was painful, and that it was almost unbelievable how incompetent the City Fathers could be. The DMC offices were described as filthy, decaying, overcrowded, and terrible. While this need not be interpreted as a racially oriented observation, the diary entry of 25 April 1935 clearly demonstrated the debasing and naturalising rhetoric of Empire that Spurr (1993) described:

> "The futility of these birds, with brains like liquid manure which dribbles through a spout is sometimes past endurance. For sheer inefficiency and utter incompetence the Delhi Municipal Committee must be quite unsurpassed. We are to blame: we have allowed them to think they can do something: they themselves know they can't."

Here, Hume hints at discomfort with municipal mimicry of roles and performances obviously, in his eyes, best left to the ICS. Yet, this ambivalence resurfaced at the higher echelons of government when Hume was faced with an Indian superior. G S Bajpai was head of the Department of Education, Health, and Lands, to which Hume was answerable when compiling his report. Bajpai was a harsh critic and often forced Hume to change his plans to make the report, and later the trust, conform to government policy. A friend had warned him that "no one suspected Bajpai of honesty" (18 August 1935) and when the two met soon afterwards Hume wrote that Bajpai was "a little bania,[5] scarcely up to my shoulders" (31 August 1935). Hume continued to meet Bajpai into the next year and confided in his diary that he hoped he would not have to do it often: "I am not prone to aversions, but Bajpai makes my stomach revolt."[6] Of a later meeting, on 26 May 1936, Hume wrote to his parents of another "comic" meeting with "Bagpipes" (Bajpai): "He wagged his fat little black bania's finger at me and drivelled something about an incomplete report being worse than none at all ... I don't think I have been warned or admonished by an Aryan brother before and for a moment felt a quite violent physical sensation of extreme annoyance." Hume's depiction of his very corporeal and embodied reaction to Bajpai hints at a more deep-seated unease with regards to status and race than can be written off as fatigue and annoyance a few weeks before his report would be submitted.

This ambivalence continued over the weeks following the submission of the report. On 22 June 1936 he wrote that Bajpai had been in the ICS since 1921 and was very capable, if pompous, although he dismissed him again in a letter five days later: "Out of little 'Baj', the dusky knight, I can get nothing, a master of ambiguity and prevarication." Likewise, Hume continued to adopt crude racial stereotypes throughout his correspondence. On 25 October 1936 Hume wrote of his struggles to find accommodation because

[5] Bania referred to a Hindu from the shopkeeper or merchant *Banya* caste, used to refer to moneymakers.

[6] MSS EUR/D724/volume 70/5 February 1936 diary entry.

most of the houses were "too woggish[7] to be inhabited by the likes of us." He similarly riled, on 1 December 1936, against the "babu mind"[8] that obstructed his attempts to get better housing. As such, there is no doubt that an unpleasant streak of racialist thinking penetrated Hume's personality. However, this must be tempered by his previously displayed lack of temper with regards to inefficiency or obstruction, which was provoked by the DMC and Bajpai. Hume's attitudes to race will be returned to, but in the context of his specifically Christian worldview.

Hume was heavily Christian and his belief pervaded his criticisms of those around him, and his aspirations for the work of the trust. On arriving in Delhi he commented, on 21 January 1935, that it was difficult to find a place to worship among the godless community out there, referring to the Europeans, not Indians. Yet, his faith would guide him, and he wrote on 4 August 1935 when considering taking up the report commission that: "Perhaps it is intended that I shall come to a position of authority and there try to stand firm for those principles which we know to be right and which now seem almost extinct." These principles were clarified in a later letter, from 6 September 1936, as being Christian ideals to be enforced as the motive power of everyday official public activity. In his writing of the report Hume also claimed on 12 December 1936 to be guided by Providence, and, when the trust office was finally opened, he wrote on 14 March 1937 that the Ten Commandments were hung on the wall.

Genealogies of the report: Hume 1936 – 37

The previous combination of chronology and analysis drew upon Hume's life trajectories. These passed through his ICS training, his family upbringing and his colonial career in the provinces, and came to affect his chairmanship of the trust. In this section, I seek to broaden the scope of influences on Hume's writings and career through complementing the chronological period of the report's completion with some genealogies that suggest themselves from the archive. Such genealogies are necessarily Janus faced, looking forward to their future influence as well as backward to their multiple origins. Various other traces in the archive do, of course, suggest themselves, but do not appear to have had an effect on the report's constitution. Hume was obviously part of a long tradition emanating from European town planning. He was inspired by 20th-century advances in housing provision and urban technologies. Yet, Hume's work also fits into particularly Indian trajectories. The two brief genealogies outlined here refer to an urban planner of whom Hume wrote with admiration, and the ideas of two Indian advisors to the municipality who worked with Hume himself [see Legg (2006a) for other arguments made in Delhi in favour of rehousing and housing cooperatives]. All three people managed, in different ways, to convey to Hume that an alternative model of improvement to the sanitation-based and engineering-based solutions of the past would be possible.

J P Orr, Patrick Geddes, and the Bombay Improvement Trust

On 6 February 1936, Hume wrote in his diary that he was reading Orr's lectures on Bombay slum clearance and the Improvement Trust, and that he felt the broad principles seemed good. J P Orr had been the chairman of the Bombay Improvement Trust and had published his lectures of 1917 on *Social Reform and Slum Reform* (Orr, 1918). In 1898 the Bombay Improvement Trust had become the first trust to be founded in India, in response to the threat of plague and disease in one of the country's

[7] *Wog* is defined as a "vulgarly offensive name for a foreigner" (OED 1989).

[8] *Babu* was originally a Hindu title of respect, akin to an English Mr or Esquire, which later came to refer to native clerks or officials. The term was often applied disparagingly to Indians with superficial English educations.

foremost ports (Kidambe, 2001, page 60). However, the trust failed to learn the British lesson with regards to the necessity of housing provision rather than just demolition (Hazareesingh, 2001, page 240). It was forced to prioritise profit making over working-class rehousing, causing an actual exacerbation of existing conditions between 1903 and 1913 as inflation forced workers to subdivide tenements in order to survive.

It was in this context that Patrick Geddes arrived in Bombay with his exhibition on "cities and town planning" (Hazareesingh, 2000, page 803). While continuing to tour the country creating reports on his town planning perspective, Geddes took up the newly created professorship of civics and sociology at the University of Bombay, which he would occupy until 1923. Geddes had established himself in Edinburgh as a polymath, expanding from his background in botany to interests in sociology and town improvement (Matless, 2000; Meller, 1993; Welter, 2002; Welter and Lawson, 2000). Like Hume, Geddes reacted against New Delhi's lack of spirituality and the cost of construction, and proposed his own techniques of diagnostic survey and conservative surgery to improve traditional towns (Leonard, 2004). The former technique involved a detailed study of the history, society, cultures, and material form of the urban environment, with a special emphasis on the home (Tyrwhitt, 1947, pages 24 – 39). The themes of a survey would include: the natural geography; means of communication and water supply; industry, manufacture and commerce; population; town conditions; and town planning suggestions (Welter, 2002, page 110). Conservative surgery aimed to halt large-scale slum demolition and dehousing by simply enlarging old lanes and removing the most dilapidated houses. Thus, while not questioning the imperial framework and still operating within what Volker Welter (2002, page 119) terms a 'patronising Edwardian attitude' to the urban environment, Geddes did provide a radically different approach to urban improvement than the sanitary engineering tradition of urban clearance and Western infrastructure.

Geddes displayed many of these principles in his 1915 Bombay exhibition (Hazareesingh, 2000, page 803). While Orr did not reference Geddes in his printed lectures, it would seem that there are clear overlaps between the two urban planners. Both authors argued against viewing spatial organisation as being separate to social relations, and Orr's (1918, page 1) opening argument was that "slum reform must follow social reform". Like Hume, Orr's task was to solve congestion. He identified this congestion as being of two types: houses in an area; and people in houses (page 19). Orr recommended not only legislation, but also the fermentation of social discontent that would demand and promote higher standards. While unhygienic houses should be demolished, without rehousing this would simply move slums around the city. As such, Orr's guiding principle was that preventative measures must precede remedial measures. In existing areas, Orr conformed to Geddes's conservative surgery by recommending the enforcing of minimum standards rather than demolition, and only evicting inhabitants of unfit buildings when they had somewhere else to live. While this rehousing would necessitate a financial loss, Orr (1918, page 7) argued that the increase in health and decrease in crime would recoup these costs from hospitals and the police.

Some of these principles would find their way into Hume's report, although others asserted themselves only when he tackled the challenges of the trust on the ground. In doing this he was aided by two men of great local experience, who were also committed to holistic, urban improvement. This is what Geddes referred to when compiling his Madras report as the promotion of life—that is, planning for life and people, not just mechanically planning places (Meller, 1982, page 13).

K S Sethna, Sohan Lal, and urban health

Between October 1935 and January 1936 Hume took the leave he had won at his "battle royal". On return he noted in his diary that "Sohan Lal" and "Sethna" visited him.[9] Both figures had been working on the technical surveys during Hume's leave and they also worked closely with him on his return. *Rai Bahadur*[10] Sohan Lal had an established career history of involvement in urban planning due to his long-standing role as secretary of the Municipal Committee. In 1927 the Government of India made funds available for modest schemes of improvement in the city, and Sohan Lal was asked for his recommendations.[11] He responded with a list of twenty-one recommendations, which he summarised in the following six points: improved drainage; slum removal; public gardens; city extensions; more land for building; and housing provision for the poor and middles classes through cooperative societies.

While focusing on traditional sanitarian responses to congestion like slum clearance and drainage, Sohan Lal emphasised that expensive street widening was not the answer. His solution lay not in the streets or bye lanes but in the houses where disease, especially tuberculosis, was rampant. The houses were built densely, but it was overcrowding *in* houses that was the real problem. Inflation had pushed up rents but not wages, leading to subdivision of apartments. The only answer was expansion of the city, although particularly bad slums could be demolished. To rehouse those living in slums cooperative societies were recommended, which would build houses in which the rents paid would contribute to the eventual house purchase. These recommendations, so like those of Geddes in many respects, were agreed upon in most senses by the Deputy Commissioner at the time, but received no funding. It was only when medical evidence was provided of the domestic health crisis in Delhi that action was taken, and this evidence came from Sethna.

During Hume's leave Sethna had helped sample localities in all seventeen wards of the city and had worked out the average space occupied per person in each home. Sethna and Sohan Lal met Hume again on 7 February at the DMC Hall on Chandni Chowk. It was agreed that Sethna would make a complete house-to-house survey of two wards to calculate a more complete average space per person per house. Sethna also contributed indirectly to the congestion report through the health reports he had been compiling on Delhi since the late 1920s, which were quoted in Hume's report. In other capacities Sethna had been working on public health in Delhi since 1915 and his writings reveal much in common with the promotion of life that Geddes proposed.

Sethna was obviously passionate about public health in Delhi and continually worked to pressure the central government into action. He had been trained in London and Cambridge and managed to balance an awareness of the advances in international health standards with an appreciation of the specificities of the colonial context. Over the following ten years, the congestion continued to grow in intensity in Delhi, as the health standards continued to fall. Sethna produced annual reports that chart the transition of barren lands into thickly crowded *basties* (slums). His report for 1929 claimed that the overcrowding had "worsened the living conditions of the people dwelling in surroundings most unfavourable to the sustenance of human life" (Sethna, 1930). These conditions were related specifically to the urban infrastructure, in terms of the conditions the poor were forced to live in. These one-room tenements, which often housed several families, had little ventilation and created unsanitary houses and surroundings. Six years before Hume's commission, Sethna had been insisting that a systematic, regular, and well-chalked-out plan of improvement was required. In concluding his report, Sethna listed

[9] MSS EUR/D724/ volume 70/4 February 1936 diary entry.

[10] An Indian acknowledgement of social standing.

[11] DSA/Chief Commissioner's files (henceforth CC)/Home/1930/29B.

forty-two needs of the city. Many of these points conformed to traditional sanitary engineering: ten referred to drainage and nine to sewerage. Yet, the other points hinted at a wider conception of public health, referring to cleaner markets, green spaces, city extensions, hospitals, and schooling.

This movement to a more social conception of health was continued in Sethna's report for 1930. Tuberculosis was explicitly stated to be a "social disease" or "house disease" that was connected to overcrowding and bad ventilation (Sethna, 1931). Sethna acknowledged that much had been done for the city in terms of drains, markets, and roads, but that public health was still not being protected and that "ignorance, prejudice and ingrained habits and customs opposed to sanitation have to be surmounted." The firmest declaration of Sethna's developed viewpoint came in the report of 1937, which marked his retirement after 24 years of service in Delhi (Sethna, 1938). Echoing the sentiments of Orr and Geddes, Sethna claimed that the cost of preserving public health was great, but that it was less than the costs of disease and that spending should target prevention. The suppression of disease was thus the beginning, not the end, of his task. Public health had evolved from prevention of diseases to the positive appeal for health, and he insisted that this appeal should begin in the home.

Sethna had appealed to the government to improve the city extensions and relieve congestion. These themes were directly taken up by Hume's report. Yet, he also argued for a deeper and more complex form of urban governance that would be influential in Hume's guidance of the trust. In appealing for this he was making more elaborate claims for Sohan Lal's insistence on moving people out of the city, and on providing means for them to be housed. This was a policy that Hume eventually adopted. In much of both his private and his public correspondence he intimated that this was a first in India, and his passion for this cause could appear to be of solely personal inspiration or a product of his Christian ethic. What these genealogies suggest is that Hume was tapping into an older stream of thought that had been impressed upon him by men who had decades of experience of the complexities of Delhi's population and health geographies. It was into this complexity, alongside the administrative interests of the Government of India, that Hume launched the Delhi Improvement Trust in 1937.

Conflicting governmentalities: Hume 1937 – 41

The form of Hume's *Report on the Relief of Congestion in Delhi* (Hume, 1936) and the specific activities of the Delhi Improvement Trust (1940; 1942) are not the focus of this paper (see Hosagrahar, 2005, pages 156 – 180; Legg, 2007a, pages 164 – 209). The report itself was certainly not a diagnostic survey in the Geddesian tradition, but it did display some of the six themes of a survey that Welter (2002) commented upon. The report charted the 'town conditions', relaying how the mismanagement of the land had led to gross congestion, which was followed by the 'town planning suggestions' that formed the basis of the Delhi Improvement Trust. The congestion was portrayed through an analysis of the 'population', in which the surveys that Sethna and Sohan Lal had contributed to were used to estimate the excess population, based on density in houses. The report echoed Orr in its analysis of 'houses on land and people in houses'. This emphasis on the home was in line with the previously outlined genealogies, yet the report did not significantly consider housing provision nor did it sufficiently consider the other diagnostic factors such as communication, water supply, industry, or culture (Legg, 2006a).

The trust itself focused on schemes of city extension and relatively restrained slum demolition, and in this sense conformed to Orr's vision. However, the Delhi Improvement Trust did not involve itself in social reform, and its greatest failing came with regards to poor-class rehousing. Hume *did* push for projects of this sort, but found the

government less and less willing to subsidise these projects. This was especially the case in the financially stringent war years, despite the increased congestion brought about by the flocking of bureaucrats and the military to the capital. This led to intense frustration for Hume as his quest as an administrator, and Christian, was thwarted. This process will be charted through returning to an analytical exploration of Hume's correspondence, describing the evolution of his feelings towards government, race, and religion. In conclusion, a more genealogical approach will be adopted in order to explain the feelings described in Hume's correspondence. This will explore the broader tensions between biopolitical and financial rationalities at play in late-colonial Indian governmentality.

Analysis: from ambivalence to antagonism

Government

From the very beginning of the trust's activity, Hume found the Government of India representatives intolerable. Even when debating the foundation of the Delhi Improvement Trust in February 1937, Hume blamed the government's "lack of guts" and "fear of offending" for curtailing the trust's powers of notification (to forcibly acquire land) and insisting on the retention of a large degree of financial control.[12] When Hume submitted the first schemes for sanction, the government immediately raised questions about how the money would be spent. Hume reacted furiously, writing to his parents that: "They are an arid body, the worthy of the G of I lacking vision, courage, Christianity, and inspiration. I can't think of anything else to say against them.' (15 June 1937).

Hume did enjoy pushing some of the schemes through during 1937 – 38 and gained the support of Viceroy Linlithgow for his work. From April to December 1938, Hume was on leave in England and found on his return that there had been little progress as a result of financial difficulties. He immediately turned his attention to rehousing, having seen such schemes in operation in England. He found the Chief Health Officer and the Chief Commissioner in agreement that, in the latter's words, rehousing was "a statutory obligation, to all extent that is reasonable and necessary."[13]

Hume was buoyed by this atmosphere and wrote, in the face of government interference, on 26th March 1939: "Nevertheless we shall leave a great and lasting impression on Delhi and shall have done some pioneer work in India in arousing moral consciousness about slum evils in cities." Hume claimed a success on 16 July when the government seemed to admit that decent housing conditions for the very poor were a public responsibility. An entertainments tax was created which would subsidise rehousing from slums, which was claimed to be a first in British India. In October 1939, Hume was looking forward to the next year when the poor-class housing would be built at 50% public expense, and would also be available for hire-purchase. Hume wrote on 19 November 1939 that he had succeeded in getting the government to agree to an English-style rehousing policy:

> "That is to say the start of a recognition has been made that miserable housing conditions are a public slur, that it is the duty of the Government to do something to improve conditions and that improvement is expensive and needs public funds."

Hume reported his experiences at a government conference on industrial housing in January 1940 to the Chief Commissioner. He boasted of Delhi's superior approach in comparison with other regions in India and insisted, in terms reminiscent of Orr, upon the need for a "wider sociological standpoint of slum clearance and providing proper accommodation for the very poor."[14] However, the government immediately

[12] MSS EUR/D724/6 February 1937; Delhi Improvement Trust, 1937.

[13] DSA/CC/Local Self Government (LSG)/1938/499.

[14] DSA/CC/LSG/1940/1(40).

started pressuring Hume to make the houses cheaper after 137 model houses had been constructed. Financial backing was delayed and by October 1940 there had still been no progress; yet Hume was confident that 5000 poor-class houses would be built the following year, which would mean that "a new epoch has opened in the history of housing for the poor of Indian cities" (2 February 1941). However, there was still little progress, with only seventy-two families rehoused in November 1940, and thirty-two planned to be rehoused for January 1941. Even this slow development was blocked on 10 January 1941 when the government insisted that no more houses would be subsidised. Hume reacted furiously to this decision, which put an end to his plans for housing provision, and caused the stalling of the slum demolition schemes that depended on rehousing. On 23 February 1941 he wrote to his parents that the trust was doing its best in the wartime conditions, while facing the "semi-civilised" attitudes of the government:

> "They have yet to learn that there are some things the success, nay, the urgency of which must be computed otherwise than in terms of rupees, annas and pies.[15] The provision of conditions fit for human habitation is one of them. My particular game of bricks without straw is to produce slum clearance schemes which by hypothesis cannot show a profit in terms of rupees .... If I can do this the bania instincts of the G of I grasp eagerly at it, if I can't they shake their heads sadly and say how sad it is that people must live in a mess, but surely it is none of their affair."

This marked the end of hopes not only for a large-scale rehousing of the poor in Delhi, but also for Hume's career in Delhi. His tenure as Chairman of the Delhi Improvement Trust ended in April 1941 and he was promoted to the Supply Department. He returned to Delhi in 1944 to organise the rationing programme, and remained in an antagonistic position with regard to his employers. He continued to refer to the government as confused and obstructive (9 January 1944), and accused them of lying and racial discrimination against Europeans when an Indian civil servant of lower rank was promoted to a level Hume had been denied (13 February 1944). Hume insisted that his decision was not clouded by his views on issues of race, but his feelings towards Indian people had continued to make themselves felt in his correspondence.

Race and religion

Hume remained committed to his Christian faith, although these sentiments were more in evidence during his rationing work of 1944, during some of the darkest times of the war, than they were during the rehousing crisis. Many of his comments during his Chairmanship, however, were racially inflected. His frustration with the DMC continued, Hume blaming them in part for the state Delhi had ended up in, and accusing them on 28 February 1937 of "spluttering and face saving" when the Delhi Improvement Trust was unveiled. In negotiating land transfers and shared responsibilities with the DMC, Hume was frustrated by any delays, claiming on 17 August 1937 that: "People are extraordinarily dense or else very obstinate, and added to that there is always Indian double mindedness to contend with." On 26 May 1939, Hume wrote that he might be required to stand in as Deputy Commissioner, and thus as President of the DMC. Combining a debasing and naturalising metaphor with explicitly violent language, Hume claimed of the DMC that it would be a "tough job to cleanse that Aegean stables .... I could kick the committee into action and doing my will, the metaphorical seat of their pants would be excessively sore at the end of that period."

Hume's broader views on the Indian people indicate the way in which race and class were mutually constitutive in the colonies. Bajpai had unsettled Hume because

[15] A rupee contained 16 annas; an anna contained 12 pies.

he was in a position of power and technically of a higher class. Similarly, Hume commented on 29 January 1939 that: "I am afraid I cannot reconcile myself to the mixing of the races even in close social relationship, much less marriage." Referring to an event he had attended in which mixed couples were present, he claimed that "such parties are a pain to me." Yet, with regards to the Indian lower classes Hume displayed not only the benevolence that had fired his belief in poor-class rehousing, but also an attitude akin to Geddes's patronising Edwardian attitude (Welter, 2002, page 119). He wrote on 9 March 1941 of the unexpected pleasure of introducing some of the few slum evictees to their subsidised homes. Hume was garlanded by the evictees and joked with the slum dwellers about their complaints with regard to the housing. He claimed that the jasmine garland was worth 10 000 CIEs (Companions of the Indian Empire awards). He had also written with affection on 10 January 1935 of the leaving ceremony given him on departing his previous post in Balrumpur. He spoke of confused and poignant memories, of days which passed like a dream, in which affection and esteem were lavished upon Hume by both "white and brown friends". Yet, he also wrote on 5 March 1944 of the problematic application of Western conceptions in Delhi, the city of Akbar, Nadir Shah, and the Moghuls. This was during his post as rationing officer and he spoke of the difficulties of dissuading an irate and pious Hindu from his lifelong tradition of giving one or two breads a day to one or two cows.

It is clear that Hume's conception of race and religion influenced his work. His brand of imperial Christianity welded together a particular complex of race, class, and gender assumptions into a modus operandi that produced extraordinary efforts to benefit poor Indians, yet extraordinarily rude and offensive statements to be made about the Indian administrational elite. Amongst all this Hume did remain committed to the idea of Empire, despite his fundamental conflict with the colonial governmentality he faced while in Delhi.

Genealogies of economic and biopolitical rationalities

> "No one should remain in these artificial surroundings too long, no one should remain under the G of I influence too long or the preservation of reason and a sense of values becomes impossible."
>
> Hume (16 April 1944)

Benjamin Zachariah (1999) has written about the emergence of the idea of 'development' in late colonial India (also see Legg, 2006b). Both nationalists and imperialists used the term, to oppose and justify the colonial system, respectively. The Depression of the 1930s put pressure on the British Empire to defend its colonies from recession, to contain socialists and communists, but also to keep colonial finances sound. Development was seen as much as part of this attempt as it was part of a longer tradition of humanitarian and philanthropic work in India. Yet, imperialists and nationalists were united in the use of political-economic language to discuss development, rather than to discuss culture, urban citizenship, or local management of resources.

While Hume had not used overtly political-economic language in his report, he had used abstract means of visualising space that promoted the mechanical planning of places over the promotion of people and life. Yet, the initial years of the Delhi Improvement Trust's activity saw Hume shift towards a defence of the biopolitical rights of slum dwellers to affordable accommodation, a right that was discussed in terms of statutory obligations, moral consciousness, and duty. The denial of these rights infuriated Hume not just because it blocked the operation of the Delhi Improvement Trust, which he had brought into being, or because he had once encouraged the belief that the trust could make money. Rather, Hume's antagonism towards the government was born

of a deeper tension between rationalities of colonial governmentality: the need to make profit, and the need to maintain a healthy workforce.

Governments *make* life, and the duty of liberal governmentality is to conduct the conduct of their populations so as to regulate life in its most beneficial state. Yet, colonial governmentality translated the norms and expectations of European modernity into an underdeveloped and extractive model that conceived of its people as subjects more than as citizens. The refusal to invest sufficiently in the lives of its people was made clear to Hume by the comparison between English and Indian town planning. Hume's antagonism was brought forth by the tension between economic and biopolitical rationalities, as well as by the foreclosure of an alternative genealogy that would have seen Delhi planned in terms of social reform and the preservation of public health. Thus, while Hume's emotions do indicate something to us of the tensions of Empire, they also speak to the tensions of a governmentality structured to benefit the bungalow residents of the new Delhi, not the slum dwellers of the old.

Acknowledgements. Many thanks to Colin McFarlane for his help in coorganising the two sessions at the RGS-IBG Conference of 2005 at which this paper was presented, and for commenting on an early draft. Thanks also go to the other participants, the audience, and the two commentators, Cheryl McEwan and Anthony King, for their incredibly constructive and generous remarks. The two anonymous reviewers' comments were very useful, as were those of Richard Toye.

References

Bauman Z, 1991 *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Polity Press, Cambridge)
Betts R F, 1985 *Uncertain Dimensions: Western Overseas Empires in the 20th Century* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)
Bhabha H, 1994 *The Location of Culture* (Routledge, London)
Blunt A, 1994 *Travel, Gender, and Imperialism: Mary Kingsley and West Africa* (Guilford Press, New York)
Blunt A, 2005 *Domicile and Diaspora: Anglo-Indian Women and the Spatial Politics of Home* (Blackwell, Oxford)
Butler L, 1991, "The ambiguities of British colonial development policy, 1938 – 48", in *Contemporary British History, 1931 – 61: Politics and the Limits of Policy* Eds A Gorst, L Johnman, W Lucas (Pinter, London) pp 119 – 140
Cohn B S, 1983, "Representing authority in Victorian India", in *The Invention of Tradition* Eds E Hobsbawm, T Ranger (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge) pp 165 – 210
Constantine S, 1984 *The Making of British Colonial Development Policy 1914 – 1940* (Frank Cass, London)
Daniels S, Nash C, 2004, "Lifepaths: geography and biography" *Journal of Historical Geography* **30** 449 – 458
Dean M, 1994 *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology* (Routledge, London)
Dean M, 1999 *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (Sage, London)
Delhi Improvement Trust, 1937 *Delhi Improvement Trust: Application to Delhi of the United Provinces Town Improvement Act, 1919* (Government of India Press, New Delhi)
Delhi Improvement Trust, 1940 *Administration Report of the Delhi Improvement Trust for the Years 1937 – 1939* (Delhi Improvement Trust, Delhi)
Delhi Improvement Trust, 1942 *Administration Report of the Delhi Improvement Trust for the Years 1939 – 1941* (Delhi Improvement Trust, Delhi)
Duncan J, Barnes T, 1992 *Writing Worlds: Discourse, Text and Metaphor in the Representation of Landscape* (Routledge, London)
Duncan J, Ley D, 1993 *Place/Culture/Representation* (Routledge, London)
Foucault M, 1970 *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (Tavistock Publications, London)
Foucault M, 1972 *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Tavistock Publications, London)
Foucault M, 1977, "Nietzsche, genealogy, history", in *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault* Ed. D F Bouchard (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY) pp 139 – 164
Foucault M, 1979 *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction* (Allen Lane, London)

Foucault M, 1986a *The History of Sexuality. Volume 2: The Use of Pleasure* (Viking Press, London)
Foucault M, 1986b *The History of Sexuality. Volume 3: Care of the Self* (Allen Lane, London)
Foucault M, 2001a [1978], "Governmentality", in *Essential Works of Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Power* volume 3, Ed. J D Faubion (Penguin Books, London) pp 201 – 222
Foucault M, 2001b [1982], "The subject and power", in *Essential Works of Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Power* volume 3, Ed. J D Faubion (Penguin Books, London) pp 326 – 349
Gordon C, 1991, "Governmental rationalities", in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* Eds G, Burchell C, Gordon, P Miller (Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead, Herts) pp 1 – 52
Goswami M, 2004 *Producing India: From Colonial Economy to National Space* (Chicago University Press, Chicago, IL)
Hannah M, 2000 *Governmentality and the Mastery of Territory in Nineteenth-century America* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)
Hazareesingh S, 2000, "The quest for urban citizenship: civic rights, public opinion, and colonial resistance in early twentieth-century Bombay" *Modern Asian Studies* **34** 797 – 829
Hazareesingh S, 2001, "Colonial modernism and the flawed paradigms of urban renewal: uneven development in Bombay, 1900 – 25" *Urban History* **2** 235 – 255
Hosagrahar J, 2005 *Indigenous Modernities: Negotiating Architecture and Urbanism* (Routledge, London)
Hume A P, 1936 *Report on the Relief of Congestion in Delhi* (Government of India Press, Simla)
Hyam R, 1990 *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester University Press, Manchester)
Jones M, 2002, "Infant and maternal health services in Ceylon, 1900 – 1948: imperialism or welfare" *Social History of Medicine* **15** 263 – 289
Joyce P, 2003 *The Rule of Freedom: Liberalism and the Modern City* (Verso, London)
Kearns G, 1987, "Private property and public health reform in England 1830 – 70" *Social Science and Medicine* **26** 187 – 199
Kearns G, 1997, "The imperial subject: geography and travel in the work of Mary Kingsley and Halford Mackinder" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, New Series* **22** 450 – 472
Kidambe P, 2001, "Housing the poor in a colonial city: the Bombay Improvement Trust, 1898 – 1918" *Studies in History* **17** 57 – 79
Kothari U, 2005, "From colonial administration to development studies: a post-colonial critique of the history of development studies", in *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies* Ed. U Kothari (Zed Books, London) pp 47 – 66
Kothari U, 2006, "Spatial practices and imaginaries: experiences of colonial officers and development professionals" *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* **27** 235 – 253
Lal M, 1994, "The politics of gender and medicine in colonial India: the Countess of Dufferin's Fund 1885 – 1888 *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* **1** 29 – 66
Lambert D, Howell P, 2003, "John Pope Hennessy and the Translation of 'slavery' between late nineteenth-century Barbados and Hong Kong" *History Workshop Journal* **55** 1 – 24
Lambert D, Lester A, 2006, "Introduction: Imperial spaces, imperial subjects", in *Colonial Lives Across in the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century* Eds D Lambert, A Lester (Cambrige University Press, Cambridge) pp 1 – 31
Legg S, 2005, "Foucault's population geographies: classifications, biopolitics and governmental spaces" *Population, Space and Place* **11** 137 – 156
Legg S, 2006a, "Governmentality, congestion and calculation in colonial Delhi" *Social and Cultural Geography* **7** 709 – 729
Legg S, 2006b, "Postcolonial developmentalities: from the Delhi Improvement Trust to the Delhi Development Authority" , in *Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies of India* Eds S Corbridge, S Kumar, S Raju (Sage, London) pp 182 – 204
Legg S, 2007a *Spaces of Colonialism: Delhi's Urban Governmentalities* (Blackwell, Oxford)
Legg S, 2007b, "Beyond the European province: Foucault and postcolonialism", in *Space, Knowledge, and Power: Foucault and Geography* Eds J Crampton, S Elden (Ashgate, Aldershot, Hants) pp 265 – 289
Leonard S, 2004, "Finding Geddes abroad", in *Think Global, Act Local: The Life and Legacy of Patrick Geddes* Ed. W Stephen (Luath Press, Edinburgh) pp 41 – 60
Massey D, 2005 *For Space* (Sage, London)
Matless D, 2000, "Forms of knowledge and forms of belonging: regional survey and geographical citizenship", in *The City After Patrick Geddes* Eds V M Welter, J Lawson (Peter Lang, Oxford) pp 91 – 112

Mbembe A, 2001 *On the Postcolony* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)
Mbembe A, 2003, "Necropolitics" *Public Culture* **15** 11 – 40
Mehta U S, 1999 *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth Century British Liberal Thought* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL)
Meller H, 1982, "Geddes and his Indian reports", in *Patrick Geddes: A Symposium, 1 March 1982* Department of Town and Regional Planning, Duncan of Jordanstone College of Art, University of Dundee, pp 4 – 25
Meller H, 1993 *Patrick Geddes: Social Evolutionist and City Planner* (Routledge, London)
Mitchell K, 1997, "Different diasporas and the hype of hybridity" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **15** 533 – 553
Mitchell T, 2000, "Introduction", in *Questions of Modernity* Ed. T Mitchell (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN) pp xi – xxvii
Moore-Gilbert B, 1997 *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics* (Verso, London)
Myers G, 2003 *Verandahs of Power: Colonialism and Space in Urban Africa* (Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, NY/London)
Orr J P, 1918 *Social Reform and Slum Reform: Bombay Past and Present* (The Times Press, Bombay)
Rabinow P, 1989 *French Modern: Norms and Forms of the Social Environment* (MIT, Cambridge, MA)
Robinson J, 2005 *Ordinary Cities: Between Modernity and Development* (Routledge, London)
Rose N, 1996, "Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies", in *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-liberalism and Rationalities of Government* Eds A Barry, T Osbourne, N Rose (UCL Press, London) pp 37 – 64
Rose N, 1999 *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)
Said E, 1978 *Orientalism* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London)
Sethna K S, 1930 *Report on the Administration of the Delhi Municipality for the Years 1929 – 30: Volume 2, Annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health for 1929* (Delhi Municipal Press, Delhi)
Sethna K S, 1931 *Report on the Administration of the Delhi Municipality for the Years 1930 – 31: Volume 2, Annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health for 1930* (Delhi Municipal Press, Delhi)
Sethna K S, 1938 *Report on the Administration of the Delhi Municipality for the Years 1937 – 38: Volume 2, Annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health for 1937* (Delhi Municipal Press, Delhi)
Spurr D, 1993 *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)
Stoler A L, 1995 *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC)
Stoler A L, 2002 *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)
Stoler A L, Cooper F, 1997 *Tensions of Empire, Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)
Thomas N, 2004, "Exploring the boundaries of biography: the family and friendship networks of Lady Curzon, Vicereine of India 1898 – 1905" *Journal of Historical Geography* **30** 496 – 519
Tyrwhitt J (Ed.), 1947 *Patrick Geddes in India* (Lund Humphries, London)
Welter V M, 2002 *Biopolis: Patrick Geddes and the City of Life* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA)
Welter V M, Lawson J, 2000 *The City After Patrick Geddes* (Peter Lang, New York)
Zachariah B, 1999, "British and Indian ideas of 'development': decoding political conventions in the late colonial state' *Itinerario* **23** 162 – 209

© 2007 a Pion publication printed in Great Britain

Conditions of use. This article may be downloaded from the E&P website for personal research by members of subscribing organisations. This PDF may not be placed on any website (or other online distribution system) without permission of the publisher.