The dynamics of urbanization and its relationship to social and economic changes can only be revealed by intensive historical studies of individual countries during the process of development. Though cities are the oldest artifacts of civilized life, studies on urban history of any particular area is a comparatively recent field of academic discipline. This apathy was mainly due to the fact that till the Industrial Revolution, the city was viewed by most social thinkers as the image of society itself, and not some special or unique form of social life. This identification of society and city, however, changed after the Industrial Revolution and the newly emerged industrial cities meant something tangled and complex, something to be explored as a problem in itself and something that could not be comprehended by the use of a few easy labels or categories. This paved the way for urban studies in the West, but India was late to catch up mainly because of its different social situation. Now, it is a welcome sign that Indian historians have turned their serious attention to urban history, at a time when the fast changing landscape of cities has left many of the old recognizable features still intact. Sooner than later many of these would also disappear leaving behind a few important monuments. It would, however, be difficult to appreciate fully the meaning of the written record or to fill up the gaps on the basis of surviving features.

A Historiographical Sketch of Urban Studies in India

Urban studies in India, within the framework of social science disciplines, are just over six decades old. Interest in towns and cities as initially stimulated among Indian social scientists by Patrick Geddes in the University of Bombay in 1915, and the study of urban
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problems was taken up by geographers and sociologists to some extent in the 1920s. However, substantive research on urban problems in India belongs to the post independence period in all the social science disciplines\(^2\). The more purposeful academic attempts to understand the nature of urbanization in India were based mainly on the archaeological excavations supported by a number of literary evidences. This move was initiated by scholars like A. Ghosh (1973), Vijayakumar Thakur (1981), and Dilip K. Chakrabarti (1988). Attaching to this category of studies on ancient Indian cities, Kameshwar Prasad published his work entitled *Cities, Crafts and Commerce under the Kushans* in 1984. In 1986, M. Lal tried to examine the role of iron and the growth of cities in the Gangetic valley. In 1987, R.S. Sharma in his *Urban Decay in India* tried to argue that the early historic cities of India declined along with the decline of trade economy which reached its water-mark during the Kushan period. In the next year, Dileep K. Chakrabarti added some comments on the ‘phenomenon of urbanization’ in his book *Theoretical Issues in Indian Archaeology* (1988)\(^3\). A few other scholars like Hameeda Khatoon Naqvi\(^4\), Gavin Hambly, S.C. Misra and I.P. Gupta, have published interesting studies on the urban history of medieval India. J.S. Grewal and Indu Banga also belong to this category.

India’s urbanization and urbanism have attracted the attention of many scholars including Max Weber, Arnold Toynbee, Milton Singer, Robert Redfield, Gideon Sjoberg

\(^4\) H.K. Naqvi has shown how different capital cities and market towns were linked together in a network of trade relations in India. She says, during the period of Mughals there was greater urbanization due to the safer Kabul-Kandahar routes and the protection and concessions given to traders and foreign merchants. The existing towns began to expand along with the emergence of many new towns in the empire. The flourishing of this process of “commercial urbanization” took place under a stable political condition. H.K.Naqvi, ‘Progress of Urbanization in United Provinces 1550-1800’, in *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, (Leiden, 1967), pp. 81-98.
and Percival Spear. Max Weber has offered a comparative historical account of the cities with special attention to the institution of caste in the context of Indian cities. According to him, the caste system obstructed the emergence of citizenry, social and legal equality, fraternization and autonomy of Indian cities. An article written by Howard Spodak on history of India’s urbanization analyses three basic areas of what according to him the most significant sections of analysis in the study of India’s urbanization. The first section of his article begins with an inquiry into the functional significance of differences in settlements as reflected in size, technology, and social and political organization. It suggests modes of examining the built environment for maximum understanding of the culture. The second section examines the urban system of Indian cities and the third part discusses the internal functions of cities such as migration, interaction of migrants with urbanites and their mutual transformation, activities of business communities and the role of urban government. Anthony D. King’s case-study of colonial urban development discusses the transformation of Delhi between the early nineteenth and the mid-twentieth centuries. It was an attempt to construct a detailed history of the socio-cultural and physical-spatial development of the capital city of Delhi, distinguishing implicitly between factors of ‘modernization’ and ‘westernization’. R.I. Crane’s work provides an insight into the growth of cities during the pre-British period while he discusses on the growth of cities during British rule. Ghurye (1962) compared urban growth in the colonial setting with
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urban growth since independence$. In his study of Ahmadabad, Kenneth Gillon (1968) analyzed the colonial situation under the British as it prevailed on the West coast. Christine Dobbins (1972), in her study of Bombay in mid-nineteenth century, brought to light the speed and variability with which different local communities which were generally receptive to the new ideas introduced by the British took advantage of the new opportunities$. This had been done by identifying the merging elites in Bombay in the mid-nineteenth century. Prof. Bayly (1975) referred to the emergence of the urban elite in the city of Allahabad. According to him, the new elite gave the much needed leadership to the nascent nationalist sentiments and their members were instrumental in shaping the early policies of the Congress Party. Pradip Sinha (1978) traced the growth of the metropolitan city of Calcutta from a cluster of villages during the times of Job Charnock to the period when it assumed the status of the capital city in India$. In this work, Sinha argues that urban landlord families created a certain type of spatial pattern in neighbourhoods following the concept of “peopling” a space.

When we come across certain recent works dealing with Indian cities and the process of urbanization, the three great works on Bombay published by the Oxford University Press in a series requires special mention. Bombay: Metaphor for Modern India and Bombay: Mosaic of Modern Culture, the first two of the series was edited by Sujata Patel and Alice Thorner in 1995 and the third volume of this series titled Bombay and Mumbai: The City in Transition was edited by Sujata Patel and Jim Masselos in 2003. Covering almost 200 years of the city’s history, the series follows Mumbai from the early 1800s when it was a

---


$Ibid.$
second-tier East India Company trading post to its current incarnation as a deindustrializing global mega city. The essays cover such themes as labour struggles, urban planning and developments, and competing and co-existing local identities. Thus the work is relevant to both scholars of Indian cities and those interested in urbanization and urbanism in general.

Two other important works which cannot be omitted while discussing urban studies in India are Sandip Hazareesingh’s work (2007) based on the twentieth century Bombay city titled *The Colonial City and the Challenge of Modernity: Urban Hegemonies and Civic Contestations in Bombay (1900-1925)* and Janaki Nair’s (2005) *Bangalore’s Twentieth Century: The Promise of the Metropolis*. Hazareesingh’s work offers fresh and stimulating insights into the multi-layered relationships between modernity, colonialism, and the production of urban space. It examines a crucial period of change in both urban forms and political conditions in Bombay city generated by the colonial context of modernity. Janaki Nair’s *Bangalore’s Twentieth Century: The Promise of the Metropolis*, a thematically presented book running to four hundred and fifty four pages discusses in great detail Bangalore city’s evolution in spatial, social, religious, economic, the colonial rule and its impact on town planning, architecture, local economy, consumption patterns and habits, post independence public sector impetus and finally its metamorphosis into the IT hub.

To refrain from the discussion on developments in historical writings on urbanization in India is not easy because very many articles and works have come up based on the theme recently. However, since the main objective of this chapter is something more than that, it would be better to terminate here such a discussion.
Conceptual Frame

As the study is an attempt to bring into focus the matrix of specific factors responsible for and accompanying the process of urbanization in a colonial set up, the prime aim of this chapter is to introduce and discuss various terms, concepts and general theories on which the theme of the thesis is based.

1. Urbanization

The dictionary meaning of the term ‘urban’ is given as polished, cultured or refined as opposed to the term ‘rustic’ which means coarse and unrefined. Urbanization is therefore said to have brought in refinement and culture. There can hardly be a single definition of the concept “urbanization” which could be acceptable or applicable to all situations. It is a complex process effecting changes in socio-economic and cultural parameters and relationships. Scholars from various disciplines have tried to study the phenomenon of urbanization from different angles relevant to their disciplines and have given different definitions. If the term urbanization is taken in the context of a transformation from ruralism to urbanism, it is concerned with three-fold changes: a) behavioural; b) economic; and c) demographic. All these affect the spatial organization of a human settlement, and thereby the designs of the city landscape itself.

From the behavioural point of view, urbanization refers to the adjustment of personal behaviour and a change in the life styles; a process which is termed as “urbanism”. The structural point of view focuses on the patterned activities of population as a whole. The demographic interpretation of urbanization is a most widely used one. According to such type of interpretations with its statistical orientation, the term
‘urbanization’ essentially refers to the increase in population concentration in ‘urban’ settlements or places of given size over a period of time. W.S. Thomson opines that urbanization is characterized by a movement of people from small communities concerned solely with agriculture to other larger communities whose activities are primarily centred in government, trade, manufacture and allied interests.12 Hope Tisdale Elridge identifies two elements in the process of population concentration: (1) the multiplication of points of concentration, and (2) the increase in the size of individual concentrations. It means an increasing shift from agrarian to industrial services and distributive occupations, is a process by which the number of points of population concentration increases involving a shift from agrarian to non-agrarian occupations.13 In other words, it signifies the development of non-agricultural functions such as manufacturing, trade and commerce, services and induces migration from rural to urban areas. According to an operational definition given by G.S. Ghurye, urbanization means migration of people from village to city and the effect of this movement will be upon the migrants and their families and upon fellowmen in the villages.14 Viewed from these angles, it is an over simplification to interpret urbanization merely as an increase in the population living in urban settlements and multiplication of such areas as it is usually interpreted by the demographers.15

There is another view on urbanization that it is “a breakdown of traditional social institutions and values”. M.S.A. Rao, who has tried to take account of the varied aspects of

the urban phenomenon in Indian context, observes that the ‘breakdown’ hypothesis originated from the western experience, and it ignores the fact of ‘traditional urbanization’ in India. He says, for instance, the ‘breakdown hypothesis’ in Indian context implies that the caste system will change into the class system, nuclear families will emerge from joint families and religion will be highly secularized. Therefore, the hypothesis assumes that urbanization in India is the same as Westernization, and ignores the existence of traditional urbanization on which modern urbanization had its first impact\(^\text{16}\).

Theories on urbanization have been around for such a long time that they have blended into and intersect with theories that also pertain to cities, industrialization, and more recently, globalization. Why and how urbanization occurs is best explained with the help of four particular theories in an article, written by Xizhe Peng, Xiangming Chen and Yuan Chang, on urbanization, of which only the first three are taken here for discussion\(^\text{17}\). According to them, the first which come to the purview is the theory on self-generated or endogenous urbanization, which suggests that urbanization requires two separate pre-requisites---the generation of surplus products that sustain people in non-agricultural activities and the achievement of a level of social development that allows large communities to be socially viable and stable. From a long temporal perspective, these changes took place simultaneously in the Neolithic period when the first cities emerged in the Middle East. A much later period in which these two pre conditions interacted strongly was the late eighteenth century when the rise of industrial capitalism led to the emergence of urban societies in Britain, North-West Europe and North America. In the demographic


sense, this theory focuses on the rural-urban population shift as the foundation of urbanization but it identifies industrialization as the basic driver behind the movement of rural population to urban areas for factory jobs. Actually, this approach suffers from the drawback of focusing narrowly on the rural-urban shift within countries as the key to urbanization.

In the ‘modernization theory’, another theoretical approach, there is always a tendency to compare the present state of any given society with its initial state of urbanization at the onset of modernization. It gives more emphasis to technology than a society’s social organization in shaping urbanization.

Another theoretical perspective known as the dependency/world system theory was put forward by A.G. Frank (1969) and Immanuel Wallerstein (1979). These theorists assume that there exists a unique capitalist development pattern, which asserts capitalism as a unique form of social organization. It argues that capitalism requires a certain social structure, which is characterized by an unequal exchange, uneven development, individual social inequality, core-periphery hierarchies and dominance structure. Indeed, the dependency/world system theory is stronger in suggesting the association rather providing a causal relationship between urbanization and capitalist development.

a) Urban Area

In order to get a better understanding, one needs to have a deeper study into the various interrelated concepts of urbanization. Just as there are a variety of definitions of urbanization, so also there are different criteria for classifying a settlement as ‘urban’. The term is used in two senses---demographically and sociologically. In the former sense,
Emphasis is given to the size of population and the density of population, while in the latter sense, the focus is on heterogeneity, impersonality, interdependence, and the quality of life. According to the discipline of Urban Geography, the settlements in which most of the people are engaged in secondary, tertiary and quaternary activities are known as urban places. On the one hand, the emergence of these settlements indicates the growth of secondary and tertiary activities like manufacturing, trade, commerce etc. and on the other threatens the growth of agricultural areas. So, in general usage, an urban area can be related to cities and towns, where it serves as a dwelling place, whose residents are mainly engaged in industry, retail trade, wholesale trade and transport activities. This can also be treated as an economic criterion for identifying the urban places by focusing on the occupation of the working population. For this purpose, the workers are divided into two categories---those engaged in agriculture and those engaged in the secondary and tertiary sectors. The basic assumption here is that agriculture is a non-urban occupation and hence the absence of this occupation is an indication of the urban character of the place.

Most of the countries define their urban settlement on the basis of a minimum qualifying size of population. However, this is a difficult task since the size may vary from country to country and from plain regions to mountainous tracts and desert regions. Hence, it is appropriate at this stage to examine this aspect briefly. Majid Hussain makes a detailed investigation on this aspect. He says, in Israel, a town, irrespective of its size of population, is a non agricultural settlement, while in Chile a town is a centre with urban characteristics. But when we consider the settlements as urban on the basis of merely the size of population, it becomes more complicated. For instance, in Canada, all settlements
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18 R.Ramachandran, op.cit., p.102.
with more than 1000 population are called urban whereas in Columbia, the dividing line between rural and urban is 1500 and in Argentina the settlements above 2000 persons are recognized as urban\(^2^0\). In China, a settlement to be identified as urban requires a minimum population of 2000 of which not less than fifty percentages must be in non-agricultural occupations; whereas in Japan, a minimum population requirement is set at 30,000. In South Korea, all incorporated cities of 40,000 or more inhabitants are classified as urban. In U.K., a settlement is designated as urban on the basis of local government such as borough, municipal boroughs and urban districts, while in U.S.A., urban settlements have more than 2,500 people\(^2^1\).

The Census definition of an urban area in India remained more or less the same for the period of 1891-1951. During this period, a town was defined as: (1) every municipality of whatever size; (2) all civil lines not included within the municipal limits, (3) every other continuous collection of houses, permanently inhabited by not less than 5,000 persons, which the Provincial Superintendent of Census may decide to treat as a town for Census purposes\(^2^2\). From this definition, it is seen, first, that a place is considered as a town because of its administrative status irrespective of its population size; second, the discretionary power vested in the Census Superintendent introduces a further element of subjectivity in its delimitations; and third, there were no specified tests of urban characteristics such as public utility etc., which a settlement was required to have in order to qualify as an urban place. In order to avoid these anomalies, Indian Census adopted relatively strict and comprehensive definition in 1961 and it was further elaborated during

\(^{20}\) Ibid.
\(^{21}\) Ibid.
the three successive Censuses of 1971, 1981 and 1991\textsuperscript{23}. Since the details of those periods do not come under the purview of the present study, only the first five decades of Census administration in India is taken into consideration.

**Urbanization Process in India 1901-1951**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Years</th>
<th>Number of Urban Agglomeration/town</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Urban Population</th>
<th>Rural Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>238396327</td>
<td>25851873</td>
<td>212544454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>252093390</td>
<td>25941633</td>
<td>226151757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>251321213</td>
<td>28086167</td>
<td>223235046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>278977238</td>
<td>33455989</td>
<td>245521249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>318660580</td>
<td>44153297</td>
<td>274507283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td>361088090</td>
<td>62443709</td>
<td>298644381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Degree of Urbanization 1901-1951**

Source: Census Reports of India 1901-1951.

\textsuperscript{23} For more details see, M.T.K. Naik and S. Mansoor Rahman, *Urbanization in India*, (New Delhi, 2007), pp. 2-5.
b) Urban Environment

By the urban environment is meant the human made spaces, buildings, developments and structures that one finds in towns and cities, as opposed to the rural countryside where the natural environment and its processes are ‘managed’ but not created by humans\textsuperscript{24}. It is an open, highly interrelated system or subsystem of natural and manmade elements, the latter consisting of extremely mobile functions of various character performed in an intensely concentrated built up area\textsuperscript{25}. Thus the towns and cities represent an artificial environment that humans make for themselves and others. To the layman, urban environment is different from rural environment in terms of their physical appearance. There are two aspects relating to this: the morphological aspect and the functional aspect. In terms of morphology, the urban areas are characterized by a core area with brick and mortar structures of which some have more than two storeys. The main streets and roads carry heavy vehicular and pedestrian traffic and the public buildings, such as administrative offices, courts, schools and hospitals, stand out prominently in the urban landscape. The clustering of variety of shops like tea and coffee shops, grocery shops, textile shops, stationery shops, bakeries, electrical and other gadgets shops, huge vegetable markets and fish selling centres etc. attract customers not only from within the settlement but also from nearby settlements. Here again, the layman’s perception of the city’s or town’s environment is essentially in terms of its commercial role\textsuperscript{26}. The urban environment also constitutes parks, playgrounds and similar organized open spaces because it has to play an integral role in recreational functions and it nourishes healthy life of the dwellers,

\textsuperscript{26} R.Ramachandran, op.cit., p.104.
physically and mentally. Water supply systems, electricity supply, sewerage and drainages, and other public utility services are of great importance in this artificial urban environment. At the same time the urban environment is also a disturbed environment where the growth of the built up areas brings about imperceptible changes in the natural physical background of the area by transformation of the natural ground surface into one masonry structure, macadamized road and concrete surface changing the basic natural vegetative surface along with air and water pollution\textsuperscript{27}. When we speak of the social environment of the urban centres, though it tends to provide congenial atmosphere, standard earning, hygienic situation etc., still the excessive concentration of human resources results in joblessness, insecurity of employment, uncertainty of life and chaos everywhere. No wonder, the anti-social elements disturb the urban environment in the form of crimes like theft, burglary, forgery, pick pocketing, adultery, quarrels and combating, rape and even murder.

c) Urbanism and Urbanity

Urbanism is a particular concept which inherits within itself all the characters connected with urbanization and the urban way of life. The concept was given its final shape by Louis Wirth. According to him, it is a “way of life”\textsuperscript{28}. He identified population size, density and heterogeneity as the basic determinants of urbanism. He has given four characteristics of urbanism: transiency, superficiality, anonymity and individualism. 1) The increase in the number of inhabitants in a settlement, beyond a certain limit will lead to competition over scarce resources and a search for alternatives and reduces intimacy and

\textsuperscript{27} Probhat Kumar Sen, ‘Environmental issues in the Urban Areas: Some Indian Case Studies’, in Prithvish Nag, op.cit., p.268.

nearness of relations and tends to forget its old acquaintances and develop relations with new people. The personal traits, occupations, the cultural life and the ideas and attitudes of members of an urban community may, therefore, be expected to range between widely separated poles, such give rise to the spatial segregation of individuals, according to economic and social status, tastes and preference. In short, the bonds of kinship, of neighbourliness and the sentiments arising out of living together for generations under a common folk tradition will be absent under such circumstances. 2) In an urban society, competition and formal control mechanisms provide the substitutes for bonds of solidarity. Urbanites meet one another in highly segmental roles. They are dependent on more people for the satisfaction of their needs and the relationships will lie superficial in almost all cases. 3) This results in a condition, where urbanites do not know each other intimately and 4) they always give more importance to their own vested interests. The central problem before Wirth was to discover the forms of social action and organization that typically emerge in relatively permanent compact settlements of large numbers of heterogeneous individuals. To arrive to an adequate conception of 'urbanism as a mode of life' Wirth says it is necessary to stop 'identifying urbanism with the physical entity of the city', and go 'beyond an arbitrary boundary line' and consider how 'technological developments in transportation and communication have enormously extended the urban mode of living beyond the confines of the city itself.'

The Marxist geographers like Harvey and Castells see this as the effect of the accumulation of capital at certain points. There is also a view expressed by Hebbherbert Kotter in 1963, which argues that ‘urbanism is no longer a matter of geographic location,
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29 Ibid.
30 Louis Wirth, op.cit.
something confined to urban places. It is characterized by a certain mentality and way of behaviour\textsuperscript{31}.

According to Theodorson and Theodorson, the term ‘urbanism’ reflects an organization of society in terms of a complex division of labour, high levels of technology, high mobility, interdependence of members in fulfilling economic functions and impersonality in social relations\textsuperscript{32}. Ruth Glass considers mobility, anonymity, individualism, impersonal relations, social differentiation, transience, and organic type of solidarity as the important characteristics of urbanism. Anderson has listed three characteristics of urbanism: adjustability, mobility and diffusion. K. Dewis has highlighted eight characteristics of the urban social system. Referring to the cosmopolitanism and the specialization in occupation, he places social heterogeneity as the main feature of urbanism. Secondary association, social mobility, individualism, spatial segregation, social tolerance, secondary control and voluntary associations are according to Dewis, the other seven characteristic features of urbanism\textsuperscript{33}. There are different types of inter related definitions given by many scholars which collectively presents an exaggerated picture of the urban man and his life, but ultimately it should be viewed as a mechanism of social change taking place in a complex society that is termed as “urban” and hence an analysis of these definitions becomes necessary for making a base for any study on urban society.

Now it is essential to distinguish the concept of urbanization from the notions of urbanism and urbanity. If we consider together the three-fold changes of urbanization, the

\textsuperscript{31} As quoted by Sumitha Ghosh, \textit{Introduction to Settlement Geography}, (Kolkata: 2003), p. 121.
concept of urbanization can be referred to a process of change in values, attitudes, and styles of life of those people who migrate to cities from villages, thereby resulting in the concentration of more people in these urban areas as well as the results of the same affecting the physical conditions and demands more spatial utilization in the urban spaces. The particular type of thus shaped culture, adopted by the people living in urban areas is termed as ‘urbanism’. It can be characterized as a system of values, norms and attitudes towards interpersonal relations in terms of formalism, individualism and anonymity. Finally, the next term in question is ‘urbanity’, which is, conceptually, something more than what it is defined so far. When we see that the reality of the city is not in its forms but rather in the practices of its inhabitants, then urbanity refers to that ‘pattern of life’ the inhabitants of urban centres lead in terms of work situation, food habits, stress patterns, and also according to their views and perspectives. It is also a state of people living in urban areas distinct from those living in the countryside.

The approach adopted for the present study to analyze the urban process that took place in Calicut during the British colonial period fall into two broad categories—materialistic and non-materialistic. Here, the materialistic approach gives priority to the external environment, land-use pattern, population structure, and so on; the non-materialistic approach covers the role of social and cultural values, attitudes and behaviour of people as determinants of urbanization. The non-material aspect of urban life is derived from the natural will or gemeinschaft elements while the material aspect derives from the rational ill or gesellschaft elements to be found in human values, attitudes and
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behaviour. The non-materialistic approach focuses attention on ‘urbanism’ and ‘urbanity’ largely as a way and pattern of life, both in terms of values, attitudes and behaviour. At the same time, according to Meadows, urbanism or urbanity depends upon the appearance and growth of an economic surplus, which forms the part of materialistic approach. From this point of view at least, the non-materialistic and materialistic interpretations are complimentary with one another.

**Space, Spatialisation and Spatial Processes: A Conceptual Study**

Our common understanding of the space is that it is simply there, intangible but given. When we treat space as a social product, considering the instrumentality of space as a register of not only built forms but also of embedded ideologies, it entails a demystifying of space as natural and transparent so that it is understood as a product with particular, localized meanings. Such demystification has already been well advanced by the work of Henry Lefebvre, David Harvey, Edward Soja and others who have tapped the critical potentials of spatiality as a positive response to the decline of historicism in the postmodern era. Lefebvre has produced voluminous meditations on ‘the production of space’, advancing schematic and typological analyses which have had a profound impact on contemporary studies of urban space and spatiality. He wants us to see that space is not
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35 The German sociologist, Ferdinand Tonnies in 1887, differentiated two types of union between people, referred to as “community” (Gemeinschaft) and “society” or “association” (Gesellschaft). This classificatory forms have, through the years, is employed in a number of ways to express (1) the distinction between types of human relation, e.g. intimate and dispersed; (2) the distinction between types of agglomeration or proximity, e.g. rural and urban; and (3) the distinction between actual types of society, e.g. traditional and modern. Ferdinand Tonnies (1955) as quoted in Chris Jenks, Urban Culture, *Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*, Vol.I, (New York, 2004), p. 4.

simply the parameter or stage of social relations and actions; rather that it is operative in
the ‘assembly’ of these. He argues that traditional dualities of physical space and mental
space are bridged by the processes of the production of space, especially as these are
enacted through ‘spatial practice,’ which he founds on the material experience of social
relations in ‘everyday life (Lefebvre, 1991).’ Harvey and Soja have built on and
influentially promoted these ideas in Anglo-America contexts to emphasize the
productivity of urban space under conditions of an advanced capitalist political economy
(Harvey, 1989) (Soja, 1989)\textsuperscript{37}.

Geographers have traditionally used the term “spatial” as an adjective to apply to
many concepts and ideas used in other areas of research to signify the locational
component of a concepts’ meaning. More precisely the term spatial refers to the
geometrical properties among locations in space. This absolute understanding of space
treats space as a system of geometrical organization, ‘a kind of absolute grid, within which
objects are located and events occur’. A spatial distribution, therefore, refers to the
geometrical properties or characteristics of such things as cities, farms, people or forests
located in space at a single point in time. A relative understanding of space prioritizes
analyses of how space is constituted and given meaning through human endeavour. Here,
space is not a given neutral and passive geometry but rather is continuously produced
through socio-spatial relations; the relationship between space, spatial forms and spatial
behaviour\textsuperscript{38} is rather a product of cultural, social, political and economic relations; space is

\textsuperscript{37} Liam Kennedy, Race and Urban Space in Contemporary American Culture, (Edinburg, 2000),
pp. 8-9.

\textsuperscript{38} Spatial behaviour refers to the behaviour those results from decisions involving locations,
movement, or the use of space. Migration is a form of spatial behaviour that involves a complex
decision about current location, movement, new location, as well as other factors such as
not an objective structure but is a social experience. As such, space is ‘constituted through social relations and material social practices’. But Soja takes a more restricted view of space when he defines socially produced space as ‘spatiality’, suggesting that not all space is socially produced, but all spatiality is\(^\text{39}\).

Spatialisation focuses on ‘space’ as a fundamental variable influencing the society’s organization and operation, and the behavior of its individual members\(^\text{40}\). ‘Space’ as Lefebvre notes, ‘is an epitome of rational abstraction because it has already been occupied and used and already been the focus of past processes whose traces are always evident in the landscape. It argues that through analyzing the space one can reach the history of that people. In the material process of existence, people make modifications in the spatial structures. This results in modified landscapes. If you think of the past as a landscape, then history is the way we represent it, and it is that act of representation that lifts us above the familiar to let us experience vicariously what we cannot experience directly; a wider view\(^\text{41}\). To Cosgrove, landscape is a ‘way of seeing’ than an ‘object for seeing.’ And this way of seeing is ideological\(^\text{42}\). This type of modified way of seeing by various power groups resulted in the changing spatial patterns and spatial relations. Simultaneously, by a continuous spatial processes, the spaces become private and public, commercial and employment, transfer of job, and the like. C.Murray Austin (et.al), Human Geography, (St.paul, 1987), p. 23.

ceremonial, sacred and profane, shared and divided, individual and institutional and furthermore, the spaces of male and female.

**The ‘City’**

All definitions of “urbanization” refer in some measure not only to change, but also to conceptions of efficiency, increased human and spatial interaction, and extraordinary complexities of social relationships, broadly interpreted. Invariably, these ideas also have come to be associated with the ‘city’ since the term ‘urban’ is very much identified with a city. It is used as an adjective referring to the activities and characteristics related to and found in cities.

The city has been defined according to several points of view. For Henri Pirenne, the city was a purely economic entity based on long distance trade, originating after the Muslims allegedly closed the Mediterranean to trade in the seventeenth century. He saw the late medieval cities as increasingly industrial, dominated by craftsmen who, by controlling governments through their guilds, institutionalized a narrow focus that compromised the city’s prosperity by self defeating industrial protectionism\(^\text{43}\). The economically defined perspective of city as a settlement the inhabitants of which live primarily on trade and commerce rather than agriculture, however, is not altogether proper to call all localities as “cities where the trade and commerce dominate. Pirenne and his followers considered the cities to be the islands of capitalism in a ‘feudal’ world. The German sociologist Max

\(^{43}\) David Nicholas, *The Growth of the Medieval City, From Late Antiquity to the Early Fourteenth Century*, (New York, 1997), p. XV. Pirenne defines a medieval European town as having three characteristics: its population was engaged in industry and commerce; it had a distinct legal constitution and institutions, and it as the centre of administration and a fortress. See, Henri Pirenne, *Medieval Cities: Their Origin and the Revival of Trade*, (Princeton, 1946), pp.56-76, 133-60.
Weber saw the city as fundamentally economic in character, with a high degree of occupational differentiation. The largest cities attracted capital by providing services and eventually by exporting surplus raw materials and manufactured goods. But the demand generated by the local market, where city dwellers could satisfy virtually all their needs and wants, also helps to explain the permanence of the city. Weber argues that the medieval cities usually had wealthy consumers, political rulers or land owners who controlled capital through rent, and they provided demand for the goods of long distance traders. He saw most of the cities were also political centres, with fortifications, a court and a related form of association. Weber’s emphasis was on social action and autonomous city government. Gideon Sjoberg distinguishes cities into two: (1) pre-industrial and (2) industrial. But there are limitations to this approach. The pre-industrial city was a feudal one and feudalism as not the only basis of city formation. The industrial city which represents the modern city is found due to many other factors, in addition to industrialization.

While opposing the definitions that portray population density as the influential feature of a city, Kingsley Davis argues that “city is the community characterized by social, economic and political heterogeneity and is organized by formal means of control due to its artificiality, individualism, competition and congestion. From a modern political point of view, a city is essentially a political unit. It refers to a place governed by some type of administrative body or organization such as Corporation or Municipality where territorial control is precisely defined. In other words, City is a term that usually refers to a
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specifically bounded urban place, with a name and with specific political boundaries\textsuperscript{47}. It is the space where power groups and social groups translate the meanings of power and hegemony. Apart from the political aspect, a city is the microcosm of the socio-economic and political processes happening around it. Population patterns, interaction and communications, socio-cultural factors, political institutions and roles, economics, spatial behaviour, and locational decision making all operate in conjunction with each other in this complex system called ‘city’. It is not static; its content and meaning vary on the basis of the alterations in the socio-economic and political processes.

Spengler, Toynbee, Geddes, Ghurye, Mumford and Wirth consider world history in terms of city history and the city is explained as the mirror of civilization. To Harvey, the city is the high point of human achievement, objectifying the most sophisticated knowledge in a physical landscape of extraordinary complexity, power and splendor at the same time as it brings together social forces capable of the most amazing socio-technical and political innovation\textsuperscript{48}. In his words, “a city is an agglomeration of productive force built by labour employed within a temporal process of circulation of capital. It is nourished out of the metabolism of capitalist production for exchange on the world market and supported out of a highly sophisticated system of production and distribution organized within its confines. It is populated by individuals who reproduce themselves using money incomes earned off the circulation of capital (wages and profits) or its derivative revenues (rents, taxes, interest, merchant’s profits, payments for services)\textsuperscript{49}.

\textsuperscript{47} C. Murray Austin, op.cit., p.418.
\textsuperscript{48} David Harvey, \textit{The Urban Experience}, (Baltimore, 1985), p. 229.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
When the concept of city is discussed on lines of the theory of urbanism, then the definition given by Robert E. Park requires special mention. He says, the city is something more than a congeries of individual men and of social conveniences---streets, buildings, electric lights, tramways, and telephones etc. and something more than the cluster of public institutions and administrative devices like courts, hospitals, schools, police and civil functionaries of various sorts. The city is, rather, a state of mind, a body of customs and traditions, and of the organized attitudes and sentiments that inhere in these customs and are transmitted with this tradition. The city is not, in other words, merely a physical mechanism and an artificial construction. It is involved in the vital processes of the people who compose it. Moreover, it is a product of nature, and particularly of human nature

Functional Classification of Cities

Cities can be divided into size classes on the basis of their functional complexity and importance. One can measure the numbers and kinds of functions each city or metropolitan area performs. The hierarchy is like a pyramid; the few large and complex cities known as ‘metropolitan city’ or ‘mega city’ at the top and the many smaller ones are at the bottom. In India an urban place with more than one lakh population is considered as a city whereas no specific size range, to distinguish a town from a city, is generally accepted. David Nicholas, while distinguishing the towns and cities of the medieval times, says that, a medieval town had a higher degree of occupational differentiation and specialization than the villages but less in turn than the city. While the town had merchant
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and artisan elements, its economic radius was narrower than the city. To C.A. Bayly, a town having above a population of 10,000 can be rightly called as a city. Here he refers to a country town known as Qasbah, having a population of more than 3,000.

Cities developed as a focal point for the variety of activities undertaken by people. These activities included trade, distribution, crafts, manufacturing, religious and political administration and defense. Ancient history of India refers to a number of towns and urban centres. A Nagara was an ordinary fortified town where inland trade was the important activity, whereas a Pattana was a large commercial port situated on the bank of a river or a sea. A small market town in the midst of four hundred villages, and lying on the delta of a river or seashore, frequented by traders was known as Dronamukha. Kheta was a small walled town situated on the plain, near a river or a forest, lying in the midst of villages and having facilities of communication. If a Kheta, was combined with local industries such as mining, it was known as Sakhanagara. Another type of market town was Nigama, which consisted of mainly the settlements of artisans; also served as a resting place for traders and caravans. The capital city of ruling dynasties was known as Rajadhani. It had a belt of walls and ramparts circumscribed by ditches and military outposts. According to Kautilya, the capital city’s internal structure comprised of the royal palace, the quarters of ministers and other royal functionaries, records and audit offices, royal armoury, the royal
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51 David Nicholas, op.cit., pp.XVI-XVII.
52 Qasbahs were the residence of gentry who served as soldiers or administrators for the regional states. Sometimes these were Hindu families of the warrior castes, but very often pedigree Muslim lineages. Most Qasbahs also supported bodies of artisans paying varieties of ground-rent and professional tax. Technically, Qasbahs were also supposed to provide the services of the Islamic judicial official called Qazi, and to have a mosque with its own Imam. C.A. Bayly, Rulers, Townsmen, and Bazaars: North Indian Society in the Age of British Expansion 1770-1870, (New Delhi, 2004), p.111.
53 M.S.A. Rao, op.cit., p. 22.
mint etc. The city also had the residences of merchants, settlements of craftsmen, warehouses and workshops and business quarters. The residences of ordinary people were found in outside the Central Business District\textsuperscript{54} of the city. A temple dedicated to a supreme deity and around it the settlements of priestly class, also stood as an integral part of the city. City’s public amenities included tanks, wells, and pathways and there were gardens, taverns and brothels too. *Durga* was another term used to denote a fortified town equipped with an arsenal. *Senamukha* was a military base which was also a suburban town, a little away from the main city. There were university towns known as *Matha* which grew up around academic traditions like Nalanda and Taxila. Some towns emerged as a result of pilgrimage associated with the major temple inside it.

An important and conspicuous landscape feature of medieval cities in India is the fort with its associated features. Segments of concentric walls representing the periphery, the mosque and the traditional market centre or the *chowk* still continue to dominate the city landscape. Thus most of the cities of this period were commercial centres having royal patronage and some were built to show the pomp and glory of the ruling elites. During the colonial period, the general categorization of cities included Cantonment towns and the Hill Resort towns. Bayly says that in 1770 there were sixty larger urban centres in North India and they served many different functions, but broadly these can be classified into three

\textsuperscript{54} According to Burgess, an urban area consists of five concentric zones. The zones represent areas of functional differentiation and expand rapidly from the business centre. The zones are: 1. Central Business District, 2. the zone in transition, 3. the zone of working men’s home, 4. the residential zone of middle class and upper class professionals and executives and, 5. the commuter’s zone. CBD is usually situated in the central part of the city. This nuclei part of the city contains all the major commercial spots like shops, ware houses, business offices etc. Transportation routes from all parts of the city converge upon it. Majid Hussain, op.cit., pp. 353-356; R.K. Sharma, op.cit., pp.39-40.
groups. First, cities acted as retail centres and bulking points for their immediate hinterlands which served areas with a radius of fifteen to twenty miles around them. Many goods in the villages were provided along networks of small-scale carriers and through periodic religious fairs. Secondly, larger towns were generally transit points for the longer distance high value trades which is why so many brokers and merchants congregated there. Thirdly, the last group of functions was grouped around the service of regional rulers or their great lieutenants and patterns of religious observance which drew pilgrims and devotees from the whole region or sub continent\textsuperscript{55}. In fact, classification of cities according to function is always not a simple task since cities perform more than one function at the same time.

**The Colonial City**

Colonial cities arose in societies that fell under the domination of Europe and North America in the early expansion of the capitalist world system. The colonial relationship required altering the productivity of the colonial society in order that its wealth could be exported to the core nations, and colonial cities centralized this function. Their major cultural role was to house the agencies of this unequal relationship: the colonial political institutions—bureaucracies, police, and the military—by which the core ruled the colony, and the economic structure—banks, merchants, and moneylenders—through which wealth drained from colony to core.

Bombay and Calcutta under the British, the European trading cities in China and West Africa, the British East African and Dutch East Indian urban centres for the collection
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\textsuperscript{55} C.A. Bayly, op.cit., p. 112.
of plantation crops—from the 18th through the mid-20th centuries—represent this urban type. The core capitalist nations implanted colonial cities as new growths into preexisting pre capitalist state societies in many world regions, just as they altered the societies by making them unequal participants in world capitalism. The resulting urban culture represented a novel amalgam of the core and the periphery, with qualities not found in either parent culture.

This new combination was most in evidence in the elite population of the colonial city and its cultural forms. For example, new classes and urban life ways appeared among the indigenous population. Most of the time the cultural role of the colonial city required the creation of an indigenous urban lower-middle class of merchants, moneylenders, civil servants, and others who were educated to serve the colonial political and economic establishment. For instance, Thomas Babington Macaulay, a British Indian administrator in the mid-19th century, hoped to create elite through Western-style education that was “Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and intellect”56. The colonial educated lower-middle class often attempted to reform its culture in line with that of the colonizing power, most often through new urban institutions like schools, welfare associations, and sectarian or secular reform groups. A generation or so later, this class transformed by these urban institutions commonly formed the leadership of nationalist, anti colonial movements. Thus, the colonial city, which began as an instrument of colonial exploitation, became a vehicle of anti colonial protest through this lower middle class and

the cultural institutions, schools, newspapers, and other urban cultural forms it had constructed.

**Recent Discourses on the ‘Colonial City’**

The city has become the focus of debate concerning the nature and impact of colonialism. No longer taking for granted the city as metaphor for European civilisation, or as historical reality of European colonial domination, the colonial city is increasingly being seen as a ‘contested space’ (Brenda Yeoh, 1996). The occupation and ‘consumption’ of the city as a European dominated cultural space is both contested by its indigenous inhabitants, and increasingly subjected to modernising tendencies emanating from the heartland of Western civilisation, i.e., Europe. At a theoretical level, however, the colonial city continues to be perceived as a symbol of modernity—the questions now raised concern the ownership of modernity, the extent to which modernity was mediated by its exotic relocation beyond Europe and the ways in which modernity represented colonial oppression. The study considers some of the recent discourse surrounding the notion of the colonial city drawing on postcolonial perspectives and focuses empirically on the British administration in Malabar district under Madras Presidency. It draws on the history of one specific colonial city—Calicut, the capital city of erstwhile Zamorins—to explore the tensions, continuities and innovations that marked the development of the city in the context of Colonial Malabar.

In the history of colonised Asia the ‘colonial city’ has become an increasingly ambiguous concept as researchers have gradually dismantled a colonialist historiography and begun to uncover an indigenous social history of the city. As Swathi Chattopadhyay
argues with reference to the history of Calcutta, ‘common to the study of colonial cities’ is a ‘colonial notion of what constituted the city itself’, underpinned by an emphasis on ‘architectural and planning scholarship’ and in seeing ‘colonial cities as caught in the web of global capitalism with the native culture seen as merely ‘impacted’ by capitalist domination and Western intellectual and artistic ideas’

Moreover, typically the Asian city existed prior to the colonial presence and, as importantly, habitation by its urban Asian community continued during colonialism. Nor, typically, can a claim be made for exclusive ‘white domains’ within the urban space, since it was particularly in such compact and populous locations that the colonial boundaries were most porous. On the other hand, from the latter part of the nineteenth century, European interests, expressed principally in terms of architecture and town planning and to some extent also demographically, as Hosagrahar details in the case of Delhi after the ‘mutiny’, increasingly reshaped the Asian city. The post colonialist historians of the subcontinent have led the way in the current debate on the city during European imperialism and the Indian scholarship in this field provides a model that can be readily adapted to a discussion of the colonial city elsewhere.

The debate about the ‘colonial city’, then, has largely focussed on this transitional moment, the more intense colonising of the indigenous urban space. The question of how to deal with the urbanity engendered by the colonial presence has, however, been a more ambiguous subject within the postcolonial perspective. For (some) Indian researchers with access to a rich archive of indigenous middle class ‘modern’ urban history, this has been

58 Ibid., p.135.
somewhat easier to deal with. Partha Chatterjee who recognize indigenous Indian urban
cultural activity, suggests as a contributing element in the trajectory of Indian anti-colonial
nationalism, as ‘cultural nationalism’\(^6^0\), although he had earlier seemingly rejected the
modernity represented Nehru and the cadre of modern intellectual nationalists who had
assumed control of the colonial state and its modern apparatus\(^6^1\). More confidently
contemporary historians such as Swati Chattopadhyay detail the rich cultural life of middle
class Bengali Calcutta. She demonstrates at the same time the susceptibility of white
colonial culture and everyday Anglo life to permutation through daily urban contact with
‘the native’ while simultaneously, the consumption of ‘modernity’ by a native elite
‘necessarily entailed a ‘transformation of meaning’\(^6^2\). The urbanity of the colonial city---
that is, its assumed European/Western character is much more ambiguous than claimed in
conventional colonialist historiography, and the confrontation between the native
population and the colonial masters is much less clear cut than a conventional post
colonialist paradigm might suggest. The colonial city, then, arguably represents a
transitional moment in both global and national history in which new hybrid ‘modernities’
were created\(^6^3\).

Against this new kind of focus on indigenous urban social history one can observe
an increasingly detailed critical history of colonial urban reform. While this also reaches

\(^{62}\) Chattopadhyay, op.cit., p.163.
\(^{63}\) In her well-researched work, Hosagrahar shows how local customs, spatial practices, and
knowledge traditions in the city both changed and were changed by a modern form of urbanism and
scientific rationality that she sees as having been “imposed” on the city by the British. Jyothi
Hosagrahar, op.cit., p.190.
into a revisionist history of the imperial centre, in terms of a history of the process of urban colonisation such studies have now established what can be regarded as an incontestable ‘sequence’ in the creation of the twentieth-century colonial city. In reviewing the ‘shapers of colonial urban landscapes’ of the British empire Robert Home succinctly summarises this sequence as “Kondratieff waves of influence” 64. The actors were primarily a class of migrating professionals who carried with them and implemented a sequence of what Anthony D King has described as a set of dominant techniques and discourses, an ‘expertise’, learned in Europe’s developing cities and somewhat modified by prevailing local colonial conditions 65. Thus the urbanity of the colonial city in British India consists of a gradual layering of the outcomes of Europe’s own modernising and urbanizing processes in the colony: first by land surveyors 1820-1870, then engineers, 1850–1900, doctors, (especially sanitary specialists) 1880–1930; architects and planners 1910–1960. Home suggests that it was this ‘new breed of managers’ with ‘distinct cognitive structures, claiming universality and a theoretical orientation’ to which entry was strictly controlled, for whom ‘the empire offer[ed] …wider scope and opportunity than they might have had at home’.

‘Governmentality’: A Theoretical Frame Work

Colonialism does not take up much room in Foucault’s work but his ideas have inspired colonial studies. Thus, many recent colonial studies have been inspired by Foucault’s outline of the development of political rationality in modern societies – under

the notion *governmentality* – in which he argues that modern societies are characterized by their ability to produce self-governing individuals. Here Foucault distinguishes three political rationalities: a) *Sovereignty* which is concerned with territories; aims to preserve the power of the sovereign; and has law as its most important technique. B) *Discipline* which is concerned with individuals; aims to shape the norms of these individuals; and relies on a disciplinary technique that works mainly through institutions such as schools, hospitals and prisons. C) *Government* which is concerned with controlling risk and shaping responsible and self-governing individuals; the technique is a complex of measures that seek to shape the life world of individuals through incentives, rather than through prohibitions or normative work.

The term ‘governmentality’ is a combination of the words ‘govern’ and ‘mentality’, and is frequently defined as the “art of government” or governing. Foucault proposed the concept of governmentality for the first time in his lectures at the *Collège de France* in 1978 and 1979\(^6\). The notion derives from the French word *gouvernemental*, meaning “concerning government”. It includes the practices of governments and their affects on the people who are governed. Governmentality should not be confused with the simple act of governing however, at least not in a strict sense, because it also includes the way people govern or conduct themselves, as well as how these two issues are intertwined. Foucault traces the way governments have attempted to control populations throughout history; power has exerted itself in many different forms. He understands power

\(^6\) The word “governmentality” was known even before it figured as a central term in Foucault’s work. Roland Barthes had already used the “barbarous but unavoidable neologism” in the 1950s, to denote an ideological mechanism that presents the government as the origin of social relations. For Barthes, governmentality refers to “the Government presented by the national press as the Essence of efficacy”. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, (New York, 1989), p. 130.
differently, however. He sees that the modern state uses many different tools beyond the threat of death to control populations. The state works through seemingly benevolent institutions in order to gain control of a population those self-disciplines itself. For example, the seemingly infallible area of psychiatry has been used to repress sexuality; homosexuality was declared a "disease" that needed to be "cured" in the mid-20th century. The idea that homosexuality was something to be looked down upon became seen as an objective, secular fact that wasn't tied with religion, when in reality the area of medicine was used as a tool to oppress a population. This is one example of the state using "objective, benevolent" institutions to discipline populations. Using these methods, the state operates not through a simple, top-down power structure, but rather through a multiplicity of institutions that attempt to use each and every individual as a part of state control. The population becomes the police. In short, Governmentality is now the governing of mentalities—the shaping of the minds of a population through seemingly transparent institutions such as schools, hospitals, prisons, etc. The ways people govern others have changed throughout history from the very first nation-state and simple rule through brute force to the complex governments we have today. Governance has become governmentality.

Many colonial studies informed by Foucault’s outline of governmentality, however, have utilized his concepts without relying on the oversimplifying dichotomy between a pre-modern colonial and a modern western setting. When Gyan Prakash (1999) provides a sophisticated analysis of how the coercive nature of colonial governance in India, differing
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67 Geoff Danaher, et al., Understanding Foucault, (Sydney, 2000), pp. 82-96.
from its western counterpart, actually provided a productive breach for the Indian nationalists, Nicholas Thomas’ (1994) work reminds us not to underestimate the diversity in the rationalities behind different colonial projects. He stresses the dimension of failure as a characteristic feature of colonial projects; in most situations colonial powers did not have all pervasive control over their colonial subjects. Prakash argues that the colonial governmentality was obliged to develop in violation of the liberal conception that the government was part of a complex domain of dense, opaque, and autonomous interests that it only harmonized and secured with law and liberty. It had to function also as an aspect of coercion, which is, instituting the sovereignty of alien rulers. To him, it is the lack of political legitimacy and cultural alienation of British rule, which determines the peculiarity of colonial governmentality and explains its violence. However, violation of metropolitan liberal norms is constructed to be ‘a productive breach, not a restrictive liability; it instituted a generative dislocation, not a paralyzing limitation’.
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