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ABSTRACT

This study addresses issues that pertain to the urban transformation of the built-environment of a pre-colonial city of the Indian subcontinent following British occupation. The research centres on the city of Shahjahanabad / Old Delhi as the recipient of change that transformed the architecture and urban form of the 17th century city built by the Mughals to conform to the British vision of urbanism shaped by political needs and belief in the superiority of European civilization. The study extends the past scholarship on the city by presenting a total picture of Shahjahanabad / Old Delhi’s built-environment and the transformation of its urban form at macro and micro levels as one culture made way for the next.

The study acknowledges the presence of political considerations, both in their direct manifestation and as an undercurrent, in all architectural interventions, given the colonial relationship between the city and its British occupants. The Mutiny was the fulcrum about which two architecturally distinct approaches towards addressing the city’s urban form can be discerned. The year 1911, when the politically significant decision to transfer the capital of British India to Delhi was announced, also had a bearing on the relationship between the British and the city. As the British attention was diverted towards building New Delhi interventions in the older city, now referred to as Old Delhi, were directed to make it a presentable neighbour of New Delhi. The study explores how British architecture, planning and urban design inputs contributed towards the creation of a British identity, in the backdrop of the political climate, by transforming the urban landscape of 17th century Shahjahanabad from the early 19th century to the early 20th century.

It is concluded that the degree of interventions made in the built-environment of Shahjahanabad / Old Delhi was the outcome of contemporaneous political developments. The interventions were directed to make Shahjahanabad / Old Delhi habitable for the resident European community and to create a British
identity. The study draws attention to the difference in the pre-Mutiny and post-Mutiny architectural scenario as well as to the post-1911 neglect of the city.

The following themes are scrutinised in a chronological sequence: (i) the development of the built-environment of Shahjahanabad under the Mughals, from Emperor Shahjahan and his successors, till its British occupation, (ii) the British response to Delhi’s Mughal institutions and built-form types as rulers of the city and subsequent introduction of European institutions to forge their own identity in an alien cultural milieu. This is discussed as two distinct sets of reactions underpinned by the Mutiny, as in pre-Mutiny and post-Mutiny scenarios, (iii) the contributions of the institution of the durbar (court) with its transient trappings of ceremony, festivity and cardboard architecture as harbingers of a permanent identity, (iv) the building of a new capital as a symbol of the permanence of British Raj (rule) and the concomitant diversion of attention to the New Delhi project leading to the neglect of Shahjahanabad / Old Delhi.

The outcomes of this research, based on the interpretation and description of empirical data and documentary sources, are presented in two parts. Part-I builds the picture of the city at the macro level as it traces the evolution of the built-environment of the city as a whole. Part-II delves into the city fabric to present the micro level architectural scenario as it examines case studies of various built-form precincts whose urban form was transformed following British intervention.
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The main aim of this study is to understand how the built-environment of a pre-colonial city was transformed under a colonising industrial power. It is worthwhile to point out at the outset that the issue of urban transformation in the colonial context is neither unique to Shahjahanabad / Old Delhi, the subject of this study, nor is it exclusive to the Indian Subcontinent as the attitude of the incoming culture exhibited similar characteristics in other colonial contexts. The study attempts to examine the relationship between a pre-colonial city’s urban environment and the incoming dominant culture that was equipped with its own cultural values through the interface between the 17th century city of Shahjahanabad and its early 19th century British rulers who referred to it as Delhi. Delhi that comprised not one but many cities built over time was etched in public memory as a power centre. The British did not overlook this image of the city and paid the ultimate tribute to the city by building a new colonial capital of British India in Delhi in the 20th century.

Following the British occupation of the city, Shahjahanabad’s Mughal envisioned built-form became a receptacle for novel built-form interventions of an industrialised culture whose own sets of beliefs and urban institutions were introduced in an alien context. The study examines the relationship between the city and its new rulers that lasted close to 150 years with one theme underlying the discussion. Given the colonial context, the built-form interventions in Delhi’s 19th century urban landscape were an outcome of the political developments with the degree of architectural intervention depending on Delhi’s role as a participant in contemporary political events.

It is concluded that Delhi’s role in the 19th century political events governed the British perception and response towards the city’s built-environment. The Mutiny qualifies as the most significant political occurrence of the 19th century and Delhi’s role as one of the major centres of the revolt, marked a shift in the British attitude towards the city. Its pre-Mutiny perception as a political backwater and
upcountry town that prompted an architecturally modest intervention, changed after the Mutiny. Post-Mutiny, Delhi was viewed as a hostile and unsafe city that had to be controlled through an aggressive policy of urban restructuring. The urban management of the city was based on a selective approach with a distinct bias towards the areas of British habitat. With the passage of time, public spectacles of pageantry in the form of durbars (court) replaced the aggressive display of authority of the immediate post-Mutiny years, while retaining the objective of establishing the supremacy of British rule. The early 20th century marked another shift in the British attitude towards the city as the building of New Delhi got underway. The older city, now referred to as Old Delhi, was viewed as an undesirable neighbour of New Delhi with efforts directed towards making it a safe but physically distant neighbour.

The study is organised in two parts. It begins with an introduction to the subject that sets the context for the entire discussion. Part-I presents the study of the city and its hinterland as an urban entity as a whole and has five chapters. Chapter 1 deals with the Mughal built city of Shahjahanabad (1639-1803) that provides the background for the British intervention in 1803. The chapter discusses Mughal urban institutions and built-form types that constituted Shahjahanabad’s urban environment with the Qila (Palace-fort) as the most important built-form type in the city. Chapter 2 deals with the interface between the British and the city prior to the outbreak of the Mutiny. It examines the spatial interventions that were made in the city proper, particularly around the Palace-fort, and in the hinterland where British colonial military and civilian neighbourhoods, namely the cantonment and civil lines, were laid out. The chapter also takes up for discussion the introduction of urban institutions of European provenance not only to facilitate European style living for the city’s European residents, but also reform native societal practices. Chapter 3 focuses on the impact of the Mutiny on the city’s built-environment. It examines the urban reprisal measures that were launched by the military authorities to reconstruct the city. Next, it looks at the arrival of the railways not simply as a communication mode, but also as a check against future uprisings and as an agent of change that ruptured the urban fabric along the route of the lines.
The chapter also discusses the introduction of civic governance via the institution of the municipality that together with the Victorian fetish for public health were imported from Britain for application. Consequently a British civilian territory was delineated with a civic hub that boasted of urban forms borrowed from the Victorian civic landscapes and several improvement schemes were initiated to improve both the physical and moral health of the city residents. Chapter 4 examines the new mode of power assertion that replaced the aggression of the immediate post-Mutiny years. This was the British adapted Mughal institution of the durbar. Delhi hosted three grand durbars whose organisation entailed raising cardboard infrastructure on a scale comparable to that of a city. Delhi’s northern hinterland was transformed into a vast tented city for the duration of the event. The chapter examines how the durbars with their fanfare were just as effective as the military measures in reinforcing the legitimacy of British rule. Chapter 5 examines how the politically significant decision to shift the capital of British India to Delhi diverted the attention of the British to planning and building the new capital. Old Delhi was reduced to a severely fragmented and overcrowded service centre whose contents were forbidden to spill beyond the 17th century city wall lest they spoil the prospects of the environs of New Delhi.

Part-II presents a detailed examination of the city fabric at the micro level via case studies. The case studies comprise ten varying built-form precincts, each designated as a site, whose study and analysis contributes in appreciating the changes in the urban form. The sites are selected from within the walled enclosure of the city and the hinterland. Both Part-I and II rely on graphic archival and contemporary data to show the changes in the built-environment of the city over time. The study concludes with a chapter that draws together the findings of the entire investigation.

The investigation draws upon the surviving built-form heritage in the city, manifest in its buildings, pattern of streets and open spaces, and spatial delineation of city quarters, to record the process of its urban transformation over a period of over 250 years. It is worthwhile to point out that the process of urban
transformation is an ongoing one and the rate at which the built-environment of the city has changed since independence to contemporary times has altered or obliterated a substantial part of the built-heritage. This study realises that there is a sense of urgency in taking up this research before the entire corpus of built-heritage is lost forever, for any future study of Shahjahanabad / Old Delhi might have to rely purely on documentary sources.
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1.1 Introduction

Cities of the Indian Subcontinent have been frequent subjects of scholarship in their pre-colonial, colonial and contemporary incarnations. Little research has been devoted to the study of the built-environment that resulted when pre-colonial cities came under British colonial rule. The urban form of these cities then came to be shaped by two culturally distinct sets of influences, first Muslim followed by British. These cities embodied in their urban form Muslim ideas of urbanism that were transformed once Muslim rule was replaced by British dominion, when the built-environment was transformed to cater both to British cultural needs that were at variance with those of the natives, and to further British political agenda. The transformation of the urban landscape came about with architecture and planning ideas becoming tools that shaped the urban form of cities.

This research takes up one such pre-colonial city, Shahjahanabad that the British called Delhi (henceforth Shahjahanabad / Delhi wherever applicable), for study to investigate the transformation of its urban form after British occupation. Shahjahanabad / Delhi was conceived by the Mughals and took shape in accordance with the Muslim vision of urbanism that was informed by external influences and by the 700 years strong, indigenous tradition of Muslim rule in the Subcontinent. The word Mughal is used in the study in an all-encompassing sense as connoting the era and rule of the Mughal dynasty in all its manifestations. Subsequent to its occupation by the British, the city became a recipient of British urban imagery and built-form types set in a colonial context. Each culture had its own frame of reference that informed the perception of the city’s built-environment. This study focuses on Shahjahanabad / Delhi’s built-environment and its transformation at macro and micro levels as one culture made way for the
next. The word colonial city in the context of the study refers to an urban centre, Shahjahanabad / Delhi in this case, occupied by the British in British India and characterised by territorial segregation of social groups. Pre-colonial city refers to the urban centre, namely Shahjahanabad, prior to the British occupation. The phenomenon of a pre-colonial city’s urban transformation following British occupation is not unique to Shahjahanabad. In fact urban centres like Agra, Allahabad, Jhansi, Kanpur, Lahore, Lucknow and Meerut that were part of the Mughal Empire and later occupied by the British, shared the same fate. It is felt that it would be too ambitious and unrealistic to attempt a study of all pre-colonial cities thus transformed. Instead, the research focuses on a single city, Shahjahanabad / Delhi to examine the urban form’s transformation.¹

The study acknowledges that the transformation of Mughal built Shahjahanabad’s built-environment was not an event occurring in a vacuum rather it was shaped by several cultural strands of both the incoming British culture and the recipient indigenous culture’s response. Further, it was also not exclusive to the city as the urban landscape of several pre-colonial cities was likewise transformed. The study recognizes that the relationship between the British and Shahjahanabad / Delhi was based on the colonial premise of the ruler and the ruled and conformed to accepted norms of colonial behaviour in the context of the Indian Subcontinent. Given the colonial context, an explanation of some terms critical to the study and used throughout the study is essential. The word indigenous / native city or quarters refers to an area of the colonial city, in this case Shahjahanabad / Delhi, occupied by the native or indigenous population. The words, indigenous and native have been used both in their conventional and derogatory sense in the colonial context, as applicable in each case. The word ridge has also been used in its conventional sense as a topographical feature in the landscape, but where

¹ Pre-colonial cities like Agra, Jhansi, Meerut and Kanpur find a brief mention in Mutiny and immediate post-Mutiny accounts as places whose urban form was restructured with a view to making them safe for the resident European community. Lucknow has been a subject of scholarship with its transformation explored under the British. For a complete discussion on Lucknow, see, Veena T. Oldenburg, The Making of Colonial Lucknow 1856-1877, (New Jersey, 1984); Rosie Llewellyn-Jones, A Fatal Friendship-The Nawabs, the British and the City of Lucknow, (Delhi, 1985)
referred to as the Ridge it implies the ridge that skirted Shahjahanabad / Delhi to its west particularly the section running through the British hinterland settlement north of the Mughal built city. Urban transformations under British rule became a marker of British identity that was created in the unfamiliar setting of the Mughal built city, using norms of European provenance set in a new context. The study also concedes that while politics remained an undercurrent, interventions in the built-environment were not solely driven by political considerations as belief in the superiority of European civilization saw the introduction of prevailing European social practices and technological developments to shape the urban environment of the city to conform to European habitat needs. The degree of architectural intervention in a city’s urban form depended on the prevailing political scenario in general and on the role played by the city in contemporary political events.

Given the impact of political events, the research acknowledges the events of the Mutiny as markers of a shift in the British attitude towards the city’s urban form. It identifies two architecturally distinct scenarios in the form of pre-Mutiny and post-Mutiny responses to a city’s built-environment. It follows that attention be paid to a surprisingly neglected area of scholarly examination, namely the impact of coeval political developments particularly the Mutiny, and the ensuing British response towards a city’s, in this case Shahjahanabad / Delhi’s, urban form. The word Mutiny implying a revolt against the British rule has been retained instead of its post-independence substitute, First war of independence, as the former is topical to the era under discussion. The Mutiny was perceived as a horrific event by the British, both at home and in the Subcontinent, and is one of the most extensively recorded events in India’s political history, however its impact on the urban landscape of cities has received scant scholarly attention. Architectural interventions in the post-Mutiny scenario were dictated by a city’s role in the unrest. Towns and cities that did not participate in the 1857 events whether native, like Trivandrum in south India, or British, like Bombay, received interventions to improve their urban landscape for their own sake and not out of a sentiment of fear that unleashed a programme of taming insurgent cities as those of the north,
such as Agra, Bareilly, Delhi, Lucknow and Kanpur, that had been active centres of unrest during the Mutiny. In the case of Shahjahanabad / Delhi the British response to the city’s built-environment ranged from the architecturally modest interventions of the pre-Mutiny era to an aggressive display of imperial authority following the Mutiny.

The research also concedes that the motive of the British in transforming the urban landscape of Shahjahanabad / Delhi was two-fold, one being based on political considerations and secondly on a heightened perception of the superiority of their own cultural roots. It examines the role played by architecture, planning and urban design as tools of building British identity. The entire range of British responses to the city is explored, from the architecturally tentative gestures of the early 19th century to the post-Mutiny urban reprisals, followed by a public display of pomp and festivity exhibited in the Durbars before culminating in laying out New Delhi.

The study builds its argument by examining the following ideas. The first concerns the Mughal built city of Shahjahanabad. It traces the evolution of Shahjahanabad’s built-environment under Emperor Shahjahan and his successors and brings it on the threshold of British occupation. The second theme, being the core idea, explores the British response to Mughal urban institutions and the introduction of European institutions to create their own identity in Delhi. The responses are identifiable as two distinct sets of reactions, namely pre-Mutiny and post-Mutiny responses that have been discussed chronologically. The third theme, an extension of the core theme, scrutinizes the institution of durbars where rituals combined with cardboard architecture to transmit the imperial impulse among the natives and set the stage for a permanent British identity. The study concludes with the British undertaking the planning and building of a new capital, New Delhi, with the venture resulting in Delhi, now referred to as Old Delhi, being ignored as it was perceived as an unsightly slum threatening to blot the new

2 Pride in one’s ancestry was not an exclusive English trait but common to Europe at large and equally valid in other European colonial contexts.
capital. Interventions made in and around Old Delhi were designed to make the old city and its environs a presentable neighbour of New Delhi.

The chronological boundaries of the research have been limited from the year 1639, the year Shahjahanabad was founded, to 1911, the year of the Coronation Durbar. Of this time span of 272 years, the period of British occupation in the 19th and 20th centuries has been chosen as the focus. For better understanding, the entire period has been divided into phases resolving the time-span into smaller modules. Three phases, namely the Pre-Shahjahanabad Phase (1639-1648), Phase-I (1648-1707), and Phase-II (1707-1803) covering the era of Mughal rule, deal with pre-colonial Shahjahanabad. The period of focus that covers the period of the British rule, dealing with colonial Delhi, is divided into two phases, namely Phase-III (1803-1857) and Phase-IV (1857-1911). The Post-1911 era examines the architectural scenario once the British focus shifts to New Delhi while neglecting the old city.

The method adopted to investigate the urban form of Shahjahanabad / Delhi and its hinterland is based on interpreting and describing, on the basis of evidence gathered from the fieldwork and from documentary sources, the why, when and how of the built-environment's transformation process. The interpretation and description also relates to the colonial context that acts as the backdrop. The primary material for the research consists of empirical data and data culled from documentary sources.

The empirical data comprises fieldwork that entails a physical survey of the city to identify the surviving built-heritage in the city and to compile it into an inventory. Subsequently, the study selects some specimens of built-heritage from the inventory for a detailed examination of their urban transformation over a period of

---

3 The events of the 19th and 20th centuries are relatively recent occurrences and are better recorded and understood as compared to their 17th and 18th century counterparts. Availability of data, especially primary sources, both textual and graphic, for the British period is easier as methods of recording, storing and disseminating data are more advanced. Comprehensibility of the data is also a consideration, as the medium is largely English, a language that the author understands.
time. For the purpose of conducting the survey, the study relies on the format of the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England (RCHME). Built-heritage refers to built-form interventions in the pre-colonial and colonial city, Shahjahanabad / Delhi, that constitute the urban landscape. These interventions conform to the definition of a historic structure as laid down in Article 1 of the International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (1964) usually referred to as the Venice Charter. “The concept of an historic monument embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization, a significant development or a historic event. This applies not only to great works of art but also to more modest works of the past which have acquired cultural significance with the passing of time.”

The observations emerging from the physical examination of the city are recorded in the form of an inventory. Apart from existing structures, the purview of the inventory is expanded to include structures that were built in the city and hinterland but are either no longer existing or have been altered beyond recognition. For a compilation of the non-existing structures the inventory relies on documentary sources chiefly the ASI Inventory. The intention of the inclusion of these structures is to underline the complete range of built-form types. To find a place in the inventory, the built heritage component, must have one or more of the following attributes, historical / architectural / archaeological value. Contained in the purview of the inventory are built-form types, both within the city’s walled enclosure and in the hinterland, which subscribe to the chronological limits of the study. The results are compiled in separate listings, one for structures within the

---

4 The Commission has identified four levels of recording ranging from the simplest visual account to highly detailed records with architectural and historical data and its analysis. These levels are not meant to be definitive but are flexible enough to accommodate modifications, as deemed necessary, by the surveying agency. At the same time, the levels also encompass the most likely conditions under which built heritage can be subjected to scrutiny for its architectural, archaeological and historical merit.
walled confines of the city and the other for the hinterland. Each phase, from
Phase-I to Phase-IV thus has two listings each. In addition, examples of built-
heritage that pre-date the year of the founding of Shahjahanabad are also listed as
a separate inventory to draw attention to the architectural potential of the site
selected for the capital prior to the building of the city. The format adopted to
record the data is based on RCHME Level 1 Survey 6 considering that the level of
information should be sufficient to provide a base on which the investigation can
then be built. The complete inventory is enclosed as Appendix-III of the Thesis. 7

From the inventory some examples of built-heritage precincts, designated as Sites,
are selected for a detailed examination of the changes in the built-form at the
micro level. The selection of case studies has been made both from the corpus of
built-heritage within the city and hinterland. The study of sites entails a physical
inspection to garner facts through a detailed survey that can be equated to
RCHME Level 3 Survey. 8 The fieldwork is bolstered by documentary sources to
enable the case studies to present a picture of the urban transformation at the
micro level.

Additionally, some empirical data for the research is also culled at an informal
level from informants connected with the city either as its current or former
inhabitants or relate to the city at an academic level, through interviews and
conversations. Some data has been gathered through personal observation of how
life is being lived in the city today.

Documentary sources, comprising textual and graphic material, complement the
fieldwork and are drawn from a plethora of disciplines, notably, history,

---

5 Article 1, Venice Charter, The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)
6 RCHME Level 1 survey is the simplest record with minimum of information needed to identify a
building's location, age and type, to build a database of a large number of buildings. It included a
visual record with a brief written account.
7 For a detailed account, see, Appendix-III of the Thesis
8 RCHME Level 3 survey is a detailed descriptive and analytical account based on the physical
scrutiny of the site and includes a textual account and its graphic counterpart comprising a drawing
and photographic account.
geography, literature, architecture and archaeology, and government reports and gazetteers. Textual sources include both primary and secondary material and comprise indigenous sources, namely, court chronicles, independent historical accounts, Mughal administrative records such as *farman* \(\text{royal decrees})\), letters, land grants and epistolary collections, poetic compositions, fiction writing and memoirs and biographies. The European sources include correspondence of the employees of the English East India Company, Company Records and court minutes, European travelogues, memoirs and biographies, tourist guidebooks, Government records including imperial, provincial and district gazetteers and reports of archaeological surveys of the Archaeological Survey of India. Secondary textual sources include historical works, architectural histories, anthropological studies, proceedings of seminars, conferences and symposia organised by government and non government institutions addressing issues under consideration in this study and academic exercises on the city’s built-environment taken up both at under-graduate and post-graduate levels in architecture schools. Textual sources have been accessed largely from the following repositories, The Oriental and India Office Reading Room at the British Library, London, Archaeological Survey of India Library, New Delhi, Indian Council for Historical Research (ICHR), New Delhi, National Museum, New Delhi, National Archives of India (NAI), New Delhi, and Delhi Archives, New Delhi. Graphic sources comprise miniature paintings, paintings by European painters, Company Paintings, architectural drawings by Indian draftsmen under British supervision and by Europeans, including both amateur artists and official and professional artists, maps and surveys by cartographers and surveyors, and photography. Graphic sources are largely drawn from the Oriental and India Office Collection held at the British Library, London and the Photographic Library of the Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi apart from published sources.

The thesis has been presented as a two part compilation. The introduction to the subject is followed by Part-I that is a collation of the findings of the research that deals with the city as a whole. The core chapters deal with Phase III and Phase IV examining the city under British rule. The chapter dealing with Mughal
Shahjahanabad sets the context and the closing chapter on the building of New Delhi provides a picture of the city when the British interest is transferred to building New Delhi. The chapters in Part-I are chronologically arranged for an effective transition from one theme to the next. Part-II presents the case studies that examine interventions in the built-environment and its transformation at the micro level through sites, demarcated as precincts with varied built-form types. The study concludes with a chapter that brings together the findings of the entire investigation.

1.2 Relationship to previous scholarship

Scholarship on Mughal and colonial Shahjahanabad / Delhi has tended to focus on either the city’s history or on the archaeological and architectural character of its Mughal built-heritage, with little study devoted to the city’s architecture and urban form following British occupation.

Historians, writing on the city’s history, notably Spear (1951), Blake (1990) and Chenoy (1998) have confined themselves to the pre-Mutiny era, concluding their account either before or at 1857, the post-Mutiny era being largely overlooked by historians, except by Gupta (1981). As for a post-Mutiny account, historians have tended to focus on New Delhi, Irving (1984), Stamp (1982), Volwahsen (2002) and Nath (2002) to the near neglect of Shahjahanabad / Delhi.

The archaeological and architectural scholarship is informed by the 19th century European historians’ endeavours at classifying the Subcontinent’s built-heritage into styles. The studies address prominent structures of the city’s Mughal built-heritage as specimen of imperial and sub-imperial patronage and part of a larger ensemble of Mughal and specifically Shahjahani buildings. 19th century British building enterprise in the city has gone largely unnoticed and unrecorded. The city has been overlooked as a specimen of British colonial architecture, as in the context of the Indian Subcontinent its identity was overshadowed by the architectural scenario of Presidential cities. Scholarship of British colonial
architecture of Shahjahanabad / Delhi is confined to a few buildings of the pre-Mutiny era that are treated as representative of the larger repertoire of colonial architecture of the Indian Subcontinent, as in Nilsson (1968), Morris (1983) and Davies (1985). There is a near total neglect of the post-Mutiny architectural developments in the city in scholarly works with Gupta, King (1976), Frykenberg (1993) and Ehlers and Krafft (1993) including a small discussion on the city’s urban character following the Mutiny. Some scholarly articles have dealt with the city’s architecture after British occupation. These have tended to focus on one aspect of the city’s urban form. Some aspects under discussion include, the city’s havelis (mansions) by Hosagrahr (2001), the city wall by Gupta (1971), civic improvement measures by Goodfriend (1989) and Prashad (2001), and the attitude towards the city’s built-heritage by Roberts (1999). These writings tend to be isolationist and do not build the total picture of the city’s urban transformation.

A corpus of Shahjahanabad / Delhi’s built-heritage has also been compiled into inventories, first by the Archaeological Survey of India (henceforth ASI) in the early 20th century and subsequently updated by the Delhi Chapter, Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage (henceforth INTACH) at the close of the century. Both inventories can serve as a base to build-up further research on the city’s architectural evolution, as on their own, they are inadequate as studies of the city’s urban composition.

This study aims to fill the gap in the existing scholarship on Shahjahanabad / Delhi by investigating a rather neglected aspect of its history, the transformation of the city’s built-environment as a whole as power changed hands from the Mughals to the British. The study shuns the building centric approach of previous scholarship as studies of individual buildings, though complete in themselves, are alienated from the context of their urban setting, thereby tending to project a singular image, neglecting their role as a built-form type impacting the urban form of the city. Instead it deals with the city’s overall urban form and builds up the picture of urban transformation from whole to part. The built-form types then do not become an end unto themselves, but are among the elements that contribute to
the whole picture. The study appreciates the city as a site whose built-environment, a manifestation of Mughal urban institutions, was superimposed with a new layer of influences rooted in a different cultural context after the British occupation. The study also emphasizes that the medium of graphics is intrinsic to understanding the city as a spatial organisation and to facilitate the comprehension of the transformation of its urban form. It therefore provides a lucid visual account of the process of urban transformation through maps, images and architectural drawings both at the macro level of the city and micro level of built-form precincts.

Both the Mughal and British built-environment interventions, a tangible reminder of the past, survive in the city today as built-heritage, however, marginal or fragmentary. The exploration of this heritage forms the starting point of this study as it enables a reconstruction of the layers of chronological change. It is also pertinent to point out that the rate at which transformations in the city’s built-environment are taking place there is an imminent danger of the built-heritage being lost to contemporary interventions. The study is thus propelled by a sense of urgency before the entire corpus of built-heritage is lost. Any attempt then to investigate the built-environment of Shahjahanabad / Delhi will have to rely on documentary sources.
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PART-I OF II
CHAPTER 1
PRE-COLONIAL SHAHJAHANABAD: 1639-1803

1.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the development of the Mughal Badshahi Shahr (imperial city), Shahjahanabad, from its founding in 1639 to the threshold of the British invasion and occupation in 1803. It discusses the transformations in the city's urban form under successive Mughal emperors from the founder Emperor Shahjahan onwards. It is difficult to establish a conclusive picture of the urban form of 17th and 18th century Shahjahanabad as our knowledge of the city is sketchy due to lack of relevant coeval sources. The study relies on later sources to trace the evolution of the urban form of the city in the 17th century that seems to be an outcome of two different approaches, a formal idea and a spontaneous response. In the 18th century, the prevailing political situation and outside invasions followed by depleting resources and relative decline in patronage informed urban transformations that largely fell in the realm of apathy and neglect.

The chapter focuses on the Mughal Qila (palace-fort) as the most important built-form type that formed the core of the city and ordered urban space that was delimited by the city wall. The Qila, whose planning embodied Mughal concepts of formality and grandeur, was a symbol of power, an image that sustained despite the political upheavals. Transformations within its precincts and the immediate environs are of concern as they informed the British response following their...
occupation of the Qila premises. Other built-form types under discussion include the city's Jami Masjid, bazaars (markets), muhallas (neighbourhoods), havelis (mansions), gardens and the canal that became receptacles of British intervention after 1803. Their architectural adaptability to absorb new influences shaped the city's built-environment during the period of British occupation.

1.2 Pre-Shahjahanabad Phase: 1639-1648

The Mughal notion of a capital city or Dar-ul Khilafat was centred on their court called Urdu. The court comprising the Emperor and umara (nobility) was the centre of Mughal kingship and its presence granted the status of capital to a city. The Mughal court's itinerant ways and a city's status as capital being hinged to the presence of the court, the notion of a capital became a transient. Agra, Lahore and the new capital Shahjahanabad were Mughal capitals but none enjoyed the status of a permanent power centre given the Mughal court's peripatetic temperament.

Agra, the 16th century Mughal capital, was found unsuitable by Emperor Shahjahan thus prompting a decision to shift the capital. Among Agra's shortcomings were its oppressive heat and the erosive action of the Jamuna, besides its urban form did not allow the desired interface between the Qila and the city owing to lack of ceremonial avenues and public gathering space. Emperor Shahjahan's architectural ambition was also a consideration as architecture offered him a medium of realising his heightened consciousness of architecture as a medium of exhibiting status and authority. Further, by founding a new city, the Emperor was also conforming to the established Mughal tradition of founding new cities as the custodian of a dynastic tradition, besides perpetuating his name for posterity.

1 Urdu meaning horde or crowd subsequently became synonymous with camp, with the term extending its application to the Qila that was called Urdu-i Maula (Exalted Palace)
Inayat Khan, a Mughal amir (noble) and author of a chronicle, *Shahjahanama*, mentions Emperor Shahjahan’s injunction to build the Qila on a “pleasant site on the banks of the (Jamuna) distinguished by its genial climate”\(^2\) this coupled with his preference for a site in the northern part of the Empire, “somewhere between Agra and Lahore”\(^3\) prompted the selection of the site “outside of the city of Delhi lying between the most distant suburbs and Nurgarh, commonly called Salimgarh.”\(^4\) The site’s topographical characteristics can be established based on a map of the early 19\(^{th}\) century.\(^5\) The site was a flat plain with the Jamuna on its east and seasonal nallahs (seasonal streams) to the northwest. A spur of the Aravalli hills called Pahari skirted the entire western edge up to the Jamuna, besides emerging as two detached hillocks, Jhojla Pahari and Bhojla Pahari on the flat plains [Fig.1.1]. Manmade interventions included built-form types, road network, and remnants of a 14\(^{th}\) century Tughluq canal.

The team for bringing the capital project to fruition comprised city *Subahdars* (administrative functionaries), master artisans and craftsmen. Stonecutters, sculptors, carpenters and labourers converged onto the site from throughout the Empire by imperial diktat. The building of the capital began with the Qila, whose foundation was marked with “the usual ceremonies, according to the plans which had been devised in the august presence on the night of Friday, the 25\(^{th}\) Zi’il-Hijja (29 April 1639) at the exact moment appointed by the astrologers.” with foundation laying ceremony taking place on “night of Friday the 9\(^{th}\) Muharram of the year 1049 AH (12 May 1639 AD)”\(^6\)

---

\(^2\) Inayat Khan, *Shahjahanama*, A.R. Fuller, tr., W.E. Begley and Z.A. Desai, ed., (Delhi, 1990), 406


\(^4\) Inayat Khan, *op cit.*, 406

\(^5\) Site description based on data drawn from Map ‘Sketch of the Environs of Delhi (Delhi and surroundings) 1807’ [henceforth Delhi 1807], Survey of India, 1989

\(^6\) Inayat Khan, *op cit.*, 407
1.3 Mughal Shahjahanabad: 1648-1707

Emperor Shahjahan’s formal arrival at the Qila (palace-fort), that was completed on “24th of Rabi’ I 1058 (18 April 1648)” marked its opening. A grand inaugural durbar was held to showcase imperial might and benevolence. The inauguration of the Qila by extension became an invitation to the populace to make the Badshahi Shahr called Dar-ul Khilafat Shahjahanabad or Dar-ul Hukumat Shahjahanabad their home.

1.3.1 Shahjahanabad’s urban form

Shahjahanabad’s spatial organisation is difficult to reconstruct conclusively owing to lack of contemporaneous cartographic sources. The urban form was recognisably an outcome of two approaches, one a pre-determined vision of its patron who with his collaborators was desirous of establishing the Mughal state’s legitimacy. Architecture and planning became tools that focused on the urban core and the city limits at the macro level. Two, a spontaneous response that shaped the urban form at the micro level as resident social groups had the leeway to treat their personal property as they deemed fit. Nothing is suggested by contemporary sources or later descriptions that indicates any models being considered as prototypes for the city’s layout, though the city was compared in eulogistic chronograms to contemporary cities such as Istanbul and Isfahan.

Therefore our knowledge of Shahjahanabad’s urban form in this phase is very sketchy. The earliest cartographic source that assists in building a picture of the city’s urban form is a map dating around 1850. The study and analysis of this

7 ibid, 407
8 For a detailed account of the inaugural ceremony, see, ibid, 407-409
9 For a detailed discussion establishing the legitimacy of Mughal rule, see, Urvashi Dalal, ‘Shahjahanabad: An Expression of the Mughal State’s Legitimacy’ in Islamic Culture, (October, 2000), LXXIV/4, 1-17
10 For a discussion on the prototypes for Shahjahanabad’s urban layout, see, Blake, op cit., 31-36
11 Map ‘Plan of the city’ IOR: X/1659 OIOC Collection redrawn by Eckart Ehlers, Thomas Krafft and Jamal Malik as ‘Shahjahanabad: Delhi Around 1850’ (Geographische Institute der Universitat
map has been undertaken in chapter 2 as the map is chronologically compatible with phase-III of the study. It is also important to point out that some elements of the urban form of Mughal Shahjahanabad did not alter vastly from their 1850 representation in the map mentioned above. These elements of the city’s urban form are examined in the following discussion.

Physically a wall defined Shahjahanabad’s anderun fasil (extent of the city as defined by its enclosure wall). It chartered a path that enclosed an irregular quadrant. The core of the quadrant was the Qila [Fig.1.2a] and dispersed around it were built-form types such as mosques including the Jami Masjid, havelis, baghs and bazaars. The quadrant’s radii were physically manifested as two orthogonal, east-west and north-south, avenues that originated from the Qila [Fig.1.2b]. Of the two, the longer east-west axis divided the quadrant into two unequal halves to its north and south. The north-south axis marginalised a relatively smaller area of the quadrant towards east along the Jamuna. The quadrant was further divided by a hierarchical system of non-orthogonal streets that connected the city gates to the Qila and the Jami Masjid and atomised the urban fabric into smaller spatial units whose infill was provided by clusters of muhallas (neighbourhoods).

The Qila: core of the urban form

The Qila variously called Qila-e Maula, Qila-e Mubarak and Urdu-e Maula constituted the core of the city catering to the public, semi-public and private needs of its occupants including the Emperor, his extended family and service providers. Besides, serving as the seat of governance and residential precinct, it also served military, commercial, religious, recreational and utilitarian interests. The Qila also embodied an abstract symbolism as an icon of imperial might, an attribute that was to be publicly demonstrated at the urban level, for as outsiders,

constituting an elite minority, in the land they ruled, the Mughals were aware of the potential of architecture as a means of self assertion.

Site and surroundings

The Qila was sited on the west bank of the Jamuna, whose high ground and availability of water made the site more defensible. To its north was Salimgarh, a 16th century palace-fort built by Islam Shah on the riverfront. To the south was Firuzabad, the 14th century capital built by Firuz Shah Tughluq on the Jamuna front. The river Jamuna skirted the site edge on the east and on the west lay open tract. The site's riverfront location [Refer Fig.1.2a, Fig.1.3] caused it not to be centrally placed in the city as the city was confined to the west bank, with the east bank susceptible to flooding and the riverbed being too wide. While this position of the Qila may seem anomalous, particularly when considering the traditional notion of the Qila serving as the theoretical centre of the city, the patron was only following an established precedent as at Agra where the Qila was also sited on the Jamuna waterfront. Presumably, the attraction of water was too great to be overlooked as the Mughals found the subcontinent's heat unbearable. The location also afforded ease in transport and security from invasions. The Qila was oriented along the cardinal axes with greater frontage along the river from north to south. Past precedence also existed with the Agra Qila also fronting the Jamuna.

Relationship with the City

The Qila embodied the principles of formal composition based on geometry, symmetry, axial disposition and sequential spatial transition and became a point of reference for the city, ordering its structure from the Diwan-e Am, the originator of two cardinal axes, physically manifested as Shahjahanabad's principal avenues.

12 For a discussion on the Qila as centre of the city and Empire, see, Blake, op cit., 29-30
13 For a detailed discussion on building along the waterfront, see, Ebba Koch, 'The Mughal Waterfront Garden' and 'Mughal Palace Gardens from Babur to Shah Jahan (1526-1648)', in Ebba Koch, Mughal Art & Imperial Ideology- Collected Essays, (Delhi, 2001), 183-228
The city also became the ground for Mughal courtly rituals as imperial cavalcades, in public displays of splendour, moved down the principal avenues serving as ceremonial routes. An observer, negotiating the east-west avenue from the landward side, west of the Qila, saw the Qila as a fitting culmination point of this journey. The axis was traversed first through the city and then the Qila in a succession of courts and built-forms that denoted the public, semi-public to private domains [Refer Fig.1.2a, Fig.1.4a, b] terminating rather surprisingly at the Qila’s Rang Mahal pavilion instead of the more befitting Mussamman Burj, whose overhanging jharokha (overhanging balcony) was used for the daily ritual of imperial darshan (the ritual of the Emperor showing himself to his subjects). The location of the Mussamman Burj off the ritual axis was probably intentional to respect the need of imperial privacy as the Mussamman Burj formed part of the Emperor’s living quarters, the private Khass Mahal. The deflection of the axis was also not a novelty in the case of Shahjahanabad’s Qila as it had been attempted in the Qilas at Agra and Lahore, where the darshan jharokha was not located at the culmination of the axis. The Qila also established a formal spatial relationship with the city's prominent built-form types representing Mughal urban institutions, an aspect explored by scholars like Noe and Petruccioli. 

The Qila interacted with the city via a maidan (large open space), [Fig.1.5] described by Bernier as a “great royal square, faced on one side by the gates of the fortress, and on the opposite side of which terminate the two most considerable streets of the city.” Bernier also took note of its activities including pitching of tents of those “Rajas” or “petty sovereigns”, mounting guard on a weekly

---

14 For a detailed discussion on this seemingly anomaly, see, Anisha Shekhar Mukherji, The Red Fort of Shahjahanabad, (Delhi, 2003), 139-140
15 For the layout of the Agra Qila, see, M. Ashraf Husain, An Historical Guide to the Agra Fort, (Delhi, 1937) and for the layout of the Lahore Qila, see, Kamil Khan Mumtaz, Architecture in Pakistan, (London, 1985), 55-66
17 Francoise Bernier, Travels in the Mogul Empire, 1656-68, Irving Brock, tr., Archibald Constable, ed., (Delhi, 1968), 243
rotational basis, exercising, examining and branding royal horses by the “grand Muster-master of the cavalry.” The maidan was also a venue for a bazaar with a variety of services and wares on offer.

On the east, the Qila overlooked a reti (sandy riverbank) between itself and the Jamuna, whose existence depended on seasonal variations.\textsuperscript{18} Those approaching the Qila by boat landed on the reti whose sands hosted activities like public assembly for imperial darshan, elephant combats and parades of the umara.

Qila layout

Absence of 17\textsuperscript{th} century cartographic sources prevents a complete understanding of the Qila layout, even as textual descriptions of the Qila in memoirs of 17\textsuperscript{th} century travellers abound.\textsuperscript{19} The study relies on data drawn from the 1850 map\textsuperscript{20} to build the Qila layout [Fig.1.6a-c].

The Qila enclosure wall was in the form of a Muthamman Baghdadi (irregular octagon)\textsuperscript{21} that was altered by extending its northern side to form a triangle with one edge parallel to Salimgarh. A khandak (moat) surrounded the wall\textsuperscript{22} that allowed entry into the precinct via darwazas (gateways) and khirkis (posterns / wickets), with Lahori Darwaza and Akbarabadi Darwaza as the two principal entrances. Salimgarh Darwaza, on the northeast connected the Qila to Salimgarh, on the landward side. The riverfront openings included the Emperor’s private entry from the Khizri Darwaza, a water gate, at the Mussaman Burj, besides a

\textsuperscript{18} During the rainy season, when the Jamuna was in spate, it flowed along the retaining edge of the city, thus submerging the reti, while rest of the year, the reti was accessible.
\textsuperscript{19} A tour of the Qila was an integral part of the visitor's itinerary, who described parts of the Qila accessed, namely, the public areas. Private living quarters, particularly the imperial zenana were out of bounds to all. Bernier did manage to gain entry into the imperial zenana, but was led blindfolded, lest its privacy be violated.
\textsuperscript{20} Data drawn from Redrawn Delhi Map
\textsuperscript{21} For a discussion, see, Ebba Koch, Mughal Architecture: An Outline of Its History and Development (1526-1858), Munich, 1991), 110
\textsuperscript{22} Data drawn from a painting, ‘The Panorama of Delhi’ Add.Or.4126 OIOC Collection
khirki near the Salimgarh Darwaza and a water gate at the Asad Burj. Within, spaces ranged from public, semi-public to private areas, progressing sequentially from the landward side with privacy levels increasing towards the riverfront. Spaces were delineated as per each occupant groups' behavioural norms, namely royalty and masses, the latter comprising umara, officials and servants. Public-imperial areas were characterised by formality and symmetry, while in private-imperial areas privacy took precedence over formality. Public areas for the masses evolved informally through their respective occupants’ intervention, while their private spaces, though informal in nature, were governed primarily by the need for privacy.

Spatial division into imperial, public and private areas and areas for the masses notwithstanding, each spatial zone type was not rigidly compartmentalized as interchangeable and multiple usage of space was the norm. Imperial-public areas were aligned along the central east-west axis physically extending into the Qila from the city via Lahori Darwaza and proceeding along Chatta Bazaar and Chauk, Naqqarkhana and Chauk onto Diwan-e Am Chauk to terminate in the Diwan-e Am pavilion at the elevated kursi (throne) [Fig.1.7]. Imperial-private areas comprised living quarters, zenana, gardens and residences of the extended royal family. The riverfront terrace was reserved for the Emperor's quarters, namely, the Tasbihkhana, Khwabgah and Baitthak and the Musamman Burj [Fig.1.8a-d]. Imperial zenana quarters (womens' quarters) were also built on the terrace, and included the Mumtaz Mahal also called Chota Rang Mahal and the Rang Mahal. Two gardens, the Hayat Baksh Bagh [Fig.1.9] and Mehtab Bagh occupied the northern part of the layout stretching from the river to Rastah Salimgarh leading northwards from the Naqqarkhana Chauk. Non-imperial zenana quarters lay south of the Diwan-e Am Chauk, bordered on the west by Bazar Dihli Darwazah and on south by the Qila wall. The masses' public areas including karkhanas

23 For a detailed description of openings, see, Archaeological Survey of India [henceforth ASI], List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments in Delhi Zail (Calcutta, 1915-22) [henceforth Listing], I, 4-8
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(workshops), stables, kitchens, stores, rathkhana (carriage house), toshakhana (apartments for sewn garments and jewellery) and shops were probably sited between the Qila wall on the west and Bazar Dihli Darwazah and Rastah Salim Garh. Areas for troops and their umara were in the arcades of the Naqqarkhana and Diwan-e Am chauks. The masses' private areas were in all likelihood interspersed with their public areas, while observing privacy norms with their own separate walled confines. Additionally, some public movement took place in the imperial-private zone as select umara had access to the Diwan-e Khass [Fig.1.10a, b] court and pavilion and the adjoining the Hammam, where the Emperor discussed matters of state. Both these structures were also built on the eastern terrace. The transition from the public space of the Diwan-e Am to the semi-public area was effected through a specially designated doorway called Darwazah La’l Burdah. 25

Antecedents of the Qila layout

The Qilas in Agra and Lahore built under successive Mughal emperors in the 16th and 17th centuries were available models. Shahjahanabad's Qila departed from its predecessors, in that it was not an intervention in a pre-existing complex, but built on a new site. While, stylistically, it drew upon its Agra and Lahore counterparts, the Qila in Shahjahanabad was laid out with a unified vision. The Qila's built-form components comprised single-storied arched pavilions for private and public use. Courtyards served as formal assembly spaces or as forecourts of important buildings and as linking spaces between areas. Elevated terraces along the waterfront enabled taking in of views and breezes. Gardens were laid as private retreats or provided a visually enriching setting as a foreground for important buildings, and also served as transitional areas. Design elements included jalis as partitions for varying degrees of privacy, colonnades as spatial enclosures and also as space for shops, offices and quarters for troops and umara. Textiles enhanced

24 Bernier described these as “large halls [...] called Kar-kanays or workshops for the artisans”, where a diverse range of products were being made. Bernier, op cit., 258-259
the porosity of spatial flow between indoor and outdoor areas as *shamiyanas* (tents) and *kanats* (awnings) formed pavilion and courtyard walls, partitions, fenestration coverings and roof coverings26 [Refer Fig.1.10b, Fig.1.11]. Historians like Petruccioli and Nath have considered the possibility of the Mughal camp layout inspiring that of the Mughal Qila’s petrified built-form types,27 however the extent to which Shahjahanabad’s Qila may have drawn upon the Mughal camp layout for inspiration is difficult to establish.

Transformations in the Qila under Emperor Aurangzeb

Barbicans were added for additional security to the Lahori and Akbarabadi Darwazas and also perhaps to the water gate at the Asad Burj.28 This addition altered the centrality of the cardinal axes in relation to their foreground, as Lahori Darwaza and Akbarabadi Darwaza originally entered from the west and south, were later entered from north and west respectively, even as the main facades retained their original orientation. A mosque, the Moti Masjid, [Refer Fig.1.9] was added west of the Hammam, with its own walled space so as not to impinge upon other activities, its skewed *Qibla* (direction of Mecca) orientation accommodated within the enclosure without disturbing the geometry of the layout.29 In all probability, the Emperor laid out a walled garden, the Mehtab Bagh, west of the Hayat Baksh Bagh for his wives30 [Fig.1.12]. The puritan Emperor’s diktat

25 A red colour curtain, *Lal Purdah*, was hung in the opening and the *umara* allowed access beyond it were called *Lal Purdis.*
27 For a detailed discussion, see, Attilio Petruccioli, ‘The City as an Image of the King: Some Notes on the Town-planning of Mughal Capitals in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, in Monica Juneja, cd., *Architecture In Medieval India*, (Delhi, 2001), 541-548; R. Nath, ‘Sources and Determinants of the Architecture’, in Michael Brand and Glenn Lowry, ed., *Fatehpur-Sikri*, (Bombay, 1986), 149-184
28 ASI, *Listing*, 1, 8-9
29 Construction of *Moti Masjid* is attributed to Emperor Shahjahan by some scholars.
30 Data drawn from a painting, ‘Mehtab Bagh’ from Bibliotheque nationale de France, Collection, BNOd 63/11, in Jean-Marie Lafont, *Chitra, Cities and Monuments of 18th century India from French Archives*, (Delhi, 2000), 3
denouncing the *darshan* ritual for its deification of a mortal left the imperial *jharokha* at the Musamman Burj only for witnessing elephant fights and inspection of parading animals.

**The city wall: urban enclosure**

The city wall called *Divar* or *Shahr Panah* delineated the extent of the urban area that Manucci noted lay "in a large plain of great circumference, and is in the shape of an imperfect half moon"\(^{31}\) [Fig. 1.13]. Built in 1650 in stone and mud, the wall gave away at several places due to heavy rains in 1651\(^{32}\) and a new wall was raised by imperial command, "built one half of brick and the rest of stone. [...] At every 100 paces is a strengthening bastion, but on these there is no artillery [...] the city on the eastern side along which the river Jamnah flows, has no wall."\(^{33}\) The wall was 6,664 yards long, 4 yards in width and 9 yards high\(^{34}\) and followed an amorphous semi-circular path on the landward side connecting two points along the Jamuna in an irregular arc, thus prompting Manucci's remark. Openings in the wall included seven *darwazas* on the landward side and five along the river opening onto *ghats* (stepped waterfront embankment) from where the Jamuna was accessed. Lahori Darwaza and Akbarabadi Darwaza at the termination of the principal avenues on the west and south served as ceremonial entry points of entry into the city with Manucci calling them "the chief gates are the one leading to Agrah and the one leading to Lahor"\(^{35}\) [Fig. 1.14a, b]. The number of *khirkis* is difficult to establish. The wall was seemingly not designed to sustain a siege but to act as a deterrent for plunderers like Mewatis and Gujars of the hinterland who made forays into the city.\(^{36}\) This was corroborated by Bernier, who noted that


\(^{32}\) Kambo, *op cit.* - cited in M.A. Ansari, ed., *Geographical Glimpses of Medieval India*, (Delhi, 1989), 12-13

\(^{33}\) Manucci, *op cit.*, I, 177

\(^{34}\) ASI, *Listing*, *op cit.*, I, 187, No. 410

\(^{35}\) Manucci, *op cit.*, I, 177

\(^{36}\) For a detailed discussion on the wall's purpose, see Catherine B. Asher, 'Delhi Walled: Changing boundaries' in James D. Tracy ed., *City Walls - The Urban Enceinte in Global Perspective*, (Cambridge, 2000), 247-281
"there are neither ditches nor any other kind of additional defence, [...] except flanking towers of antique shape, at intervals of about one hundred paces, and a bank of earth forming a platform behind the walls, four or five feet in thickness."37

The street pattern

Lack of 17th century cartographic sources also makes it difficult to establish Shahjahanabad’s street pattern with certainty. The street pattern as indicated in the 1850 map has been examined in Chapter 2. The two cardinal thoroughfares originating from the Qila, envisaged as grand ceremonial avenues were recognisably planned formally. Bernier was clearly referring to a clearly identifiable separate level of streets that he described as “not so long nor so straight as the two principal ones, but resembling them in every other respect. Of the numberless streets which cross each other, many have arcades; but having been built at different time periods by individuals who paid no regard to symmetry, very few are so well built, so wide, or so straight as those I have described.”38 Bernier’s comment on the “numberless streets which cross each other”39 is possibly a reference to streets born out of spontaneity.

The muhalla: basic unit of spatial organisation

Administratively, the city was divided into twelve wards called thanas40 whose boundaries probably followed the lines defined by the city’s secondary level streets. The thanas were atomised into muhallas (neighbourhoods) that constituted the basic unit of spatial organisation. The number of muhallas in 17th century Shahjahanabad is not known but the mention of the word in 17th century texts

37 Bernier's opinion was undoubtedly influenced by 17th century European fortification of cities that was highly evolved. Bernier, op cit., 242
38 Bernier, op cit., 246
39 Ibid., 246
40 Narayani Gupta, Delhi between Two Empires, 1803-1931, (Delhi, 1998), 83
indicating their presence.\textsuperscript{41} The inauguration of the Qila was deemed as an invitation to the umara (nobility) to set up their households in the city. That amiri households had a significance at the urban level can be gauged by Wheeler's remark that Shahjahanabad was divided into thirty six parts, each named either after a particular amir who resided in that part, or after some local factor.\textsuperscript{42} The elite comprising the ruler, princes and high-ranking umara, had elaborate households "in the courtyard of each one the area of a city is empty" with service-providers clustering around their dwellings. Such an arrangement has led scholars like Blake to suggest that the extended elite household constituted a muhalla with the Qila being the supreme elite muhalla that topped the muhalla hierarchy followed by the princely and amiri muhallas. Another type comprised the habitats of people who lived and worked independently that were clustered on caste and craft basis.\textsuperscript{43} Probably the city was an agglomeration of both elite and non-elite muhallas in Phase-I and II with the former dominating the cityscape. The urban form of the muhalla types is difficult to ascertain in pre-colonial Shahjahanabad and has been taken up for discussion in Chapter 2 based on the 1850 map.

**Mughal urban institutions and their built-form types**

Shahjahanabad’s urban institutions and their built-form types were assigned a place in the urban form based on hierarchy. For example the mosques in the city ranged from the Jami Masjid, that exerted influence at the level of the city, to mosques that formed the focus of a city quarter at the thana level to the muhalla

\textsuperscript{41} "In the beginning when Shahjahanabad was first constructed there was no mahallah in which there was not the mansion of an Iranian amir and those mahallas were known by the names of those amirs." Shah Nawaz Khan, *Ma'asir-al Umara* [henceforth *Maasir*], Maulvi Abd ar-Rahim and Maulvi Ashraf Ali, ed., II. Beveridge and Baini Prasad, tr., (Calcutta, 1952), 3, 690

\textsuperscript{42} J. Talboys Wheeler, *Early Travels in India 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} Centuries* - cited in Shama Mitra Chenoy, *Shahjahanabad: A City of Delhi, 1638-1857*, (Delhi, 1998), 49, Footnote 15

\textsuperscript{43} Kambo, *op cit.*, 3, 45 - cited in Blake, *op cit.*, 45, Footnote 86

\textsuperscript{44} For a complete discussion on Blake’s Interpretation of Shahjahanabad’s muhallas, see, Blake, *op cit.*, 83-90
level mosques that catered to the local resident community. The following discussion examines the urban institutions and their built-form types.

Institution of religion and mosques

Since the Mughal Empire was not a truly Islamic state, the traditional Islamic equation between the state and religion as manifested through architecture was probably not deemed necessary. Spatially this implied that the Qila, representing the state, and the Jami Masjid, representing the institution of religion, were not necessarily formally related in the city layout [Refer Fig.1.2b]. However, with Emperor Shahjahan digressing from the more inclusive state policies of his predecessors in favour of a more explicit Islamic identity, it was inevitable that Islam would find a strong representation in the urban landscape through its various built-form manifestations, particularly, the Jami Masjid that epitomised the mosque par excellence. Prior to founding Shahanabad, Shahjahan had once ordered that mosque be built in every city that had a Muslim population.

With the founding of Shahjahanabad, in keeping with Shahjahan’s orders, “in every lane, bazaar, square, and street they have erected mosques.” The Jami Masjid, Shahjahanabad's largest congregational mosque was built by Emperor Shahjahan in 1650. Its location, on Bhojla Pahari, was commensurate with its exalted status as the imperial place of worship [Fig.1.16a, b]. At the urban level the relationship between the Qila and the Jami Masjid seemed rather informal due to the absence of a tangible geometry between the two built-form types. The Jami Masjid had four cardinal axes and that to the east linked the mosque with the Qila's Akbarabadi Darwaza forming a processional path to enable the Emperor to arrive in a procession for Friday prayers. Scholars like Noe have suggested that the layout of Shahjahanabad was far more complex than commonly recognised in

45 State machinery was run by imperial directive and not in accordance with Sharia, thereby causing administrative establishment to distance itself from the religious. R.P. Khosla, Mughal Kingship and Nobility, (Delhi, 1976), 161
46 Kambo, op cit. - cited in Blake, op cit., 52
47 Sujan Rai, Khulasat al-Tawarikh, fol.25a - cited in Blake, op cit., 52
which built-forms like the Jami Masjid and the Qila were linked together in a
dimensional and geometric relationship. The Jami Masjid was a rallying point
for Muslims of Shahjahanabad on all matters and in all likelihood served as a
model for emulation for other mosques built under royal and amir\i\ patronage.
These mosques, such as the Fatehpuri Masjid and Akbarabadi Masjid, dominated
their respective city quarters, attracting people from their catchments areas.

Institution of commerce and bazaars

Bazaars formed the hub of a Mughal city and transcended their role as places of
commerce into social institutions. Manucci observed that 17\textsuperscript{th}
century Shahjahanabad had several large bazaars selling many products, of these, the
chief ones were those along the streets that led to the Qila from the Lahori and
Akbarabadi Darwazas. The bazaar along the east-west avenue was developed by
Jahanara Begum in 1650 [Fig.1.17]. It was divided into three sections and had
two chauks (squares) broke the linearity of the avenue. The bazaar along the
north-south avenue, called Faiz Bazaar was developed at the behest of Nawab
Akbarabadi Begum in 1650 [Fig.1.18]. Another important bazaar came up along
the street between the Akbarabadi Darwaza of the Qila to the eastern gate of the
Jami Masjid called Khass Bazaar. It had two chauks, Chauk Sa’adullah Khan, near the Qila and other near the mosque. Bernier’s observation of the bazaar
shops makes their reconstruction possible. Ganjs (wholesale bazaars) dealing in
grain, fruits, vegetables and cattle were in the hinterland.

Institution of leisure and baghs

The Mughal notion of leisure implied a languorous and sensual partaking of the
bounties of nature in the seclusion of a bagh (garden). Several garden laying

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotetext[48]{For a detailed discussion on this aspect of the city’s urban form, see, S.V. Noe, ‘Shahjahanabad:
Geometrical Bases for the Plan of Mughal Delhi’, in Patwant Singh and Ram Dhamija, ed., Delhi: The
Deepening Urban Crisis, (Delhi, 1989), 19-26}
\footnotetext[49]{Manucci, op cit., 1, 177}
\footnotetext[50]{For a description of the two main bazaars, see, Shah Nawaz Khan, op cit., II, 272}
\end{footnotesize}
commissions were undertaken by Shahjahan, his consorts, members of the royal family and umara, as testified by Manucci, that "round these palaces or cities are many royal gardens for recreation, where are grown many kinds of fruits and flowers, chiefly roses, from which are distilled the essences for the royal household." Unlike Agra, in Shahjahanabad, access to the waterfront was almost the sole prerogative of the imperial authority with the result that gardens were built on land-locked sites in the city and its northwest hinterland.

Within the city, three gardens enveloped the Qila on its north, south and west namely, Anguri (grapes) Bagh, Buland Bagh and Gulabi (Rose) Bagh respectively53 [Refer Fig.1.6a]. Of these the first was probably a vineyard planted within a walled enclosure, while Gulabi Bagh had an avenue of trees lining a central pathway that terminated at one end in a raised pavilion, overlooking the garden probably planted with a preponderance of roses.54 It is quite possible that the gardens were developed as part of the Qila environs and were meant to be pleasure gardens, with their flowers and greenery creating a striking contrast with the red sandstone walls.55 The most prominent garden for royal ladies was Bagh-e Sahibabad or Begum-ka Bagh, laid out by Jahanara Begum, north of Chandni Chauk.56 Emperor Aurangzeb was not as prolific as his father when it came to laying gardens, yet he ordered that the gardens of the Qila, city and its hinterland be properly maintained.57

Institution of dwelling and havelis

51 For a detailed account of the shops, see, Bernier, op cit., 245
52 Manucci, op cit., II, 256
53 Data from Redrawn Delhi Map
54 Data drawn from Map 'Map of the Red Fort, Delhi' Add. Or.1790 OIOC Collection
55 Bernier, op cit., 243, 248-249
56 For a detailed account of the Begum-ka Bagh, see, Part-II of the Thesis
57 Emperor Aurangzeb in a missive, sent during his Deccan campaign, to Asad Khan, enquired about the state of the gardens and ordered that they be properly maintained. Inayat Allah, Ruka’ar-i Alamgiri, J.H. Billimoria, tr., (Delhi, 1972), 116
The haveli (mansion) was the basic unit of residence built by the elite. Absence of coeval sources makes it difficult to reconstruct the urban form of the haveli in Phase-I and II and it has been taken up for discussion in Chapter 2. Likewise, the number of havelis in the city cannot also be established with certainty. Following the completion of the Qila, royal princes and high-ranking umara, wealthy merchants and bankers undertook building of their havelis. Bernier wrote a general account of a haveli’s attributes, stating that “there are many in Dehli possessing all the properties” that he attributed to a “good house” probably implying a haveli. Manucci also wrote of “fine palaces for the nobles; a great numbers of other houses have thatched roofs, but are highly decorated and commodious inside.”

It would be erroneous to think of Shahjahanabad as lying only within the limits prescribed by the city wall. Beyond the city wall was the hinterland with pockets of habitation of which some were of pre-Mughal origin and some grew up with the founding of Shahjahanabad.

1.3.2 Extramural settlements beyond the city wall

The extent of Shahjahanabad’s hinterland can be gauged from Bernier’s observation of the “suburbs” that were “considerable, comprising a long chain of buildings on the side of Lahor, the extensive remains of the old city, and three or four smaller suburbs. [...] Though I cannot undertake to define exactly the circumference, because these suburbs are interspersed with extensive gardens and open spaces, yet you must see that it is very great.” Shahjahanabad’s hinterland settlements ranged from the ruinous remnants of older cities in the Delhi region to newly established pockets of habitation that acted as service providers to the city with ganjs (wholesale bazaars) and venues for recreation and pilgrimage [Fig.1.19].

58 Shah Nawaz Khan, op cit., II, 271
59 For a complete account, see, Bernier, op cit., 245-248
60 Manucci, op cit., I, 178
Hinterland gardens for recreation

Hinterland gardens were meant for both pleasure and interment of the deceased. Those laid out by the royal family were largely approached from the city proper via the Lahori and Kabuli Darwazas. The Tees Hazari Bagh was laid out by Emperor Shahjahan where a daughter of Emperor Aurangzeb was interred. The Sirhindi Bagh or Bari Sirhindi Begum also served as its patron’s final resting place. The Roshanara Bagh was planned as a funerary garden that was a place of leisure while its patron was living. The Shalimar Bagh was a pleasure garden that doubled as a halting place for the royal entourage on its northward journey. Emperor Shahjahan also laid out a garden, Khizrabad, along the Jamuna, south of Shahjahanabad, where Aurangzeb held Dara Shikoh captive in 1658. Beyond the Kashmiri Darwaza, were amiri gardens namely, Bagh Nawab Ali Mardan Khan and Bagh Nawab Jafar Khan. Emperor Shahjahan also built a shikargah (hunting lodge) at Palam game preserve with a lofty hunting tower. The gardens were maintained in a state of verdure through irrigation by reviving a pre-existing canal making its way to the city.

The canal

The 14th century canal built by Sultan Firuz Shah Tughluq was revived and extended to the city. Upon completion of the work, the canal became the chief source of water supply that transformed the arid Delhi region into arable, verdant land through irrigation. It flowed through the northwest hinterland before entering Shahjahanabad via the Kabuli Darwaza, where it bifurcated to flow down major avenues and through the Begum-ka Bagh, after which it was lifted to flow through the Qila.

---

62 For a detailed description of the hinterland gardens, see, Constance M. Villiers-Stuart, Gardens of the Great Mughals, (London, 1913), 91-117
63 For a description of the hunting preserve, see, Ebba Koch, Mughal Art and Imperial Ideology- Collected Essays, (Delhi, 2001), 177-179; ASI, Listing, op cit., IV, 39, No.75
64 Data pertaining to the canal’s path drawn from Redrawn Delhi Map
1.4 Mughal Shahjahanabad: 1707-1803

Following Emperor Aurangzeb’s demise in 1707, the weakening of imperial authority opened the doors of the city to military invasions and a civil war that resulted in plundering sprees in Shahjahanabad. The depletion of imperial resources affected Mughal institutions like court mobility and rituals. According to a late 18th century description of the court under Emperor Shah Alam II, reduced to a pensioner of the Marathas, the “pompous spectacle of the audience of Aurangzeb which Bernier has described for us with so much pleasure and exactness has been replaced by the strictest parsimony which is born of real poverty and not of a weakening of the taste for external pomp.”65 The Mughals, contrary to their temperament, adopted a relatively sedentary lifestyle and their excursions comprised short trips for hunting, leisure and pilgrimage to Shahjahanabad’s hinterland. The nobility, both Muslim and Hindu, had left Shahjahanabad for newer power centres emerging in the 18th century such as Faizabad, Murshidabad, Lucknow and Hyderabad, leaving behind talented artists on the brink of starvation due to lack of patronage.66

1.4.1 Changes in Shahjahanabad’s urban form

Under the prevailing circumstances, it was unlikely for the cityscape to undergo any major change from its 17th century urban form [Refer Fig.1.2a]. Shahjahanabad was deprived of its greatest source of artistic and building enterprise as imperial patronage of art and architecture declined.67 Imperial patronage of architecture was centred largely on spiritual enterprises as additions were made to the dargahs (Sufi saint’s shrine) of Sufi saints that also doubled as

65 Comte de Modave - cited in Major A.L.II. Polier, Shah Alam II and His Court, Pratul C. Gupta, ed., (Calcutta, 1947), 87-88
67 The most sincere upholder of the Mughal ideal of adab, was Emperor Muhammad Shah, whose interest however, lay in painting, literary and performing arts, than in architecture.
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the resting places of their patrons. Some umara continued to patronise art and architecture, though Shahjahanabad was not necessarily the recipient of their munificence, as new settlements were founded. The city witnessed the emergence of Islamic reformatory movements and many dargahs, khanqahs (Sufi seminary) and madrasas (institute of Islamic learning) were built. The following discussion examines the transformation in the urban form in light of the circumstances in this phase.

Retention of the Qila as the urban core

The Qila (Palace-fort) upheld its symbolism as a power centre and continued to be the fountainhead of both military and civil administration even as the Mughal power was on the wane. Invaders such as Nadir Shah, the Afghans and the Marathas aspired to take possession of the Qila. Changes in the Qila were inevitable but were not positive contributions rather, they qualified as plundering sessions that were detrimental to the precinct.

Transformations in the Qila: Spoliation of the precinct

Political circumstances in this phase caused the Qila to play host, for the first time since its founding, to non-Mughal occupants. Nadir Shah, whose collection of ransom probably included several items from the Qila besides the famous Peacock Throne, took up residence in the imperial apartments with the incumbent Emperor, Muhammad Shah, relegated to the Shah Burj. During the reign of Emperor Farrukhsiyar in the early 18th century, the silver ceiling of the Rang Mahal was replaced by a copper substitute. In 1757 Ahmad Shah Durrani occupied the Qila after driving Emperor Alamgir II to the Qudsiya Bagh, a

---

68 For an account of imperial patronage of dargahs, see, Dargah Quli Khan, Risalah-1 Salar Jung, Shama Mitra Chenoy and S. Chandrashekhar, tr., Muraqqa-e Dehli, The Mughal Capital in Muhammad Shah's Time, (Delhi, 1989), 6-11
69 For a detailed discussion on Islamic reformatory movements, see, Jamal Malik, 'Islamic Institutions and Infrastructure in Shahjahanabad', in Eckart Ehlers and Thomas Krafft, ed., Shahjahanabad/Old Delhi Tradition and Colonial Change, (Stuttgart, 1993), 43-64
hinterland garden to the north. The Marathas wrested control of the Qila in a battle during which the precincts were bombarded from the east targeting the Asad Burj, the Mussaman Burj and other structures on the terrace. Following the assault, the Diwan-e Khass, the Rang Mahal, the Moti Mahal and the Shah Burj were damaged. The Marathas and their Jat allies plundered the Qila, removing the silver ceiling of the Diwan-e Khass and gouging out precious stones from their pietra-dura settings from the walls of several imperial apartments. Almost three decades later, Ghulam Qadir, a Rohilla Afghan, in a furtive search for treasure in the Qila, caused more damage as “the floors of every apartment in the Citadel were dug up, every article seized, even to the Pots of the Kitchens. [...] The Old Queens of Mahummud Shaw, [...] were forced from their houses [...] Their property was seized, and the floors of even their apartments dug up.” Ghulam Qadir, defeated by the Marathas, ignited a powder magazine causing a conflagration that was brought under control before too much damage could be done. Subsequently, the Qila remained intact under Maratha occupation although it was badly in need of repair and maintenance, issues that were of marginal concern in the politically turbulent times.

Spoliation, apart, the Qila also suffered from dilapidation due to earthquakes in 1719 and 1757. Depleting resources prevented maintenance of the precinct. Water supply by the canal being intermittent, this must have also contributed to the neglect of the gardens and imperial apartments. Spatially, the Qila was not at a great variance with its 17th century layout as is revealed in a painting made by an architect working for the Avadh Nawab, Shuja’ ud-Daula [Fig.1.21a, b].

70 ASI, Annual Report 1911-12, 5, Footnote 8
71 ibid, 6, Footnote 2
72 Jonathan Scot in a letter to Governor-General Hastings - cited in Percival Spear, Twilight of the Moghuls, (Cambridge, 1951), 27-28
73 Inference drawn from painting, 'Palace of the great Moghul, Delhi, from the bank of the Jamuna' Bibliotheque Nationale de France Collection, BNo 63/3, in Jean-Marie Lafont, Chitra, Cities and Monuments of 18th century India from French Archives, (Delhi, 2000)
Transformations in the maidan

Cartographic sources dating to this phase indicate\(^{74}\) that the maidan fronting the Qila remained an open area with a few structures interspersed with trees [Refer Fig.1.5]. Its exclusivity as a parade ground was somewhat mitigated by the construction of a mosque south of the Akbarabadi Darwaza by the head eunuch of the imperial zenana.\(^{75}\) The Gulabi Bagh and Anguri Bagh remained buffers between the Qila and maidan.

The city wall retained as urban container

This phase provided a test for the wall’s efficacy against marauders as the hinterland was laid waste due to plundering and civil riots and people flocked to the city proper for refuge. The wall was breached during attacks mounted under Ghulam Qadir in 1787.\(^{76}\) The wall circuit remained unchanged but additional khirkis increased its porosity.\(^{77}\)

The street pattern

Like the overall urban form, the street pattern is also not likely to have deviated from the hierarchy established in the last phase [Refer Fig.1.2b]. Cartographic sources indicate that the east-west and north-south avenues were the most prominent streets.\(^{78}\) The possibility of the network becoming denser due to the addition of streets cannot be denied. Dargah Quli Khan’s account\(^{79}\) enables us to

\(^{74}\) Cartographic sources include three maps, ‘Map of Chandni Chowk’ Cat. no. AL 1762, 140x31 cms.; ‘Map of Faiz Bazar’ Cat. no. AL 1763, 135x31 cms.; ‘Map of the Fort’ Cat. no. AL 1754, 82x75 cms. from the Victoria and Albert Museum Collection, in Susan Gole, ‘Three Maps of Shahjahanabad, in South Asian Studies, (London, 1988), 4,13-27

\(^{75}\) ASI, Listing, op cit., I, 29-30, No.33

\(^{76}\) Blake, op cit., 168

\(^{77}\) ASI Listing, op cit., I, 35

\(^{78}\) Maps from the Victoria and Albert Museum Collection, in Gole, op cit., 13-27

draw the following conclusions. Streets called Kuchas (narrow streets) were named after individuals, for instance Kucha-Pati Ram, or a commodity, namely Kucha-Murghian (fowl), or a physical attribute, as Kucha Bazaar-Imli (street with a tamarind tree). The Maratha influence, introduced a new word to the architectural lexicon, the suffix, wara, implied a munalla as in Kucha-i Maliwara.

Transformation in the muhallas

The number of thanas and muhallas cannot be conclusively established. According to an observer writing in 1785, Shahjahanabad had so many muhallas that it was not possible to keep count of them. The probable three-fold muhalla typology was perhaps retained as Gentile observed, “there are many mansions of the nobles, which one can compare to small towns and in which reside the women, equipment, and bazaars (or public markets) of the nobles.” Following mid-18th century, the number of caste and craft muhallas probably increased as service providers were either deprived of amiri patronage or threw off their allegiance to princely and amiri households to work independently and cluster into a muhalla. The emergence of Hindus as a sizeable community in the city by the beginning of the 18th century also led to muhallas with Hindu patrons. Some muhallas were probably the result of fragmentation of an older haveli. The spatial organisation of each muhalla type was not likely to vary from its 17th century counterparts.

---

83 For a detailed discussion, see, Benny Sender, ‘Kashmiri Pandits and Their Changing Role in the Culture of Delhi’, in Frykenberg, *op cit.*, 316-331
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Transformations in the built-form types of urban institutions

_Bazaars_

Shahjahanabad's principal _bazaars_ [Refer Fig.1.17, 1.18] were bustling with activity. Murtaza Hussain commented in 1731 that the _bazaar_ was “perfectly brilliant and heavily populated [...] in the evening one could not move one gaz [yard] in Chandni Chawk and the Chawk of Sa'adullah Khan because of the great crowds of people.”84 Dargah Quli Khan described the east-west _bazaar_ as “a centre of recreation for the pleasure seekers and a gallery of rarities for the interested buyers” with its goods and diversions such as _qahwa-khanas_ and houses of courtesans and described Chauk Sa'adullah Khan as a place of hectic activity.85 Anand Ram Mukhlis recorded that “the chandni chauk, the fruit market, the Dariba bazaar and the buildings around the Masjid-i Jama were set fire to and reduced to ashes.”86 However the setback was transient as _bazaars_ had revived by the 1740s when Joseph Tieffenthaler observed that apart from the three main and biggest _bazaars_, the entire area of the city had shops and stalls in its lanes, by lanes and street corners.87 By 1785, Shahjahanabad, had as many as forty-six _bazaars_ that could be classified as central _bazaars_ and did not include the _bazaars_ in the city _muhallas_, the latter being beyond computation as the number of _muhallas_ was large.88

_Baghs_

Garden building continued, although lack of irrigation is likely to have affected their state. In the city were laid out the Zinat Bari and Bhagwa Bari, both funerary, as their respective royal patrons were interred here. The Zinat Bari also served as

---

84 Murtaza Hussain, _Hadigat- ul- Aqalim_, 41 - cited in Blake, _op cit._, 162, Footnote 5
85 Dargah Quli Khan, _op cit._, 21, 23
86 Anand Ram Mukhlis - cited in H.M. Elliot and J. Dawson, ed., _The History of India as told by its Own Historians: The Muhammadan Period_, (Allahabad, 1964), VIII, 88
87 Tieffenthaler, _op cit._, 1, 127 - cited in Gole, _op cit._, 14
88 Ghulam Muhammad Khan, _op cit._, - cited in Naqvi in Frykenberg, _op cit._, 146, Footnote 94
burial ground for other members of the royal family [Fig.1.22] and lay north of Begum-ka Bagh. Bhagwa Bari lay west of the Qila, in its shadows. The Begum-ka Bagh probably no longer served as a zenana garden and its large open area provided refuge to those fleeing the hinterland. No information is available of the gardens that enveloped the Qila.

**Havelis**

A map of the city, tentatively dated to late 18th century and annotated in Urdu, shows more than a hundred havelis in the city proper. Forbes, on comparing the havelis of the city to the palaces of European nobility found the former to be much larger in size. Tieffenthaler remarked that “the exterior of these Delhi houses presents neither elegance nor wealth; but the interior of those which are occupied by the nobles is magnificent and very ornate, in the custom of the country and following the taste of the inhabitants.”

Several 17th century havelis had new owners in this phase including the state that put it to use as imperial property. The Persian, Afghan and Maratha invaders were also forceful occupants of former amiri and princely havelis during the course of their stay in the city. A haveli could also have non-imperial owners ranging from the umara to non-elite, the latter comprising incoming migrants from the hinterland. The emerging merchant class also possessed the
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89 Data drawn from Redrawn Delhi Map
90 For a detailed account of the Begum-ka Bagh, see, Part-II of the Thesis
91 ‘Urdu Map of Delhi’ 1843, Musavvir Muhammad, Private Collection - cited in Hosagahar, op cit. 31, Figure 5
92 Forbes, op cit. 4, 61-62, - cited in Blake, op cit., 49, Footnote 100
93 Tieffenthaler, op cit., 1, 125, - cited in Gole, op cit., 14
94 Haveli Ali Mardan Khan had among its occupants, Jahanara Begum, Prince Azam and Emperor Shah Alam II. For an account, see, Dlak, op cit., 76; Chenoy, op cit., 46, 72
95 Haveli Sa‘adullah Khan was first ransacked by Nadir Shah’s men and subsequently used as a base by Mirza Najaf Khan, in waging a war against Marathas in 1772. For a discussion, see, Blake, op cit., 81; Chenoy, op cit., 47, 74
96 Dargah Quli Khan mentions havelis like Haveli Puran Khaiyat (tailor), Haveli Zeenat Tawalif (courtesan) and Haveli Yat Baqqalan (traders) that are a pointer towards the newly emerging trends in haveli ownership. Dargah Quli Khan, op cit., S. Nurul Hasan, op cit., 94
wherewithal to buy *amiri havelis*, as the *umara* migrated to new urban centres. Preferred sites for new *havelis* were not in proximity to the Qila as prominent *havelis* were built close to the city gates, for instance Haveli Nawab Vazir Burhan ul Mulk Sa’adat Khan near Kabuli Darwaza [Fig.1.23]. *Amiri havelis* retained their splendour in the manner of Haveli Nawab Safdarjung that was large enough to accommodate five thousand soldiers and five hundred horses and had an elaborate *tehkhana* (subterranean chamber) to escape the heat. The restraint on occupying the riverfront continued as new *havelis* came up on landlocked sites in the city. In the hinterland however, they were sited along the Jamuna, like Haveli Khwajasara Javed Khan built on the riverbank near Akbarabadi Darwaza.

Shahjahanabad’s hinterland witnessed intense fighting and plundering in this phase adversely affecting its settlements as discussed below.

### 1.4.2 Transformations in Shahjahanabad’s hinterland

Tieffenthaler observed in 1747 that the hinterland extended eight miles from Arab Gate, near Emperor Humayun’s tomb complex, in the south to the Salt Market in the north. He also stated that Paharganj was one of the five main *bazaars* of Shahjahanabad and the only one located outside the city wall. Some hinterland habitations were laid waste either by fighting among Mughal *umara* or by outside invasions. *Bazaars* and *ganjs* either closed down or shifted to the city proper. In 1776 Major Polier corroborated that the “suburbs [...] are now a heap of ruins, a

---

97 Although the trend of upward mobility of the merchant class was highly pronounced following British occupation and regulation of trade practices, its initiation was an 18th century phenomenon.

98 For a discussion, see, Forbes, *op cit.*, 4, 63-64

99 Jadunath Sarkar, *Fall of the Mughal Empire*, (Calcutta, 1950), I, 374


101 For a detailed account, see, Christopher Bayley, ‘Delhi and Other Cities of North India During the Twilight’ in R.E. Frykenberg, ed., *Delhi Through the Ages: Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society*, (Delhi, 1986), 221-236
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By 1785, Forbes noted that the area beyond the city walls was desolate with no people in sight, while some years later, in 1792, Twining, observed that “as we advanced [into Delhi] the ruins became more thickly scattered around us, and at length covered the country on every side as far as we could see. Houses, palaces, tombs in different stages of dilapidation, composed this striking scene.”

Emergence of new settlements

Some new areas of habitation emerged for example Jaswantpura, Madhoganj, Aliganj and Najafgarh. Mehrauli was revived due to the frequent imperial and amiri visits for leisure and spiritual solace. [Refer Fig. 1.19]. Other areas of the hinterland also experienced building activity as sections of the umara laid out gardens, tombs, and serais, particularly until the mid 18th century.

Hinterland gardens

New gardens were laid out in the hinterland [Refer Fig.1.20] by royalty namely the Talkatora Bagh of Emperor Muhammad Shah lying southwest of the city and the Qudsiya Bagh north of the Kashmiri Darwaza. Existing 17th century hinterland gardens were also in use with the Tees Hazari Bagh used as the royal burial place. The Shalimar Bagh remained in use in the early 18th century. Emperor Muhammad Shah visited 17th century imperial gardens for mental
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104 For a detailed account, see, Villiers-Stuart, op cit., 114-117
105 For a detailed account of the Qudsiya Bagh and the Shalimar Bagh, see, Part-II of the Thesis
diversion. The state of the gardens was likely to have been adversely affected due to the neglect of the canal.

The canal

It cannot be established with certainty when the canal went dry in the 18th century. The canal was revived in the 1730s by Nawab Sa’adat Khan and came to be called Nahr-i Sa’adat Khan. His successor, Nawab Safdarjung, continued to maintain the canal and collected tax from the users. Following the civil war, the canal fell into disuse and subsequently went dry as observed with regret by Major Polier, that the “troubles and confusion that followed prevented the necessary attentions being paid to so useful a work. It dried up.” He further noted that Ahmad Shah Durrani repaired it in mid-18th century and water once again began to flow through the city. Prevailing political conditions however again caused the canal to fall into neglect as it dried up with parts choked with rubbish.

1.5 Conclusion

The political events of the 18th century made Shahjahanabad a hunting ground for invaders whose contribution to the urban landscape was largely an outcome of plundering misdemeanours. The urban form remained unaltered, even as rebuilding was frequent owing to the invading groups’ acts of looting and burning of the city. The inability of the Marathas to provide political stability was an invitation to the British desirous of expanding their domain. At the turn of the century, in 1803, the British, led by Lord Lake, met the Marathas at Patparganj, a

107 Blake suggests that water stopped flowing in the canal, albeit temporarily, first in 1707 and then in 1740. The Canal was dry in 1727-28 and a mosque was built over it by a foster brother of Emperor Jahandar Shah. Mosque listed in ASI, Listing, I, 175, No.387
108 The name seems to have been later adopted as a muhalla name, Nahar Saadat Khan that came up on the site of the Nawab’s estate in the early 20th century. Ibid., I, 172
hinterland settlement of Shahjahanabad on the eastern bank of the Jamuna. The incumbent Mughal ruler, Emperor Shah Alam II, welcomed the English and thus unfolded a new chapter in the history of Shahjahanabad.

Times changed with the coming of the British, but "Mogul ways continued on, [...] the Mogul legacy remains as an aura, a state of mind, a tongue, a taste [...]"

\[110\] Mike Edwards, ‘When the Moguls Ruled India’, in National Geographic, (April, 1985), 167/4, 493
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THE BRITISH AND DELHI: 1803-1857

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the British response to Shahjahanabad, now called Delhi, in all its architectural manifestations from the early days of the British conquest of Delhi to before the outbreak of the Mutiny. Response to the city’s built-environment was driven by both political and apolitical considerations. As colonisers, the British acquired the mantle of a ruling power in this phase as the East India Company. From the British perspective, politically Delhi was neither an administrative nor a commercial urban centre of importance, but was perceived as an up-country military post with a rich history manifest in its ruins. The Mughal ruler now referred to derisively by the British, as the ‘King of Delhi’ was a British pensioner whose authority was undermined while retaining an outer garb of deference. Further, the British took pride in their civilization and were unequivocal in their conviction of its superiority in comparison to the vastly different Mughal cultural milieu they encountered in Delhi. British society, in 19th century Britain, relied on industrial technology whose inanimate energy sources had influenced all spheres of living. The chapter examines the degree of transmission of this influence to the Subcontinent as part of the programme of introducing British standards in all areas of life including architecture.
In comparison to the Presidency towns, Delhi's upcountry image drew an architecturally un-ambitious response. Calcutta had emerged as the seat of British administration with architecture firmly established as a vehicle of colonialism, as expressed by Lord Valentia that "India [...] be ruled from a palace not from a country house." Bombay was at the forefront of commerce and the presence of enlightened patrons of architecture in Bombay ensured the sustenance of the idea of architecture as a tool of image building. This chapter focuses on the adoption of a different stance in Delhi. The existing Mughal infrastructure around the Qila, now called Palace-fort, was readapted for use and the King continued to occupy the Palace-fort, the most cogent symbol of authority. In keeping with colonial norms, the British carved out a territory for their military and civilian population from the pre-colonial built fabric of the walled city. The city's indigenous quarters save for the area around the Palace-fort were not impinged upon and urban form remained unaltered. Some East India Company officials' penchant for a native lifestyle also blunted an architecturally vigorous response in the British enclave. The input of technology was also limited in Delhi as no factories were built and civic improvement measures pertaining to public services largely relied on Mughal practices. On the other hand, the development of the hinterland subscribed to colonial practices as the area north of Delhi was suburbanised to set up the cantonment and civil station at a distance from the city proper resulting in the tripartite division of Delhi into the cantonment, civil lines and the native city.

2.2 Arrival of the British in Delhi

2.2.1 Revival of the name Delhi

The name Delhi was an anglicised version of the original Dilli or Dihli that had been applicable equally to the earliest Hindu settlement in the Delhi Region and those established following Muslim rule. Although founders of new settlements

---

gave each city a different name, the original name endured. The British chose to call the city Modern Delhi instead of the personality specific Shahjahanabad and to distinguish it from the older Delhis.

### 2.2.2 The British perception of Delhi

The Delhi region was well known as a place of antiquity being a subject of remark among the earliest British travellers who mentioned it among the prominent urban centres of the Mughal Empire and toured its old monuments. After the rise of the British power, the number of British visiting the city increased and comprised East India Company envoys, military officials and artists.

Post-1803, British presence rose significantly in Delhi. Besides being a traveller's destination, the city became a place of residence as East India Company officials, merchants, missionaries and professionals made Delhi their home. The early settlers did not press for indigenous societal reforms rather, some adopted native ways in camaraderie with the native elite. Their successors, influenced by Evangelical and Utilitarian thinking, perceived the indigenous culture as decadent. Wearing the reformatory mantle, they retained their own lifestyle and impressed upon natives to follow European ways.

Delhi was perceived as a traditional seat of power with the glory of the Mughals etched on British minds. Emma Roberts noted, “There is no place in British India which the intellectual traveller approaches with feelings more strongly excited than the ancient seat of the Mughal empire.”

---

Desai, *Architecture and Independence-The Search for Identity- India 1880 to 1980*, (Delhi 1997), 64

2 Edward Terry, William Fitch and Thomas Coryat traveled to Delhi before Shahjahanabad was founded.

3 For a discussion on British policy of westernization of the Subcontinent, see, G.I.R. Tillotson, *The Tradition of Indian Architecture* (Delhi 1989), 29-33

made Delhi a place of picturesque beauty, as "from the outside the view is splendid; domes, mosques, cupolas and minarets, and the imperial palace... appearing in the midst of groves of clustering trees, so thickly planted that the buildings have been compared, in Oriental imagery, to rocks of pearls and rubies, rising from an emerald sea." On approaching Delhi from the Jamuna one saw "the wonderful red walls that surround the city, [...] and as we crossed the river, the view in both directions with this magnificent city lying before us, was quite wonderful, so many exquisite towers towering up into the sky belonging to the Mohammedan temples" [Fig.2.1a, b]. The city offered several diversions, as visitors enjoyed "driving through the streets of Delhi as everything was new and striking; the buildings of marble and red sandstone were so magnificent, the shops were so quaint, the colours of the cotton cloths hanging from the windows and across the streets were so gorgeous, the costumes so picturesque, and the crowds were so extraordinarily thick." Delhi was however not entirely enchanting, one Captain Thomas Skinner, camping immediately below the Palace-fort walls, found himself to be "in the centre of bustle, but smothered by dust and tortured by flies. It is impossible to convey an idea of the numbers of these insects, and the intolerable nuisance of attending them; they are quite enough to keep you in a perpetual fever." 

Politically, the East India Company perceived Delhi as an up-country town, lacking Calcutta's sophistication and Bombay's vibrancy. However, its potential as a militarily strategic outpost, due to its central location in northwest India, was acknowledged. The presence of the Mughal ruler, his diminished status notwithstanding, made Delhi a hub of political activity. Delhi was also a cultural
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5 A late 18th century English aesthetic ideal between the sublime and beautiful as manifested in the landscape and architecture  
6 ibid., 271  
7 Lady Emily Bayley - cited in M. M. Kaye, ed., The Golden Calm: An English Lady's Life in Moghul Delhi (Exeter, 1980), 122  
8 ibid., 162  
10 For a discussion on the attributes of Delhi and state of affairs at the time of British occupation, see, Percival Spear, Twilight of the Moghuls, (Cambridge, 1951), 1-12
centre with a strong literary tradition of Persian and Urdu poetry. The city and its hinterland were strewn with ruins that enhanced its image as a historic power centre. Thus, aware of Delhi's potential, the British took up the task of governance [Fig.2.2a].

2.2.3 The British governance of Delhi

The British monopolised the governance leaving no room for indigenous participation. The Mughal emperor, called the King of Delhi, remained a titular head and his authority was confined to within the Palace-fort precincts, creating a "political paradox as the Mughal was to become a pensioner, a pageant, and a puppet. He was to be a King, yet no King - a something and yet a nothing - a reality and a sham at the same time."

The task of governance was initiated by physically delineating the territory ceded by Marathas that was called 'The Assigned Territory for the Support of the Royal Family at Delhi' [Fig.2.2b]. Presence of the King made Delhi special as it was exempted from the Regulating Act bringing Delhi Territory under direct East India Company administration with a Resident representing the Governor General. The Resident was aided in governance by Company officials that included both military and civilian officials.

It followed that to create a habitat conducive for the city's British community, appropriate spatial transformations be made in the city. The city and its hinterland

12 Devendra N. Panigrahi, *Charles Metcalfe in India: Ideas and Administration 1806-1835* (Delhi, 1968), 24
13 The Regulating Act of 1773 was enforced in all British held territories in the Subcontinent. Exemption from the Act implied that the territory came under direct supervision of the Governor-General-in-Council, giving Company officials greater operational leeway.
14 Office of the Resident was abolished in 1831-32 and the administration was subsequently headed by the Commissioner
were at British disposal, particularly royal properties being held in trust, and became recipients of architectural interventions that would contribute not only to smooth conduct of the East India Company’s business, but also create a British identity in a city where they were in a small minority.

2.3 Delineation of the British territory and transformation of the urban landscape

The territorial isolation of the British from the natives, described by Rudyard Kipling as “shut-upness”, was a norm of colonisation. Spatially, both the military and civilian functionaries of the East India Company demanded their own exclusive domains where the natives were not welcome in a show of racial and cultural superiority. As was the case in the colonisation of pre-colonial settlements, the British presence in Delhi led to a three-part demarcation of the city into a British military area called the cantonment, a British civilian area and the indigenous city. As the British went about carving out their domain, they made interventions in the urban form of the city.

Considering Delhi’s image as a backwater, a grand architectural intervention to mark British presence in the city was not an option under consideration. Spatially, the city’s elite properties, namely haveli precincts and gardens, presented themselves to the British as attractive acquisition propositions to meet their military and civilian requirements. This was probably on two accounts, firstly, the large size of the property and its spatial composition of built-form and open space would not only permit flexible re-adaptation into a new function, but also prove a time saving measure in comparison to building new structures, secondly, the act of acquiring and modifying an existing property with symbols of British identity would mark British presence in the city. Former princely and amiri havelis now

15 The properties were initially under the city kotwal’s charge and in 1822, they were transferred to a specially appointed darogah. Narayani Gupta, Delhi between Two Empires, 1803-1931(Delhi, 1998), 17, Footnote 95
16 For a discussion on territorial segregation, see, Jan Morris and Simon Winchester, Stones of Empire - The Buildings of the Raj, (Oxford, 1983), 32-35
garbed in a western architectural style would also help in driving home the notion among the natives that the British were in power, a perception that the new incumbents must have been anxious to perpetuate. The following discussion examines the transformation of some city quarters into a British habitat.

2.3.1 Transformations in the Palace-fort

British inroads into the Palace-fort

In the pre-Mutiny phase, political events did not overwhelmingly influence the architectural interventions as the British, despite being in control, did not establish their own power centre but clustered around the Palace-fort, appropriating areas to its north and south for their use. The Palace-fort was retained as the city’s focus, and topped the hierarchy of elitist properties in the city. Its authoritarian imagery was acknowledged by the British who wanted the precinct for their use after clearing it of its numerous occupants. Company officials such as Sir Thomas Metcalfe proposed that the King be shifted to the Qutub Complex in Mehrauli, while Charles Napier recommended that the King be moved to Fatehpur Sikri. The recommendations were not carried through and the Palace-fort remained crowded with the King’s extended family, salatin (royal collaterals) and servants, all enjoying diplomatic immunity as the King’s diktat prevailed within the walls. Their presence was an irritant to Company officials, as the Palace-fort was seen as a “den of thieves and murderers and criminals of all classes, a source of never-ending difficulty and annoyance to the British Government.”

The British inroads into the Palace-fort were therefore rather limited in that a few Company officials resided in the precincts. The apartments above the

17 Data drawn from Map ‘Plan of the city’ IOR: X/1659 OIOC Collection redrawn by Eckart Ehlers, Thomas Krafft and Jamal Malik as ‘Shahjahanabad: Delhi Around 1850’ (Geographische Institute der Universität Bonn, 1992) as accompaniment to Eckart Ehlers and Thomas Krafft, ed., Shahjahanabad/Old Delhi Tradition and Colonial Change, (Stuttgart, 1993), [henceforth Redrawn Delhi Map]

18 ibid., 14, Footnote 73
Lahore Gate were taken up to station civilian and military officers, to monitor the precinct and to be near at hand should the King wish to communicate with his protectors. Following an assassination bid on a Resident's life by one of the King's sons, a Commandant of the guard was permanently stationed in the Lahore Gate whose upper apartments were adapted as his quarters. The security of the premises was bolstered by adding a magazine, sited in the southwest part of the Palace-fort, close to the Delhi Gate. Additionally, Company officials, from the Resident downwards, were regular visitors to the Palace-fort as Company emissaries participating in the King's *durbars* held in the Diwan-e Khass, the Diwan-e Am being abandoned. The conduct of some Company officials was found objectionable as they did not observe Mughal court etiquette and walked into the Diwan-e Khass with their shoes on and sat on the seat traditionally reserved solely for the Mughal King. Formal complaints were made to higher authorities in this regard. Since it was politically expedient to appease the King and acknowledge his authority, albeit titular, it did not fall within the British scheme of things to ask the King and his entourage to vacate the premises.

The Palace-fort as the Mughal residence

Externally although the Palace-fort showed little signs of neglect, the developments of Phase-II had left several structures in a ruined state and only parts of the water system and planting had survived. The upkeep of the premises required a substantial sum considering their extent. In 1835 a monthly sum of Rs. 5000-00 was recommended by the Resident, Thomas Metcalfe, for the repair and maintenance of the Palace-fort wall, Salimgarh and the Diwan-e Am. However, this money was not made available and funds for the precinct's upkeep had to be apportioned from the King's pension. Areas of imperial use were maintained by the King while the other occupants were responsible for the upkeep of their respective portions. Unlike past practice, Mughal princes no longer dwelt in the
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19 Lady Emily Bayley's description of the Palace-fort during a visit - cited in Kaye, ed., *op cit.*, 208
20 *ibid.*, 167 Lady
city but built their living quarters within the Palace-fort. Further, their dwellings were not confined to one part of the precinct, but were scattered across the premises in violation of the spatial organisation envisaged by the premises’ founder. The royal princes appropriated the public domain of the Palace-fort including areas around the Naqqarkhana forecourt and along the Palace-fort’s Delhi Gate to the south. The entire precinct presented a very ill kempt look, as corroborated by European visitors to the premises. The chief contributors to the ruinous appearance were the quarters of the salatin and servants, comprising largely clay and thatch huts lying particularly in the area between the Naqqarkhana and the west wall of the Palace-fort. These lay along the path of visitors to the Palace-fort thus justifying their comments on the squalor. Orlich observed that the appearance of the Palace-fort “is sadly marred by numerous clay huts which are erected on the outer side of the courts” [Fig.2.6].

Among the many changes in the premises as reported by a native scholar, Sayed Ahmad Khan, were that the Diwan-e Am was no longer in use while the garden fronting the Mumtaz Mahal had disappeared; in the Rang Mahal court water channels and fountains were replaced by structures, while additions were made to the Khawabghah group of structures by Mirza Jahangir Bahadur; structures stood north and south of the Moti Mahal, although in a ruinous state; the Hayat Baksh Bagh was desolate and the incumbent King remained unconcerned about its state; the silver fountains in the Bagh’s central tank had been pillaged and only their holes remained and its water system was defunct; in the adjoining Mehtab Bagh, remnants of a water channel were visible. Despite these conditions, repair work, additions and alterations were made in this phase, commissioned by royal occupants, chiefly the successive Kings and their family members.

21 Data drawn from Map ‘The Palace before 1857’ illustrated in Carr Stephen, The Archaeological and Monumental Remains of Delhi, (Calcutta, 1876), Map 6
22 K.C. Yadav, ed., Delhi in 1857- The Trial of Bahadur Shah, (Gurgaon, 1980), 1, 144, 175, 183
23 Data drawn from a painting “The Panorama of Delhi” Add.Or.4126 OIOC Collection. Painted by Mazhar Ali Khan for Sir Thomas Metcalfe in 1846, it showed living quarters called Makanat-e Riayah and to their east, Now Mahia with its own walled enclosure and gateway. Carr, op cit., Map 6 designated this area as Common Houses.
24 Leopold von Orlich, Travels in India, H. Evans Lloyd, tr., (London, 1845), II, 26
Under King Akbar II repair work on some structures was taken up and a few additions made. The Diwan-e Khass was repaired by replacing the missing precious stones in the *pietra dura* work with mock ones and the damaged Asad Burj was repaired. The copper ceiling of the Rang Mahal was replaced in wood that, however, deteriorated with time. The additions made by King Akbar II included the replacement of wooden drawbridges at the entrance gates of the Palace-fort with masonry ones in 1811. A balcony was added to the Mussaman Burj overlooking the Jamuna, in 1808-09, and a wooden mosque, Chobi Masjid, was built between the Diwan-e Am quadrangle and the Mehtab Bagh [Refer Fig.2.4]. Apparently the repair work was not followed up consistently as by the time of Bishop Heber's visit in the 1820s even the imperial apartments were in a squalid state.

European influences within the Palace-fort

Influences from Europe made their way into the Palace-fort premises. Europeans visitors' encounters with the members of the Mughal family in the Palace-fort indicate that there existed a spirit of enquiry about Britain, its government, court etiquette and British lifestyle. Mughal princes, notably Mirza Jahangir and Mirza Babur, sons of King Akbar II, emulated the British in mannerisms, fashion, epicurean preferences, riding habits and architecture.
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25 R. Nath, *Monuments of Delhi: Historical Study* (based on Sayed Ahmad Khan's *Aasar-us-Sanaadid*), (Delhi, 1979), 13-19
26 A monthly sum of five hundred rupees was set aside for repairs. Spear, *op cit.*, 60
27 Lady Nugent, who visited it in 1812, wrote that the “effect was good”. Lady Maria Nugent, *Journal of a Residence in India*, I - cited in Spear, *op cit.*, 60
28 Asad Burj had suffered damages during the Maratha siege in 1804 that was warded off by Ochterlony, but not without causing damage to the Palace-fort walls. Archaeological Survey of India [henceforth ASI], *Annual Report 1911-12*, 6
29 R. Nath, *op cit.*, 14
30 ASI, *List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments in Delhi Zail* (Calcutta, 1915-22) [henceforth *Listing*], I, 9, No.9, 19, No.19, 62, No.117
In architecture, European influence entailed the superficial use of design elements, such as the cornice, pediment, semi-circular arch and columns. These elements were grafted over a structure of non-European origin and the resultant style was derided by the British as a “bastard style” with no merit. New living quarters, many exhibiting European design elements, were built in various parts of the precinct for royal inmates [Fig.2.7]. The patrons of these residences were Mughal princes who had generous allowances that facilitated undertaking of building ventures within the precincts. Some residences stood along the waterfront between the Rang Mahal and the Mumtaz Mahal. North of the Hayat Baksh Bagh and Mahtab Bagh, stood princely residences including a garden built by Mirza Jahangir, *zenana* of the heir apparent in a garden setting, a *Toshakhana*, stables and a pavilion along the peripheral wall, north-west of the Shah Burj [Refer Fig.2.5]. Mirza Babar built his residence in the courtyard of the Rang Mahal over its garden and water channel with fountains. Area south of the Diwan-e Am was “disfigured by unsightly erections used as the houses for the King’s sons and built in the bastard European style of architecture which became common in India at this time.”

The second initiative of repairs and additions was made during the reign of King Bahadur Shah II. In 1837-38 he undertook the repair of the arcaded *dalan* and red sandstone railing of the Diwan-e Am. Around 1842, he added a pavilion, the Hira Mahal, on the waterfront north of the Hammam [Refer Fig.2.4]. Another pavilion, the Zafar Mahal was made in the centre of the tank in the Hayat Baksh Bagh thereby interrupting the original spatial flow of the garden [Fig.2.8]. He added a *jharna* (water cascade) to the west wall of the Mehtab Bagh, similar to the one at the *dargah* of Kaki at Mehrauli. A well was sunk in the Hayat Baksh Bagh in 1840 to augment the water supply. A garden along the Jamuna front was also
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31 Orlich attributed this group as constituting the residences of the King and his wives. Orlich, *op cit.*, 24
32 *ASI, Listing, op cit.*, I, 26, No.27; Carr, *op cit.*, Map 6
33 Spear, *op cit.*, 64-65
34 *ASI, Listing, op cit.*, I, 12
35 Nath, *op cit.*, 13; *ASI Listing, op cit.*, I, 12
laid by the King, accessed from the Palace-fort by steps and "adorned by every variety of flowers, and some large tamarind and banyan trees; doves also are kept here for the special amusement of the aged king." He also built a modest mosque south of Chatta Chauk.

The Palace-fort as a site of visitor interest

The Palace-fort became a site frequented by European visitors including Bishop Reginald Heber, Emily Metcalfe, Fanny Parks, Emily Eden and Leopold von Orlich. British officers based on the premises took them around, as Orlich was shown around by the Commandant, a Captain Angelo. The tour began at the Lahore Gate and proceeded down Chatta Bazaar to the Naqqarkhana and its courtyard and onto the Diwan-e Am courtyard [Refer Fig.2.4, Fig.2.9]. It also entailed, depending on one's social profile and sex, an audience with the King or a visit to the imperial zenana. To supplement the visitor's experience of the Palace-fort, a few guidebooks on Delhi were in circulation describing the structures of the Palace-fort in detail. The Palace-fort, with its size, never failed to impress visitors, while at the same time, its desolate and unclean state became a subject of frequent remark. Heber observed that, "it far surpasses the Kremlin, but I do not think that, except in the durability of its materials, it equals Windsor." Not only the peripheral structures, but also those used by the royal family, ranging from apartments to gardens were in a state of neglect that rendered their use difficult. The repair work undertaken by King Akbar II had probably slackened for by the time of Bishop Heber's visit in the 1820s, the Diwan-e Khass was

36 Orlich visited the garden as part of the tour of the Palace-fort. Orlich, op cit., 25
37 ibid., 20
38 Grant of an audience with imperial residents entailed making a petition in advance and observing Mughal etiquette like offering of nazr to the host and accepting khillats in return, however tawdry, they might seem to European taste. Orlich received "a sabre which I cannot use, and a robe of honour which I cannot wear." Orlich, op cit., 21
39 One such guidebook was Beresford's Delhi written in 1856 containing a detailed description of the Palace-fort.
40 Bishop Reginald Heber, Narrative of a Journey through the Upper Provinces of India, (London, 1844), I, 561
41 Orlich, op cit., 25
“dirty, desolate and forlorn” and the Shah Burj’s “bath and fountain were dry. The inlaid pavement hid with lumber and gardener’s sweepings and walls stained with dung of birds and bats.” The Moti Masjid had peepal shoots growing out of its walls, while the Diwan-e Am was “full of lumber, broken palanquin and empty boxes. The water jets in the Rang Mahal garden were destroyed and on the garden stood “wretched houses.” The Hayat Baksh Bagh was also in a state of neglect, and was described by Heber as, “not large but in their way, must have been exceedingly beautiful. [...] full of very old orange and other fruit trees, with terraces and parterres, on which many rose bushes were growing, and even now, a few jonquils in flower.” The imperial zenana was no better, as Fanny Parks, who had an invitation for a visit, described the apartments as “queer places filled with women of all ages; the narrow passages were dirty and wet” and in a hall, which was probably the Rang Mahal, “over the marble floor, and in the place where fountains once played, was collected a quantity of offensive black water.” Likewise, Emily Eden noted that “in some of the finest baths there were dirty charpoys spread”, the overall picture being so “magnificent originally, and so poverty-stricken now.”

The tour did not fail in providing visitors a first-hand spectator’s experience of a powerful dynasty’s decline, whose members also became exhibits on account of their lineage and with the architectural setting of the Palace-fort presented a picture of melancholy and neglect. There was curiosity about the life lived by the Mughals within the walls of the Palace-fort. European visitors such as Bishop Heber, W.H. Sleeman, Major Archer, Fanny Parks and Lady Maria Nugent recorded not only the state of the structures within the precincts, but also the physical appearance, personality and demeanour of the members of the royal family, particularly the incumbent King of Delhi; Mughal lifestyle and court

42 Heber, op cit., II, 303-305
43 ibid., II, 303
44 Fanny Parks - cited in ASI, Annual Report, op cit., 22
45 Emily Eden - cited in Alexander, op cit., 83
rituals. The King’s and his family’s adherence to court protocol, despite their reduced means, often made the felicitation ceremonies of visiting European dignitaries a subject of derision. To the visitors doing the rounds of the premises, the unfolding scenes of dereliction perhaps strengthened their belief in their own civilization’s capability of deliverance, now that the British were in control.

2.3.2 Transformations in the maidan

The maidan’s traditional role as a formal assembly square fronting the Palace-fort was marred by new additions. Roads linked parts of the British enclave from north to south of the Palace-fort and traversed the maidan [Refer Fig.2.4]. A water-tank was built southwest of the Lahore Gate detracting the square’s character as an assembly place [Fig.2.10a, b]. Of the 17th century gardens surrounding the Palace-fort, the Gulabi Bagh disappeared without a trace, part of the site taken up by the tank. Other gardens, namely the Buland Bagh and Baghicha Mirza Gauhar were retained though their condition cannot be ascertained. The Anguri Bagh survived as a garden and held a crowd on the morning of May, 11, 1857 following the news of the arrival of rebellious native troops in the city. Not only the British, but natives too encroached the maidan. The King’s chobdars (mace-bearers) built their modest dwellings in front of the Palace-fort at the termination of the east-west bazaar, after paying the King rent for land acquisition. Changes in the maidan were part of overall changes taking place around the Palace-fort, born of functional necessity as perceived by the British.

46 Bishop Heber minutely recorded the felicitation ritual held in the King’s court in his honour. For a detailed account, see, Heber, op cit., I, 304-306
47 Data drawn from Redrawn Delhi Map
48 Yadav, op cit., 205-206
49 ibid., 56-57
2.3.3 Fortification of the city wall

Within a year of the British occupation, Delhi was attacked by the Marathas at the walls. The city wall had been damaged in the 1720 earthquake and called for repair. With the Maratha siege warded off, the British turned their attention to repairing the wall to conform to European defense criteria, rather than the Mughal consideration as a deterrent to plunderers. The wall was strengthened at the behest of Resident Ochterlony to Colonel Napier’s design supervised by engineers [Fig.2.11]. While the amorphous, semi-circular circuit was retained, the madrasa and tomb complex of a 17th century Mughal amir was included in its ambit in 1811. The wall circumscribed a total length of six and a half miles demarking the periphery of the walled city. It was fortified by repairing existing burjs (tower) to enable the mounting of guns, the burjs named after Delhi’s military and political personages. Martello Towers and embrasures were added between bastions to shorten the curtain wall’s running length. Bishop Heber observed the ongoing work on the "embattled wall which the British Government have put into repair and now are engaged in strengthening with bastions, a moat and a regular glacis". The number of gates and posterns also increased to handle the rising traffic. The British added a gate, the Calcutta Gate, along the east edge overlooking the river in 1852.

Having examined British interventions on two 17th century Mughal urban built-form types, the Palace-fort and the city wall, the discussion now turns towards British interventions in the city and its hinterland to create their own territory.

---

50 A strongly fortified city wall was needed to keep out invading armies and not just offer protection against marauders. Catherine B. Asher, ‘Delhi Walled: Changing boundaries’ in James D. Tracy, ed., *City Walls-The Urban Enceinte in Global Perspective*, (Cambridge, 2000), 247-281
51 H.C. Fanshaw, *Delhi Past and Present*, (Delhi, 1991), 5
52 Data drawn from Map ‘Delhi 1857’ IOR: X/1663 OIOC Collection
53 Heber, *op cit.*, II, 297
2.3.4 The cantonment

The cantonment was one of the three spatial enclaves that evolved in the pre-colonial city following its occupation by the British. It was laid out as an enclave dedicated exclusively to the military [Refer Fig. 2.3].

Urban form

The location of the cantonment called for a strict segregation from the native city to insulate the troops from the physically and morally debilitating vices of the native city. Being a military enclave, its urban form reflected the military's norms of order and discipline. Spatially, the cantonment occupied a large tract of land and its urban form was an outcome of a low-rise, low-density development as there was no dearth of land to meet the military's operational demands [Fig. 2.12]. The cantonment edge was not well defined physically, instead it blurred with the open country that acted as a buffer against the native city. Building activity was discouraged in the buffer except gardens and a tree cover that enhanced the sense of seclusion from the city. The layout was primarily dictated by defence considerations. The occupants comprised the military's three broad organisational hierarchies, namely the native troops, European troops and European officers. The native troops were segregated from their European counterparts and the European officers maintained an appreciable distance from the troops, thus calling for separate areas and built-form types for each of the three occupant types. An orthogonal road network with wide and straight roads linked all parts of the cantonment. The urban form comprised a fabric dominated by open spaces ranging from large exercise grounds for troops to gardens within individual plots. The built mass was conspicuous by its relatively less volume in comparison to the open spaces that gave the cantonment a park-like setting. The layout of the built-form varied as the lines of European troops strictly conformed to a linear arrangement, while those of the native troops showed a certain degree of laxity in the layout thereby drawing attention to the difference between the troops. Further, the built-form types also varied as the European troops lived in permanent
barracks and the native troops in temporary huts. The officers resided in bungalows, a quintessential residential built-form type in British India that has been taken up for discussion later in the chapter. Apart from the provision of accommodation, the cantonment also included infrastructure for the use of its European occupants, namely, the church, cemetery, racecourse, club, hospital and bazaar. In addition there were exercise and camping grounds, parade ground, shooting range, magazine, workshops and stables.

The following discussion examines the layout of the cantonment in Delhi.

Transformations in the city to set up a military base

During the first twenty-five years of their occupation of Delhi, the military, comprising troops and officers, was stationed in the city, as the hinterland was unsafe for habitation. This resulted in setting up the cantonment within the walled city whose built fabric posed a spatial constraint that prevented the British from laying out a conventional cantonment whose urban form had evolved during the course of the Subcontinent’s colonisation. The built-forms intrinsic to the functioning of the military were interspersed in the existing built fabric without any clear territorial delineation of the military area. Some functions were housed in existing structures after alteration such as the magazine that was located in a part of an erstwhile Mughal prince, Dara Shikoh’s haveli precinct.

Analysis of a pre-Mutiny map of the city furnishes data that enables a reconstruction of the cantonment. The military occupied areas north and south of the Palace-fort where they laid out their infrastructure. North of the Palace-fort, around Kashmiri Gate were built a walled arcaded enclosure as a guard house with barracks for troops, stables, a hospital, magazine and a bazaar [Fig.2.13a]. The area south of the Palace-fort had barracks in two areas to segregate the native troops from their European counterparts, south of Buland Bagh skirting the Palace-fort walls and further south towards Delhi Gate of the city. Ancillary
facilities included two hospitals, a church, a godown and a bazaar [Fig.2.13b]. The accommodation of military officers was interspersed with residences of British civilians and native elite, north and south of the Palace-fort and comprised the bungalow. Some military officers also resided in kothis, a built-form type that mediated between the bungalow and haveli and has been taken up for discussion later in the chapter. The maidan remained the largest open space in the city and was used as a parade ground. It was traversed by a road following the Palace-fort wall to link British territory north and south of the Palace-fort. Additional roads were laid within the cantonment that unlike streets in the native quarters did not meander but traversed a fixed path, whether straight or curvilinear. Though it cannot be established with certainty, the roads probably cut through former amiri and princely haveli precincts thereby dividing the Mughal era properties.

Development of the cantonment in the hinterland

The cantonment moved out to the hinterland by 1828 as by now the region was secure from external threats. Unlike the city where the existing built-form was a constraint, the hinterland allowed more freedom in planning and laying the cantonment. The hinterland cantonment thus conformed to the conventional urban form. The choice of the site was an outcome of strategic considerations as the location allowed effective control of the city and to thwart any attack made from it, though its own northern edge was susceptible to attack.\textsuperscript{55} It was also perceived as a healthier place, free from the contagions that plagued the city as it received northerly breezes that blew unhindered by the city’s built-mass [Fig.2.14a]. The site was north of the city near Rajpur village and was most conveniently approached by the Kashmiri Gate.\textsuperscript{56} Between the cantonment and the city were the gardens of Mughal royalty and nobility followed by open tract, both being retained as buffers. The cantonment was laid out in a triangular expanse, whose east and west edges were defined by the Grand Trunk Road and the Ridge

\textsuperscript{54} The following description of the cantonment is based on data drawn from Redrawn Delhi Map
\textsuperscript{55} Spear, op cit., 145
respectively. The Najafgarh Jheel Canal ran through its centre, southwest to northeast. The site overlapped with Chandrawal village that was partly cleared for the cantonment [Fig.2.14b].

Analysis of an 1849-1850 map of the city and its northern hinterland facilitates the reconstruction of the cantonment. The area covered by the cantonment equalled the area of the walled confines of Delhi. Comparing the number of occupants in both settlements, the cantonment indeed had a low-density urban development. It was separated from the city proper by the Ridge and open country, the latter criss-crossed by a road network among a sparsely planted tree cover. It was laid out to the west of the Ridge without any prescribed boundaries, making it rather amorphous. This was a reflection of emerging European industrialised notion of walls being viewed as health hazards. An orthogonal road network was laid parallel to the Ridge and it enclosed plots with bungalows for military officers. Between the officers' area and the Najafgarh Jheel Canal to the west was accommodation for the troops that was laid out in lines parallel to the Ridge. Further to the west were three bazaars including a Sadar Bazaar, cattle sheds and a burial ground for Europeans. Beyond the Najafgarh Jheel Canal to the northwest was an oval shaped brigade ground with an encircling racecourse and stand. A Government Garden for leisure, rifle range, ice pits, Sappers and Miners Lines and entrenchment, and exercise ground for Field Battery were also provided [Refer Fig.2.14b]. The Magazine was located within the city, south of the Residency, and was not moved until 1850-51 to a location in the extreme north along the river. A tower, called Flagstaff Tower, was built towards the northern end of the Ridge to serve the dual purpose of a signalling post and a flagstaff tower, its form evocative of British dominance [Fig.2.15].

56 This was the most suitable direction for development, as on the east was the river, and northwest, west and southwest had settlements.
57 Data drawn from Map ‘The Fort and Cantonment of Delhi (1849-1850)’ IOR X/1661 OIOC Collection [Henceforth Delhi (1849-1850)]
58 Data drawn from Map Delhi (1849-1850)
2.3.5 The civil station

The civil station, also called civil lines, together with the cantonment constituted British territory in the pre-colonial city. It was developed as a civilian territory [Refer 2.3].

Urban form

Like the cantonment, the civil station was also located at a distance from the native city. The latter was perceived by the British as a dangerous place particularly from the point of view of sanitation for “the state of sanitation is such that diseases when introduced spread with incredible rapidity.” The urban form of the civil station, also called civil lines, catered to the functional requirements of the European civilian population that was a mix of government officials, traders, missionaries and professionals. The civil lines was in close proximity to the cantonment and often was an extension of the latter with no clearly defined boundaries of its own. However, it steadfastly maintained its buffer from the native city. The pattern of urban development was akin to that of the cantonment in that it was a low-rise and low-density spread [Fig.2.16]. A system of wide orthogonal roads gave access to different parts and divided the entire area into rectangular quarters that were subdivided into plots for the various built-forms types. Emphasis on plantation both within individual plots and in the entire area gave the civil lines an appearance of a “well-planted spaciousness with a high proportion of trees and shrubbery.” The built-forms were hidden by the tree cover so much so that to an onlooker approaching the civil lines “unless it is evening and lamps are lit, you can only guess that there are houses behind the trees.” Each plot was physically demarcated with a boundary, either a wall or hedge, and was called a compound. The compounds were laid out in a linear
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59 The Magazine was moved at the demand of natives who feared an accidental explosion, like Colonel Napier and Lord Ellenborough had pointed out in the 1840s. Gupta, op cit., 12
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arrangement or in a cluster and constituted the basic spatial unit of the civil lines. The compound size was dependent on organisational and social hierarchy. Economising on land was not a consideration thus leading to compounds with generous plot dimensions. In fact, the compound size was far greater than what its occupant’s social and occupational status would permit him to have in Britain. The built-form types that stood in the compound catered to a wide range of functions such as administrative, religious, leisure and residential. Within each plot, the built mass did not occupy more than twenty five percent of the total plot area thus contributing to the park-like ambience of the entire civil lines. The residential built-form type was the bungalow. The other built-form types in the civil lines included the church, club, racket court, public gardens, hospital, cemetery, and bazaars.

The following discussion examines the civilian areas of Delhi.

**Transformations in the city to house the civilians**

Shahjahanabad had lost control over its hinterland in the 18th century to become introverted, shielding itself from the depredation of the countryside by the city wall. In the beginning of the 19th century, the British lived in the city, since the hinterland was still unsafe and the British community was very small in number. Like the cantonment, the civilian area was part of the existing city fabric with some functions housed in pre-existing structures after adaptation and some in newly built ones. The analysis of the city as shown in a pre-Mutiny map permits the civilian area’s reconstruction.63 The areas appropriated for civilian use lay north and south of the Palace-fort, in a linear stretch, un-segregated from the military area and pockets of native settlements. This part of the city had traditionally been occupied by the havelis of the elite as access to waterfront sites

---

63 Data drawn from Redrawn Delhi Map.
was severely restricted.\(^4\) While 18\(^{th}\) century developments perhaps caused fragmentation of the residential estates, this quarter of the city nevertheless retained its urban character as a low-density area. The British undoubtedly viewed this area as an asset as its low density facilitated architectural intervention. The civilian area south of the Palace-fort defined by the Faiz Bazaar on the west and the river on the east, comprised the areas of Rajghat and Daryaganj. The northern area was defined by the Jamuna on the east and had an amorphous edge on the west and included Nigambodh Ghat, Kela (Qila) Ghat, Naseerganj and the area around Kashmiri Gate [Refer Fig.2.13a, b].

The civilian area together with the cantonment was a self-contained enclave, not particularly desirous of making contact with the indigenous city. Its spatial planning being a question of fitting into an existing situation, perhaps caused the British vision of urbanity to be somewhat compromised as various built-form types clustered together in an informal arrangement. The architectural intervention can be classified as a two-fold response. One, where an old Mughal haveli was taken and readapted to house British urban institutions, and two, where new structures were built on sites carved out of Mughal elite estates. In the case of the former, the existing structure was subjected to additions and alterations for reuse, from horticultural inputs to addition of new structures to enhance its efficacy as a British institution. All built-forms, whether existing or new, received European inputs out of functional, aesthetic or political considerations, or a mix of all three. Buildings were provided with open space as foreground and were approached formally by pathways. Building facades were articulated with European architectural elements, primarily of classical origin, that were part of the British architectural vocabulary since the early days of their presence in the Subcontinent.\(^5\) The result was a cityscape at complete variance with the native, thereby lending the area its own identity.

\(^{64}\) The original occupants of the river-front sites were Haveli Dara Shikoh and Haveli Ali Mardan Khan north of the Palace-fort and Haveli Sa’adullah Khan to the south.

\(^{65}\) British presence in India spanned over many architectural styles, Palladian, Baroque and Gothic Revival, whose transportation to the Subcontinent was marked by a time lag. The classical style
Topping the British hierarchy of built-form types in the civilian area was the Residency. It was the Resident's living cum work place before it shifted to the civil station in the hinterland [Fig.2.17]. The Residency was located to the north of the Palace-fort in the haveli premises of Dara Shikoh. A detailed account of the former Haveli's transformation to serve as the Residency has been taken up for discussion as a case study in Part-II of the Thesis. The Residency symbolised British authority and had to exude the new power equation of dependency of the King on the Company for which it relied on spatial and facade articulation as per European norms. Its location made the civilian area to the north of the Palace-fort, from the Residency to the Kashmiri Gate, more prestigious. Built-form types catering to other administrative functioning of the government clustered around the Residency and included the Magistrate's kutcherry and the treasury located close to the city wall, near the Moira Bastion [Refer Fig.2.13a]. For meeting the religious and funerary obligations, a church and a European cemetery came up south of the Magazine. These institutions, whether housed in older Mughal structures or newly built, continued to run from the city despite the civilian area's subsequent shift to the hinterland. An open space for public assembly was carved out around the Church. The area south of the Palace-fort was largely residential in terms of land use.

The residential organisation observed social and occupational hierarchy with the elite, comprising high Company officials, Police Chief, Magistrate and Sessions Judge, residing close to the Kashmiri Gate and around the Residency. The code restricting access to the waterfront was violated as both the British and natives built their dwellings along the Jamuna. The waterfront north of the Residency was predominantly British with prominent persons, including Keating, Metcalfe, and Colonel Robert Smith residing there. The remaining European community, including Company clerks and traders and native Christians and Anglo-Indians, was considered most appropriate for British buildings in India as it stood for European cultural superiority.

66 For a detailed account of the Residency, see, Part-II of the Thesis
lived in areas such as Daryaganj, Rajghat, Kucha Itiqad Khan and Nigambodhghat. South of the Palace-fort European residences were interspersed with those of the native elite.

While built-forms of urban institutions exhibited an architecturally subdued approach towards asserting their identity, residential development saw the haveli being challenged as the predominant form of domestic architecture as two novel types, the kothi and the bungalow were introduced to Delhi.

A novel residential built-form type: the kothi

Urban form

The term kothi was in circulation since the 17th century and implied a trader’s house that also included his warehouse. It was a term used to designate the East India Company’s factories built in the Subcontinent. However, by the 19th century, the purview of the term had expanded to include a residential built-form type mediating between the bungalow and the haveli as it had elements of both. The kothis constituted part of the urban form of colonial cities in the 19th and 20th centuries. They formed part of an amorphous cluster of various built-form types, their plot boundaries being contiguous with the adjoining property. A typical kothi had a walled enclosure that contained the kothi proper and ancillary structures for servants and services usually separated from the main house [Fig.2.18]. The open space was laid out as gardens with driveways and pathways for access. The kothi proper had a central hall as the chief spatial unit with remaining areas disposed around it. Indigenous features were incorporated owing to primarily climatic benefits. Many Europeans had appropriated older havelis for use and appreciated
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68 A few British residents dwelt in the indigenous city, namely James Skinner in Ballimaran and Captain Manuel in Dariba Khurd. Shama Mitra Chenoy, Shahjahanabad: A City of Delhi, 1638-1857, (Delhi, 1998) 86,90

the features that were integral to the haveli layout. These features were incorporated into the kothi layout for enhanced comfort and included a hammam (bath), tehkhana (subterranean chamber), zenana (women’s quarters) and a garden. European influence ranged from superficial decorative details to spatial compartmentalization for various functions.

The kothi was effective in dealing with the Delhi climate, making it attractive to prospective occupants both Europeans and the native elite who resided in them in proximity to each other as discussed below.

The kothis in Delhi’s British enclave

The scrutiny of a pre-Mutiny map of the city reveals that kothis were built north and south of the Palace-fort [Refer Fig.2.13a, b]. There was a comparatively larger concentration of kothis of Europeans to the north around the Kashmiri Gate area, while the natives’ kothis were concentrated to the south of the Palace-fort. Among the prominent kothis lying north of the Palace-fort were Kothi Sikandar Sahib, a large estate with a mosque on the premises south-west of the Kashmiri Gate [Refer Fig.2.18]; Hatah (Compound) Fastr (Foster) Sahib, near Kashmiri Gate; Hatah Saint Sahib; Kothi Resident Sahib (Official residence of the Deputy Resident); the kothis of Major Smith, Ahmad Ali Khan and Rustal; and Kothi Raji Dandi (Residency). To the west of the Palace-fort stood one of the most prominent kothis of Delhi, Kothi Begum Samru, whose owner and her entertainment soirees held in the premises were a subject of remark among Delhi’s European residents. South of the Palace-fort stood Kothi Kawli Sahib; Kothi Shams ad-Din Khan; Kothi Nawab of Jhajjar; and Kothi Khan Sahib.

The indigenous elements in a kothi never ceased to draw the attention of the Europeans. Orlich remarked that the house of the editor of the Delhi Gazette possessed “like many of those inhabited by Europeans, subterranean apartments, in which, during the prevalence of the hot winds, he is protected against the dry,
sultry heat, and enjoys a temperature lower by 10 degree.  

Equally well known was the tehkhana in Major Smith's residence where the "descent to the apartment was 30 feet, ... The rooms are ample, large, lofty and convenient." The hammam of Kothi Begum Samru as well as the zenana and bagh in Kothi Sikandar Sahib also had their admirers from within the European community.

The emergence of the bungalow in the city proper

In the British enclave, giving the kothis company, with whom they often shared their plot boundaries, were the bungalows. The bungalow had already been established as a pan-Indian, British dwelling model at the time of the British occupation of Delhi with a highly evolved spatial layout and form articulation. Laying out a bungalow in the city proper caused its urban form, taken up for discussion later in the chapter, to be compromised due to spatial constraints of intervening in the existing city fabric. Nevertheless, bungalows made up a part of the city's British enclave as shown by an examination of the pre-Mutiny map [Refer Fig. 2.13a, b]. Bungalows were built north and south of the Palace-fort for the military and civilian officers. Each dwelling unit stood detached in its own compound with sufficient space around it for visual appreciation and for privacy. Prominent bungalows north of the Palace-fort housed the British such as Bangla Chabi Sahib; Bangla Jali Sahib [Fig.2.19]; Bangla Nikson Sahib and Bangla John Gubbins. South of the Palace-fort were Serjant Bangla; the bungalow of Chaplain Thomson of the Baptist Mission, that overlooked the river; and a group of four bungalows whose occupants' identity is obscure. Members of the indigenous elite also built bungalows south of the Palace-fort for example Bangla Nasim Sahib perhaps as an overture to exhibit solidarity with the British.
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Development of the hinterland civil station: physical distancing from the natives

The city's European civilian residents moved out to the hinterland after the shifting of the cantonment to establish the civil station or civil lines in keeping with the well established norms of colonialism that demanded both physical and social distancing from natives. The also allowed the British to lay out the civil lines along the conventional pattern, besides offering exotic views of the walled city from the hinterland to satiate the British yearning for the picturesque. The civil lines occupied the area between the Kashmiri Gate and the Ridge, safely ensconced between the city and the cantonment from which it was not clearly demarcated [Fig.2.20]. It enclosed a triangular area bordered by the north wall of the city to the south, the Ridge to the west and the Jamuna on the east. The site encompassed Chandrawal village that was cleared by felling old tamarind and cedar trees to make land available for the layout. 74

A map of the hinterland drawn in 1849-1850 helps in reconstructing the civil lines layout. 75 Like the cantonment, the civil lines was also not physically demarcated with a boundary wall allowing for future expansion. Its occupants comprised the British elite, namely Company officials like the Resident or successive Commissioners and Agents and other officers down the hierarchy, who moved out from the city. The area they vacated in the city proper was occupied by Europeans of a lower social order for example Company clerks, soldiers and merchants and traders. 76 The civil lines was separated from the city proper with the Qudsiya Bagh and open land acting as a buffer. The road network connecting the city to the cantonment ran through the civil lines. The layout conformed to pre-established norms, with wide, tree-lined roads, open spaces and large compounds. Development was concentrated in an area defined by two roads, namely Rajpur
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75 Data drawn from Map Delhi (1849-1850)
76 Spear, op. cit., 148
Road (linking the city’s Kabul Gate to the cantonment) and Alipur Road (linking the city’s Kashmiri Gate to the cantonment) on the east and west respectively, the city proper to the south and the Ridge to the north. This area was nearly equivalent to the area of the city proper lying north of the east-west avenue between the Palace-fort and the city wall. Given the fact that the number of occupants in civil lines was small, this area was very sparsely populated with only a handful of structures scattered in the open landscape [Refer Fig.2.20]. The civil lines had a rather limited role in that it was primarily a residential enclave as the institutions of administration, religion, commerce and leisure continued to be based in the city proper. The chief built-form type was the bungalow. The kothis were conspicuous by their absence, their native affinity perhaps marring the exclusive European look and feel of the civil lines. A custom house for the taxation of goods entering the city via the Kashmiri Gate was built on the premises of the Qudsiya Bagh. By the 1840s, an Assembly Room and a Racquet Court were built for leisure [Refer Fig.2.20]. A few institutions also came up in the southern hinterland beyond the Delhi Gate. A lunatic asylum was built in 1840 and the District Jail operated from a readapted serai, Serai Nawab Shaikh Farid Khan.77 Beyond the Turkman Gate were ice-pits.

The emergence of the bungalow

Urban form

The bungalow, defined by King as the “basic residential unit of the colonial urban settlement”,78 was an integral part of the urban landscape of the Subcontinent’s cities. Bungalows built within the native city while forming part of its urban fabric insulated themselves from their immediate environs by their distinctive urban form. In the cantonment and civil lines, the form of the bungalow contributed to imparting a spatial character that distinguished the cantonment and civil lines

77 ASI, Listing, op cit., II, 59-60, No.100
78 For a detailed discussion on the bungalow, see, Anthony D. King, The Bungalow: The Production of a Global Culture, (London, 1984)
from the native city. A typical bungalow stood in large plot of land called a compound that was usually walled with a gateway opening onto a road for communicating with the outside world [Fig.2.21]. The compound contained the bungalow proper, ancillary structures and ample open space where the built mass did not occupy more than twenty five percent of the total plot area. The positioning of the built mass in the compound made it a self-centred space that stood isolated from its neighbour with whom it shared its plot edge. The bungalow proper usually occupied the middle of the site, the location governed by considerations of high ground for better drainage and visual appreciation. The bungalow was expected to provide good views of the environs outwards from within its spaces and also form a pleasing visual ensemble when viewed from a distance. The bungalow proper was consciously separated from the ancillary areas comprising the native service providers' working cum living space for the fear of catching a disease. The service areas were normally confined to the periphery of the site’s rear edge. The open space was well planted with trees and plants for much desired fresh air and for solar protection. Driveways and pathways were interwoven into the landscape for accessing the main house and service areas.

The bungalow proper provided dwelling space that was compartmentalised into separate living, dining and bedrooms, with toilets. The living room often formed the central space around which the other spaces were arranged. A verandah enveloped either part or the entire structure forming a transitional space between the outside world and the private space within. The kitchen was detached from the main house and formed part of the service area. Apart from the open space and planting, the built-form also had design features to counter the heat and humidity such as thick walls, high ceilings, small size openings and an absence of vertical forms to assist the flow of air. Thus externally, it was a low, single storey structure hidden from view by the plantation [Fig.2.22].

As in other colonial contexts in the Subcontinent, bungalows were built in Delhi in the city proper, as has been discussed, and in the hinterland. Unlike the city where the bungalow formed part of a cultural landscape comprising both
Europeans and the native elite, in the hinterland it had the exclusivity of being part of a purely British territory in this phase as discussed below.

The bungalows in Delhi’s civil lines

Bungalows were built in civil lines for representatives of the East India Company namely, the Resident and successive Commissioners and Agents, the police inspector, and the civil surgeon. The scrutiny of pre-Mutiny maps indicates that the number of bungalows were not more than six to eight up to 1857. This is also supported by the inventory of structures in the hinterland that records a majority of bungalows as built in the post-Mutiny phase. Orlich described the view where “a road, constructed of cancar, led through the cantonments, past some handsome bungalows, to an eminence ... The road now gradually descends for about two miles to the Kashmir Gate; it is skirted by beautiful villas, among which that of Mr. Macduff, lying in a fine large park, is conspicuous by its handsome colonnade.” The bungalows clustered together along Alipur Road or off it in a pocket northwest of the Qudsiya Bagh. Each bungalow stood in its own compound of two to two and a half acres generously planted with shrubs and trees for visual appreciation and privacy. Among the prominent bungalows were Ludlow Castle, the residence of a surgeon [Fig.2.23], and the bungalow of Sir John Lawrence in its vicinity.

Relationship of the British hinterland settlement with the city proper

The British settlement was consciously detached from the native city to keep all kinds of native influences, both real and imaginary, at bay. Despite its physical separation from the city, the British were dependant on the city proper as they commuted to it everyday to discharge their duties or business. This to and fro

---

79 Data drawn from the following maps, Map Delhi (1849-1850); Delhi 1857- A Plan of the City and its immediate surroundings, drawn in the Quarter-Master General’s Office in the British Camp on the Ridge
80 For a detailed account, see, “Inventory of structures in the hinterland (Phase-IV), Appendix-III of the Thesis
81 Orlich, op cit., 2-3
movement echoed the commuting induced by separation of workplace from dwelling area, a reality in their industrialised homeland.

A road network developed between the city proper and the British territory for effective communication. Roads led from the Kashmiri, Kabul and Lahore Gates of the city to civil lines and beyond the Ridge to the cantonment. To facilitate laying of roads, old mango trees lining the old road to the north, were felled\textsuperscript{82} as new wide roads chartering a straight path cut across the landscape. A scrutiny of pre-Mutiny maps reveals the road names that were based on the topographical peculiarities, prominent structures, or older villages in the area, lending the roads a distinct British identity.\textsuperscript{83}

\textbf{A case of contrasts: the British settlement versus the native city}

The urban form of the cantonment and civil lines was at variance with that of the native city as the latter “curiously contrasted with a new suburb, the villas belonging to Europeans attached to the Residency and with the Cantonments lately erected for the three regiments of sepoys.”\textsuperscript{84} The difference lay not only in the layout and built-form types, but the cultural context in the two areas was completely different. A European visitor’s attention was drawn to the contrast following a visit to the native quarters. In the words of one such visitor, “the European station is laid out in large rectangles formed by wide roads. The native city is an aggregate of houses perforated by tortuous paths. [...] The Europeans live in detached houses, each surrounded by walls enclosing large gardens, lawns, out-offices. The natives live packed in squeezed-up tenements, kept free from falling to pieces by mutual pressure. The handful of Europeans occupy four times the space of the city which contains tens of thousands of Hindoos and

\textsuperscript{82} Gupta in Frykenbcrg, ed., \textit{op cit.}, 256
\textsuperscript{83} Roads had names like Alipur Road, Rajpur Road, Khyber Pass, Flagstaff Road, Underhill Road, Ludlow Castle Road, Court Road, and Racquet Court Lane. Data drawn from Map Delhi (1849-1850)
\textsuperscript{84} Anon., ‘Delhi in 1835’ in \textit{The Tourists Guide from Delhi to Kurrachee}, (Lahore, 1835) - cited in King, \textit{op cit.}, 196
Mussulmen. Therefore, the urban form of the native quarters has been taken up for discussion later in the chapter.

The contrasts notwithstanding, some Company officials serving in Delhi were called "Nabobs", a corruption of the native appellation Nawab, due to their unequivocal love for the city and for native aristocratic living. The Nabobs copied erstwhile Mughal aristocracy by laying out hinterland estates as either permanent residences or for repose. Their lifestyle also echoed that of the landed aristocracy in Britain, a circumstance made possible by their being based in the Subcontinent as colonial rulers. The following discussion examines the hinterland estates of some Delhi Nabobs.

**Hinterland country estates of Delhi's Nabobs**

Apart from laying the cantonment and civil lines, the hinterland also provided a setting for the country estates of Nabobs. The estate could be carved out of an existing Mughal site or be built anew. Unlike civil lines, where the bungalow was the residential built-form type, the country estates displayed an eclecticism ranging from indigenous Mughal influences to European models. The size, layout and architectural character of the estates were impressive and they became subjects of discussion among visiting Europeans, on account of their novelty as specimens of European habitat. There is no record of native reactions to these developments.

Delhi's four Nabobs were David Ochterlony, Charles Metcalfe, William Fraser and Thomas Metcalfe. Ochterlony and Charles Metcalfe lived in the Residency in the city and had hinterland retreats, while the remaining two had residences in the hinterland. The hinterland estates were built north and northwest of the city in the early decades of the 19th century as Delhi District was not assessed for land revenue until the end of 1830s. Besides, the Nabobs became an extinct species with the passage of time as new Company officials had nothing but contempt for...

---

native society and its mores, thus ending any future prospects of emulation of native lifestyle.

Ochterlony's Mubarak Bagh

Ochterlony\textsuperscript{86} remodelled the 17\textsuperscript{th} century haveli of Mughal heir apparent, Dara Shikoh, into the Residency. For repose, he retired with his entourage to his country estate named after one of his native companions, Mubarak-un-Nissa Begum.\textsuperscript{87} The estate was four miles northwest of the city, close to the Mughal imperial highway leading to Lahore and Kashmir [Fig. 2.24]. The estate became a British addition to a series of gardens that had been laid out by Mughal royalty and nobility along the fringes of this much-traversed route of the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries. Considering the patron's fondness for native living, the estate was in all likelihood laid out as a Mughal pleasure garden, to whose introverted folds, Ochterlony retired with his zenana for leisure. The principal structure crowned by a lofty dome, is believed to have been made as Ochterlony's mausoleum.\textsuperscript{88} Once the cantonment shifted out of the city, its race course and band stand skirted the estate.\textsuperscript{89} After the patron's demise, the site was visited in large numbers by people from the cantonment for leisure, particularly in winter. In 1839, Mubarak-un-Nissa Begum, set up a claim for 180 bighas of the estate, but was allowed only 42 as her due by the government.\textsuperscript{90} With time the site fell into disuse and neglect.

\textsuperscript{86} Ochterlony was twice Resident of Delhi between 1803 and 1825. He lived like a Mughal amir, his opulent and ostentatious lifestyle shocking his countrymen like Bishop Heber.

\textsuperscript{87} It was not unusual for Nabobs to keep a zenana, in the manner of Mughal nobility.

\textsuperscript{88} Text accompanying the illustration in Thomas Metcalfe, \textit{Reminiscences of Imperial Delhi} [henceforth Metcalfe's folio] in Kaye, \textit{op cit.}, 181-182

\textsuperscript{89} Data drawn from Map 'Delhi and Environs', Imperial Gazetteer Atlas of India, Plate 55
Charles Metcalfe’s Kothi in the Shalimar Bagh

Charles Metcalfe\textsuperscript{91} resided in the Residency as Resident and on weekends went to his estate carved out of the Shalimar Bagh.\textsuperscript{92} It included both new structures, a Kothi set amidst an orchard and a Mughal pleasure pavilion readapted as a weekend party venue. The estate has been taken up for discussion in Part-II of the Thesis.

William Fraser’s Residence

The residence attributed to William Fraser\textsuperscript{93} is believed to have been built by Resident Edward Colebrooke as the Residency in the hinterland. Following Colebrook’s suspension, it was probably bought by Fraser, who took over as Resident.\textsuperscript{94} The house, described by von Orlich as a “very charmingly-situated villa,”\textsuperscript{95} formed part of a large estate on the Ridge commanding good views. [Refer Fig.2.11] It stood in splendid isolation, save for a couple of pre-Mughal structures in the vicinity. Jacquemment, who lived there in 1831, observed that the “immense house which is a kind of Gothic fortress,”\textsuperscript{96} an erroneous observation, since the house was built in the prevailing classical style. It stood on a high plinth to accommodate a tehkhana and was entered via a porch [Fig.2.25]. Following Fraser’s murder in 1835, the property was put on sale as the Residency stood abolished. It was bought by a Maratha, Raja Hindu Rao Ghatke, who occupied it till his death in 1855, his twenty year long association with the house gave it its commonly known name, Hindu Rao’s House. Subsequently, it became the

\textsuperscript{90} Gupta, op cit., 15, Footnote 83
\textsuperscript{91} Charles Metcalfe was Assistant Resident and later became the Resident twice and almost single-handedly created the premise for administering the Delhi Territory.
\textsuperscript{92} For a detailed account of the original Mughal garden and its transformation under Charles Metcalfe, see, Part-II of the Thesis
\textsuperscript{93} William Fraser, described by his botanist friend, V. Jacquemment, as “half Asiatic in habits, but in other respects a Scotch Highlander” was appointed briefly as Resident and later became the Agent of the Governor General.
\textsuperscript{94} Spear, op cit., Appendix-B: Hindu Rao’s House, 191-193
\textsuperscript{95} Orlich, op cit., 10
\textsuperscript{96} V. Jacquemment, Letters from India (1828-31), II, 240 as cited in Spear, op cit., 192
residence of the District Treasurer till the outbreak of the Mutiny. During the siege operations of the Mutiny the house witnessed action as the British engaged the insurgents in a battle. Post-Mutiny it became a sanatorium for convalescing troops.

Thomas Metcalfe’s Metcalfe House

Thomas Metcalfe had a passion for building. Metcalfe House was built in 1828-30. The large estate was carved out of Chandrawal, north of the city proper, and the house, sited near the Jamuna bank, was about a mile away from the Kashmiri Gate. It stood in an estate of close to a thousand acres planted with orange trees and contained artificial lakes and beautifully laid-out gardens that “undulated away in lawns and drives, between the Ridge and the river" besides containing ancillary structures including stables, servants’ quarters and a cow house. The main house was enveloped by a wide verandah whose flat roof was carried on lofty classical columns. The south verandah, faced the river, and was laid out as a terrace overlooking the Jamuna, making it ideal for taking in the breeze. The terrace allowed the construction of a tehkhana in the actual riverbed, making it a cool haven during the hot summer months.

The house had an oratory, study, library, billiard room, swimming bath and Napoleon Gallery displaying Napoleonic memorabilia. The “study, library and Napoleon Gallery were in one line, facing the north portico. Then behind them were the drawing room and banqueting room, facing east and west. Then came the big bay-drawing room and a small dining room, drawing room, and serving room. These opened into the oratory and lobby off which opened the large square bedroom and dressing room. Then again facing the south verandah
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97 Thomas Metcalfe, younger brother of Charles Metcalfe, served the Company both as Agent and Commissioner and epitomized the British Nabob.
98 Nath, op cit., 72, No.27 listed as ‘Kothi Jahan-Numa’; ASI, Listing, op cit., II, 291,No.410; INTACII, Delhi The Built Heritage A Listing. (Delhi, 1999), 2, 27, Serial No.C40
99 Chandrawal’s original occupants, the Gujars, were evicted and their agricultural and grazing land was acquired by Metcalfe.
were the bedroom of Sir Thomas, the sitting room of Lady Metcalfe and my own bedroom."\(^\text{101}\) The entire house was filled with family treasures brought over from Britain, to which was also added Metcalfe's own collection of books, engravings and several objects d'art such as furniture, clocks and statuary. Cooling devices like punkahs, khas-khas tatties and thermantidotes kept the house cool.\(^\text{102}\) The property was reputed to be the most expensive in the North-Western Provinces. Following Thomas Metcalfe's demise in 1853, his son, Theophilus Metcalfe took up residence in the house till the day of the outbreak of the Mutiny in Delhi, when the House was looted and burnt by Chandrawal's zamindars and Gujars. Its charred remains served as a British picket during the siege operations. Post-Mutiny, having passed through hands of banias, Metcalfe House was acquired by the government and rebuilt into a government Reception House.

Thomas Metcalfe's Country Retreat – 'Dil-Koosha'

Thomas Metcalfe did not use the Shalimar Bagh retreat built by his brother Charles Metcalfe instead he built his own retreat called Dilkhusha in 1844 by readapting a tomb in Mehrauli and building additional structures, amidst a landscaped garden.\(^\text{103}\) The estate has been taken up for discussion as a case study in Part-II of the Thesis.

2.4 The native city

By definition the native city was an area occupied by the native or indigenous population and formed part of the tripartite division of urban territory in the colonial context [Refer Fig.2.3]. In case of Delhi, the term native city encompassed the settlement within the walled confines of the city and hinterland settlements that were located primarily in the western and southern hinterland.

\(^\text{100}\) Flora Annie Steel, *On the Face of the Waters* - cited in ASI, *Listing, op cit.,* II, 293, No.410
\(^\text{101}\) Lady Emily Bayley - cited in ASI, *Listing, op cit.,* II, 291-292, No.410
\(^\text{102}\) Lady Emily Bayley - cited in Kaye, ed., *op cit.,* 160
2.4.1 The native quarters within the walled confines of the city: urban form

Unlike the last phase, the study and analysis of a map of the city dated around 1850\(^{104}\) permits us to arrive at a picture of the native quarters' urban form. Even as the British moved to the hinterland, they continued to occupy a part of the city proper to the north of the Palace-fort. Barring this area under British occupation, the rest of the area enclosed within the city wall constituted the native quarters. The wall clearly defined the edges of this quarter on all sides except to the north, northeast and east, where the edge was rather blurred as the native quarters tended to overlap with the British enclave [Fig. 2.27]. With the British confining themselves to their territory, the urban form of the indigenous quarters beyond the British domain remained largely unaffected by the interventions in the British territory. The Palace-fort, the city wall and the two cardinal avenues were the chief elements ordering the urban form. The Palace-fort remained the core of the city that physically continued to dominate the landscape despite the dismal state of affairs within the precinct. The city wall retained its circuit to maintain the overall city form of the irregular quadrant. The cardinal avenues established the street pattern hierarchy and also transcended their role as circulation spines as their edges became prominent sites for the location of urban institutions.

The street pattern

A scrutiny of the 1850 map enables us to comprehend the street pattern that comprised two architecturally identifiable linkage types. One was a linear entity or street known variously as Rastah, Guzar, Kucha and Gali and the second was the square called Chauk. Both streets and chauks recognisably occurred in a hierarchical order.

\(^{103}\) For a detailed discussion on the country estate, see, Part-II of the Thesis
\(^{104}\) Data drawn from Redrawn Delhi Map
The streets were open to sky linkages as covered streets called *chattas* were a rarity. They could be named after a patron if formally laid out by him; a prominent resident of the area; commodity sold; vocation or caste of the major community that lived in its vicinity; a special physical attribute such as its dimensions; the existence of an old tree, a mosque or temple. At the top of the hierarchy were the two cardinal avenues that originated from the Palace-fort and terminated at the two main gates of the city, namely, the Lahori and Akbarabadi Gates [Fig. 2.28a, b]. Both the avenues also doubled as the main *bazaars*, being laid out like promenades with the canal flowing down their entire length. These avenues can be designated as the primary streets in the hierarchy of streets. The next or secondary level comprised streets that led from the city gates into the city and streets that originated from the Jami Masjid [Fig. 2.29a, b]. They divided the urban fabric into smaller spatial entities whose edges they defined. The main activity they supported was also commercial and were identifiable as *bazaar* streets. Among the most prominent secondary streets were the Khass Bazaar originating from the east face of the Jami Masjid and Bazaar Lal Kuan from the Lahori Gate. The third or tertiary level in the hierarchy comprised streets that branched out from the primary and secondary streets to further atomise the city into *muhallas* (neighbourhoods) and further branched off to set up linkages within each *muhalla* [Fig. 2.30a, b]. These streets were both semi-public thorough streets and private cul-de-sacs and were referred to as *Galis* (lanes). They were most likely to be residential, though in the absence of strict compartmentalisation of land use the presence of some local level *bazaars* and social institutions cannot be ruled out entirely.

*Chauks*

The *chauks* were also organised into a hierarchy based on the street type from which they emerged. Leading the hierarchy, were the *chauks* along the primary streets that formally conceived spaces such as Chandni Chauk [Refer Fig. 2.28a].
The second category of *chauks* occurred along the secondary streets and could be both formally planned such as Chauk Sa’adullah Khan and informal such as Chuak Qazi-ka Hauz [Refer Fig.2.29b]. The third level of *chauks* occurred at the junction of the tertiary streets and was amorphous in form [Refer Fig.2.30c].

**Atomisation of the urban fabric: the *muhalla***

The 1850 map indicates that of the three *muhalla* types namely the Palace-fort, the elite *muhallas* and the caste and craft *muhallas*, the last two formed the urban fabric of the native city [Refer Fig.2.27]. Spatially, a *muhalla*, was not likely to be at variance with its 17th and 18th century predecessors as it was unaffected by European influence at the urban level.

**Urban form of the *muhalla***

The *muhalla* was a self-contained, semi-public spatial entity whose physical edges were defined by the city’s streets [Fig.2.31a, b]. It generally evolved spontaneously with time, as its urban form was modified in accordance with its inhabitants’ needs. It usually had a main street that acted like a spine from which took off a web of linkages comprising through streets, *cul-de-sacs* and *chauks* that ensured internal connectivity between its parts. The spine formed the connection of the *muhalla* with the rest of the city usually via a gateway that marked the transition from the anonymous, public world of the city outside to the semi-public one within the *muhalla* fold [Fig.2.32]. The physical form of the *muhalla* was amorphous as it was an outcome of the street pattern that defined the *muhalla* edges and also separated one *muhalla* from the next [Refer Fig.2.31a]. Even as it was largely residential in composition, the fabric supported mixed land use with built-form types of other urban institutions such as mosques, *dargahs*, temples, *madrasas* and *serais*. Interspersed in the fabric was yet another smaller unit of spatial organisation called a *Katra* that was a walled enclosure with residential and commercial built-form types arranged around a central courtyard and communicated with the rest of the *muhalla* via a gateway [Fig.2.33]. The urban
fabric of the *muhalla* was dense with the built mass dominating the spatial composition. Open spaces in the fabric comprised the streets, namely the *kuchas* and *galis*, and *chauks* at the *muhalla* level, while at the built-form level, the courtyards and private gardens of the houses lent porosity to the urban fabric [Fig.2.34]. It was imperative for the built mass, irrespective of ownership, to draw a distinction between the public realm and the private domain thus resulting in an inward looking built-form of the *muhalla* that qualified the semi-public domain.

The native city’s *muhalla* types

The Palace-fort, though still the largest form of spatial organization housing the ruler and his family, *salatin* and servants, had received some British interventions and formed the fulcrum of the British enclave. The number of elite *muhallas* cannot be established as the changed political scenario caused the *umara* (nobility) to be in a state of flux. They had either migrated to newer urban centres or were men of reduced means with shrinking sizes of native land holdings. Escalation in land values following the British occupation of the city also deprived the elite of their commodious and grand spatial ventures. The *haveli* precincts were susceptible to fragmentation with several occupants drawn from different folds of the society. One such elite *muhalla*, Haveli Nawab Qamruddin Khan has been examined as a case study to show how the precinct underwent a transformation in this phase.°° The elite *muhallas* tended to be sited off the secondary streets such as Haveli Sadr-ud Din that was located along the street emerging from the Jami Masjid’s southern gateway and was called Bazaar Chitli Qabr. The spatial organization centered on the personal living quarters of the patron and was named after him. The precinct comprised the Haveli proper, Tabela (stables), Katra and other built-forms disposed along the streets and *chauks* [Fig.2.35]. This phase abetted the creation of the caste and craft *muhallas* as patronage declined and services were commercialised. In the changed scenario, the caste and craft *muhallas* were likely to be the dominant form of indigenous spatial organization. Caste and craft *muhallas* focused on the resident
community's mosque or temple and could be named after the resident community, their vocation, product under manufacture, a prominent resident or a local landmark. The muhallas housing the service providers belonging to the lower folds of the social order tended to be sited along the city wall and in proximity to the city gates such as the chamars (sweepers) in Chamarwara near the Mori Gate and Kashmiri Gates, kumhars (potters) in Muhalla Kumhar and mochis (shoemakers) in Gali Mochi near the Ajmeri gate and qassab (butchers) in Qabbabpura in close proximity to the Kashmiri and Delhi Gates [Fig.2.36]. The habitat of the traders tended to be in proximity to the bazaars such as Katra Marwari near the Lahori Gate of the city along the east-west avenue. The area along the east-west avenue had a preponderance of Hindu occupants, while the area around the Jami Masjid was largely occupied by the Muslims.

Indigenous urban institutions and their built-form types

The urban composition of the muhalla indicated a mixed land use with native urban institutions manifested through their respective built-form types. While the spatial character of the muhallas remained unaffected by European influence at the urban level, some built-form types incorporated European architectural influences and were transformed.

Mosques

The perusal of the 1850 map permits us to classify the city's mosques into three distinct types. At the top of the hierarchy was the Jami Masjid that served as an archetype and was the rallying point for the city's entire male Muslim population. The second level of mosques comprised those built by the elite, such as the Fatehpuri Masjid, Akbarabadi Masjid, Sirhindi Masjid, Zinat-ul Masjid, Aurangabadi masjid and Fakhru-ul Masjid. Each mosque formed the religious and social hub of the city quarter in which it was located. The third level of mosques comprised the muhalla level mosques that were scattered throughout the city.

105 For a detailed discussion, see, Haveli Nawab Qamruddin Khan, Part-II of the Thesis
They were an integral part of the *muhalla* fabric where the resident community was Muslim.

**Bazaars**

*Bazaars* came up along the edges of streets thus tending to be linear, although they were also organised around a central courtyard to form a *katra*. The *bazaar*’s quintessential built-form type was the *dukan* (shop) and a number of shops collectively made up the *bazaar*. The *bazaar* was not a mono-cultural place, but also accommodated non-commercial built-form types for example a *serai*, *hammam*, *masjid* and temple along with public utilities like water pools and fountains, besides serving as a place of social interaction. The main *bazaars* of the city came up along the primary streets and were followed by those along the secondary streets. The tertiary streets usually had one or two shops selling items of daily consumption.

**Baghs**

The gardens comprised the open space in the city and were private in nature. They formed part of a residential precinct such as the garden within Haveli Nawab Mir Fakhr Khan located near the Turkman Gate [Fig.2.37]. The gardens along with the courtyards enabled the aeration of the densely built urban form. The largest garden in the native quarters, in fact in the entire city, was the Begum-ka Bagh, a *zenana bagh* for the women of the imperial and *amiri* households [Refer fig.2.27]. Its original function as a pleasure retreat had been compromised since phase-II and the site had been encroached. This site has been examined as a case study.

**Havelis**

Setbacks in *amiri* privileges notwithstanding, the *havelis* were a prominent residential built-form type in the indigenous city. They were scattered throughout the native quarter and were the most prominent built-form type in the urban fabric.
in terms of area. Bishop Heber’s remark that the houses in the city “far exceed in
grandeur anything seen in Moscow”\(^{106}\) substantiates the contribution of the havelis
to the urban form.

Urban form of the haveli

The term haveli implied an indigenous residential built-form type owned by a
wealthy patron. It was an integral component of a muhalla and very often it
tended to be its focus with the built mass clustering around it [Fig.2.38]. The
edges of the haveli were contiguous with those of the adjoining properties. A
typical haveli was a walled precinct with gateways for access from the enclosing
streets. The walled configuration created an introvert and sheltered form that
separated the semi-public muhalla domain from the private world of the haveli.
With the precinct, spatial progression proceeded from the domestic public to the
domestic private domain. The patron’s living quarters were the focus with the
ancillary areas such as the stables, stores and servants’ quarters around them
[Fig.2.39]. The spatial delineation of the main living quarters was gender specific
with the mens’ area called mardana constituting the domestic public and semi-
public domain and the womens’ area called zenana being intensely private. Multi-
functional use of space was the norm. The mardana was located close to the
entrance and allowed the haveli to communicate with the outside world, while the
zenana was completely introvert. Transition from one domain to the next was
effected via courtyards that were referred to as chauks [Refer Fig.2.39, Fig.2.40].
Both the mardana and the zenana comprised a set of apartments built around the
courtyards with arcaded vestibules called dalans facilitating the spatial transition
from the courtyard to the apartment [Refer Fig.2.40]. Often the courtyard or part
of it was laid out as a garden to offset the built mass with elements of nature.
Externally, the haveli’s built mass was one with the surrounding built-form and
the transition from the hustle and bustle of the street to the inside was quite
dramatic. At the interface of the street and the haveli were some architectural
elements that articulated the façade [Fig.2.41]. These included the chabootra

\(^{106}\) Heber, \textit{op cit.}, 1, 563
(raised platform), arched niche and flanking platforms for seating, the entrance
doorway set back in the arched niche, overhanging chajja, alas (small arched
alcoves) flanking the arched niche, and jharokhas (aedicular projections with
columns and a roof screened with a jail or lattice that permitted the outside view
without being visible).

Transformations in the haveli: European influence

The pattern of haveli ownership was altered as it was no longer the exclusive
domain of the umara as the rapid rise of a merchant class that possessed the
wherewithal to either buy an amiri haveli\textsuperscript{107} or build one, ensured that the once
elitist residential built-form type was now within reach of other sections of
society.

Just as the British were anxious to graft visual symbols of European origin on
older Mughal structures to assert their identity, natives also adopted the same
symbols to underscore their allegiance to the British. Consequently, European
architectural influence began to manifest itself in the city by the third decade of
the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, when indigenous dwellings, notably havelis were exhibiting
European architectural elements, to a degree unsurpassed as “the houses are of
various styles of architecture, partaking occasionally of the prevailing fashions of
the west. Grecian piazzas, porticos, and pediments are not infrequently found
fronting the dwellings of Moslem or Hindoos. [...] The houses are for the most
part white-washed, and the gaiety of the appearance is heightened by the carpets
and shawls, strips of cloth of every hue, scarfs, and coloured veils which are hung
out over the verandah or on top of the house.”\textsuperscript{108} The transformations were only
superficial as the spatial delineation of havelis still conformed to the traditional

\textsuperscript{107} Upward mobility of the merchant class was highly pronounced following British occupation,
when trade practices were regulated, however, its initiation was an 18\textsuperscript{th} century phenomenon. For a
discussion, see, Christopher Bayley, ‘Delhi and Other Cities of North India During the Twilight’ in
Frykenberg, \textit{op cit.}, 221-236

\textsuperscript{108} Anon., \textit{op cit.}, in King, \textit{op cit.}, 204-205
pattern. These external symbols became the markers of a new native identity that was reticent to let go of its roots [Refer Fig.2.7].

2.4.2 The native hinterland settlements

Hinterland settlements, particularly those that had serviced the city, revived as observed by the Revenue Commissioner, Fortescue in 1820. He reported that the hinterland was bustling with trading activity with as many as fifty-two bazaars and thirty-six mandis.¹⁰⁹ The land-use remained unchanged with settlements as venues of wholesale trade in essential commodities, pilgrimage centres and places of leisure.

Data drawn from the 1808 trignometrical survey of the environs of the city furnishes information that assists in reconstructing the picture of native hinterland settlements [Refer Fig.2.2a]. The settlements were connected via a road network with the surrounding areas of the Delhi Territory and were buttressed by ancillary facilities, predominantly, serais.¹¹⁰ One road from the Kabul Gate of the city went northwards to Sonipat with Badli-ki serai enroute and another road led northwest to Rohtak with Rohilla Khan-ki Serai and Sita Ram Serai along the way. Mughalpura and Sabzimandi to the northwest had gardens and orchards that had been planted by royalty and nobility and served as leisure places for both natives and Europeans. The King visited Tees Hazari Bagh for excursions and elite Company officials used older Mughal gardens for leisure. Beyond the gardens extended agricultural land and forests that stretched over an area of two miles,¹¹¹ and benefited from the revived canal. The state of verdure in the hinterland caused John Lawrence to remark in 1819 that the hinterland was like a “highly cultivated

¹⁰⁹ Thomas Fortescue, Delhi Residency and Agency Records 1807-1837 - cited in Gupta, in Frykenberg, op cit., 257
¹¹⁰ Data drawn from Map ‘Trignometrical Survey of the Environs of Delhi or Shahjahanabad - 1808’ IOR: X/1658 OIOC Collection.
¹¹¹ As per a government official, in the 1830s large-scale indiscriminate felling of trees was in practice that reduced the forest cover. Gupta, in Frykenberg, op cit., 256
garden. To the west of the city proper were the settlements of Paharipur, Teliwara, Shiddipura and Sarai Idgah that were exclusively native domains. Paharganj on southwest retained its reputation as one of Delhi's largest markets of wholesale trade. Area north of the city had gardens of Mughal royalty and nobility along the Jamuna edge that provided a buffer between the city and British hinterland enclave of the cantonment and civil lines. The settlements of Mehrauli and Palam inhabited by natives lay to the south and southwest of Delhi and were the largest in area.

2.5 Introduction of European urban institutions and novel built-form types

European urban institutions that were vastly different from the indigenous were introduced in Delhi. The natives were unfamiliar with the urban institutions while their built-form types were a novelty in the urban landscape. They marked British presence in the city, becoming rallying points for the community in their enclave. The European community, however, was not the sole recipient of these institutions, for institutions of religion, education and economic practices were also introduced for the city's native population. Delhi's Europeans had their own institutions to fulfil their requirement of religion, socialising and pursuit of antiquarian interests. Catering to the needs of urban living of both the European community and natives were civic improvement measures.

2.5.1 Native-centric urban institutions

The late 18th century and early 19th century interest in Indian civilization began to wane as the new wave of evangelical and utilitarian thinking that was sweeping across Europe, also made its way to the Subcontinent. Company officials arriving in Delhi by the second decade of the 19th century had nothing but contempt for

112 Sir John Lawrence - cited in Gupta, in Frykenberg, op cit., 256, Footnote 25
native culture. Delhi’s British residents were anxious to reform native practices thus propelling the introduction of urban institutions directed at the natives.

The motive of the British whether the Company, private groups or individuals, in initiating the natives to new religious beliefs, western learning and novel trade practices was not apolitical. They were convinced in their belief of European cultural superiority over the indigenous culture. The institutions were perceived as instruments of change that would place at their disposal a loyalist brigade of transformed natives who would contribute towards furthering the Company’s cause. The native reaction to the institutions ranged from initial opposition to final acquiescence.

Religion

Missionary groups engaged in proselytization of the natives. They setup mission houses in the city by acquiring property in the native quarters to remain in close contact with their wards. Desisting from making a bold statement about their identity, old acquired properties were not extensively remodelled. Façade articulation that would be suggestive of their European allegiance was avoided to appear one with native built-forms. The missions initiated the natives into a western way of living by patronising public works in the city namely hospitals and dispensaries, schools and colleges. The first mission to acknowledge Delhi as a seat of missionary activity was the Baptist Mission that built the Baptist Church in 1845 north of the east-west avenue. Its prominent location made the church highly visible as a symbol of the faith of the new rulers. In 1852 the S.P.G. Mission also opened its mission house in the city and managed to convert to Christianity two prominent native dwellers of the city. Another development was the organisation of theological debates between maulvis and Christian leaders, held in mosques.

113 For a detailed discussion on the change in British attitude, see, Spear, op cit., 49-59
114 For a complete discussion on Delhi’s loyalists, see, Gupta, op cit., 70-156
115 For a detailed discussion on the reaction of Muslims to European urban institutions, see, Mushirul Hasan, ‘Resistance and Acquiescence in North India: Muslim Responses to the West’ in Mushirul Hasan and Narayan Gupta, ed., India’s Colonial Encounter: Essays in Memory of Eric Stokes, (Delhi, 1993), 39-63
like the Jami Masjid. Though communal harmony prevailed, there was resentment against the authority wielded by the missionaries as “the imam al-Muslimin wields no authority, while the decrees of the Christian leaders are obeyed without fear [of the consequences].”\textsuperscript{116} Conversions particularly from the lower societal folds, notwithstanding, indigenous religious practices continued unabated as both mosques and temples were built across the city.\textsuperscript{117}

**Western education**

Education was believed to be an effective medium by which British authority could be strengthened. British administrators and missionaries introduced western educational ideas and practices. The resultant contact between the British and native intellectuals caused an awakening of the indigenous intellect, described by scholars as the Delhi Renaissance.\textsuperscript{118} Contrary to the trends in the Presidency towns, the people of Delhi were more inspired by western thought than practice, as they opted to educate themselves in their vernacular.

Western education acquired an institutional base in the city in 1827, when the 35 years old Delhi College\textsuperscript{119} introduced the English department and had a European principal. The College attracted scions of the native elite to acquire an education enabling them to serve the British. The Mission houses opened schools in muhallas where their target groups dwelt, where learning was imparted in the vernacular. Native built-form types were readapted as mission schools, their courtyard planning presenting no difficulty in adaptation. The schools were architecturally modest conceptions whose founders did not think it expedient to exhibit European symbols to assert their identity. The presence of mission schools


\textsuperscript{117} For a listing of religious structures built in this Phase, see, *Inventory of Structures within the City wall in Colonial Delhi (Phase III) and Inventory of Structures in the Hinterland in Colonial Delhi (Phase III)* in Appendix-III of the Thesis

\textsuperscript{118} For a discussion on Delhi Renaissance, see, Gail Minault, ‘Sayyid Ahmad Dehlavi and the Delhi Renaissance’ in Frykenberg, op cit., 287-298, Gupta, op cit., 97-124

\textsuperscript{119} For a detailed discussion on Delhi College, see, Part-II of the Thesis
notwithstanding, Delhi’s reputation as centre of Islamic theological studies continued unabated with its madrasas attracting students from afar.  

**Trade and industrial practices**

The British presence gave an impetus to trading activity as relatively peaceful conditions prevailed in the Delhi Region. European system of banking and credit facilities were introduced. A novel built-form type, the bank came up in the city in 1847 for which a native kothi was readapted to function as a bank. It was called the Delhi Bank. To cater to the retail needs of the Europeans, shops managed by Europeans traders came up in the British enclave providing items of consumption imported from Britain. Native bazaars offered an attractive retail proposition, with the east-west bazaar street, now called Chandni Chauk in its entirety, being the most popular venue [Fig.2.42]. Shops in bazaars were not only “crowded with all sorts of European products and Manufactures” but also reflected prevailing European taste in display with “signboards, on which the names and occupations of the inhabitants are emblazoned in Roman Characters, a novel circumstance in a Native City. […] The English placards have a very curious appearance, mingled with the striped purdahs or curtains which […] supply the place of doors, and the variegated screens”  

Waning of indigenous elite patronage caused decline in manufacturing and service industry in the city. The British perception of Delhi as a military outpost and not as a manufacturing centre prevented establishment of factories in Delhi, unlike Agra. Delhi remained a manufacturing centre for craft items that were in demand

---

120 For a listing of prominent madrasas of this Phase, see, Inventory of Structures within the City wall in Colonial Delhi (Phase III) and Inventory of Structure in the Hinterland in Colonial Delhi (Phase III) in Appendix-III of the Thesis

121 For a detailed discussion on the transformation of the kothi into a bank, see, Part-II of the Thesis
by Europeans. These included jewellery in gold, silver, pearls and precious stones; filigree work in gold; silverware; ivory and wood carving; gold and silver lace; brass and copperware; pottery; paper; cotton weaving and painting. A Gazetteer of Delhi (1883-4), (Gurgaon, 1988), 2nd Edition, 124-138

Leisurely pursuits

The Nabobs took to engaging in forms of leisure of the Mughal elite. Apart from adopting the indigenous elitist tradition of retiring to their hinterland estates for repose, they participated in outdoor activities like hunting and in sedentary activities like enjoying poetry, music and dance or nautch soirees [Fig.2.43]. A stroll down Chandni Chauk also constituted a popular pastime and “On fete days the crowd in the Chandnee Chouk, or Silver Street, was so numerous and compact that the children could walk on the heads of the people.”

Mughal royalty and nobility, in contrast to the British, patronised hinterland settlements to the south. Mehrauli provided a substitute to the traditional Mughal leisure destination of Kashmir and witnessed building activity with prominent elite built-form types like Zafar Mahal, havelis of Mirza Salim, Mirza Babar and Mirza Nili, and Baghichi Zinat Mahal. The natives also flocked to the hinterland settlements lying west and south to visit dargahs whose environs offered an ambience of repose amidst gardens and water features, in addition to
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spiritual stimulation. The impact of European forms of leisure on native lifestyle was at best minimal.

2.5.2 British-centric urban institutions

The British need for institutions arose out of the practical necessity of easing their living in a new environment apart from serving colonial ends. The institutions were an integral part of European living and recreated the familiarity of home in an alien environment.

Religion

The British met the demands of their own faith by building churches in their enclave that probably acted as a rallying point for Delhi's European community. In the early 19th century, churches were certainly an oddity in the city's landscape that was so far dominated by domes and minarets of mosques. Two churches were built, one south of the Palace-fort near Buland Bagh that catered primarily to the military and the other Saint James Church built north of the Residency. Christian funerary practices required burial grounds and therefore a cemetery was laid north of the Palace-fort, its wall contiguous with the Magazine [Refer Fig.2.13a]. In 1855 a new cemetery was laid out along the southern periphery of civil lines.

Social infrastructure

In the initial years of their occupation of Delhi, the British population was very small in numbers, for the most part comprising Company officials and "at that time there was no amusement in Delhi, except an annual ball on the Queen's birthday at the Assembly Rooms, and an occasional dinner party at some of the

128 The vicinity of Khwaja Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki's dargah had Birka and Hauz-e Shamsi where devotees enjoyed bounties of nature.
129 For a detailed discussion on urban institutions, see, King, op cit., 41-179
residents' houses." Additionally in the initial years of their presence in Delhi, the spirit of cordiality between British officials and native elite dampened the need for infrastructure for conventional European social activities. As the European community grew in number and the Nabobs became a rarity, socialising provisions had to be made where unlike native mores there was no gender segregation. The club traditionally formed the focus of British society in the colonial context and all residents flocked to it.

The Delhi Club and Assembly Rooms

The Delhi Club was built on the maidan, in the shadow of the Palace-fort, to its west. It was located off the chauk along Faiz Bazaar opposite Akbarabadi Masjid [Fig.2.43]. The size of the European community in the city did not call for a large setup hence the club was a modest building, whose size contrasted sharply with that of the Palace-fort. In keeping with its function, it must have catered to several social diversions like games, reading and dining. The building's architectural expression was in keeping with the prevalent stylistic norms with a classical arcade topped by a pediment. Delhi Club was open only to the European elite, with rest of the European population turning for entertainment to their own versions of the club. Increase in European population and the move to the hinterland prompted the building of Assembly Rooms and a Racquet Court in 1840s towards the northern limit of civil lines [Refer Fig.2.20]. By 1849-1850, the redundant Delhi Club was converted into a dak bungalow and the Assembly Rooms became the new social hub.

---

130 Lady Emily Bayley cited in Kaye, op cit., 145
131 George Orwell, *Burmese Days*, (1935), wrote "In any town in India the European Club is the spiritual citadel, the real seat of the British power, the Nirvana for which native officials and millionaires pine in vain." Cited in Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj: Images of British India in the twentieth century*, (London, 1975), 99-108
132 Design elements visible in a photograph 'Old Elahi Club' from Delhi Fort Archaeological Museum Collection Vol.7 1936-1940 D.G.A.S.I. 286/95 ASI Photo Archives
133 Data drawn from Redrawn Map of Delhi that shows the Delhi Club as Dak Bungalow
Pursuit of antiquarian interests

British attitude towards the built-heritage of the Subcontinent was shaped by developments in Europe where the Enlightenment had perpetuated architecture as an independent discipline. Architecture was poised at the juncture of archaeology, history and museology and was viewed as being worthy of study for its own sake. Delhi was perceived as a place rich in built-heritage and hence worthy of British contemplation. The city invited a response in the form of an archaeological and architectural interest in its historic sites. There was ample scope for pursuits both intellectually inclined and mundane. Orlich, on a visit to the Qutub, “sat for a full hour gazing on the scene where there is so much to engage the mind of man, and where thousands of years speak the language of warning and instruction.” Delhi’s built-heritage apart from being available to the British for reuse, offered other avenues of exploration.

Amateur exploration of the built-heritage

Visitors and Company officials could hardly ignore the strong presence of the past that survived throughout the Delhi Region. Charles Metcalfe wrote of “ruins of grandeur that extend for miles on every side, fill it with serious reflections. [...] These things cannot be looked at without indifference. The view at present before me from my tent contains the history of ages.” His views were echoed in Hamilton’s East India Gazetteer of 1815 which noted that the ruins of Delhi “cover the plain for an extent of nearly 8 miles (diameter) to the south of Shahjahanabad [...] exhibiting throughout this great tract one of the most striking

134 The founding of the Asiatic Society in Bengal in the late 18th century created the forum for research in India’s architecture. By the 1830s, several ancient sites had been excavated and explored. For a discussion on study of architecture in India see Monica Juneja, ‘Introduction’ in Monica Juneja, ed., Architecture in Medieval India, (Delhi, 2001), 1-105
135 Orlich, op cit., 29
136 Charles Metcalfe in a private letter to J.W. Sheer, dated, 14 March 1806 - cited in Panigrahi, op cit., 7
scenes of desolation to meet with throughout the whole world.\textsuperscript{137} Those who sought intellectual stimulation explored the built-heritage sites by reading about the sites, touring the area and recording their observations. Writing and graphics namely drawing, sketching, painting, cartography and later photography were the prevalent modes of representation.\textsuperscript{138} Several Company officials posted in Delhi were also amateur artists who had ample opportunity to indulge in their hobby\textsuperscript{139} [Fig.2.44a, b]. Those who did not possess the requisite skill or the time to make their own recordings turned to native artists who were commissioned to make paintings of historic sites that were often bound into folios\textsuperscript{140} [Fig.2.45a, b]. The favoured subjects of representation included the Palace-fort with Diwan-i Am and Diwan-i Khass, Jami Masjid, Qutub Minar and tombs of Emperor Humayun and Nawab Safdarjung. The drawing technique was influenced by prevailing trends in Britain, where the picturesque theory of painting gave sanction to ruined structures as fit subjects for painting. Native painters also learnt western drawing techniques at their patrons' behest or of their own volition.\textsuperscript{141}

For the worldly inclined the ruins provided the desired ambience for picnics, \textit{nautch} performances and camping. Major Archer, part of one such group on a visit to the Qutub Complex in the 1830s, observed that the visitors “breakfasted in a tomb of some former noble of the state, [...] nautch singers entertained us during our meal”\textsuperscript{142} [Fig.2.46].

\textsuperscript{137} Hamilton, \textit{East India Gazetteer}, (1815) Cited in Jagmohan Mahajan, \textit{The Raj Landscape}, (Delhi, 1988), 129


\textsuperscript{139} Among them were Lt.Col. C.R. Forrest, Commander Robert Elliot, Col. Robert Smith, Major John Luard, T.C. Dibdin, David Roberts and Thomas Bacon. Mahajan, \textit{op cit.}, 121-136

\textsuperscript{140} Thomas Metcalfe, William Fraser and Colonel James Skinner were among the city’s elite who employed artists like Mazhar Ali Khan and Ghulam Murtaza Khan.

Academic interest in the built-heritage

A formal forum was created in 1847 called the ‘Archaeological Society of Delhi’ patronised by Company officials, native elite and Delhi College academics, with Thomas Metcalfe as President. The Society’s objectives outlined in its publication of 1850, *Journal of the Archaeological Society of Delhi*, were the investigation “by means of plans, drawings, and elevations, by inscriptive, traditional and historical researches, and, if possible, by publications of ancient remains, both Hindoo and Mahomedan, in and around Delhi.” It met monthly in the Assembly Rooms to share and discuss information pertaining to ancient remains of the Delhi region, where its members were urged to “communicate such information [...] likely to contribute to the general stock of our knowledge of the country, which it is highly desirable to cultivate and improve.” In 1850 the Society decided to collaborate with and admit to its ranks, native scholars. Sayed Ahmad Khan, who was inducted in 1852 as Native Honorary Member, had authored a book, *Aasar-us-Sanaadid* (The Ruins of the Cities of Delhi) that described in detail Delhi’s numerous sites of architectural and archaeological interest. With the inclusion of native scholars in its fold, the Society made a beginning towards building native participation in matters relating to Delhi’s built heritage.

Looking after the built-heritage

The natives did not exhibit any desire of looking after their architectural legacy, an attitude that baffled the Europeans. Orlich viewed the native attitude as regrettable and wrote that “it is to be lamented the living pay so little respect to the memory of the dead, and deny them this repose. [...] Every where the finest

142 Major Archer - cited in Alexander, *op cit.*, 51-53
143 *Journal of the Archaeological Society of Delhi*, (1850), Appendix: i - cited in Juneja, *op cit.*, 11, Footnote 40
144 *ibid.*
145 This work could have been inspired either directly or indirectly by an earlier work in Persian, *Sair al-manazil*, by Ali Akbar Beg, that gave a detailed account of important buildings of Shahjahanabad. The first edition of Khan’s work was published in 1846 and the second two years after his induction and was dedicated to Thomas Metcalfe.
monuments exhibit traces of sacrilege, [...] indeed they leave it to the English to protect and repair their mosques, tombs and palaces.” The government undertook the cleanliness, repair and maintenance of old structures. The Palace-fort received some attention from time to time for cleanliness and repairs, though it was considered impossible to maintain the entire precinct. In 1822 the cleaning of old buildings like mosques was initiated and the Company appointed a garrison engineer, Major Robert Smith as in-charge of the repair of some old monuments from 1822 to 1830. In the course of repairing an old structure, the chances of the repairer permitting his whim to take precedence was a distinct possibility, thereby advertently or inadvertently altering the character of the site. Major Smith undertook repairs of the Jami Masjid, as testified by Heber and the Palace-fort wall. He also repaired the Qutub Minar that had been damaged by an earthquake in 1803, where along with landscaping the monument's vicinity, he added a Gothic balustrade to the Minar's balconies and repaired the main doorway, where the inscribed stone slabs were placed in the wrong order. Further, in his enthusiasm for repair, Major Smith, allowed his fancy to take flight and redesigned the Qutub Minar's crowning cupola replacing the original structure built by Firuz Shah Tughluq. The addition was an elaborate octagonal chattri in sandstone with elements like fluted columns, bangladar eaves, a smaller wooden cupola, flagstaff and an umbrella of Chinese inspiration. The whole ensemble received criticism and was finally removed from the Minar and placed on a mound to its east [Fig. 2.47]. The British response to the built-heritage satisfied both their position as rulers of Delhi and therefore custodians of its heritage, and also their own cultural urge of safekeeping history for posterity.

146 Orlich, op cit., 27-28
147 Charles Metcalfe, in his second tenure at Delhi opined that the “ruinous part of the Palace would take immense sums to repair it and cannot with any reason be thought of” - cited in Spear, op cit., 61
148 The cupola was removed at the behest of Lord Hardinge and was called 'Major Smith's Folly'.
2.5.3 Civic improvement measures in the city and hinterland

The British presence in Delhi necessitated a review of its civic conditions. That improvements were needed to make Delhi suitable for European habitation was a foregone conclusion. In 1823, a Town Committee was constituted to undertake civic improvement works to be executed by system of taxation called Town Duty. The native attitude towards civic improvements was marked by apathy. The administration expecting little native support, initiated civic improvement schemes on its own initiative. The improvement schemes targeted the city's indigenous quarters were received with opposition by the natives. In 1837 the administration tried to cajole the native elite into contributing towards improvement of streets, but met with little success. In the face of opposition, the improvement measures undertaken were localised in nature and included measures such as tree plantation along Chandni Chauk by Resident Seton and removal of encroachments by shopkeepers along various bazaar streets. Water that was stagnating in ditches, pools and the canal was thought to be a breeding ground for contagion causing malaria, cholera and Delhi Boil and as a consequence the canal, drains and bridges were repaired. Healthcare infrastructure came up in the form of hospitals including the Delhi Civil Hospital built south of the Palace-fort and another hospital adjacent to the Post Office. No large-scale schemes targeting the entire indigenous quarters were considered by the government, firstly as the British were physically segregated from this section of the city and were ensconced in the relative safety of the hinterland and secondly the native attitude was a deterrent. As a result, the British diverted the civic improvement measures to their own hinterland settlement.

---

149 This move was opposed by Charles Metcalfe and eventually town duties were abolished. Gupta, *op cit.,* 15
150 Data drawn from Redrawn Map of Delhi
Water Supply

The 17th century canal had fallen into disuse due to neglect in the late 18th century prior to the British occupation of Delhi. Following British takeover of Delhi, two individual offers were made to the Company for reviving the canal but the Company chose to take up the work itself.\(^{151}\) Two years following Lord Hastings visit to the Delhi Territory in 1815, restoration work of the canal was initiated and it was desilted and opened to the public by Charles Metcalfe in 1820-21 amidst great festivity. The canal benefited both the indigenous quarters and the British territory in the city. With time, the water supply to the city dwindled as most of the water was being used for irrigation by the farmers in the hinterland, who had gradually increased their land holdings. There were also proposals to harness water for power and to use the canal as a means of transport as reported by Bishop Heber. To tackle water scarcity, attention was turned to wells that had been neglected and their water had turned saline.\(^{152}\) Tanks were built as additional reserves to ameliorate the water woes of the city's residents. The most prominent tank was built in 1846 close to the Khass Bazaar on the maidan along the road connecting the two British enclaves. It was called Ellenborough Tank\(^{153}\) or more popularly, Lal Diggi. In 1848 another tank was built in the middle of Chauk Hauz Qazi, in the indigenous quarters, where probably an older tank or hauz had once existed.

Once the British moved to the hinterland, the intention was to siphon off more water per capita from the canal to their territory than to the native quarters in the

---

\(^{151}\) An engineer, a Mr. Mercer, offered to revive the canal at his own expense, provided he was allowed to collect and keep canal revenue for the coming twenty years. Likewise, a native elite, Diwan Kishan Lal, offered to drain the Najafgarh Jheel, and also demanded keeping half the profit, once the hinterland became arable. Gupta, op cit., 19

\(^{152}\) In 1843 as many as 555 of the 607 wells of the city were declared brackish thus adding to water scarcity. ibid., 19

\(^{153}\) The tank was built at the behest of Lord Ellenborough, by the Provincial Ways and Means Committee, measuring 150'-0" by 500'-0" and paved in red sandstone, hence its name, Lal (Red) Diggi. ibid., 19
city. The diversion of relatively larger amount of water to the cantonment and civil lines ensured that the land was rendered fertile and presented a verdant look. The Ridge remained was barren and its extreme temperatures made it an unhealthy area, thus giving the city its reputation of being one of the hottest stations in the Subcontinent. The Delhi Gazette reported in 1854-55 that troops were not based in Delhi for longer than two years as the Ridge acted as a health hazard.

Sanitation

The city's drainage system that dated back to Emperor Shahjahan's reign, had served it well all these years, despite being neglected in the 18th century. Apart from the wear and tear of drains, the inept handling of the system by the British engineers caused a reverse flow in the system, thus flooding the city. In 1852 the repair and maintenance of old drains in Faiz Bazaar was undertaken at the behest of the Collector and Magistrate, Mr. A.A. Roberts. New surface drains were made along shops that were now accessed by platforms in red sandstone. In 1852 W.H. Greathead, Deputy Superintendent, Delhi Canals, prepared a drainage report, Report on the Drainage of the City of Delhi and on the Means of Improving It, in which he expressed admiration for the Shahjahani drainage system and declared that "Delhi itself is one of the healthiest places in Bengal." He argued that "without constant and unremitting care even the most perfect system of under-drainage must be ineffective." Greathead made recommendations for improving the sewage, drainage and water supply network.

---

154 Vijay Prashad, 'The Technology of Sanitation in Colonial Delhi' in Modern Asian Studies, (Cambridge, 2001), 35, Part 1, 120; For a detailed account, see, Prashad, 113-155
155 Spear, op cit., 148
156 Gupta, op cit., 19
157 Nath, op cit., 21
Refuse was collected manually by sweepers and carried to receptacles called *dalaos* from where it was carried to hinterland sanitary landfills. The landfills were consciously located away from the British territory and lay to the northwest, south and west. 160 Traditionally, the city’s night soil and refuse had been used as manure by the cultivators of sugarcane and melons in the hinterland and thus some refuse found its way to sewage farms, while the rest was dumped into the Jamuna. From the 1840’s the scarcity of water in the city owing to the bias towards the British settlement, led the residents to use the city ditch as a receptacle for sewage, thus negating all attempt at making Delhi a healthy place. 161 In 1849 an appeal was issued for introducing taxation to fund a conservancy scheme, but it had no takers among the natives. 162

**Utilitarian facilities**

The small size of the British community led to the provision of only the basic utilitarian facilities in the British enclave. 163 The Post Office was located opposite the Residency premises to its west, but it was subsequently converted into a *dak* bungalow as new post offices were built in the post-Mutiny era. The Telegraph Office was sited behind St. James Church. Printing presses, essentially printing newspapers, came up, with one along the city wall adjoining the Residency premises to the north, and another in the indigenous quarters north of the Delhi Bank property. Delhi Club was converted into a *dak* bungalow. Hindu and Jain patrons added to the infrastructure by building *dharamshalas*, an equivalent of *serais*, in various parts of the city including the immediate vicinity of the Palace-fort.

159 Greathed, *op cit.*, in Prashad, *op cit.*, 119-120

160 These were operational at Malkaganj, Motia Khan and Original Road, and Delhi Gate. Refuse was collected manually by the lower societal sections. Prashad in *Modern Asian Studies, op cit.*, 148-149

161 Prashad, *op cit.*, 120 National Archives of India, Home (Sanitary), A Progs, 7 Nov. 1868, nos. 5-6

162 Gupta, *op cit.*, 20

163 The following observations are based on data drawn from Redrawn Map of Delhi.
Suburbanisation of the indigenous city

While the government neglected the native city, individual enterprise stepped in with attempts to decongest it. Two new native settlements were laid out in the hinterland by individual endeavor. Their location was seemingly chosen consciously to be distant from the British settlement in the north. They lay beyond the Lahore Gate of the city, to the west as this area already had a fairly dense concentration of habitation and was found suitable for development with potential to draw occupants. The layout of the new settlements was inspired by European planning norms that some natives could find appealing due to the slowly increasing British cultural influence. Both settlements were named after their respective founders, the first a British official, Charles Trevelyan who was First Assistant to the Resident, and the second, a native, Diwan Kishen Lal who was the Diwan of the Nawab of Jhajjar. The motive of their patronage was not only the altruistic aim of decongesting the city proper, but also gratification of personal whim in case of Trevelyan, and currying favours with the British in case of the Diwan who was made Deputy Collector by Thomas Metcalfe following his enterprise.

Trevelyanganj

Trevelyanganj was also called Trevelyanpur or Deputyganj after its patron Charles Trevelyan. It was laid out in 1830 on a rocky and fallow tract in Pahari Dhiraj area that was under government control. The patron bought 200 bighas of the tract for this venture [Fig. 2.48]. He hoped it “will soon become a handsome city, without my laying out a Rupee on it except the original purchase money of the ground.”¹⁶⁴ It lay west of the city not far from Lahore Gate and west of the native settlement of Paharipur. The layout conformed with the patron’s vision of urbanity with orthogonal streets of ninety feet width which opened centrally onto a central square, called Bentinck Square, whose facade was articulated as per prevailing

¹⁶⁴ The Trevelyan Papers - cited in Gupta, op cit., 35, footnote 93
The land was plotted and applicants were encouraged to buy plots as per their need to build residences or lay out gardens. The money raised from the sale of plots was reinvested on further development of the settlement. Trevelyanganj was a novel experiment in settlement planning as perceived by the natives and was an oddity, probably attracting curious visitors from the city *muhallas* for a visit.

Kishenganj was founded by Diwan Kishen Lal in 1837 after he bought a portion of land from Charles Trevelyan to lay out the settlement. It lay in the immediate vicinity of Trevelyanganj towards north [Refer Fig. 2.48]. The Western Jamuna Canal touched its northern edge before making its way into the city via the Kabul Gate. Entry to Kishenganj was through a gateway that fronted the Lahore Gate of the city. In 1853 about eleven acres of land was allotted by the government to grain merchants to set up a wholesale grain *ganj* to facilitate trade with Punjab. It would not be erroneous to suggest that the layout of Kishenganj could have been inspired by that of its predecessor, Trevelyanganj and at best Kishenganj could be seen as an extension of the latter towards north.

### 2.6 Conclusion

British interventions in Delhi in this phase were modest with an enclave in the city proper and one in the northern hinterland, the former born of political necessity and latter conforming to the colonial tradition of distancing themselves from the natives. The indigenous quarters remained unchanged as the British confined themselves to their own enclaves. British perception of Delhi as a political backwater notwithstanding, Delhi was seen as power centre as the King, despite his titular status, remained the fount of Indian polity from whom all legitimacy flowed. His presence in Delhi made it one of the main centres of the Mutiny in 1857.

---
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1857 as the rebels seeking to revive the lost glory of the Mughals marched to the Palace-fort in May 1857 to restore to the King of Delhi the throne as Mughal Emperor.

166 Data drawn from Map 'Cruchley's New map of India: The seat of the Mutinies'. Drawn soon after the Mutiny, it showed the seats to be at 'Delhi', 'Meerut', 'Cawnpore' and 'Lucknow', all part of Bengal Presidency.
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THE BRITISH AND DELHI: 1857-1911

3.1 Introduction
This chapter unfolds in the backdrop of the Mutiny in Delhi and examines the shift in British response to Delhi's built-environment in the Mutiny aftermath, first under military and later civilian authorities. It first examines Delhi under military administration, where the policy of appeasement of the King was substituted by one of aggression as the Crown replaced the East India Company as ruler of the Subcontinent. In hindsight the Mutiny events made the British aware of their vulnerability, not only to natives, but also to disease, and bolstered the need to assert themselves as a superior ruling power. Driven by political objectives and using industrial technology, the British were engaged in creating an identity of dominance. They strengthened their position by making the city secure against insurgents and safe from contagions as they took control of public space and initiated public health improvement measures. The military took charge of security, sharpening its control over the city. The chapter focuses on the military's urban restructuring strategy based on demolition, seizure and rebuilding that created a military landscape with the cantonment in the heart of the city and the Fort turned into a garrison. The Ridge, the scene of British action was preserved as a Mutiny site, while properties of Muslims, viewed as villainous protagonists of
the Mutiny, were demolished or confiscated. It also examines the role played by
the railways as an instrument of consolidation of British position in Delhi with
improved connectivity with the outside world to check future insurgencies. The
railways large claim on urban land made it a major agent of urban transformation
in the city and hinterland.

The chapter then goes onto examine Delhi under civilian authorities, where the
aggression of the immediate post-Mutiny years had subsided as the Victorian
institution of municipality was introduced to Delhi. The focus is on the institution
of the Municipality and the concomitant creation of a civic landscape that centred
on the town hall, the public park and the railway station. Issues related to public
health are also discussed in the backdrop of the Victorian notions of cleanliness
encompassing both physical and mental health, whereby the urban form of the
indigenous city was declared as the chief threat to public health. Improvement
measures pertaining to water supply, sanitation and provision of public parks,
were largely directed towards areas of British occupation, neglecting the native
quarters of the city. This partisan attitude, like military aggression, also
underscored the British assertion of authority in the post-Mutiny era.

3.2 The Mutiny in Delhi and its aftermath

3.2.1 The Mutiny

The rising of 1857 is considered an important landmark in the history of the
Subcontinent as it is seen as the first step in the country’s ensuing struggle for
independence from British dominion. The unrest began among the native soldiers
of the British Indian Army in Bengal to protest against grievances including the
issue of using greased cartridges. Gradually, driven by resentment against British
rule, the unrest spread beyond Bengal assuming a much larger proportion by
drawing in the civilian population into its fold. The main centres of the revolt
were Meerut, Kanpur, Lucknow, Jhansi and Delhi.
In May, 1857, the handful of British residents of Delhi were no match for the collective might of troops that arrived from Meerut, backed by three native regiments stationed in the city and the King, Bahadur Shah II's retainers. The mutinous group took control of the Palace-fort after setting fire to European dwellings in Daryaganj and killing or capturing Europeans. Ghalib, who witnessed the events of May, 1857, described how "ill-starred soldiers [...] invaded the city [...] thirsting for British blood [...] and [...] pitched their camps throughout the city and in the Fort, where they made the royal orchards a stable for their horses and the royal abode their sleeping quarters."

Mrs. Keith Young wrote home in anguish that "the ladies and children have been murdered; those in cantonments have escaped to Kurnaul, and are now on their way to Umballa." The mutineers also committed atrocities on the natives who in turn, petitioned the King about the excesses being committed, particularly in the hinterland settlements of Jaisinghpura and Paharganj. The King was himself engaged in ridding the Palace-fort of troops camping in the Hayat Baksh Bagh, Mahtab Bagh, Chatta Bazaar, Diwan-e Am, and near the Salimgarh and Lahore Gates. The troops were in control of the city, although the supremacy of the Mughal ruler was recognised, they established an alternative government whose functioning was severely thwarted by mutual rivalries.

The British marched from Ambala towards Delhi, engaging the mutineers in two hinterland battles, first at Badli-ki Serai, and then at Hindu Rao's House. They managed to occupy the Ridge and set up their pickets, with batteries commanding the city gates and shells could be thrown into the Palace-fort from them [Fig.3.1a, b]. Having settled down for a siege of Delhi, the British battled not only rebellious troops but also diseases like heat stroke and cholera, which took a heavy toll of

---

2 Mrs. Keith Young, wife of Colonel Keith Young, writing from the relative safety of Simla. May, 14, 1857. Sir Henry W. Norman & Mrs. Keith Young, Delhi 1857, (Edinburgh, 1902), 17
3 Men who made ice for royal consumption in Turkman Gate ice-pits complained in a petition that the troops had plundered their settlement, forcing most inhabitants to flee. [Petition of Imam Baksh, Chowdary, and all the men of the Ice-pits. No.33, No date], K.C. Yadav, ed., Delhi in 1857- The Trial of Bahadur Shah, (Gurgaon, 1980), 1, 35
their men. A siege train came from the Punjab in September with ammunition believed to be sufficient to blow the city to powder. The British launched attacks on the city walls and began their advance towards the city [Fig.3.2]. Examination of a map showing siege operations at Delhi indicates the location of the batteries. 4 Batteries were set up at Metcalfe House estate, Ludlow Castle and Qudsiya Bagh. In the words of an officer, "On the 11th our batteries opened fire, [...] it brought down the wall in huge fragments [...] On the night of the 13th the engineers stole down and examined the two breaches near the Kashmir and Water Bastions; and both being reported practicable, orders for the assault were at once issued, to take place at daybreak the following morning." 5 On 14th September, the final assault was made on the city at dawn, the four points of attack being Kashmir Bastion, Water Bastion, Lahore Gate and Kashmir Gate [Fig.3.3a, b]. The British entered the city and penetrated as deep as the Jami Masjid, before being repulsed. They nevertheless fought their way through and captured the city's liquor cellars. The troops in a state of numbed drunkenness not only fought the mutineers but also "overran the city in all directions. All whom they found in the streets they cut down. [...] For three days every road in the city, from the Kashmiri Gate to Chandni Chauk, was a battlefield. [...] a vast concourse of men and women [...] took to precipitate flight [...] Seeking the little villages and shrines outside the city, they there drew breath to wait until such time as might favour their return." 6 By 20th September, the British were completely in command of the city and the Palace-fort from where "this morning a royal salute was fired by us. The King has not given himself up, [...] however, our soldiers will come across him, and save us further trouble with him." 7 The King who had sought refuge in Humayun's tomb complex, surrendered with his family to Major Hodson and was held captive in the Palace-fort. With the King's capture, British victory in Delhi was accomplished.

4 Data drawn from Map 'Plan of the City of Delhi and the Ridge, 1857 (A Chart showing the Siege Operations before Delhi in 1857)' Henry L.A. Tottenham (1836-1896) 2051 OIOC Collection
5 Officer called Felix, probably of the Engineers, writing to the Editor of Lahore Chronicle - cited in H.C. Fanshawe, Delhi Past and Present, (Delhi, 1991), 163-176
6 Ghalib in a missive to Tufta, December 1857. Russell and Islam, op cit., 140
3.2.2 The aftermath

After the British victory, an orgy of violence was unleashed on the city. "for several days after the assault every native was [....] killed; the women and children were spared."8 Harriet Tytler, upon her return to the city wrote, "the first thing that struck me so forcibly on entering the great city of Delhi, only a few months so crowded, was that it was now a city of the dead. The death-like silence of that Delhi was appalling."9

The second fallout of the victory was the large-scale plundering by all, irrespective of their position, as the British were fully aware of the riches they were going to lay their hands on, even before the final assault on the city had been made.10 In 1858-59, the British government confiscated the crown properties of the Mughals and the private assets of the King and nobility in Delhi city and District. The Commissioner, Mr. Saunders, wrote, "the troops, were completely disorganised and demoralized by the immense amount of plunder which fell into their hands."11

The government ordered all natives to leave the city thus triggering a mass exodus to the hinterland in search of refuge. Mrs. Saunders observed that “every house in the city was desolate [....] The inhabitants [...] are dying daily of starvation and want of shelter.”12 Ghalib, who stayed back wrote, “many of the wretched people

7 Colonel Keith Young, writing to his wife, 21st September 1857. Norman & Young, op cit., 300-301
8 Mrs Saunders, wife of the Commissioner of Delhi - cited in Narayani Gupta, Delhi between Two Empires, 1803-1931(Delhi, 1998), 21
9 Harriet Tytler was a survivor of the rebels' attack on the British, on May 11, 1857 and the only lady at the siege of Delhi. - cited in Anthony Sattin, ed., An Englishwoman in India, The Memoirs of Harriet Tytler 1828 - 1858 (Oxford, 1986), 165
10 Colonel Keith Young wrote to his wife of the appointment of Prize Agents, by the government, who, were to look for treasures, a job, that “may perhaps be very remunerative one, for there is certain to be lots of plunder if it can only be secured.” 5th September 1857. Norman & Young, op cit., 265
11 Mr. Saunders, 15 November, 1857 - cited in Percival Spear, Twilight of the Moghuls (Cambridge, 1951), 218
12 ibid., 218
of the city have been driven out, and the rest lie here, prisoners of hope and fear [...] everyone, rich and poor alike, has left the city, and those who did not leave of their own accord have been expelled."\(^{13}\)

This state of affairs continued unabated till Sir John Lawrence took charge in February 1858. Meanwhile, some wealthy and influential residents secured protection from British harassment by paying a ransom that guaranteed their personal safety and of their assets.\(^{14}\) In January 1858, a general disarming of people took place and at the same time the political punishment for Delhi was announced. Delhi was annexed to Punjab as a provincial town.\(^{15}\) In October 1858, the military commission that conducted the trial of the King decreed that the accused and his immediate family be banished to Rangoon.\(^{16}\) With the last vestiges of Mughal authority out of the way, a proclamation was issued in November 1858 that declared end of Company rule and bringing the Subcontinent directly under the Crown. This marked the initiation of British Raj in the Subcontinent and accompanied with the order that "all well wishers of the English are to illuminate their houses, and there are also to be illuminations in the bazaars and on the Deputy Commissioner Sahib's bungalow."\(^{17}\)

Delhi was administered by the army following its seizure from the rebels in 1857. Military rule brought military authorities to the forefront of the city’s governance. The British military sharpened its control over the city. The entire city became the property of the army that had the power to acquire and dispose off property. Under their charge, "there was not a house which had not been ransacked of its

\(^{13}\) Ghalib in a missive to Tufta, December 1857. Russell and Islam, op cit., 144

\(^{14}\) Two muhallas of the city, namely Katra Nil, residence of wealthy merchants and a lane in Ballimaran occupied by hakims, were two such areas. Gupta, op cit., 23

\(^{15}\) This pronouncement was made under Act XXXVIII of 1858, whereby the city lost its imperial status and the entire Delhi Territory came under the charge of the Chief Commissioner. A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), (Gurgaon, 1992), 2nd Edition, 46

\(^{16}\) The trial was conducted in the Diwan-e Khas of the Fort. For almost a year, the King, was held captive in the Fort under conditions that completely contrasted with his former status as ruler. Furthering the indignity of his state was his becoming an object of curiosity among European visitors to the Fort as they flocked to look at him.

\(^{17}\) Ghalib in a letter to Aram, November 1858. Russell and Islam, op cit., 190
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contents, friends and foes of the Government, suffered to an equal extent." The urban landscape was transformed to conform to a military landscape that would thwart all future insurgencies. Ghalib, viewed the transformations and declared that Delhi "is no more a city, but a camp, a cantonment. No Fort, no city, no bazaars, no water-courses." Poets like Ghalib and the King of Delhi composed elegies on the death of the city. The following discussion examines the military measures and their impact on the physical form of the city and the manner of its spatial transformation.

The use of military measure to control the city was not unique to the Subcontinent's cities that had been centres of the Mutiny, but was part of a generic response to counterattack insurgency as shown by contemporaneous developments in Europe. Military strategy was therefore not exclusive to Delhi, but was applied as immediate post-Mutiny reprisals in other centres of the revolt namely, Agra, Jhansi, Lucknow and Kanpur. The interventions in one place informed urban transformation of another. Like Delhi, Agra was punished for its role in the Mutiny by stripping it of its status as provincial capital that was moved to Allahabad. While, Colonel Robert Napier's recommendations for post-Mutiny restructuring of Lucknow's and Kanpur's urban form were in all probability the inspiration for the measures adopted in Delhi. In turn Napier's own vision was perhaps informed by European responses to insurgency.

18 C.B. Saunders, in a missive to Sir W. Muir - cited in William Coldstream, ed., Records of the Intelligence Department of the Government of the North-West Provinces of India during the Mutiny, II, 229
19 Ghalib in a missive to Majruh, 1861. Russel and Islam, op cit., 252
20 This genre of verse called Shahr-e Ashub, had been the forte of poets like Sauda, Mir and Nazir Akbarabadi who lamented the destruction of Delhi in the late 18th century
21 For a detailed discussion on European response to insurgency, see, E. J. Hobsbawm, Revolutionaries: Contemporary Essays, (London, 1973), 220-233
22 Colonel Robert Napier, of the Bengal Engineers, was an active contributor to post-Mutiny urban restructuring schemes. For a detailed account of Lucknow's post-Mutiny urban reconstruction, see, Veena T. Oldenburg, The Making of Colonial Lucknow 1856-1877, (New Jersey, 1984)
3.3 Military administration and the creation of a military landscape

Military administration brought to an end the policy of appeasement of the King and replaced it with a policy based on aggression that overtly displayed British military authority. The benefits of military control were a forgone conclusion and not a post-Mutiny realisation. This can be gauged from Elphinston’s 1819 remark urging that “it is on the strength of our military establishments that the tranquillity of the country and the security of our possession of it must principally depend. [...] it is dangerous [...] to cease to be prepared for unforeseen contingencies.” In the post-Mutiny era, emphasis on increased military control over the city can be understood as a reaction to native hostility and British fear experienced during the Mutiny, and the firm resolve to curb all future revolts. Among the administrative measures adopted to create a secure living environment for Delhi’s Europeans were deployment of troops, effective policing and restructuring of the city. The last being an architectural intervention made a significant impact on the urban landscape.

Although no direct evidence of this influence is available, a potential source of inspiration in the restructuring of insurgent cities could have come from Europe. 19th century improvements undertaken in Paris and Vienna, affected entire Europe, including Victorian Britain, where “the planning and rebuilding of Paris, was a favourite theme of civic reformers.” From Britain, before long, the Parisian impulse could have been transmitted to the Subcontinent.

3.3.1 The Parisian model as a possible restructuring archetype

The rebuilding underway in Paris in the wake of the 1838 revolt was the brainchild of Napoleon III and Baron Haussmann and it transformed the medieval

23 Mountstuart Elphinstone, 1819 — cited in Meera Kosambi, in ‘Colonial Urban Transformation in India’ in Mushirul Hasan and Narayani Gupta, ed., India’s Colonial Encounter: Essays in Memory of Eric Stokes, (Delhi, 1993), 219

24 Asa Briggs, Victorian Cities, (London, 1990), 84
city into a grand baroque conception.\textsuperscript{25} The scheme was based on the realisation that the potential threat was not external, but within the city, thus prompting appropriate measures to quell that threat. Structures that could offer cover to future rioters were demolished from the vicinity of palaces. Straight and wide avenues that enhanced troop mobility were cut in all directions in a radial pattern, inspired by Versailles, not only in pursuance of an aesthetic ideal, but also the pattern enabled greater control over an area from a single point. New avenues were lined with four or five floor apartments that had shops on the ground and dwelling units above. Public health issues were also tackled as outbreak of cholera epidemic led to an improved system of sewage and water supply.\textsuperscript{26} The measures were not entirely inspired by military concerns, as Napoleon III also had the welfare of residents at heart thus giving impetus to a holistic approach of reconstruction. It was hoped that the extensive rebuilding exercise would revive the economy and provide employment opportunities to the residents, thereby shutting out from their minds all thoughts of troublemaking.

In Vienna, a similar military exercise got underway in 1858 when the old fortifications were razed at imperial directive and replaced with the Ringstrasse, a wide horseshoe shaped avenue that permitted military access to the old city.

Unlike their European, particularly French counterparts, the British in the Subcontinent had no holistic objective of economic revival to benefit the natives, their approach being limited in its goals. The primary concern was suppression of the natives through military power and urban reprisal measures were geared towards transforming the city from a place of rebellion to one that was safe for its European residents.

\textsuperscript{25} For a detailed appreciative account of the transformation of Paris after the revolt, see, David H. Pinkney, \textit{Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris}, (New Jersey, 1972)
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{ibid.}, 35-39
3.3.2 Urban reprisal measures

Urban reprisal measures entailed adherence to a three-fold programme of demolition, coercive seizure and rapid reconstruction to create a military landscape in Delhi. The measures were informed not simply by military considerations, but were also politically driven. A policy of discrimination was pursued against Muslims, who as a community were clearly the most adversely affected by the Mutiny and its aftermath. In contrast, an attitude of reverence was reserved for their own British exploits during the Mutiny that were extensively recorded.

A discriminatory approach towards the Muslims

The execution of the immediate post-Mutiny military programme was marked with selectivity as the Muslim community bore the brunt of British ire. The city's Hindus and Jains were regarded with clemency. Muslims were considered to be the perpetrator of the insurrection owing to their religious affinity with the ruling Mughal dynasty that the insurgents wished to revive. Further, by adopting a biased attitude the British were also aiming at driving a wedge between the Muslims and Hindus to their own advantage. By January 1858 Hindus and Jains were permitted to return to the city, Muslims not being allowed till a year later in January 1859. Despite orders for return, Delhi appeared deserted as several residents particularly Muslims migrated to other cities. The ethnic composition of the city changed as Muslim properties were increasingly transferred to Hindu bankers and merchants. Though a general pardon had been issued in November 1858, several Muslims, who the government suspected of complicity in the Mutiny, were kept under house arrest. The discriminatory policy extended to the built-heritage of Muslims as it was viewed as a potential abettor of trouble.

27 For a detailed discussion on the impact of the Mutiny on Muslims, see, Francis Robinson, "The Muslims of Upper India and the shock of the Mutiny- Rustkhez-i beja, in Hasan and Gupta, op cit., 183-199
Post-Mutiny the future of Delhi, whose foundation was of Muslim provenance, became a subject of debate between two considerations, of either retaining the city or destroying it. This was resolved in favour of the former in May 1858, at the urging of John Lawrence.\(^{28}\) Once the decision was made, attention turned to the city’s built-heritage, now seen not as objects of picturesque beauty but as potential sites of unrest that could threaten British safety in the future, as it was feared that the spatial enclosures could be put to military use. The city’s elite mosques were seen as rallying points for the Muslim population, and hence impending sites of future revolts. This perception led to their forceful occupation by the military thereby depriving Muslims of worship in their precincts. Hugh Chichester declared, “there are several mosques in the city most beautiful to look at. But I should like to see them all destroyed. The rascally brutes desecrated our churches and graveyards, and I do not think we ought to have any regard for their stinking religion.”\(^{29}\) Echoing these sentiments it was suggested that the Jami Masjid be razed to the ground for the act, Outram averred, would be seen as “a beacon and a warning to the whole of India and a heavy blow to the Mahomedan religion.”\(^{30}\)

The City Magistrate, Egerton, suggested that the Jami Masjid be converted into a church and on each panel of its chequered flooring, a name of a Christian martyr be inscribed. Apart from mosques, the Palace-fort, havelis and kothis of the nobility were taken over by the military. Properties like Skinner’s House and Hindu Rao’s House with their commodious premises were attractive for stationing troops for effective assertion of authority throughout the city.


British veneration of Mutiny sites

In contrast, those premises and structures that had been under British occupation during the siege, particularly those on the Ridge, were deemed sacred and not impending trouble spots, with the entire Ridge treated as hallowed territory. All sites associated with the British during the Mutiny were incorporated into a circuit of memorial sites of the Mutiny. The Mutiny circuit became an integral part of the visiting Europeans’ itinerary. Touring the circuit was akin to a pilgrimage with tourist guidebooks exhorting all visitors to Delhi to visit the Mutiny sites.

Retention of pre-existing structures

An examination of a collection of maps of the city and its environs drawn up during the siege clearly indicate that the Ridge had been the prime action area where the British had camped from June through September, braving the heat and rain, and battling both the enemy and disease. Dotting the Ridge were structures associated with the Mutiny events. Some had been built by the British, namely Flagstaff Tower and Hindu Rao’s House. Others were pre-existing and had been appropriated during the campaign to win back the city. These included the Chauburji, Pir Ghaib also called Observatory Tower, Asoka Pillar and a temple referred to as Sammy’s House. All the structures were allowed to remain as reminders of the Mutiny despite some being of Muslim provenance. Additionally, sites east of the Ridge in civil lines, like Metcalfe House, Ludlow Castle and Qudsiya Bagh were also taken over for inclusion into the Mutiny circuit [Fig.3.4a-e].

---

31 The following maps have been consulted. Map ‘Delhi and it’s Environs during the Siege’ IOR:X/1664 OIOC Collection; Map ‘Delhi:1857’ IOR:X/1663 OIOC Collection; and Map ‘Plan of the City of Delhi and the Ridge, 1857(A Chart showing the Siege Operations before Delhi in 1857)” Henry L.A. Tottenham (1836-1896) 2051 OIOC Collection
32 Archaeological Survey of India [henceforth ASI], List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments in Delhi Zail (Calcutta, 1915-22) [henceforth Listing], II, 277, No.400; 278, No.401; 281, No.404; respectively
Erection of commemorative structures

Like the existing structures that acquired a halo of sacredness, the commemorative structures erected in the post-Mutiny years also acquired an aura of sanctity. [Refer Fig.3.4a] In 1870 a Mutiny Memorial came up on the Ridge, on the site of a former breaching battery, called Taylor's Battery, to commemorate the victims of the 1857 siege [Fig.3.5a, b]. It was a tower of Victorian Gothic conception with memorial plaques covering its surface. The Memorial was a potent symbol to the vanquished natives of the might of the victors. Care was taken to drive home this message most effectively by ensuring that the Memorial height exceeded that of its neighbour and symbol of native achievement, the Asoka Pillar, in a clear attempt at visual subjugation.³³ A road linked the Mutiny Memorial to the city and was called Mutiny Memorial Road. Beyond the Kashmiri Gate, came up a memorial to the most celebrated Mutiny martyr, John Nicholson. His mortal remains were interred in a new cemetery beyond the Kashmiri Gate, while a memorial garden, the Nicholson Garden, also called the Government Garden came up near the Qudsuya Bagh. In the 1870s, an afforestation drive was launched on the Ridge to improve its barren landscape [Fig.3.6a, b]. The wooded Ridge invited excursions to take in the cool and calm environs and enjoy nature's bounties through its flora, fauna and landforms. The sites of piquets and batteries were preserved with stone markers and plaques installed to commemorate the associated event. Commemorative markers like obelisks were also attached to sites that witnessed much action like the Kashmiri Gate and the Magazine. Even as late as the early 20th century, Fanshawe was urging the government to conserve the old military cemetery in the former Rajpur Cantonment as the act would be "Another honour which is due to the men who fought and fell at Delhi."³⁴ The Mutiny sites constituted a sacred precinct that forged a bond with both the resident European population and visitors.

³³ Jan Morris and Simon Winchester, Stones of Empire The Buildings of the Raj (Oxford, 1983), 191
³⁴ Fanshawe, op cit., xiii
Three-fold urban restructuring strategy

Urban reprisal measures were launched in Delhi under military supervision to carve out two clearly delineated spatial quarters, the British and the native, that operated as two separate entities. Data drawn from post-Mutiny cartographic sources delineates the British enclave with its military and civilian zones and occupying an area that stretched northwards from the city's Delhi Gate to Kashmiri Gate and from the Fort westwards to Lahore Gate, north of Chandni Chauk. Unlike the last phase, the British territory had well defined edges with newly laid roads separating it from the indigenous quarters. The Fort lay at the heart of the British area and became the fulcrum about which two functional entities, the military and the civilian zones, operated. The military zone comprised the Fort and the area to its south and southwest with structures and open space for use of troops, while the civilian area lay west and north of the Fort. The urban form of the city proper was thus fragmented into two distinct territories.

Demolition

The Mutiny had changed the perception of the former Palace-fort to a "sink of inequity and rallying point of every hostile influence." It should come as little surprise that when deliberations were on regarding the future of the city, proposals to demolish the Palace-fort were not wanting. Sir Charles Trevelyan recommended that it be demolished and on the site thus cleared, a new British citadel, called Fort Victoria, be built. This citadel, replete with magazines, artillery, treasury and barracks for European troops, would stand on the site of the former Mughal Palace-fort as a symbol of British authority. These recommendations were not carried through for it was thought to be politically expedient to occupy the Fort rather than raze it. To make the Fort suitable for

---

35 Data drawn from Map 'Delhi & Environs' by J.G. Bartholomew, Imperial Gazetteer Atlas of India, PLATE 55 [henceforth Delhi & Environs]
36 Charles Trevelyan in a letter to The Times - cited in Trevelyan, op cit., 66
37 ibid., 66
38 Secretary of State in a missive to John Lawrence - cited in Gupta, op cit., 25-26
military occupation, demolition of structures on its premises was undertaken to raise military infrastructure.\(^39\)

In the city, the demolitions were underway, resulting in loss of property, accumulation of debris and displacement of residents. The issue of displaced natives overcrowding the shrinking native quarters due to delineation of military territory found no sympathy with the army that focussed only on its own territory. The chief area earmarked for demolition was around the Fort where a *cordon sanitare* covering an area of five hundred yards was to be established that prohibited the existing built-forms to stand in the earmarked zone\(^40\) [Fig.3.7a, b]. The decision pertaining to demolition of structures within this zone was not entirely based on military considerations, but was also influenced by political concerns. This is apparent from a communication from the Executive Engineer, Delhi Division, to the Delhi Commissioner that suggested that the extent of the demolitions be decided by a specially appointed Committee and the “extent of clearance, should no longer, as a general question, be discussed on political grounds but on military ones. [...] This limit once fixed Political grounds might be allowed to modify it to a certain extent so far as to spare for the present, detached temples, an important street and so on, but we should have something tangible to go upon & the Political arguments could be duly considered and weighed against the Military ones.”\(^41\)

The demolished area presented a spectacle of “barrenness covered here and there for a space of two miles in length and 500 yards in breadth by foul weeds, heaps of demolished buildings, with wells and water-ducts choked up.”\(^42\) Ghalib,

---

\(^{39}\) A detailed account of the demolitions in the Fort has been taken up in a section on the Fort later in the Chapter.

\(^{40}\) D.C. Records, File DC2/1864, Delhi Archives

\(^{41}\) Executive Engineer to Delhi Commissioner, 28 March 1860, R.R. Records, Box No.5, File 48, Delhi Archives - cited in Anisha Shekhar Mukherjee, *The Red Fort of Shahjahanabad*, (Delhi, 2003), 203, Footnote 40

\(^{42}\) Lord Mark Kerr, Brigadier General of the Delhi Cantonment - cited in Douglas E. Goodfriend, “The Tyranny of the Right Angle: Colonial and Post-Colonial Urban Development in Delhi (1857-
lamented that “in front of the Fort, where Lal Diggi is, there is to be a great area of open ground. It will take in the whole area right up to the Khas Bazaar […] except for Lal Diggi and one or two wells, no trace of any building will remain.” and by 1861 he wrote “from the Jama Masjid towards the Rajghat Gate is a barren wilderness.”

The superimposition of the pre-Mutiny map of Delhi over the post-Mutiny map furnishes invaluable information about the properties lost to the demolitions. Among the prominent gardens lost to the demolition were gardens in the Fort foreground, the Anguri Bagh, Buland Bagh, Gulabi Bagh and Baghica Mirza Gauhar. The demolished bazaars included the Khass Bazaar, Khanum-ka Bazaar and Urdu Bazaar. Properties of the former rulers of Jhajjar, Ballabhgarh, Bahadurgarh and Farrukhnagar were lost. Havelis and kothis, for example Haveli Khan Dauran Khan, Haveli Salatin, Kothi Ali Khan, Kothi Khan Sahib and Kothi Shams-ud din Khan were also razed. Mosques, namely Akbarabadi Masjid and muhalla level mosques and imambaras and entire neighbourhoods were demolished, among others, Kucha Bulaqi Begum, Chotta Kashmiri Katra, Kucha Aqil Khan and Kucha Chaudhary.

The superimposition also substantiates the selective criteria of execution of the scheme as Hindu and Jain temples that fell in the military area were retained, while several Muslim built-form types, including mosques, imambaras and madrasas were destroyed, with only graves of holy men, a dargah and three...
mosques being allowed to stand. Of all built-form types, mosques were viewed as potential trouble spots as they afforded public gathering space, an attribute that in the post-Mutiny scenario was seen as a possible instigator of a revolt. The Jama Masjid, the most prominent mosque in Delhi, was recommended for destruction and a cathedral be built in its place, however these suggestions were not carried through and the army occupied the precinct. While the mosque proper was spared, the area around it was cleared of settlements to build roads that enveloped the mosque to form a square [Fig.3.8a-c]. The move caused anguish to Muslims as Ghalib observed, “All around the Jama Masjid to a radius of twenty-five feet there’s to be an open space. Shops and houses will be pulled down. The Dar-ul Baqa will vanish.” Despite the prevalent sentiment, not everyone wanted the city’s built-heritage to be demolished as a Judge wrote to the Commissioner, Delhi Division in 1872, that the “destruction of historical and other remarkable buildings in this city and its environs since the Mutiny has been unprecedented. From 1851 [...] to ’56 these architectural memorials were tolerably well preserved; but since 1857 the interest in them has either been slack or spasmodic.”

That the measures in Delhi were by no means an isolated case of urban restructuring can be gauged by the transformations in the city of Lucknow. Colonel Robert Napier of the Bengal Engineers drew up a blueprint for restructuring Lucknow. In his Memorandum on the Military Occupation of the City of Lucknow he proposed that all buildings and gardens located between a

45 The temples retained were Madhavadasa Temple, Rama Rama Temple, Urdu Temple and Appa Gangadhar Temple. ASI, Listing, op cit., I, 153, No.336; 153, No.335; 151, No.333; 151, No.334 respectively.

46 The Muslim structures retained were a muhalla level mosque, Zinat-ul Masjid and Sunehri Masjid; Dargah Shah Shabir Baksh; and Graves of Shah Kalimullah Jahanabadi, Sayyid Bhure Shah, Hare Bhare Sahib, Sarmad Sahib, Hinga Madani, and two unknown graves. ASI, Listing, op cit., I, 32, No.37; 31, No.36; 29, No.33; 32, No.38; 150, No.331; 150, No.332; 148, No.328; 148, No.329; 148, No.328; 149, No.330; 30, No.34; 31, No.35 respectively.

47 Ghalib in a missive to Majruh, November 1859. Russell and Islam, op cit., 219. A clearance of twenty-five feet seems erroneous, as it is too small given the scale of the mosque and its area of influence.
palatial residence, the Martinere, and the river Gomti that the military did not acquire for its use be demolished. It was stated that the demolitions would automatically result in reducing the "dangerous overcrowding" in the native quarters.\textsuperscript{49}

Coercive seizure

Properties of the Muslims and guilty Hindus were confiscated and only those people were allowed to reoccupy their houses who presented evidence of their innocence. Sayed Ahmad Khan who had been serving the British government returned to Delhi to find his family property ransacked by government troops and his Uncle and Cousin murdered. Munshi Zakaullah, head master of Delhi Normal School was turned out of his house along with his family, the property was confiscated and later demolished with no compensation paid. Ghalib wrote to an acquaintance of a printed permit being introduced as a "Permit to reside in the city of Delhi, on condition of the payment of a fine."\textsuperscript{50} The confiscated property was subsequently auctioned with the proceeds going into the government coffers or paid as compensation. If retained, it was put to military use as accommodation for troops, stores or mess.

The Fort led the list of structures taken over for a garrison, and its maidan was used as a parade ground.\textsuperscript{51} Properties of the elite south of the Fort, in Daryaganj, were taken over for military use. The residence of the Nawab of Jhajjar was taken over to establish the Engineer Headquarters. The houses of Nawab Hamid Ali Khan were "confiscated long ago and became government property. The grounds look quite different now. There were British soldiers occupying the zenana and the big house. Now the main gate and a whole row of shops have been pulled

\textsuperscript{48} Carr Stephen to Commissioner, Delhi Division, 16 December 1872, Miscellaneous Records, File No.26, Delhi Archives
\textsuperscript{49} Colonel Robert Napier - cited in Oldenburg, \textit{op cit.}, 30-38
\textsuperscript{50} Ghalib in a missive to Majruh, February 1859. \textit{Ibid.}, 219
\textsuperscript{51} A detailed account of the transformation of the Fort follows later in the Chapter
down, the brick and stone sold by auction, and the proceeds sent to the treasury.”

Madrasa Ghaziuddin Khan’s premises were first used as an artillery barrack and then as police lines. Delhi College premises served as quarters for a battery of artillery and as police lines. Skinner’s House became the Mess House of the Queen’s Regiment quartered there. The Jami Masjid that formed the socio-religious focus of the city, especially for the Muslims, was taken over by the army and was not restored to the Muslims till 1862. A proposal to fill up the ablution tank was made, but not implemented. Demolition of properties in the mosque’s vicinity reduced it to a monument standing in isolation on a vast empty plaza, devoid of the crowds that thronged the site before its confiscation. Fatehpuri Masjid was also confiscated. It first served as a barrack for the main guard and in 1860 the prayer hall and the adjoining platform were released to the Muslims for prayer, while the courtyard and its peripheral rooms were auctioned to the highest bidder as personal property. The Zinat ul Masjid was turned into a bakery for troops, while the Idgah in the hinterland beyond Lahore Gate held troops.

Rapid reconstruction

In the area thus cleared, interventions were made that were selective in nature directed only at facilitating the military. A new road network and an esplanade were laid. Additional structures were raised in the Fort for European officers and troops. South of the Fort, facilities were provided for the cantonment occupied by a native regiment. These came up on the site of the 1803 cantonment and included a hospital, magazine, officers’ quarters and a garden for troops. The interventions were qualitatively and functionally at variance with their indigenous counterparts, the streets, chauks and maidans that were people-centric, as the British sought to keep natives at bay. The following section examines the interventions, namely, development of a road network, conversion of the Fort into a garrison and setting

52 Ghalib in a missive to Husain Mirza, December 1859. Russell and Islam, op cit., 227
53 The property was bought by a wealthy Hindu banker of Delhi, Lala Chunna Mal, for a little over Rs. 39,000-00. It remained his personal property till 1877, when on the occasion of the Delhi Durbar, it was bought back and restored to the Muslims in its entirety by the orders of Lord Lytton to gain political mileage.
up the cantonment by the British military as part of the urban restructuring of Delhi.

3.3.3 Development of an anti-insurrection linkage network

The idea that governed the transformation of the existing pattern of linkages was recognisably based on the post-Mutiny realisation that the streets and chauks of native cities had abetted the revolt being areas of public assembly that in times of adversity, like an insurrection, could prove dangerous for the authorities. Laying new roads and open spaces facilitated the military in drawing a physical boundary between their area and the indigenous quarters [Refer Fig.3.7b]. The linkage network could have in all probability, been inspired by European urban restructuring practices, particularly those initiated in Paris from the mid 19th century onwards. The Mutiny provided the authorities with an opportunity to replicate in a selective manner those of Haussmann's endeavours that could fragment the city fabric and be applied across cities that had risen in revolt. From a military perspective, the wide and straight roads and open spaces allowed ease in firing by troops and facilitated troop mobility and also acted as deterrents to any kind of subversive public acts as they fragmented the potential trouble spots within the city, considerations that were uppermost in British minds after the Mutiny.

As early as 1859, restructuring of Delhi's roads was proceeding at a brisk pace. Ghalib wrote of "two roads [...] forging rapidly ahead – the cool road and the iron road [i.e. a road with water courses, and the railway] – each in its own location." Analysis of the post-Mutiny map of Delhi indicates that the roads defined the military zone on the landward side and the river formed the zone's eastern edge.

54 E.J. Hobsbawm, in his discussion on constructing an "ideal city for riots and insurrection" avers that the pattern of its streets was a contributor to insurrection as the streets ran through the city's dense urban fabric and lead to its main urban institutions of governance and religion. For a complete discussion, see, Hobsbawm, op cit., 220-233
55 Ghalib in a missive to Yusuf Mirza, July 26, 1859. Russell and Islam, op cit., 213
56 Data drawn from Map Delhi 1873
The new roads contrasted with their indigenous counterparts, in that they were wide, open, straight and tree lined, in addition to being metalled, lit and drained. Three roads conjoined to traverse the entire north-south extent of the city, namely, the indigenous Faiz Bazaar, whose alignment was retained, Elgin Road, that followed the alignment of the Fort and lastly Lothian Road, that was made by widening the road that ran through the pre-Mutiny British enclave north of the Fort to Kashmiri Gate. Another road, Esplanade Row, defined the western limits of the cantonment skirting the Jami Masjid. The area between the Jami Masjid and the Fort was also incorporated into the military zone and used as a parade ground. Khas Bazaar, now renamed Khas Road was retained, but was realigned as a straight road and its two chauks, including the famous, Chauk Sa’adullah Khan, were removed, as the road now joined Elgin Road.

Further analysis of the map reveals the changes along the walled periphery of the city. A road called the Circular Road encircled the city following the profile of the city wall, from Kashmiri Gate to Delhi Gate, where it met with the road going to Mathura. It formed a second line of defence around the city, after the wall, and disrupted the relationship the city had with its surrounding settlements. Building of the Circular Road resulted in the removal of settlements that had thrived in the shadow of the city wall. To bolster the city’s defence, a five hundred yard wide area was cleared into an open space, all around the city on the landward side with only Shahji’s Tank, in the vicinity of the Ajmeri Gate being allowed to stand.

3.3.4 Transformation of the Fort into a military stronghold

During the course of the fighting, the Palace-fort suffered little damage. Following British victory, it was confiscated and with the Mughal ruler in exile, the precinct no longer served as the royal residence [Fig.3.9a-d]. The Palace-fort was now simply called the Fort. The presence of troops on the premises made the Fort a

58 ibid.
59 The Fort was also referred to as the Red Fort, on account of its red sandstone walls
victim of mass plundering. The copper sheathing of the Diwan-e Khass’s ceiling was removed by a Prize Agent to be sold. Twelve panels including that of Orpheus were removed from the wall of the Diwan-e Am by a Captain Jones and sold to the British Government.\textsuperscript{60} When the decision to retain the Fort was taken, the military authorities saw it as the most appropriate site to exhibit their might, as it evoked in public memory an image of authority. The Fort became a protagonist in the military ritual that was performed in the northern part of the city. Its civic association with the city was lost, as the precinct became out of bounds for natives, who in the days of the Mughals were permitted access up to the Diwan-e Aam. Interventions made in the space around the fort, both on the landward side and riverfront further alienated the Fort from the native city.

Changes were made within the Fort precinct for stationing of European troops [Fig.3.10a-g]. The peripheral wall and its gates were retained, now defining the precinct as a military area that had no contact with the rest of the city. Both Lahore Gate and Delhi Gate were renamed Victoria Gate and Alexandra Gate respectively, a tactic that went beyond mere physical occupation of Mughal territory and aimed to give the precinct a new British identity.\textsuperscript{61} Some parts of the gateways were partitioned and glazed to provide additional habitable space for troops. The battlements of the barbicans of the two entrance gateways were removed and the moat was filled up. Structures, which had formerly constituted the service and ancillary areas of the precinct, were demolished to erect barracks, the mess, canteen, magazine, battery and godowns, all linked with a road network and open spaces for troop assembly, thereby completely negating the site’s historical and architectural worthiness. A portion of the Fort wall to the northwest was broken to allow the railways into the city in 1867.

The Military Works Service, in charge of the maintenance work, carried out repairs of the Fort’s structures, from time of occupation of the Fort, but not from the perspective of preserving them as a legacy for posterity, but to enhance their

\textsuperscript{60} Archaeological Survey of India, [henceforth ASI], \textit{Annual Report 1911-12}, 7
\textsuperscript{61} Gupta, \textit{op cit.}, 28
worthiness as utilitarian military structures. Repair work was carried out in the Fort as per the guidelines of the Military Works Handbook. Needless to say, the guidelines were hardly appropriate for undertaking repair work on a historic precinct compiled as they were for British military structures dotting the Subcontinent's British settlements. The gilded dome of the Mussaman Burj was removed and replaced with a masonry and plaster dome whose form deviated from the original Mughal profile. Likewise the gilded domes of the Moti Masjid were also vandalized and later rebuilt in marble but in a manner that was incongruent with the mosque. Fergusson opined that the act of “Vandalism” that ensued was unnecessary as “without touching a single building of Shah Jahan’s there was ample space within the walls for all the stores and materiel of the garrison of Delhi, and in the palace and Salimgarh ample space for a garrison, more than doubly ample to man their walls in the event of an emeute.” Harriet Tytler, painting the scene in the Fort after it was taken over, observed that “the work of destruction began at the Queen’s Baths, now known as the Officer's Mess.” The riverfront terrace was provided with railings in varying designs, incompatible with the area’s original character, even as some structures on the terrace showed toppled or broken chattris. The sandy riverfront foreground was overgrown with grass.

It was not till 1860 that Viceroy Canning ordered that “instructions should be given to preserve isolated buildings of architectural or historic interest, [...]” though by this time enough damage had been done, if not by actual demolition, then by altering the space both around and within the extant structures. Major General Cunningham wrote of the Diwan-e Khass being “still in good order inside, but the outside view of its marble pillars is utterly spoiled by a thatched Verandah, the ugly remains of its former occupation as a Barrack. This building is

62 ASI, Listing, I, 23
63 James Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, (London, 1910), II, 312-313, Footnote 2
64 Harriet Tytler - cited in Sattin, op cit., 167
65 Data drawn from a photograph, ‘View of the Delhi Fort, on the river side’ from Sir Richard Temple Collection, 125/4(129), OIOC Collection
now used as a Museum, but I would strongly recommend that [...] the Diwan-e Khass be restored to its original state of an open audience Hall. Views like those of Cunningham were rare for authorities did not think it “even worth while to make a plan of what they were destroying or preserving any record of the most splendid palace in the world.” Of the old structures that stood, apart from the gateways, were Chatta Bazaar, the Naqqarkhana, the Diwan-e Am, the Moti Masjid, the Zafar Mahal, and the Sawan and Bhadon pavilions of the Hayat Baksh Bagh, together with the imperial buildings standing on the eastern terrace [Refer Fig.4.10b]. The imperial group included the Shah Burj, the Hira Mahal, the Hammam, the Diwan-e Khass, the Khwabgah and Musamman Burj, the Rang Mahal and the Mumtaz Mahal or Chotta Rang Mahal. In keeping with the Viceroy's injunctions, only the Diwan-e Khass was thought worthy of preservation, while all other structures and gardens were appropriated for military use. Chatta Bazaar sold supplies for European troops. The transformation of the Diwan-e Am was graphically described by a military official, “as a canteen, and on the right of the throne is a bar for serving liquor! To the left of the throne is an enclosure of bamboo screen work, in which Nubee Bux keeps a soldiers' coffee shop!” The pavilion also served as the Station Hospital. The Shah Burj was used as private quarters of military officers and the Zafar Mahal was the troops' swimming bath. The Mumtaz Mahal served first as a prison and later as a Sergeants’ Mess, and was one of the most drastically remodeled structures as its original roof was replaced, walls and facilities like cisterns and sinks were added and the structure was whitewashed thus obliterating the Mughal glasswork decoration and wall paintings in the process. A battery came up in the middle of the eastern terrace of the Hayat Baksh Bagh, between the Shah Burj and Hira Mahal, by demolishing the Moti Mahal, by demolishing the Moti Mahal. A road that allowed military access to the battery was made. Val Princep, who was in Delhi in connection with the 1877

66 Spear, op cit., 221
67 Memorandum by Major General Cunningham, 1865, R.R. Records, File Miscellaneous/19, Delhi Archives - cited in Mukherjee, op cit., 209, Footnote 53
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69 Captain H.H. Cole reporting to Secretary Government of India, PWD, Jaipur Political Agency, File No. 4/1882, 8, National Archives of India - cited in Mukherjee, op cit., 211, Footnote 54
Durbar, observed that British military interventions had turned the Fort into a “kind of hollowing desert of barracks, hideous, British and pretentious.”

Transformations made in the Delhi Fort echoed those made in its Agra and Lahore counterparts and in the palaces of the Avadh Nawabs in Lucknow. The Lahore Fort was occupied by the British in 1846 after defeating the Sikhs in a war. Several additions were made to the premises to cater to the needs of the garrison. The Diwan-e Am quadrangle was built over with barracks and the pavilion proper acquired a verandah on the south and converted into a hospital for troops. Verandahs were also added to the group of structures around Jahangir’s Quadrangle that served functions as varied as godowns and living quarters. The central court of the Quadrangle was turned into a tennis court and in the process of its conversion, the central tank was filled up. The northeast tower of Jahangir’s Quadrangle and the Diwan-e Khass were converted into military churches. The Hammam became a kitchen, while a pavilion called Kala Burj was turned into a bar.

3.3.5 The cantonment

By the mid-19th century, the 18th and early 19th century criteria of locating and laying out the cantonment in the Subcontinent based on defence considerations was overshadowed by health concerns. The Cantonment Manual of 1909 stated explicitly that the “cardinal principle underlying the administration of cantonments in India is that cantonments exist primarily for the health of the British troops and to considerations affecting the well-being and efficiency of the

---

70 Val Princep - cited in Gupta, op cit., 57
71 For the post-Mutiny account of the Agra Fort, see, Maulvi M.A. Husain (ASI, Northern Circle), An Historical Guide to the Agra Fort, (Delhi, 1937); for the Lahore Fort, see, Kamil Khan Mumtaz, Kamil Kham Mumtaz, Architecture in Pakistan, (London, 1985), P???; for Nawabi properties, see, Oldenburg, op cit., and Rosie Llewellyn-Jones, A Fatal Friendship-The Nawabs, the British and the City of Lucknow, (Delhi, 1985)
72 Kamil Khan Mumtaz, Architecture in Pakistan, (London, 1985), 56-57
73 For a detailed discussion, see, King, op cit., 97-122
garrison, all other matters must give place.”

In keeping with the stipulations, provision was made for adequate water supply and sanitation in the cantonment. The design and layout of barracks was governed by consideration of adequate natural light and ventilation. A Cantonment Committee enforced the maintenance with a set of regulations. The improvements were however for the benefit of only the European troops and the living conditions of the native troops remained unaltered.

In Delhi and other centres of the insurrection, the overriding concern regarding the layout of the cantonment in the post-Mutiny era was to ensure the safety of the city’s European residents, both military and civilian.

Transformations in the city for greater security

The cantonment that had been moved to the hinterland in 1828 in the last phase, was moved back into the heart of the city to command over it and also to protect the newly set up railway communication. The changes that had emerged in the urban form of the cantonment in response to health issues largely eluded the cantonment at Delhi as the city’s built-form permitted limited intervention, whether from the point of view of defence or health issues. The European and native segments of the military were now consciously segregated with the former occupying the Fort. Analysis of the post-Mutiny map shows that the cantonment centred on the Fort that constituted its stronghold. The cantonment limits were defined by the Jamuna edge, parts of the city wall and the new road network, and it included area south of the Fort up to Delhi Gate, westwards to the Jama Masjid and following the same alignment, skirted the gardens of Delhi Bank north of Chandni Chauk, while the Fort and Salimgarh formed its northern extremity.

74 J. Mackenzie, Army Health in India, (London, 1929), 114 - cited in King, op cit., 118
75 A Gazetteer of Delhi-1883-84, op cit., 158
76 Data drawn from Map Delhi & Environs
of a total of 1437 acres of the city area, the cantonment occupied 468 acres\textsuperscript{77} [Fig.3.11].

With the Fort transformed into a military post, it became necessary to establish a clearing around it to facilitate easy access for troops at all times and to provide a clear firing range from within the ramparts [Fig.3.12]. A \textit{cordon sanitaire} of five hundred yards width, later modified to 450 yards was made around the Fort for military use that extended in the form of a vast plaza stretching from the Fort to the Jami Masjid.\textsuperscript{78} Additionally, a five hundred yard wide area was cleared around the city proper, following the wall profile to establish a security belt, in which no native construction was allowed. The cantonment occupied about one third of the city and strictly debarred the natives causing them to push further into the shrinking indigenous quarters leading to overcrowding or to occupy the hinterland settlements west of the city.

Accommodation was provided for troops and their officers, with barracks for native troops in Daryaganj, while European troops lived in barracks in the Fort. Officers stationed in the Fort occupied former Mughal structures, now converted into residential premises. Those in Daryaganj lived either in bungalows built in the last Phase or in houses of the elite confiscated after the Mutiny [Refer Fig.3.11].

\textbf{Development of the hinterland cantonment}

The old cantonment at Rajpur, vandalised by the rebel troops during the siege, was no longer in active use as the cantonment had moved back to the city proper [Fig.3.13]. Perusal of a map of the hinterland enables a reconstruction of the

\textsuperscript{77} Anthony D. King, \textit{Colonial Urban Development, Culture, Social Power and Environment}, (London, 1976), 212

\textsuperscript{78} Data drawn from photographs from the following OIOC Collection, ‘Jami Masjid and surrounding buildings’ from Earl of Jersey Collection, 807/2(21); ‘Jumma Masjid’ from Album of photographs mostly by Samuel Bourne, 11/(66)
landscape of the hinterland north and northwest of the city after the Mutiny. The old cantonment served as a camping site for troops of the British Infantry, who moved out from the city during the monsoons for fear of contracting disease in the city. Hindu Rao’s House served as a sanatorium for convalescing troops. Some areas of the pre-Mutiny cantonment had survived such as the Sadar Bazaar, hospital, ice-house, guard houses, burial ground and the racecourse. The military retained the old parade ground for use and provision was made to accommodate a native Cavalry Regiment in Native Cavalry Lines that were laid west of civil lines, along Rajpur Road. By the early 20th century, facilities like a polo ground, golf links and a Circuit House came up in the area. A garden owned by one Mewa Lal came up on a plot east of the old racecourse. An afforestation programme was launched to make the barren Ridge green. Scattered in the cantonment area were structures associated with the Mutiny that were integrated into the Mutiny circuit [Refer Fig.3.4a]. In 1908 the native troops vacated Daryaganj and moved to the hinterland, south of the pre-Mutiny cantonment, the shift being propelled by the need to safeguard the assets of the extramural railways.

3.3.6 Deliberations on the city wall

The city wall that had been repaired and strengthened by the British in the early 19th century had ironically posed a stumbling block in mounting an assault on the city during the siege, proving difficult to breach. Once it was breached at the Water Bastion, Kashmir Bastion, Kashmir Gate and Lahore Gate, the wall failed to withstand British attack. Post-Mutiny, the future of the wall was debated between retaining it and its permanent removal in emulation of European cities where the city wall had been rendered ineffective due to advancements in transportation and military technology that coupled with increasing urban

79 Data drawn from Map ‘Cantonment, Civil Station City and Environs of Delhi 1867-68’ IOR X/1666/1-4 OIOC Collection [Henceforth Delhi 1867-68]
80 A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 199
81 Gupta, op cit., 173
population caused cities to spill beyond its walls. The military ordered the wall's removal with an order passed to "blow up or otherwise destroy all fortifications [...] destroy the walls and gates of the city as to make them useless for defences." John Lawrence, on the other hand argued in favor of keeping the wall, while pleading that there was insufficient gunpowder for blowing up the wall and its manual removal stone by stone was time consuming. Finally it was decided to retain the wall and the ditch as it offered additional protection to the British controlling the Fort. An area of 500 yards was cleared around the wall to bolster security. The issue of security is questionable as the wall's porosity had increased since it was built to provide access to the hinterland. The acknowledgement of the wall's reduced role as a security cordon is evident from the British initiative in establishing a hinterland settlement west of the city proper, whose interaction with the city was founded on the wall's porosity.

3.3.7 Sadar Bazaar: a new hinterland settlement

Sadar Bazaar as the name implies was a market set up to cater to the troops stationed west of the city at Idgah and Pahari Dhiraj. It was accessible from the Lahore Gate. The market was inaugurated in 1867 thereby formalizing what had initially been an impromptu bazaar for the army. With the shifting of the cantonment into the city, Sadar Bazaar began to grow as it attracted inhabitants such as the camp followers of the army, residents displaced due to changes sweeping across the city and labour force working on laying railway infrastructure. With time, the nature of Sadar Bazaar began to diversify as low land values attracted landowners of the city and by the 1880s and 1890s merchants migrated to Sadar Bazaar to set up their businesses.
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Once the British military territory was delineated with checks in place against future mutinies in an internalised exercise that focussed only on the city, the army turned its attention towards further strengthening its position by building an effective communication link between Delhi and rest of the Subcontinent via the railways. The following section discusses the coming of the railways to Delhi, its usefulness as an anti-insurgency facility and its impact on Delhi’s urban landscape.

3.4 The arrival of the railway

3.4.1 The railways as a safeguard measure against insurrection

The Mutiny highlighted both the importance of effective inter-city communication and its lack in Delhi. Railways were seen as a symbol of Britain’s industrial revolution and technological advancement and formed an integral part of the 19th century urban landscape of British towns and cities. Railways were introduced to the Subcontinent as a technologically superior and effective mode of communication, besides being an attractive proposition for British capital and enterprise. Prior to the Mutiny, the railways were laid to converge onto the Presidency towns. In the post-Mutiny years, towns and cities that had been centres of the revolt were linked by the railway network to bolster the security of their European dwellers as railways were seen as “strategic conveniences, and their lines were laid to military advice.” Unlike its British counterpart, the network was designed to provide refuge and quick evacuation of Europeans and to bring in additional troops in the event of an insurrection. It was decreed that new railway stations in north India in the post-Mutiny scenario be designed to be easily defensible in event of trouble. The stations were thus converted into military posts, with bigger stations “turreted and fortified in case of another Mutiny” as

---
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noted by a 19th century observer. That the instructions were implemented in all earnest is evident in stations built in Lahore in 1864 and in Lucknow in 1862, both preceding Delhi railway station and thus serving as potential archetypes. The Lahore station was designed like a medieval castle with massive walls, loopholes for guns and an open arcading that could be shut with iron doors, while the one in Lucknow included a fort, arsenal, barracks for troops and accommodation for potential evacuees. The external design elements and spatial provisions thus kept the stations in a state of readiness for any future trouble.

The railways impacted the urbanization of Indian cities significantly as the fate of towns and cities depended on whether or not they were serviced by the railways. The provision of the railways gave impetus to urban growth especially in case of junction towns and cities, while towns bypassed by the railways declined. The railways required large tracts of land to lay routes and provide space for its operational gear. Its image as a technological wonder of the Victorian era notwithstanding, the railway was a noisy and formidable barrier as it claimed sole right on land earmarked for its use, and did not permit any other usage of the area. The impact of railways on Victorian cities was aptly summed by C. Manley Smith as "the deep gorge of a railway cutting, which has ploughed its way right through the centre of the market-gardens, and burrowing beneath the carriage road, and knocking a thousand houses out of its path, pursues its circuitous course to the city." Likewise, in a manner that echoed the domination of the railways over the surroundings in Britain, railway networks were laid in the Subcontinent's cities with scant regard to their existing urban form. This indifference can be seen in Agra, where the railway station was built in close proximity to Jami Masjid, thus shattering its peaceful environs sonorously and also marring its foreground. So to

91 Morris and Winchester, *op cit.*, 131-133
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in Delhi, where as per Ghalib’s account the “iron road forging rapidly ahead” completely disregarded the muhallas that lay in its path.

3.4.2 The railways in Delhi

The benefits of the railway had already been realised by Delhi’s enterprising trading community in the pre-Mutiny days. They wanted a rail link between Calcutta and the Punjab to boost the city’s trade and facilitate urban growth. Post-Mutiny it was decided to establish a rail link between Calcutta and Meerut, bypassing Delhi, but stiff opposition changed the decision in Delhi’s favour. With the completion of the rail link, whose construction partly offset the severity of the famine of 1899-1901 as a relief measure, the railways came to Delhi with the first train arriving in 1867. Apart from its military role, the station at Delhi, also served as a junction for the Subcontinent’s rail network with rail routes from east, south, southwest and northwest meeting here. By 1883-84, Delhi was well connected with three railways linking the city and the number rose to six by 1912. The railways were also showcased as a symbol of industrial technology by extending the line to the Coronation Durbar site in 1911 to transport the invitees to the Durbar venue in the hinterland.

94 Ghalib in a missive to Majruh, 1861. Russell and Islam, op cit., 252
95 The proposal entailed laying a line from southeast to northwest of the city that passed through the cantonment onto the Ridge. However, the King opposed it on the grounds that the plying of the train would shatter the peace of the city and wished the route be laid further north. Gupta, op cit., 56
96 The city’s elite petitioned the government that bypassing Delhi would hamper trade, while the Punjab Railway Company also favoured Delhi over the more distant Meerut. Gupta, op cit., 41-43
97 The six lines were East Indian Railway in 1867, Sindh-Punjab-Delhi Railway in 1867, Agra-Delhi Chord Railway Branch of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in 1867, Rajputana-Malwa Railway in 1872, Delhi-Ambaila-Kalka Railway in 1890, Southern Punjab Railway in 1900 and Awadh-Rohilkhand Railway. Data drawn from Map Delhi 1867-68 and A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 164-165
Impact on city's urban form

Transformations in the city to lay the railway infrastructure

The site selection for the railways was driven by military compulsions that necessitated the facility be built in the city proper against the earlier proposal of confining it to the hinterland on the east with the terminal located at Ghaziabad.\textsuperscript{98} It was imperative that the facility be approachable easily from the cantonment and civil lines. Scrutiny of maps from an unpublished ledger of maps drawn in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century by the Delhi Municipality indicates the path of the railways in the city.\textsuperscript{99} The lines of the East Indian Railway after crossing the Jamuna made their way into the city via Calcutta Gate and cut through Salimgarh Fort, under military occupation, and a part of the Fort's northwest edge. The railway was aligned parallel to Chandni Chauk, lying to its north and traversed the entire east-west expanse of the city from the Calcutta Gate to Kabul Gate, both being demolished in 1862 and 1867 respectively as they formed the entry points of the lines into the city [Fig.3.15a, b]. While the Calcutta Gate received lines from the east, Kabul Gate received lines that ran through the hinterland gardens, from the northwest, west and southwest.\textsuperscript{100}

Laying of the railways called for a similar three-fold approach that had earlier dictated delineation of the military zone in the city. Yet again, through demolition, coercive acquisition and reconstruction, the British transformed both the hinterland and the city with no thought spared for displaced natives, who either added to the swelling numbers in the native quarters or shifted to the hinterland settlement to the west. Ghalib wrote of tracks advancing through the city in whose anticipation "they've cleared a path for the railway from Calcutta Gate to the

\textsuperscript{98} Gupta, \textit{op cit.}, 84
Kabuli Gate. Punjabi Katra, Dhobi Wara, Ramji Ganj, Saadat Khan’s Katra, Jarnail ki Bibi ki Haveli […] [and other localities] – you won't find a trace of any of them.” The extent of the transformation can be gauged by superimposing the pre-Mutiny map of the city on the post-Mutiny map drawn after the laying of the railway infrastructure. The entire expanse of the site from east to west was acquired and cleared of existing structures before new built-forms associated with the railways, namely, lines, sidings, railway station, operational buildings of various railway companies and ancillary structures like goods sheds, godowns, and yards could be made. In the Fort parts of the Fort’s northwest wall were removed and the Mughal bridge built by Emperor Jahangir to link Salimgarh was demolished and replaced with a new bridge. In the city the prominent muhallas and built-form types that were lost included property of Nawab Vazir Sa’adat Khan, Muhalla Punjabiyan, Zinat Bari, Ganj Ramji Mal, Baghicha Munna Baghban, Dukan Nabi Baksh, Hammam, Qabristan, Chapah Khana and several muhalla level mosques and imambaras. To cater to the increased traffic to the railway station from civil lines the Mori Gate was demolished as together with Kashmiri Gate it formed the main access point to the station from the north.

The railway precinct was defined on the east by Lothian Road and the newly built Lothian Railway Bridge. Hamilton Road lay to the precinct’s north, and Queen’s Road to the south, both hundred feet wide, while the city wall formed the western edge. The station proper was built in alignment with the Chandni Chauk square and together with the Town Hall and Queen’s Garden it constituted Delhi’s new civic landscape. The open arcading along its façade notwithstanding, the station building had formidable looking octagonal castellated turrets that were recognisably inspired by its Lahore and Lucknow counterparts to bolster its

100 The Calcutta Gate let in the East Indian Railway, while the Kabul Gate gave access to the Southern Punjab Railway, Rajputana State Railway, Delhi-Agra Chord Railway, and Delhi-Amballa-Kalka Railway.
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The station was sited in the heart of the city, in the British civilian territory with adequate buffer from indigenous quarters. Structures that catered to ancillary functions of the railways, like accommodation for railway employees and travellers also came up on and around the railway precinct. For the native railway employees railway quarters were built on the northern section of the gardens attached to Delhi Bank, while for European travellers, came up hotels, and for natives, serais and dharamshalas all sited in proximity to the station.

Transformations in the hinterland to accommodate the expanding railways network

The railway precinct earmarked within the city proper was not sufficient to hold the entire operational system of the railways therefore more area was sought beyond the walls. The extension facilities were to be in the same east-west alignment. As the eastern side of the city was bordered by the river it was unavailable for any extension. Area west of the city that also formed the point of ingress of many lines via Kabul Gate was appropriated. Here in the open tract of the military security zone, adjoining Circular Road, were laid additional lines, sidings, yards and structures that posed another barrier between the city and its western hinterland. The Deputy Commissioner's noting of 1895 corroborates the divide caused by the “advent of the A.D.C. railway round by the west wall of the town & the construction (now in progress) of its 'Delhi Sadr' station on this side of the City, has very much altered the aspect of condition of this side, where a very large station yard, locomotive yard and enclosure for staff quarters is now to stand in between the city proper & the Sadr Bazaar & Paharganj, the Sadr Bazar being linked with the City proper by a couple of bridges over a permanent way of this Railway. [...]”104 By 1910-11 when a survey of the city was undertaken and mapped by the Delhi Municipality105 the additions had developed into a wedge running north-south along the western wall of the city [Fig.3.17]. Structures built

104 Deputy Commissioner's Office, D.O. Records, 6/1895, Delhi Archives – cited in Mukherjee, op cit., 213, Footnote 9
here included goods sheds, godowns, engine house, railway sheds, electric workshops, electrical engine house, hospital, dispensary and railway servants quarters. Thus not only did the railways drive an east-west wedge within the city proper, but also, created a second line of barrier beyond the western wall in a north-south direction.

Ambitious plans drawn up by civilian authorities to link the city effectively with Sadar Bazaar could not materialise as the railways posed an obstruction. Despite the barrier, the city continued to expand westwards as the railways attracted establishment of factories in their vicinity. When the railway network was expanded, the open country, building plots and former Mughal gardens to the northwest and west of the city proper were carved into plots of various railway companies. The Rajasthan Railways, Delhi-Ambala-Kalka Railways and the East Indian Railway were given plots carved out of a serai and a muhalla and out of the Roshanara Garden, by the Delhi Municipality. Areas like Sabzi Mandi and Sadar Bazaar also had railway stations that chiefly handled goods, and in Paharganj staff quarters of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway were built in the early 20th century. Civil lines housed railway officers, while quarters for native employees were built along the western edge of the city.

The railways left a deep impact on the city in many other ways. Its location completely altered the visitors' experience of arrival in Delhi. Visitors now arrived in the heart of the city and their first visual encounter was with the city's new civic landscape, in contrast to the traditional approach from the riverside, where the Mughal built citiescape had been greeted with admiration by 18th and early 19th century visitors. For the convenience of those travelling by train, guidebooks were written that described places of interest in cities including Delhi.

105 Data drawn from Map Wilson Delhi Survey, Survey Sheets Number: 86; 100; 101; 103; 104; 105; 114 and 144 TCPO Collection
106 Civilian plans for the western hinterland are discussed in a separate section later in the Chapter.
107 D.C. Records, File No. DC2/1870, DC3/1864, Delhi Archives; Gupta, op cit., 174
that fell along a railway route and were designated as important stations. The railways offered a tremendous boost to the trade and manufacturing industry thus transforming Delhi into a major entrepot for business. It introduced to the city a novel sonorous experience that confirmed the exiled King’s fear of shattering the tranquillity of Delhi and was also responsible for holding up road traffic at level crossings. Despite the advantage of speedy and economical transportation mode, the railways severed the northern part of the city from east to west from the rest of the city that lay south of the east-west avenue. This perception of the railways as an intrusion was that of the natives, as for the British the railways drove a desirable wedge that further alienated their domain from the native city. The railway precinct had a specialised use that barred uninterrupted access to people and also shut out the possibility of other manners of usage. At the social level, also, the railways aggravated social discrimination between Europeans and natives, by differential treatment meted out to their users, so much so that for any respectable native to travel by railways was an unwelcome proposition.

The coming of electricity to Delhi introduced another novel mode of public transport, the electric tramway that became operational in 1908. It linked Sabzi Mandi, Sadar Bazaar, Paharganj and Ajmeri Gate, to the centre of the city, namely the railway station, Chandni Chauk and Jami Masjid.

The military relinquished the charge of the governance of Delhi four years after the Mutiny and the city returned to civilian authorities for governance by 1861. As civilian authorities took charge of Delhi, they addressed civic issues ranging from territorial delineation of civilian areas to implementation of schemes to improve the infrastructure. The civilian authorities also lay emphasis on a show of authority, but the aggression that marked the military approach was mitigated as the civilian administration turned to native participation in governance. They
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patronised a group of native elite loyalists who supported British ventures directed towards creating a civilian landscape in Delhi. The following section examines the transformation of Delhi’s urban landscape under civilian rule.

3.5 Civil administration and the creation of a civilian landscape

The civilian authorities in Delhi included official representatives of both the imperial and provincial government and topping the hierarchy was the Commissioner, residing in the hinterland in Ludlow Castle that served as his office cum residence. Administrative offices, namely the Deputy Commissioner’s office, civil courts and Magistrate’s residence were in the city proper near the Kashmiri Gate as in the previous phase. Since one of the ways of effective control of the city under civilian rule was through policing, the presence of the police in the city increased with three main controls in the form of thanas (wards), one in the city at the kotwali (police station), while the remaining at Paharganj and Sabzi Mandi.111 To accommodate the city’s large police force, a police lines with barracks was established south of civil lines. The civil administration also concerned itself with issues related to provision of education, healthcare and services and raised the necessary infrastructure in the city.

The model of city level civilian governance came from Victorian Britain where local civic administration got a boost after 1832 with the development of Municipal government. In Britain the Municipality created a visible expression in the city’s urban landscape through civic architecture comprising public buildings that housed civic institutions.112 Municipalities in Britain of the 1830s dealt with issues concerning keeping a control on outbreak of epidemics and improving the aesthetic quality of the towns, issues that would confront their counterparts in India two decades later. It was not before long that the Victorian municipal model was transferred to the Subcontinent to be emulated in Indian cities replacing the
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military administration of the immediate post-Mutiny years. Cities like Delhi acquired municipalities entrusted with the civic administration of the urban area by the mid 19th century. The coming of the municipality in Delhi introduced to the city a third tier of official representation apart from the imperial and provincial government representation.

3.5.1 Delhi Municipality and municipal administration

Delhi Municipality was established in 1863, comprising British officials and a handful of native loyalists who were encouraged to advance unopposed British political agenda. The Municipality's mandate as outlined by the Viceroy, Lord Lawrence, was to "raise (in any manner they decide) funds for the police and for conservancy and such other funds as the members may think fit to expend on works of improvement, education and other local objects; [...]". The Municipality raised money through taxation mainly in the form of octroi duties. The total municipal area under its jurisdiction was 7562 acres. In the initial years of its existence, the Municipality budget was dominated by police expenditure, leaving it with very little money to spend on works like maintenance of roads, conservancy and building of schools and hospitals. This invited criticism in the local press for inadequacy. Since the District formed part of the Delhi Provincial Division of the Public Works Department, most public works were undertaken by the PWD, like upkeep of imperial and provincial buildings, archaeological sites and provincial roads. Following 1871, when the Municipality was designated as a first class municipality with greater financial independence, it launched many public works in its jurisdiction, by dividing the area under its jurisdiction into fifteen sections or Wards, with twelve in the city

113 Gupta, op cit., 70
114 A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 193-194
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and three in the hinterland.\textsuperscript{116} The task got further impetus under enterprising officials heading the administration, each with his own vision of making Delhi “more attractive and ecologically a more rational and well-planned city”\textsuperscript{117} though the beneficiaries of their zeal were the civil lines and areas of British concentration in the city proper, namely, the Kashmiri Gate and area north of Chandni Chauk. Several ambitious plans drawn up for the city could not see light of the day due to friction between various agencies operating in the city, the Municipality, the imperial government represented by the Cantonment Committee and the Provincial government. In 1884, a District Board was also constituted to take care of the administration of the rural district\textsuperscript{118} with the Municipality in-charge of administering urban Delhi. Delhi’s municipal governance was weak as its income was low, a condition abetted by the native elite shirking the burden of taxation and more significantly by a bias in channelizing funds towards the British cantonment and civil lines and later towards New Delhi. Among the Municipality’s priorities was the clear delineation of British civilian territory in the city and its physical segregation from the native areas.

3.5.2 Delineation of the civilian areas

By the 19\textsuperscript{th} century the land use of the British civilian area in the Subcontinent had expanded from a largely residential land use to provide other urban institutions like administration, communication and leisure.

In Delhi, the British carved out a civilian area for their use in the city proper. Thus following the Mutiny, the British civilian presence in the city did not diminish, rather the number of people coming to the newly delineated civilian area increased as the infrastructure increased. This also affected the land use of the civil lines that

\textsuperscript{116} The limits of the city wards corresponded roughly with the Mughal \textit{thana} divisions for administering the city. Gupta, \textit{op cit.}, 83

\textsuperscript{117} The officers were Commissioner Colonel Cracroft and Robert Clarke, with the former focusing his attention on the area beyond the walls to the north, while the latter to the west. \textit{Ibid.}, 87-88
in a departure from the developments in the Subcontinent at large remained essentially residential.

The British territory in the city proper

The civilian area included the area to the Fort's north, northwest and west with the pre-Mutiny civilian area south of the Fort now forming part of the cantonment [Fig.3.18]. Cartographic sources indicate that like the military zone, the civilian domain was marked on all sides by roads, both existing and newly laid. To the south ran Chandni Chauk, and a new road, called Hamilton Road was laid parallel to Chandni Chauk, to define the northern edge of the civilian area. Elgin Road and Lothian Road lay on the east and on the west, were a section of Hamilton Road and Mission Road named after the S.P.G. Mission that occupied the property of a former Nawab of Avadh. Traversing the entire east-west extent of the civilian domain was another new road, Queen’s Road, parallel to Chandni Chauk and envisaged by the British as the latter's competitor. The area though clearly separated from the native city did overlap with some indigenous muhallas. It could be conveniently accessed by the European civilian population of civil lines. In this area, new British urban institutions were added, namely those facilitating inter-city communication and leisure, to the administrative functions of the pre-Mutiny days. Additionally, Daryaganj, where the lines of Native Infantry Regiment were stationed, also had some houses of Europeans even as greater number of people lived in the civil lines.

Civil lines in the hinterland

The need for social distancing was reinforced after the Mutiny as racial antagonism made the British want to live among their countrymen, resulting in
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expansion of civil lines. Civil lines was separated from the city by sites of Mutiny siege batteries and the post-Mutiny military security zone [Fig.3.19]. Land in the civil lines was both under government and private ownership, the latter under native traders, who did not wish to move out to the hinterland from the city. A cartographic survey of the hinterland in 1867-68 furnishes information about the civil lines. The area was still largely residential as in the last phase. Other built-form types that came up included two public parks, the Qudsiya Bagh and Nicholson Garden, and a private garden owned by one Lachman Prasad to their north. A cemetery, police lines and a hotel running from the restored Metcalfe House were also established. These facilities notwithstanding, the resident community was largely, dependent on the city for its communication and cultural needs for which Europeans commuted to the civilian territory in the city. By the 1890s, the population of civil lines received a boost with the coming of Europeans working in the railways and factories that had begun to come up in the hinterland. This also led to an increase in the number of bungalows. Additionally, civil lines, saw building of hotels and shifting of Deputy Commissioner’s office from Kashmiri Gate. By the end of this phase civil lines had grown to extend beyond the Ridge.

Civil lines bungalows

Post-Mutiny, the number of bungalows in civil lines increased as more Europeans, including those working with the railways and in factories, moved to civil lines. [Fig.3.20] This can also be inferred from the inventory of structures in the hinterland in this phase, compiled during the fieldwork that records a majority of bungalows dating from the post-Mutiny era. Some native elite also began to move to the hinterland due to the overcrowded living conditions in the city proper.
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123 For a detailed account, see, ‘Inventory of structures in the hinterland (Phase-IV)’, Apendix-III of the Thesis
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In emulation of the Europeans, they built bungalows to reside in the civil lines. Their arrival diluted the exclusive European ambience of civil lines, even as the natives tried to keep abreast of European mores. The 1867-68 survey indicates that the bungalows had clustered into two distinct areas, in the vicinity of the old Assembly Rooms and Racquet Court to the north, and in a quadrilateral formed by Alipur Road to the east, Rajpur Road to the west, Kudsia Road to the south and Underhill Road to the north. The arrangement of bungalows was linear along the defining road edges and in informal clusters in the middle of the quadrilateral. Each compound opened directly onto a road. The urban form of the bungalow remained unchanged with generous plot dimensions of compounds, an outcome of occupational and social hierarchy. The compounds were kept in a state of perpetual verdure through plantation that was extensively irrigated through the canal. The most prominent residence in the area was that of the Commissioner, who resided in Ludlow Castle, adjoining which was his office\(^{124}\) [Fig. 3.21].

Civil lines was provided with a network of wide, well lit and tree lined roads. It was linked to the city via Kashmiri Gate and Mori Gate. New roads were laid out,\(^{125}\) for example Mori Gate Road that led northwards to the Mori Gate from Hamilton Road and beyond the Mori Gate to the civil lines and roads that gave easy access to residents to the newly developed leisure circuit of public parks\(^{126}\) such as Kudsiya Road that led to the remodelled Qudsiya Bagh.

### 3.5.3 Creation of a civic core

The creation of a civic domain in the city was influenced by developments in mid-Victorian Britain, where the scope of civic improvement was enlarged to encompassed city dwellers' cultural, recreational and intellectual needs, through appropriate spatial provision for sports and games, social interaction and reading. However, unlike Britain, where civic improvements were directed at uplifting the
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physical and mental health of the masses, in the Subcontinent, they were driven by
the intention of fulfilling the needs of the resident European community.
Emulating the Victorian concept of a civic landscape, the British embarked on a
programme to create a similar landscape in cities across the Subcontinent, access
to which was restricted. The British and their native loyalists were enthused with
the sentiment of civic pride as a civic landscape was created in Delhi, while the
rest of the natives were deliberately kept at bay. The exercise was taken up with
fervour and Delhi’s civic landscape boasted of built-form types that became the
new landmarks of the city.

As the Fort and its maidan became off limits due to the cantonment, a new place
of public assembly emerged in the city with built-form types that constituted an
integral part of 19th century British civic landscape. The area north of Chandni
Chauk developed as the new hub, drawing attention away from the Fort. An
analysis of the Municipal survey maps pertaining to the site provides useful
insight into the transformation of a Mughal bazaar chauk (market square) into a
Municipal civic space127 [Fig. 3.22]. Among the built-form types erected in this
area were the railway station and the multi-functional Delhi Institute serving as
the Town Hall and also catering to social needs128 [Fig. 3.23]. A Clock Tower, a
symbol of the Western concept of time, was also built in the centre of the
octagonal chauk. It was a 130 feet high tower of Neo-Gothic conception.
Memorabilia like a bronze statue of Queen Victoria was set amidst fountains,
south of the Town Hall and a fountain, erected at the behest of Lord Northbrooke,
when he visited Delhi, in the centre of a chauk further east of the original Chandni
Chauk [Fig.3.24]. Queens Garden, a remodelled public version of the former
Mughal garden, formed an extension of the Town Hall and led to the railway
station to its north. The garden was the venue of outdoor activities ranging from
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leisurely walks to indulgence in sports and games [Fig.3.25]. The built-forms and their environs embodied the spirit of Victorian civic thinking, and their novelty made them exhibits in the city. Guidebooks exhorted visitors to visit the area.\(^{129}\)

The architectural style of the railway station with open arcading and octagonal castellated turrets and the classical façade of the Town Hall with the Queen’s Garden landscaped in the prevalent English fashion represented typical 19\(^{th}\) century Victorian eclecticism. Although native access to this area was largely restricted with the Town Hall permitting only British loyalists who were members of the Municipality, and regulating usage timings of the Queen’s Gardens for natives to two days per week, the civic space with its imposing structures was likely to impinge upon the psyche of all city dwellers as it superimposed a layer of new functional and aesthetic ideals over an older Mughal strata.

### 3.6 The indigenous city

With the British appropriating areas of the city for the cantonment and civilian functions, the area of the indigenous city reduced. Unlike the last phase, this phase saw a clear definition of the British domain as a network of new and old roads defined the limits of the British territory in the city proper. Beyond these limits was the indigenous city. In contrast to the city proper, the hinterland settlements grew primarily due to the impetus of the railways.

#### 3.6.1 Native quarters in the city proper

While the coercive seizure of space for British military and civilian use greatly reduced the area of the indigenous quarters, the number of inhabitants rose as people were displaced following demolitions and the Fort’s numerous occupants were ordered to vacate their respective premises. The city also witnessed distress migration during the famine years in the mid 19\(^{th}\) century.\(^ {130}\) The natives were

\(^{129}\) H. G. Keene, *Handbook for visitors to Delhi*, (Calcutta, 1882), 23-24

\(^{130}\) Migrants came from as far as Rajasthan and provided labour to execute British interventions in the 1860s and 70s particularly the railways.
confined to their area whose limits were fixed by the city wall and military roads however the area overlapped with the British civilian territory in the northwest part of the city [Refer Fig.3.7b]. The urban form of the indigenous city was not transformed by the British at the macro level. However, some interventions were made by the British at the micro level with a view to facilitating passage through the native quarters. These interventions included road widening and realignment of the Chawri Bazaar and Ballimaran.\(^{131}\) A new road was cut across the native quarters from the Chandni Chauk square, the new civic hub of the city, to another square along the Chawri Bazaar west of the Jami Masjid. The road called Egerton Street chartered a straight and wide course with little regard for properties coming in its way [Fig.3.26a, b]. Even as the urban form did not receive any major British intervention, changes in the *muhallas* came about as a result of the post-Mutiny urban reprisal measures. Additionally, the built-form type of the *haveli* also underwent a change owing to the increasing influence of European habits on the indigenous elite.

**Transformation in the *muhallas***

The caste and craft *muhallas* formed the core of spatial organisation with the complete commercialisation of crafts and services, in the absence of patrons [Fig.3.27]. The *amiri haveli* precincts gave way to the *havelis* of wealthy Hindu and Jain traders and bankers. The wealthy residents tended to cluster around the commercial hubs of the city namely, the Chandni Chauk and the Dariba. The city edge, along the inner periphery of the wall and near the Mori, Ajmeri and Turkman Gates, became the home of classes like potters, tanners and dyers\(^{132}\) who were potential targets of the missionaries thus resulting in heightened missionary activity along the city edge [Fig.3.28]. An 1867-68 survey of the city and its hinterland and the Delhi Gazetteer of 1911-12 indicate the presence of mission


\[^{132}\] Gupta, *op cit.*, 55
houses, churches for indigenous converts, schools and healthcare infrastructure in these areas.\textsuperscript{133}

Population pressure resulted in increase in the population density in the native city. To cope with the increasing numbers, encroachments were made on the public domain as pockets of open land were used for building poorly constructed housing stock for distress migrants.\textsuperscript{134} Migrants also encroached on properties, notably \textit{havelis}, which lay abandoned by their former owners and converted them into tenements [Fig.3.29]. The whole picture was thus described by a writer in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, "poor clerks, schoolmasters and lower middle class people [sc. living] in flats like rabbit-warrens in labyrinths of back streets."\textsuperscript{135} Ghalib feared the fate of his house, as he wrote that the "walls of the zenana have collapsed [...], the lavatory is in ruins. The roofs are leaking. [...] My own apartments are in an even worse state. [...] The roof is like a sieve."\textsuperscript{136}

The state of the native city invited comments from the British, who with their Victorian obsession for cleanliness described the city's \textit{muhallas} as places of filth and congestion, which posed a threat to public health. An 1873 report by the Punjab Sanitary Commissioner on the state of the native quarters declared that the \textit{muhallas} were responsible for the "physical degeneracy that is so marked a characteristic of Indian town dwellers."\textsuperscript{137} The Municipality framed byelaws in the 1890s pertaining to the location of slaughterhouses, markets, burial and cremation grounds, and the erection of buildings to regulate the development in the native city.\textsuperscript{138} The implementation was a half-hearted affair as there was a bias towards improving the British areas. Despite the growing awareness among the native elite regarding the ill effects on their health due to the conditions in the

\textsuperscript{133} Data drawn from Map Delhi 1867-68; \textit{A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912)}, op cit.
\textsuperscript{134} For a detailed discussion, see, Shovan K. Saha, 'Conservation based development of Shahjahanabad: The Historic Capital of India', in \textit{UNCRD Research Series Report}, (Tokyo, 1995), 9, 121-130
\textsuperscript{135} C. Foxley - cited in Gupta, \textit{op cit.}, 49
\textsuperscript{136} Ghalib in a missive to Alai, July 1862. Russell and Islam, \textit{op cit.}, 275
\textsuperscript{137} Punjab Sanitary Commissioner - cited in Goodfriend in Singh and Dhamija, \textit{op cit.}, 28
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912)}. \textit{op cit.}, 194-195
city's native quarters, the city conditions changed little. This is because the natives, driven by a mix of anglomania and opportunism and the living conditions in the city, left the native quarters to live in civil lines where they either rented or built their own bungalows. The havelis they left behind were neglected and succumbed to the ever-increasing demand for space in the city, whether residential, commercial or industrial. In the process the havelis were transformed.

**Transformation of the haveli**

The decline of amiri wealth and power accelerated after the Mutiny as the assets of those suspected of complicity in the revolt were confiscated and sold by the government as a backlash. Those who escaped retribution were no better off as they no longer had the means to support their former lavish lifestyle. Amiri haveli precincts could no longer be maintained, resulting in their fragmentation and diversification into functions as vastly different as residential and commercial. A haveli could either be sold in parts by its owner to multiple buyers, or rented out to individuals with the owner retaining a part for his own residence.\(^{139}\) Alternatively, a haveli could be abandoned by a family that no longer had the means for its upkeep.\(^{140}\) In yet another circumstance, the confiscated property could be retained for government use or it could be auctioned or handed as a reward or compensation by the government.\(^{141}\) In exceptional circumstances a haveli could be handed back to the rightful owners, provided their connivance in the insurrection was not established. Irrespective of the circumstances, there were

\(^{139}\) Hakim Ahsanullah Khan’s haveli was returned in 1859 and had an “Englishman living in the zenana, at the back of the baths. [...] Ahsanullah Khan [...] has turned the main hall into the zenana, and made his own quarters where the stable used to be.” Ghalib in a missive to Husain Mirza, July 1859. Russell and Islam, *op cit.*, 213

\(^{140}\) Haveli Begum Shah Tara was in all probability abandoned by Nawab Qamruddin Khan’s family and became the home of *kumhars* and *mochis*. For a detailed account of the Haveli, see, Part-II of the Thesis

\(^{141}\) The property of Nawab Hamid Ali Khan was confiscated and he was forced to seek rented accommodation in Haiz Qazi. His haveli including the zenana was occupied by British soldiers and the entrance gate with its row of shops demolished and the debris auctioned with the proceeds going to the government treasury. Ghalib in missives to Husain Mirza, November and December 1859. Russell and Islam, *op cit.*, 220, 227
several takers for old havelis, both legitimate occupants and squatters. The British took possession of havelis either for stationing of troops as in Skinner's House or the missionaries setup their establishments, like the S.P.G. Mission that setup its mission house in a part of Nawab Sa'adat Khan's haveli. Among native buyers of old havelis were native loyalists, who, in the post-Mutiny scenario had the wherewithal to buy property, having been amply rewarded by the government.\textsuperscript{142} Hindu and Jain merchants and bankers also bought havelis and put them to use as their own residences or converted them into tenements.\textsuperscript{143} Often, the premises served the occupational needs of trade and industry of the new owners with increasing claims on space for storage of goods, especially after the advent of railways. Shops, workshops, godowns and transit warehouses for goods being carried by the railways, operated from the haveli's premises after making basic modifications. To make the premises suitable for their habitat, the new owners often cleared the site of the older structure and built a new one that bore all the characteristics of the current times.

The new havelis that emerged in the city in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century were relatively modest conceptions in comparison to the former occupants of the site. Most havelis identified in the survey of the city date from the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{144} A survey of one such haveli that was built in 1890 and is located in Muhalla Churiwalan in Bazaar Sitaram\textsuperscript{145} allows us to reconstruct the layout of the havelis in this phase [Fig.3.30a, b]. Spatially, they were compact and usually built around one courtyard The former dalans that surrounded the courtyards were now converted into rooms with multiple fenestrations for entry. A staircase led off the courtyard to the levels above, with spatial transition from public to private based on level changes. The lower floor

\textsuperscript{142} The residence of the Mughal ruler, Shah Alam II's son, was bought by one Bishamber Nath, Haveli Hamid Ali Khan was bought by Lala Hardiyan Singh. \textit{Ibid.}, 53
\textsuperscript{143} Baradari Nawab Azam Khan was bought by the Jutewala family and Haveli Nawab Muzaffar Khan by Pandit Jvalanath. Gupta, \textit{op cit.}, 53
\textsuperscript{144} The havelis are included in the Inventory that is enclosed as Appendix-III of the Thesis
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was accessible to public, while privacy was observed by building vertically, with upper levels containing private living quarters and the domain of the household womenfolk. Visual access to the street outside the haveli was by means of projecting jharokas (overhanging balcony) screened with jails (stone lattice screen), while a projecting balcony looked down onto the courtyard below. Often the courtyard was covered with a timber or steel grille, to increase the floor area at the upper level, while still permitting light penetration at the courtyard level. The spatial novelties, reflective of a European lifestyle that were introduced were a reception room for guests located on the ground floor, close to the entrance and furnished with European furniture. New havelis were also receptive towards incorporating European industrial technology and using materials, like structural steel column and beam sections, tiles, stained glass, corrugated galvanised iron sheets, and timber panelled and louvered door and window shutters. Also popular were pre-fabricated cast and wrought elements like iron brackets, balconies, staircase, and balustrades that were imported from foundries in Britain. Among the European design and decoration elements that found a place in the havelis were fireplaces, mantelpieces, fanlights, mirrors, furniture, chandeliers, clocks and electric fans, as their owners took to a European lifestyle [Fig.3.31]. The most prominent haveli in the city was that of Lala Chunna Mal, a wealthy Hindu banker, and stood along the Chandni Chauk.

3.6.2 Growth of native hinterland settlements

The factors responsible for the growth of the native extramural settlements were the need for accommodation of residents who were expelled from the city in 1857-58 and of those displaced by the urban reprisal measures, the arrival of railways and a boom in the trade and manufacturing industry. The settlements grew in area and attracted new built-form types, like factories and railway infrastructure that impacted their urban form as land often parcelled from old gardens and orchards was made available for their construction. Land acquisition

143 The haveli was awarded the first prize by Delhi Development Authority under its Urban Heritage Award Scheme in 1998 and is listed as Serial No. A194a in INTACH, 'Delhi The Built
by all sections of people, by means fair and foul\textsuperscript{146} caused the hinterland to develop in a piecemeal fashion with no thought spared for the development of services. The pattern of development also disrupted the originally conceived concept of swaddling the city proper with foliage to offset its built-mass with greenery. Several gardens and orchards were also laid but their distance from the city proper increased for them to exert an immediate micro-climatic effect on the densely built city.

The 1867-68 survey of the hinterland brings to light the changes in the landscape of the hinterland that was largely under native occupation\textsuperscript{147} [Fig.3.32]. Beyond the Delhi Gate of the city, lay open territory to the south that was under cultivation. Two British institutions operated from here, the District Jail and the Reformatory School that ran from the premises of the former Lunatic Asylum, the latter having moved to Lahore. Beyond the Turkman Gate were utilitarian facilities like ice-pits, a new slaughterhouse and brick kilns. Paharganj remained the largest hinterland settlement with its wholesale bazaars. Between Paharganj and Jaisinghpura was an encamping site and a series of private gardens along the road from the Qutub, namely, Khairati Lala’s Garden, Bulaqi Begum’s Garden and Pomegranate Garden and Sahi Ram’s Garden. A number of gardens, both government and private stood in the outlying areas to the west, beyond Sadar Bazaar, Kishenganj, Deputy Ganj and Sarai Idgah, including Gwalior Raja’s Garden, Raoji’s Garden, Government Garden, Lall Bagh, Baldeo Thanean’s Garden and some unnamed ones.\textsuperscript{148} The physical limits of Sadar Bazaar were redefined and Paharipur, Teliwara, Sarai Idgah, Kishenganj and Deputy Ganj merged together to form a single large habitation.\textsuperscript{149} By the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, Sadar Bazaar had a wood depot, a goods railway station and a power station of the

\textsuperscript{146} The government’s ill-conceived land policy prevented it from deriving any benefit from land acquisition deals. Gupta in ‘Delhi and its Hinterland: The Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries’ in R.E. Frykenberg, ed., \textit{Delhi through the Ages, Selected Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society}, (Delhi, 1986), 264
\textsuperscript{147} Data drawn from Map Delhi 1867-68
\textsuperscript{148} ibid.
\textsuperscript{149} ibid.
Electric Tramways and Lighting Company apart from residences, shops and factories. The northwest settlements of Mughalpura and Sabzi Mandi now coalesced into Sabzi Mandi that spread on both sides of the Grand Trunk Road to Karnal [Refer Fig.3.32]. The area was dotted with serais and tombs from the past. The focus of the settlement was its vegetable market, which received produce from the fertile environs, where land was both nazul and privately held, and irrigated by the canal. In 1865, the Municipality built a new wholesale vegetable market at the foot of the Ridge to replace the old one, as it was found to obstruct traffic between the Roshanara Garden and civil lines. The gardens and orchards beyond Sabzi Mandi that thrived on canal irrigation far outstretched in extent those in rest of the hinterland. Those owned by wealthy city traders were developed as pleasure retreats, while abundant produce contributed to the upkeep of the gardens. Among the privately owned gardens were, Wazeer Singh’s Garden, Ganga Ram’s Garden, Narain Das’s garden and Salik Ram’s Garden. Gardens under government control were developed as public parks for the almost exclusive use of Europeans. The government took over two contiguous former Mughal gardens, the Sirhindi Bagh and Roshanara Bagh and remodeled them as a public park, called the Roshanara Garden. By the 1890s, industrial development was on the ascent as factories were built and land cleared for additional railway lines and a goods railway station of the Delhi-Kalka-Ambala Railway.

Once the British and native areas were clearly established, the civilian authorities turned their attention towards addressing civic issues with the Municipality’s purview of duties expanding by 1871 to include civic improvements, constituting routine matters related to public health like water supply, sanitation, lighting, communication and security, and matters related to moral and intellectual health. The following section examines the civic institutions that catered to British and native requirements of urban living in the post-Mutiny scenario.

150 A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 221
151 The vendors argued that the new market was far from their homes and they were being taxed for the use of new shops. The authorities, however, turned down their plea and shifted them forcibly. Gupta, op cit., 90
152 Data drawn from Map Delhi 1867-68
British urban institutions were not new to Delhi as they had been in practice since the days of the East India Company to facilitate European style living and to reform indigenous society. Post-Mutiny, the government decided not to interfere in native affairs and keep a safe distance from natives for fear of another revolt. The decision was prompted by the belief that British interference in native affairs had caused the natives to revolt.\textsuperscript{153} While, at the macro level of governance no native-centric policies were announced, at the micro level of city governance British interference in the local affairs remained.\textsuperscript{154} The Municipality, comprising a mix of British representatives and native loyalists, was given the mandate to tackle a city's civic affairs by framing bylaws to regulate urban living.

3.7 Civic institutions

3.7.1 Shaping native identity via civic institutions

Despite their declared intention to steer clear of native affairs, the British contributed towards shaping native identity through civic institutions. The institutions and their built-form types were viewed by native elite as specimens of “progress made by humanity towards the amelioration of its moral condition. [...] the public works [...] are proofs of a greater intellectual state of the world than in any preceding age.”\textsuperscript{155} Prolonged contact between the British and natives influenced the latter, chiefly the elite to adopt European ways, a move that was likely to assure acceptability among the Europeans.

\textsuperscript{153} For a detailed discussion, see, T.R. Metcalfe, The Aftermath of the Revolt India 1857-1870, (New Jersey, 1965)

\textsuperscript{154} For a detailed account of how British policies affected the natives despite the declared policy of non-interference in native affairs, through a case study of Lucknow, whose developments echoed in other former centres of the Mutiny, see, Oldenburg, The Making of Colonial Lucknow 1836-1877, (New Jersey, 1984)

\textsuperscript{155} Bholanauth Chunder, The Travels of a Hindoo to Various Parts of Bengal and Upper India, (London, 1869), - cited in Alexander, op cit., 147
Religion

The Mutiny hardly served as a deterrent to the mission houses operating in the city as they reorganised themselves to engage in their role as reformers of the indigenous society. The work of the missions, supported by graduates and Fellows from Cambridge and Oxford Universities, was largely directed at healthcare, training of the indigenous converts for furthering their cause, daily preaching in the bazaars and education of both native Christian boys and girls. Their area of operation was at the fringes of the city, particularly around the Mori, Turkman and Ajmeri Gates, and in the hinterland settlements of Paharganj and Sadar Bazaar. Sites to build churches for the indigenous converts and to set up mission houses were acquired by buying property auctioned by the government as in the case of the S.P.G. Mission that bought part of the haveli premises of Nawab Sa’adat Khan, near the Mori Gate to set up their mission house. Apart from the Baptist Church that had been built in the last phase and was used primarily by indigenous converts, another church was built for the native converts. St. Stephen’s Memorial Church was built in 1867 by the S.P.G. Mission and Cambridge Mission in the vicinity of the mission premises in the memory of the English and Indian Christians who had lost their lives during the Mutiny [Fig.3.33].

Chandni Chauk became the focus of religious activities of diverse faiths, as the missionaries lectured at Northbrook Fountain in the 1880s and the Muslims debated on theosophy in Fatehpuri Masjid and also debated with missionaries, till an order was passed that disallowed religious debates. The Hindu sect of Arya Samajis joined the debating fray in the beginning of the 20th century. This phase

---

156 The Baptist Mission was revived after the Mutiny, while in 1878 the Delhi branch of the S.P.G. was amalgamated with the Cambridge Mission to form the Cambridge Mission of North India. In 1892 the Methodist Episcopal Church Mission was introduced to Delhi. A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 80-82
157 Data drawn from Map Delhi 1867-68 that shows churches and mission houses in these areas that inhabited by the poorest sections of society, who were potential converts.
158 Data drawn from Map Wilson Delhi Survey, Sheet Number: 115 TCPO Collection
159 Gupta, op cit., 50, 79
also witnessed angry clashes between the traditionally peaceful, Jain and Hindus, who the administration tried hard to keep at bay.

**Western education**

This phase witnessed a spurt of educational activity as the government, missionary societies and private individuals came forward to further the cause of native education. Opening of schools and colleges where instructions were imparted in English to both sexes of indigenous communities became a matter of government policy. In 1887 primary education became the responsibility of the Municipality, though it suffered from neglect due to paucity of funds.\(^{160}\) Among the prominent institutions established under the aegis of the government were the Normal School set up in 1860 with the objective of training candidates for teaching in the primary schools of the Delhi Division and the School of Industrial Art founded by the Municipal Committee in 1883.\(^{161}\) These institutions acquired *haveli* for their operation, with Normal School running from Kalan Mahal premises before moving into new premises located within the compound of former Delhi College. School of Industrial Art was housed in an old *haveli* near Masjid Tahawur Khan in the vicinity of the Lahore Gate of the city and it subsequently moved to a place near the Ajmeri Gate.

The missions also opened several schools that catered to the needs of a wide cross section of residents ranging from native Christians to potential converts like *chamars*. The Baptist Mission's work was largely overshadowed by that of the amalgamated S.P.G. and Cambridge Mission, the two together running institutions, namely St. Stephen's Mission High School and St. Stephen's Mission College. The latter was set up in 1865 on the premises of former Delhi College.\(^{162}\)

\(^{160}\) *ibid.*, 115

\(^{161}\) *A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912)*, *op cit.*, 208-209

\(^{162}\) The college building was designed by Swinton Jacob and in 1906 additions were made by way of staff quarters, students' hostel, laboratories and lecture rooms.
Indigenous educational institutions like *madrasas* catered to higher education, with Madarsa-t-ul-Quran and Fatehpuri Masjid Madarsa being prominent. In 1867 following a directive from the Inspector of Education that languages like Arabic and Sanskrit also be taught in addition to English, educational institutions run through native enterprise were set up such as Anglo-Arabic High School, Anglo-Sanskrit Victoria Jubilee High School, Bengali Boys' High School, Tibbia School, Anglo-Vernacular Himayat-ul-Islam Middle School and Hindu College. Thus slowly large sections of the society were being inducted into European ways through education.

**Trade and industrial practices**

The reputation of Delhi as an important centre of manufacturing and service industry endured, despite a wane in traditional enterprise due to the absence of patronage. The traditional crafts were in demand among both resident and visiting Europeans. Tourist guidebooks listed names of shops where or individuals from whom best items could be procured. The craft industry faced competition with the introduction of industrial technology that flooded the market with mechanised items causing craft lovers in Britain to lament that the “beautiful works of the East are fast disappearing before the advance of Western conquest and commerce-fast, and every day faster.” The railways boosted the production of both handcrafted and mechanised items, leading to increase in trade though it was opined that the growth in trade was at the cost of craftsmanship. By the beginning of the 20th century Delhi ranked first as a commercial centre in all of Upper India vying with urban centres like Kanpur and Amritsar and ranked next

---

163 *A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912)*, op cit., 211-212
164 Among the crafts practiced were jewellery making, metal working, painting, leather work, stone work, textile and carpet weaving, gold and silver embroidery, decorative wood work, ivory carving, pottery and seal engraving. *Ibid.*, 141-159
166 John Lockwood Kipling observed that the bias “of the leading castes [...] is more towards trade [...] than towards craftsmanship.” - cited in *Gazetteer of Delhi-1883-84, op cit.*, 124
only to the seaports of Calcutta, Bombay and Karachi. To facilitate trade the number of banks in the city increased while native bazaars emerged as centres of commerce with Chandni Chauk as the hub of business. For more utilitarian items of consumption, a bazaar developed in the Kashmiri Gate area that catered to the Europeans owing to its proximity to civil lines. In the 1890s a leading Hindu banker of Delhi built a market in the area with shops on two levels.

The emergence of factories

Unlike the previous phase where British initiative in setting up factories was seen lacking, this phase witnessed a surge in growth of factories, particularly from 1885 onwards. Manufacturing establishments were mechanised and managed by companies and were not run as small-scale, individual enterprises, such as karkhanas of cotton processing and ice-making operating in the mid 1880s. The factories were financed by native bankers and landlords and were managed by Europeans. The most appropriate sites for factories were in the hinterland in Sabzi Mandi and Sadar Bazaar where land was available cheaply. Among the main factories were cotton spinning and weaving mills, cotton presses and ginning factories, flour mills, ice factories, oil and soap mill and iron workshops. In the 1890s large sections of planted land was cleared of plantation in Sabzi Mandi to build factories. Factories attracted migrant labour force from the surrounding districts resulting in an increase in the population in the hinterland.

Changing lifestyle of the natives and the emergence of native bungalows

Prior to the Mutiny, the possibility of a native wanting to leave the walled confines of the city to dwell in the northern hinterland was almost nonexistent as life in the city was the epitome of a refined urban culture or aadmiyat. With the

167 A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 161
168 The market was listed in INTACH’s inventory. INTACH, Delhi The Built Heritage A Listing, (Delhi, 1999), 1, 64, Serial No.C103
169 ibid., 160-161
170 Sayed Molinul Haq, Akbar-e-Rangeen, 22 - cited in Gupta, op cit., 5, Footnote 24
spread of European education, a section of the city’s elite became aware of European thinking and by the end of the 19th century they were ready to adopt a western lifestyle. The native havelis underwent a spatial, construction and material transformation in their owners’ urge to emulate European mores. Interaction with the British also led to notions of cleanliness rubbing off on the native elite who became desirous of a clean living environment. Under the circumstances, where the government’s policies of public improvement were shaped by a partisan approach, the elite opted to live in civil lines. Some had motives other than health concerns, such as gaining acceptability among the European community since their living in the city was a major stumbling block in their interaction with the British. This is evident from a fictionalised account of a native, Ibn-ul-Vaqt, protagonist of an Urdu novel, who is told by his English mentor, to acquire “at least a house in English taste. You know that we like to live in spacious houses outside the city and our lifestyle is also different. [....] your house is situated in the streets where one can’t take one’s carriage. Then, the streets are so narrow, winding and unclean that no Englishman would like to go to such a filthy place. Your house is not so bad but there is no chair or table to make an Englishman feel comfortable.” In wake of a plague scare in the city proper in 1898 landowners living in the city and owing land in the northern hinterland started building residences on their plots and no longer viewed the move to the hinterland as taboo. The shift to civil lines implied that the residential built-form type of the native elite also conform to the British model, the bungalow that was an emblem of a European lifestyle [Fig.3.34]. The bungalow was at complete variance with the haveli, as it stood on a large plot of land and its urban form subscribed to European notions of privacy and healthy living. For a native elite to

171 Among the prominent Delhi residents who were influenced by European thinking were Sayyed Ahmad Khan and Nazir Ahmad.
172 Their awareness is reflected through their increasingly vociferous criticism of the Municipality for its laxity in matters related to public improvement in the city, while showing exemplary alacrity in implementation of projects in civil lines.
173 Nazir Ahmad, was a reputed scholar and pioneer of modern Urdu fiction, whose Urdu novel, Ibn-ul-Vaqt, presented the late 19th century dilemma between western learning and one’s own tradition, as experienced by its protagonist, Ibn-ul-Vaqt who had an English Crown official, called
live in a bungalow demanded a change in lifestyle with the spatial disposition of
the bungalow redefining his notion of space and its usage, that were at variance
with those experienced in the haveli. Comparisons by Europeans between the
bungalow and haveli declared the former as a better dwelling type although the
haveli has “advantages in a hot climate, [...]. Taking everything into account
however, bungalows are healthier dwellings. A good many Indians are beginning
to live in them.”174 The arrival of the natives in civil lines weakened the
exclusivity of the European territory as the natives tried to bridge the divide
between themselves and their European neighbours. However, for the natives,
living in civil lines came at a price as narrated in Nazir Ahmad’s fictionalised
account, where following the outbreak of the cholera epidemic in the city proper,
an order was issued that barred visitors to civil lines from the city and no natives
except those in the employment of European households as servants were allowed
to stay.175

3.7.2 Development of British-centric urban institutions

The British-centric urban institutions had evolved over the years since their
introduction and were informed by the trends prevalent in Britain. Industrial
technology and prevalent social practices imported from home created a familiar
ground for the British in the Subcontinent.

Religion

As the resident British population increased, there emerged a need for different
churches to cater to various congregations. While Saint James Church catered
only to the Protestants, a church was built by the Roman Catholic Mission on a
site immediately north of the gardens of Delhi Bank in 1865 to cater to Delhi’s
European Catholics.

Noble Sahib, as a mentor. Nazir Ahmad, Ibn-ul-Vaqī (Son of the Moment), Mohammed Zakir, tr.,
(Delhi, 2002), 53
Social Infrastructure

With an increase in the size of Delhi’s European community, a range of leisure pursuits was introduced patterned on trends prevailing in Britain. In Britain places of leisure, ranging from those that appealed to the intellect to those purely for fun and pleasure, were seen as essential ingredients of the Victorian civic landscape. The urban landscape was seen as a “Genteel Space” that diffused outwards from middle class Victorians homes to extend into the urban space of the city that was being redefined in the backdrop of urbanization and technological development.176

This urban landscape was being shaped by built-form types like museums, clubs, public parks and utilitarian structures like hotels.177

In contrast, native leisure pursuits took the form of fairs that were revived in the 1860s. Two prominent fairs, Pankhe-ka Mela and Phoolwalon-ki Sair, attracted thousands of residents to the southern hinterland. In the city, Chandni Chauk remained the favourite haunt of natives who came to take the air, some in carriages. The city’s public parks like the Queen’s Garden despite entry restrictions on natives were among the popular places of leisure of the native elite.

The Club

The premises of the club were enlarged to include a museum, library, menagerie, conservatory and picture gallery that provided avenues for leisure appealing to the intellect. Clubs for instance the golf club and the gymkhana club catered to games and sports.

173 Nazir Ahmad, op cit., 135
177 This was a response to an upsurge of interest in expanding knowledge, particularly, scientific and practical, for the moral wellbeing of the public at large. Alan Rauch, ‘Useful Knowledge: The Victorians, Morality, and the March of intellect’ in Technology and Culture, (October, 2002), 43, 4
In Delhi the intellectual needs of the European community were catered to by a library and museum that were housed in the Delhi Institute premises. The Station Library was meant for the exclusive use of Europeans and the museum was a repository of “objects of science, art and commerce” and a place of interest of archaeologists, students of history, botany and geology. Those desirous of socialising amused themselves in the Delhi Club that was initially a part of the Delhi Institute. The Club’s “Durbar Room and rooms for social reunions” catered to social gatherings. By 1898 the Delhi Club shifted to civil lines for the convenience of Europeans and was housed in Ludlow Castle that was rebuilt after the Mutiny178 [Fig.3.35].

Public Parks

Public parks catered to the physical well being of their users by catering to games and sports, activities that the British deemed necessary to indulge in, in the Subcontinent, for the fear of contracting an illness. The development of public parks in the Subcontinent’s cities was influenced by the 19th century British public park movement. Since the 1830s public parks were laid out in Britain to act as lungs amidst the urban landscape providing access to fresh air and exercise and were seen as facilitators for the recreation of both the body and the spirit, considered “necessary for the right development of our being.”179 As an urban space, a public park was extrovert and extended into the urban realm of the city. It drew on Britain’s 18th century designed landscapes for inspiration. It was a place of physical exercise abetting indulgence in sports, strolling, riding, and driving in a carriage and subsequently in a motor vehicle. It also catered to intellectual pursuits through its various built-form types for instance a library, museum and menagerie. Its users indulged in their interests in full public view as the park provided a setting for the display of their material possessions.

178 Spear, op cit., 147
179 Throughout the 19th century, public parks were linked to the issue of public health that, with time came to constitute both physical and moral and intellectual health. For a detailed discussion on 19th century British public park movement, see, Hazel Conway, People’s Parks: The Design and Development of Victorian Parks in Britain, (Cambridge, 1991)
In the context of the Subcontinent, public parks offered a novel notion of leisure that contrasted with the recreational pursuits of the Mughal royalty and nobility. The Mughal gardens provided an ambience for languorous and sensual pleasure that was heightened by the garden setting and design elements, both permanent and temporary. The use of furnishings and reliance on dancers, singers, poets and attendants as props added to the mood. The introvert garden was a private space that shielded its occupants and their activities from the public gaze through its high enclosure walls and focussed on its own internalised, climatically modified world. Once acquired by the British government following the Mutiny, the private gardens became public property and potential candidates for receiving improvements inspired by the prevailing English landscape norms.

Theremodelling of a Mughal garden into a public park

Public parks were laid out in cities of the Subcontinent with a resident European population on either a new site or by appropriating Mughal gardens laid out in pre-colonial cities. In Delhi both types of public parks were laid out. The King Edward Park was laid out on the site of the demolished Akbarabadi Masjid on the Fort maidan.\(^{180}\) The Begum-ka Bagh was remodelled into a public park and was renamed the Queen's Garden. The remodelling of a Mughal garden to create a public park entailed large-scale alteration of the site through interventions like addition and removal of structures, replanting, and altering of the terrain. The appreciation of the site as a historic landscape operated on two levels, firstly of the garden and secondly of its historic structures. Both the garden and its structures were seen as separate entities. The garden was not appreciated as a historic site and therefore there was no thought towards its conservation. The historic structures were conserved, but the approach here too was selective. It was based on the political and cultural symbolism of the structure and its potential in terms of picturesque value that contributed to the overall scheme after the site's remodelling. Each selected site was transformed not just physically but culturally from an introvert, private garden to an open public park. Further, there was scant
appreciation of the entire site's contribution to the overall urban character of the city.

English gardeners were given charge of garden sites and their intervention in bringing about the alienation of the site from its historic context, relied on elements of design, borrowed from British prototypes. A variety of landscape elements were introduced including curving pathways to disguise the park limits, trees and shrubbery to divide the area into parts for varied usage, water to add interest, and built-forms that ranged from the utilitarian, namely lodges, pavilions, bandstands, refreshments rooms, menageries, conservatories and maintenance areas, to commemorative like statues, sculptures, canopies and obelisks. Park furnishings in cast-iron for example drinking fountains, railings, columns and brackets, manufactured in foundries in Britain were exported to the Subcontinent, making the task of creating an ambience of an English park much easier. Park layouts also allocated space for sports and games that became very popular in this Phase. Most layouts included area for a cricket ground, archery ground, shooting range, bowling green, lawn tennis court and croquet grounds. There was provision for driving through parks via roads to enable plying of carriages followed by motor vehicles. This novel means of appreciating the park by driving through it while appropriate for a large park in Britain was little suited as a means of appreciating the Mughal garden turned public park whose scale did not match that of its counterparts in Britain. Often the original approach to the garden was altered to suit the road layout, thus altering the original sequential spatial experience. 181

Another important feature of public parks in Victorian Britain was the introduction of an element of history, through an architectural folly by creating a sham ruin. 182 Often a genuine historic built-form or artefact was also appropriated for effect. The incorporation of historic ruins in the scheme was purely as a garden

180 Data drawn from Map Wilson Delhi Survey, Sheet Number: 165 TCPO Collection
181 For a detailed discussion on introduction of roads, see, Constance M. Villiers-Stuart, Gardens of the Great Mughals, (London, 1913), 111-114
182 For a detailed discussion on this trend in Britain, see, Brent Elliot, Victorian Gardens, (London, 1986)
ornament. Historic park sites in pre-colonial cities of the Subcontinent provided enough relics from the past, ranging from tombs and pavilions to ornamental pools and water channels, to satiate the British quest for a sense of history. The chosen remnants were often incorporated as the main feature in the park layout. Remodelling elements like pathways, watercourses and planting emphasized the centrality of the chief monument in the garden. This was not out of concern for the conservation of the historic remnant rather the relic was valued for its aesthetic merit.

Delhi’s public park leisure circuit

After the Mutiny the imperial government took possession of the royal nazul properties including the Fort precinct and the royal gardens both in the city and its hinterland that were later transferred to Delhi Municipality for management. Of the seized gardens, some were re-laid as public parks and integrated into a leisure circuit for Delhi’s Europeans [Fig.3.36]. The criteria of selection of garden sites for remodelling depended on the location of the garden so as to provide convenient access and also on the site’s political and cultural symbolism that was to be altered to assert British authority. The role played by a garden site during the Mutiny also had a bearing on its selection for remodelling. Garden sites used by the British during the siege became hallowed territory that could not be neglected, while those that served the enemy were remodelled in a show of British authority.

Collectively, the Mughal gardens turned into public parks both in the city proper and the hinterland to the north and northwest provided a leisure trail for the Europeans with the Delhi Municipality taking responsibility for their maintenance. In the city, the British turned to the Queen’s Garden for leisure. In the hinterland, four Mughal gardens were remodelled for British use. The Roshanara Garden was developed as a public park by merging two former Mughal gardens, the Roshanara Bagh and Sirhindi Bagh. Built-forms of the original Roshanara

183 For a detailed account of remodeling of Queen’s Garden and Qudsiya Bagh, see, Part-II of the Thesis
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Bagh namely, the eastern gateway, tomb and its adjoining tank were retained [Fig.3.37] while other structures and features were removed. As a result of the remodeling “the trellis walks and old symbolic avenues are gone [...] the terraced walk beside the water can hardly be distinguished; [...] the great tank beyond has lost its three pavilions, [...] winding roads have cut up and completely spoilt the beauty of the design.”  

In the Tees Hazari Bagh, a section of the garden was cleared of orchards to make room for a shooting range. The Qudsiya Garden was both a British Mutiny site and a public park. By early 20th century, funerary garden complexes, namely Emperor Humayun’s Tomb and Nawab Safdarjung’s Tomb were remodelled with the stipulation that they be made at least as pleasing as those remodelled gardens at Allahabad and Agra. Some public parks permitted access to the natives, albeit with regulated timings. The Queen’s Garden, Pipal Park and King Edward Park served both as an outdoor club and rallying point for Delhi’s intelligentsia [Fig.3.38a, b].

Besides public parks, the leisure circuit also included a drive along the Circular Road beginning at the Kashmiri Gate and terminating at the Delhi Gate. The drive was recommended by guidebooks including A. Harcourt’s, The New guide to Delhi.

An integral part of the tourists’ Delhi visit was a tour of the Mutiny sites, implying “those which commemorate the many glorious episodes of the siege and assault of Delhi.” The Mutiny circuit developed into a pilgrimage undertaken by all visitors to Delhi.

---

184 Villiers-Stuart, op cit., 111-112
185 For a detailed account of remodelling of Safdarjung’s Tomb, see, Part-II of the Thesis
186 Fanshawe, op cit., xlv
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The Mutiny Pilgrimage

The Mutiny was perceived as a horrific event by the British both at home and in the Subcontinent and was recorded extensively. To ensure the events' perpetuity, sites associated with the entire sequence of events in Delhi from May to September 1857 were considered hallowed [Fig.3.39]. During the restructuring of the city and its environs, the sites scattered mainly over the Ridge, were left untouched and were prominently marked on all post-Mutiny maps of Delhi. Visitors to the city, whether officials or tourists included in their itinerary a visit to these sites, the tour being accorded status of a pilgrimage. Guidebooks allocated pages to “Localities of the Siege” and eulogistic descriptions of British achievements, with comments like, “The performance of Alexander and Xenophon are outdone by this marvellous achievement.”189 Visitors were urged to tour these places not only because they could relate to them better as the events were relatively contemporary, but also, out of a sense of patriotism as the sites “are, of course, of surpassing interest to every Englishman, and all visitors, [...] will not be content with less than a day for this pilgrimage.”190

The development of leisure infrastructure

The opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 increased the influx of visitors to the Subcontinent, who also partook of the leisurely activities that resident Europeans indulged in. Delhi with its historic past was a popular tourist destination with travel greatly facilitated by the railways. In 1874 Edward Lear, spent ten days in the city “making Dehlineations of the Dehlicate architecture, as is all impressed on my mind as inDehlibly as the Dehliterious quality of the water of that city.”191 For the well-heeled itinerant visitor a novel built-form type namely the hotel was

188 Reynolds Ball cited in G.A. Nateson & Co., All about Delhi: An Exhaustive Handbook compiled from Authentic Sources, Madras, 1912), 15
189 Keene, op cit., 67-68
190 Ball in Nateson & Co., op cit., 15
191 Edward Lear, Indian Journal - cited in Alexander, op cit., 31
introduced to Delhi. Hotels run under European supervision came up and were listed in guidebooks for the convenience of visitors.

In Delhi most hotels came up in the area around the Kashmiri, Mori and Kabul Gates and in civil lines. Often older sites were converted into a hotel such as the office of Delhi Gazette Press sited behind St James Church. The prominent hotels were Courtney’s Hotel adjoining St James Church, Mrs. Benn’s Hotel near the Kabul Gate, with an annexe behind Ludlow Castle, Mr. Rodger’s Hamilton Hotel close to Kashmiri Gate and Laurie’s Hotel beyond the Mori Gate with another within the city at Mori Gate. By 1888 two more hotels, namely the Northbrook Great Eastern Hotel and the United Services Hotel, had come behind St James Church. In the hinterland the Maiden’s Metropolitan Hotel built in 1900 near Ludlow Castle was the most famous. There were also two rest houses in Mehrauli of which one was set up in a Mughal era tomb of Adham Khan. To meet the growing need of touring officials, a dak bungalow was set up in the former post office building south of the Fort.192

Native utilitarian structures such as dharamshalas and serais patronised by wealthy Hindu and Jain merchants continued to be built in the city. They tended to cluster around the Railway Station. In the 1860s a government serai called Queen’s Serai was built close to the Railway Station to its east. It catered to the accommodation of native travellers and European travellers of a lower social standing.193

Contributing to leisure infrastructure were native bazaars, particularly Chandni Chauk, Dariba and Chawri Bazaar that attracted Europeans in search of handcrafted souvenirs, with guidebooks listing prominent shops where good bargains could be had.

192 Spear, op cit., 149
193 The serai was also called Mor Serai and was built through a generous donation by Lala Chunna Mal
Leisure writing: the Delhi Guidebooks

Guidebooks on cities like Agra, Lahore and Delhi were written to provide the reader, particularly travellers, an understanding of the city. They included a historical sketch of the city, profile of its built-heritage and a description of the British interventions in the city.

In case of Delhi, guidebooks were in circulation prior to the Mutiny, with Mr. Beresford's *Beresford's Delhi* published in 1856, being popular with visitors. Post-Mutiny, from 1870s onwards, there was an increase in the number of guidebooks on Delhi as the influx of people to the city increased. Guidebooks were updated as successive writers had additional information to dispel among their readers. In the early 20th century, guidebooks based on late 19th century sources were reprinted for the convenience of invitees to the Delhi Durbar of 1911. Among the well known guidebooks on Delhi that were in circulation were F. Cooper's *Handbook for Delhi*, (1863); A. Harcourt's *The New Guide to Delhi*, (1866, 1873); H.H. Cole's *Architecture of Ancient Delhi*, (1872); Carr Stephen's *The Archaeological and Monumental Remains of Delhi*, (1876), H.G. Keene's *Handbook for visitors to Delhi*, (1882); H.C. Fanshaw's, *Delhi Past and Present*, (1902) and Gordon Risley Hearn's *The Seven Cities of Delhi*, (1906).

The contents of a typical Delhi guidebook included a historical profile of the Delhi region encompassing all the older cities of Delhi with an enclosed map on which the historic sites were located. There was a description of the prominent specimens of Delhi's built-heritage sometimes accompanied with an illustration. The Fort received special attention with a detailed account of its history and architecture. An exclusive guidebook on the Fort, compiled by Gordon Sanderson, *The Red Fort, Delhi: A Guide to the Buildings and Garden* was also available for interested visitors post-1911. Other structures in the walled city finding mention included the Jami Masjid, Kalan Masjid and a modern Jain temple, with some writers dismissing the rest of the built-heritage corpus as "not of sufficient interest.
to the tourist to warrant any notice of them being here inserted."\textsuperscript{194} A book on the Jami Masjid, Aziz-ur-Rahman's \textit{History of Jama Masjid and Interpretation of Muslim Devotion} was also in circulation. In the hinterland, the Jantar Mantar Observatory, Emperor Humayun's Tomb, Nawab Safdarjung's Tomb, Tughlakabad and the Qutub complex were recommended as places of interest. A day by day itinerary covering the historic sites in the Delhi region was included to serve as a useful guide if the visitor was hard pressed for time as in H.A. Newell's \textit{Three Days at Delhi, A Guide to Places of Interest}. Guidebooks reserved a section for "Localities of the Siege"\textsuperscript{195} describing in detail the events and sites of their occurrence and urging visitors to make the Mutiny pilgrimage. The guidebooks contained a section with a detailed account of architectural interventions in the British enclave, including built-form types, roads and civic improvements. Visitors were urged to visit sites of British intervention like the Delhi Institute and the Queen's Garden. A listing of hotels and shops that sold artefacts, shawls, jewellery, and miniature paintings was provided. The inclusion of information of the British enclave, while being of use to a European visitor, also did not fail to draw attention to the contrast between pre-colonial Delhi and Delhi transformed under British rule. Guidebooks began their account of the city "in an inverse manner with a description [...] under the modernizing influence of the British, instead of progressing linearly from historical times to the present day."\textsuperscript{196} This was perhaps a deliberate attempt at projecting the vitality of their rule in the backdrop of the past.

\textbf{The pursuit of antiquarian interests}

With the angst of the Mutiny behind them, Delhi's historic sites again aroused British interest. As early as 1859, when deliberations on the Fort's future were being made, Harriet Tytler, thinking that the Fort buildings were going to be demolished set up her painting equipment in the "little hot weather sleeping room

\textsuperscript{194} A. Harcourt, \textit{The New Guide to Delhi}, (Allahabad, 1866), 25

\textsuperscript{195} For a detailed account, see, Keene, \textit{op cit.}, 67-74
on the second storey above the present Diwan-e Aam, [...]" to paint the scene in the Fort before it was lost for ever. Those who wished to acquaint themselves with Delhi’s history captured its built-heritage through painting, drawing and increasingly from the mid 19th century onwards, through photography. That there was a large section of people interested in visiting sites of Delhi’s built-heritage, is evidenced by a proliferation of printed guidebooks in this phase. Guidebooks suggested a day-by-day itinerary of historic sites together with places of stay and best shops for artefacts.

Apart from a flourishing amateur interest in built-heritage, this phase saw the birth of an organisation, the Archaeological Survey of India, dedicated to the cause of the Subcontinent’s built-heritage. The issue of looking after built-heritage also received unprecedented attention from the highest representative of the Queen in the country as Viceroy Curzon took up the issue of conserving built-heritage with enthusiasm.

The Archaeological Survey of India

Viceroy Canning’s 1860 declaration ordering structures with architectural or historical merit be preserved in the Delhi Fort, was matched by the founding of Archaeological Survey of India (henceforth ASI). Under the ASI’s aegis, historic sites in the Subcontinent, were surveyed with the aim of making available “an accurate description-illustrated by plans, measurements, drawings, or photographs and by copies of inscriptions-of such remains as deserve notice, with the history of them so far as it may be traceable, and a record of the traditions that are retained regarding them.” The survey findings were compiled as reports that

---

196 Dr. Mubarak Ali’s comment on the Lahore Guidebook, that was equally applicable to Delhi.
197 Harriet Tytler – cited in Sattin, op cit., 219
198 There are conflicting dates of the year of the ASI’s founding, from 1860, 1861 and 1865 due to lack of documentary evidence. Alexander Cunningham was appointed as Archaeological Surveyor and headed the organization followed by James Burgess and John Marshall.
were published annually. The reports entailed three aspects, conservation, exploration and research, and epigraphy, their objective being to supplement ongoing archaeological operations on a site. The annual reports became a regular feature under John Marshall from 1902 onwards. These reports meticulously recorded the interventions made on a site thereby furnishing a valuable insight into the transformation process that a site underwent. With time, the ASI’s fieldwork was enlarged to include examination of contemporary Indian buildings to assess the current state of craftsmanship of native craftsmen. The task was assigned to Gordon Sanderson of the ASI, who on account of time constraint confined his survey to parts of Rajasthan, Central and North India. Despite the limited purview, Sanderson reported the existence of a strong craft tradition that was visually conveyed through over ninety photographs and a list of the best craftsmen in places he surveyed. Sanderson’s report is significant considering the time of it’s commissioning that just pre-dated the discussions to be initiated regarding building of New Delhi.

In Delhi, the sites under the charge of the ASI in this phase included imperial structures in the Fort precinct, Emperor Humayun’s Tomb Complex and Nawab Safdarjung’s Tomb. The ASI’s initial work chiefly “concentrated upon rescuing the monuments from the utilitarian purposes to which they have been put and in effacing the evidences of modernisation.” In case of the Fort, the ASI observed that the repairs undertaken by the army along the lines of the Military Works Handbook left a lot to be desired.

---

200 Annual Reports were published with unremitting regularity from 1902 to 1937 except for four years in between from 1930 to 1934. Additionally, a separate series titled, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, was also published from 1919.

201 This proposal came forth in November 1910, from a newly formed India Society, in Britain. For a detailed discussion, see, G.1I.R. Tillotson, The Tradition of Indian Architecture (Delhi 1989), 110-111.

202 Other sites were taken up in the years following 1911.

203 ASI, Annual Report 1903-4, 5.
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Curzon and India’s built heritage

Curzon regarded “one of the primary obligations of Government [...] the conservation of ancient monuments.” Curzon regarded “one of the primary obligations of Government [...] the conservation of ancient monuments.” This view contrasted sharply with the utilitarian approach of the military, often resulting in conflicts between the ASI and the army. Therefore it is hardly surprising that Curzon was extremely critical of the government’s interventions on historic sites where the government “in an excess of exceptional enlightenment or prosperity, spared little money for the fitful repair of ancient monuments [...] but these spasmodic efforts resulted in little more than the collection of a few drawings.” He extensively toured the Subcontinent’s historic sites and issued instructions for the upkeep of built-heritage. In 1904 Curzon was instrumental in passing the ‘Ancient Monuments Preservation Act’ that provided for the protection of monuments and objects of archaeological, historical or artistic merit, bringing several heritage components under its purview with the hope to rid them of acts of vandalism perpetrated by the “barrack-builder, and the military engineer.” The Act had provision for protecting and repairing monuments, prohibition on exporting movable objects of antiquity from the Subcontinent and keeping them in situ and prohibition of excavation of historic sites by untrained persons.

Even before visiting Delhi in his official capacity as Viceroy, Curzon in his speech to the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta spoke of “the horrors that have been perpetrated in the interest of regimental barracks and messes and canteens in the fairy-like pavilions and courts and gardens of Shah Jehan.” During his first official visit to the Delhi Fort, Curzon’s attention was drawn to the state of the

205 Excerpt from Curzon’s speech on ‘Ancient Buildings in India’ delivered at the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1900. Curzon reviewed the callous British attitude towards Indian heritage, with a promise of a better future. The speech formed part of a private publication, Indian Archaeology, 1899-1905. Indian Archaeology, 1899-1905, 86 - cited in Derek Linstrum in ‘The Sacred Past: Lord Curzon and the Indian Monuments’ in South Asian Studies, (London, 1995), 11, 3
206 Indian Archaeology, 1899-1905, 77, - cited in Linstrum, op cit., 3
207 Linstrum, op cit., 12
208 Excerpt from Curzon’s speech in Indian Archaeology, 1899-1905, 78, - cited in Linstrum, op cit., 4
structures in the Fort by Major H.H. Cole, Curator of Ancient Monuments.\textsuperscript{209} Curzon severely criticised the Public Works Department for the repainting done on the ceilings of both the Diwan-e Am and the Diwan-e Khass.\textsuperscript{210} He was also instrumental in bringing back and restoring to the Fort’s Diwan-e Am, some missing panels that had been appropriated during the Mutiny aftermath and getting substitutes made for those still missing.\textsuperscript{211}

SPAB and India’s built-heritage

The SPAB Manifesto of 1877 called upon those dealing with buildings “to put Protection in place of Restoration, to stave off decay by daily care, [...] and show no pretence of other art, and otherwise to resist all tampering with either the fabric or ornament of the building as it stands; [...] to treat our ancient buildings as monuments of a bygone art, created by bygone manners, that modern art cannot meddle with without destroying.”\textsuperscript{212} SPAB’s interest also extended to the Subcontinent’s monuments and in a joint communication by the Society and likeminded organisations to the Secretary of State for India they urged proper classification of monuments, employment of personnel trained in conservation for their care and an annual allocation of funds.\textsuperscript{213} The Society’s greatest worry regarding Indian monuments lay in their being subject to a misplaced zeal for repair executed to perfection at the hands of native craftsmen, who possessed of commendable imitative skills, a practice that went against SPAB’s Manifesto. SPAB representatives visited sites in the Subcontinent where conservation work was ongoing and upon deliberation the Society made a departure from its principles, declaring that Indian built-heritage was not comparable to European medieval heritage. Unlike Europe, traditional building skills were extant in India and could be used to repair “the more modern creations of the Muslim invaders” thus drawing a distinction between the Muslim built-heritage and the “older Hindu

\textsuperscript{209} Louise Nicholson, \textit{The Red Fort, Delhi}, (London, 1989), 114
\textsuperscript{210} \textit{Indian Archaeology, 1899-1905}, 111-112 - cited in Linstrum, \textit{op cit.}, 9
\textsuperscript{211} ibid., 384-405 - cited in Linstrum, \textit{op cit.}, 9
\textsuperscript{212} Excerpt from SPAB’s Manifesto - cited in ASI, \textit{Annual Report 1906-7}, 2
\textsuperscript{213} For details of the correspondence see Linstrum, \textit{op cit.}, 4
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and Buddhist edifices". 214 A SPAB member, visiting Delhi in early 20th century, remarked of the Moti Masjid in the Fort, "The Pearl Mosque at Delhi [...] is [a] casket like gem that stifles you with its unity of beauty [...] I could not wish it repaired differently." 215

The initiation of a conservation programme in the Fort

Military interventions in the Fort had deprived European visitors from seeing its structures in their correct historic, spatial and functional context, as the "bewildered visitor to the palace of the 'Great Mogul' wandered aimlessly about from building to building." 216 Despite its transformation into a military area, the Fort's image as a place of ceremony was not lost, as the Fort still served "on occasions as the noblest and most imperial setting for the highest functions of State, and [...] could not be left in a state of semi-ruin." 217 This remark is an indicator of the likely thrust of any conservation plan to be prepared for the Fort where the thrust would be towards enhancing the worthiness of the Fort's structures and their settings as facilitators of British celebratory functions chiefly the events of the durbars. In 1902 the ASI initiated a conservation plan for the structures in the Fort under the supervision of John Marshall. The plan was directed towards acquisition of as much historic area as possible from the military and its subsequent formal delineation by a barrier to check further military intervention. The area acquired was designated as an Archaeological Area 218 [Fig.3.40a, b]. The implementation of the plan got a boost once it was decided to host some celebrations in the Archaeological Area of the Fort in connection with the 1911 Coronation Durbar 219 and the conservation plan was completely implemented. The announcement of the transfer of the capital of British India to Delhi seemingly did not boost the Fort's status as a historic precinct nor did it

214 ASI, Annual Report 1906-7, 1907-8, 1-3
215 Mrs. C.J. Herringham in a letter, 9 February 1907 - cited in Linstrum, op cit., 10
216 ASI, Annual Report 1911-1912, 7
217 ASI, Annual Report 1906-7, 2
218 ibid, 7
accelerate its conservation programme. Conservation works continued in the Fort at the same pace till the outbreak of the First World War, after which they took a backseat and only consolidation and repair of individual structures was taken up.\textsuperscript{220} In fact the use of the Fort as a place of ceremony declined with the building of New Delhi's capitol. The Fort was used as a prison where Indian nationalists were imprisoned and tried.

An examination of the ASI's \textit{Annual Reports} reveals that the ASI's conservation plan entailed evacuation of the site by the military, removal of post-Mutiny additions whether buildings or roads, and conservation of the site including its buildings, gardens and open spaces. It also included restoration of the old ground levels as far as possible given the constraints of existing military structures. Further, it was proposed that the location of demolished courtyards and passages whose vestiges remained as plinths or could be confirmed through pre-Mutiny maps of the Fort be indicated by planting "pleasing lawns and shrubberies."\textsuperscript{221} This substitution of building elements with planting to indicate missing parts, while attempted to recreate the physical extent of the former courtyards and colonnades, however, did not convey the original spatial ambience, despite Sanderson's rather optimistic assertion that the Diwan-e Am quadrangle's Mughal spatial character was "suggested by a pleasant stretch of lawn and the gorgeous colonnades [...] by screens of flowering shrubs."\textsuperscript{222} The planting comprised firstly "an encircling inga kept closely trimmed, so as to sharply define the area of the former buildings. This is backed by rows of acalypher and duranta, while behind these are taller shrubs such as Murya, Havelia, Bougainvillea, (the compact variety), Hybiscus, Tecoma etc. At full growth the effect should be very fine."\textsuperscript{223}

\textsuperscript{219} A discussion on the preparations in the Fort for the \textit{Durbar} has been taken up in a separate Chapter of the Thesis.
\textsuperscript{220} Inference drawn from ASI's \textit{Annual Reports} after 1911
\textsuperscript{221} ASI, \textit{Annual Report 1911-12}, 8
\textsuperscript{222} ibid., 16
\textsuperscript{223} ibid., 15
The British notion of treating a historic built-form as an object in a landscaped setting as seen in the remodeling of garden sites into public parks, also extended to structures in the Fort. Each pavilion in the Archaeological Area was seen in isolation in its immediate environs that were fashioned by English landscape ideas. The introduction of horticulture provided the desired setting, in conformity with prevailing tastes, for viewing the surviving remains [Fig. 3.41]. While the conservation plan focused on the restoration of individual pavilions, the open spaces were provided a park-like setting, thereby detracting from their original conception as an integrated composition.\textsuperscript{224} The structures taken up for conservation included the Hammam, the Moti Masjid, the Shah Burj and the Sawan and Bhadon pavilions of the Hayat Baksh Bagh. Structures including the Naqqarkhana, the Rang Mahal and the Mumtaz Mahal were included in the Archaeological Area following 1908, after which attention was directed towards their conservation.

The execution of the conservation plan was not smooth as archaeological initiatives were overshadowed by military concerns. The military delayed the removal of its additions from the Archaeological Area, like the Battery on the eastern terrace was not removed till 1913. The military also continued to occupy the servants' quarters and used the roads it had laid in the Archaeological Area. It disallowed reintroduction of water in the tanks and channels, unless covered with kerosene to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. It also did not permit disposal of water on the ground below the Fort, thereby prompting ASI to recycle the water.\textsuperscript{225} The conservation work was also affected by the fact that some movable features had been removed from the Fort premises to alternate locations in the city and even to Britain. They included the elephant statue and the marble basin that had been setup as urban embellishments in the remodeled Queen's Garden. The mosaic panels of the Diwan-e Am had found a place as museum pieces in South Kensington Museum in Britain. The setbacks notwithstanding, the ASI went about its work in the Archaeological Area. Despite the Fort's part conversion into a

\textsuperscript{224} For a detailed discussion on the Fort's conservation plan, see, Mukherjee, \textit{op cit.}, 212-236
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historic precinct, its image as a power center prevailed as “Delhi is still the centre of India, so is the old Mughal Palace [...] the centre of Delhi – and it is very important that the people of Delhi should see our garrison in the Fort and know that the city is at the mercy of the guns in front of Lahore Gate.”

The emergence of garden conservation

As has already been discussed, easy accessibility was an important consideration for remodelling a Mughal garden into a public park. It followed that sites that were not accessible to public either due to their relatively inconvenient location or where public access was denied, were not remodelled. Such sites were left either unattended for example the Talkatora Bagh or put to inappropriate use in the years following the Mutiny such as the Hayat Baksh Bagh in the Fort. It was not until the beginning of the 20th century, that gardens began to be appreciated in their entirety as historic sites. The ASI prepared conservation schemes for gardens that were not appropriated for conversion into public parks under impetus from Curzon.

Garden conservation schemes were based on Sir John Marshall’s directive as outlined in his ‘Conservation Manual for the Care of Ancient Monuments’ of 1902-03. Marshall averred, “In laying out or restoring ancient Indian gardens, it is all important to pursue the essential character of the original, [...] But it is not necessary to reproduce with pedantic accuracy the original appearance of the garden in all its particulars [...] Since the days of the Mughals, horticulture has made immense progress [...] concessions are rightly to be made to modern taste and the wishes of the community who frequent the garden. An officer should endeavour to observe the happy mean between antiquarian accuracy on the one hand and aesthetic beauty on the other.”

226 Fanshawe, 1906, - cited in Gupta, op cit., 139
227 For a detailed account of the garden, see, Villiers-Stuart, op cit., 114-116
spatial ensemble. Excavations were carried out to determine the remains of the permanent built-forms whether structures or parts of the water system and broken or missing parts were reconstructed. On the other hand, the details of the open spaces were overlooked as replanting was not undertaken accurately with both the planting location and planting type being altered. The management of water systems did not conform to the original rather water tanks and electric power driven pumping systems were installed. The use of the plantation to represent missing built-forms, courtyards and colonnades while being an innovative attempt at three-dimensional reconstruction, did not convey the exact position of the missing parts rather it created only a territorial semblance of the original space.²²⁹

The built-forms were reduced to objects in the landscape as the horticultural management of the site saw replanting being done on English landscape design ideas with the grounds “grasped over as a lawn in the English fashion”²³⁰ and trees and shrubs planted to enhance the picturesque value of the site. The site was thus presented in an altered context. This approach had its critics in Europeans like Villiers-Stuart who declared that horticulture, while resulted in clearing the site “of much accumulated overgrowth and rubbish,” was “not an art at all, but only the science of improving the form and flavour, scent and colour, and is quite apart from the garden-craft which afterwards can in combination and arrangement make use of such knowledge with artistic skill.” They also appealed to “revive the dying art of Indian gardening [....] As a living example of Mughal art at its best, it would mean more, educationally and artistically, than all the priceless Mughal treasures locked away, isolated, in many fine but lifeless museums.”²³¹ The criticism against the approach notwithstanding, the British treatment of historic garden sites that were not remodelled into public parks was perhaps among the

²²⁹ For discussion, see, Mukherjee, op cit., 227-228
²³¹ ibid., 85, 89, 25
earliest endeavours in garden archaeology with an awareness of the garden as an integral part of the site. 232

In Delhi, the ASI took up the conservation of two Mughal garden sites, the Hayat Baksh Bagh in the Fort and the Shalimar Bagh in the hinterland. 233 Both gardens were inaccessible to the public, the former being part of the garrison and the latter sited too far from civil lines to be integrated into the leisure circuit. It would certainly not be far-fetched to suggest that of all the garden sites in Delhi, the Shalimar Bagh was altered the least from the original. 234

The conservation of the Hayat Baksh Bagh in the Fort

The Hayat Baksh Bagh formed a part of the Fort’s Archaeological Area [Refer Fig. 4.33]. The military occupation of the garden had resulted in a part of the garden, towards the west, being built over with barracks and the rest becoming a barrack-yard. The military intervention destroyed the relationship of the garden with the surrounding structures. The ASI’s conservation plan for the garden aimed at “restoring it to a semblance of its former self” 235 [Fig. 3.42a]. The site had piles of accumulated earth and debris that had to be removed before work could begin. It is possible to reconstruct the sequence in which the conservation work was undertaken from the recordings in the ASI’s Annual Reports of the 20th century. 236

In 1903-4 trial digging revealed existence of old water channels and excavations were taken up the following year. The first structure taken up was the central tank holding the Zafar Mahal [Fig. 3.42b]. The tank was cleared of debris and exposed in 1904-5 and its depth was increased. By 1907-8 the paving around the garden’s two pavilions, Sawan and Bhadon, was laid [Fig. 3.42c]. The site level was lowered below the causeways and the surface dressed for planting. In 1910-11 the garden was grassed and planted, in keeping with the prevailing horticultural

232 For a discussion, see Roberts, op cit., 55-57, 60-62
233 For a detailed account of ASI’s interventions on Shalimar Bagh, see, Volume-II of the Thesis, 25-41
234 For a discussion, see Roberts, op cit., 43, 45-64
235 ASI, Annual Report 1905-6, 3
practices [Fig. 3.42d-f] and water was reintroduced into the garden. Water from old wells in the garden, was lifted by electric pumps into R.C.C. water tanks raised behind the Bhadon pavilion. Planting was used to convey the position of missing parts. The missing colonnade north and south of the garden was indicated by “dense masses of flowering shrubs, while a screen of conifers, backed by Gravillia trees, masks the iron railing which surrounds the area, and will, at full growth, screen off the unsightly modern barracks from the gardens.” Following the 1911 Durbar, improvement works continued on the site that focussed mainly on the repair of broken or missing parts of causeways and water channels. The availability of water kept the garden in a state of verdure. The conservation plan transformed the military barrack-yard into a well-ordered garden whose regularity of plantation, grass lawns and pathways had a rather frigid feel in comparison to the originally designed sensual ambience.

3.7.3 Civic improvement measures in the city and hinterland

The whole issue of civic improvement was dealt with in a skewed manner with the main aim being ensuring the safety and health of the British enclaves. A bulk of the civic improvements was implemented in the British military and civilian areas in the city proper, and in civil lines. Adoption of a holistic approach in civic improvement matters that examined the whole gamut of urbanism in its entirety eluded Delhi as there was little coordination among Municipal officials, imperial government and provincial government representatives. 238

236 The following account of the conservation works taken up and completed on the site has been drawn from ASI’s Annual Reports from the year 1903-4 to 1936-37
237 ASI, Annual Report 1911-12, 9
238 Friction between the government and the municipal agencies was characteristic of towns and cities across British India in the 19th century
Improvement of public health

By the mid-19th century the British concern for the safety of their troops and the civilian population on health grounds increased due to awareness of diseases and the factors contributing to their dissemination.\(^{239}\) Healthcare concerns were propelled by the British confrontation with disease and death during the siege and furthered by the Victorian obsession with cleanliness. The Victorian belief that that absence of fresh air, water and light was the fundamental cause of ill health was transmitted to the Subcontinent.\(^{240}\) An 1863 report on the sanitary state of the military in the Subcontinent, *Report of the Royal Commission on the Sanitary State of the Army in India*, established that it was “impossible to separate the question of health, as it relates to troops, from the sanitary condition of the native population, especially as regards the occurrence of epidemics.”\(^{241}\) The Sanitary Commission recommended guidelines to keep areas of British habitat free from infection. These guidelines included maintenance of physical distance from native quarters, bifurcation in the water-supply lines and provision of public parks and it was believed that collectively these measures would ensure clean air and freedom from affliction.\(^{242}\) Sanitary concerns that had been marginal in Delhi during the last phase came to the forefront. The increased emphasis on health issues was because of the presence of European troops in the city proper. Elsewhere in the Subcontinent, the cantonment layout underwent a change to provide an adequately lit, ventilated and drained area for European troops. In Delhi the changes could not be implemented in full measure owing to spatial constraints in the Fort where the European troops were stationed. It followed that attention be diverted towards improving conditions in the city proper. In a complete turn-around of Greathed’s report on Delhi, the 1863 report referred to Delhi as “irremediably vicious” on account of “bad air”, “badly constructed and ill-ventilated habitations” and “poor

\(^{239}\) For a detailed discussion, see, King, *op cit.*, 97-122

\(^{240}\) In the mid 19th century, the working class in Britain also had no access to drainage and clean water and lived amidst the threat of endemic disease. Victorian Britain adopted the 18th century medical theory of Dr. Pringle, that attributing ill health to humidity and lack of fresh air, water and light. This theory was also brought to the Empire.

\(^{241}\) Oldenburg, *op cit.*, 99
The indigenous city became a subject of close examination and a recipient of improvements to make it conducive for the army.

Concepts of cleanliness began to make their way into the native psyche and the city was perceived as unhealthy. By the 1870s the native elite became aware of the lack of sanitation in the city and its effects on their health and they criticized the Municipality for allowing the dirty water runoff to mingle with well water. The native press was also vocal about the inadequacies on this front and took the Municipality to task for its partisan attitude towards civil lines where large sums of money were spent on building “drains of minor importance” while neglecting the indigenous city. It was increasingly being felt that the solution lay in installing “sound drainage and ventilation schemes. These, united with the fresh water supply, ought to make Delhi the healthiest city in India.” This solution echoed the model developed by Sir Edwin Chadwick for combating disease in British cities and was exported to the Empire for replication everywhere including Delhi.

Elements of urban form perceived as a threat to public health

Indigenous elements of urban form namely, the city wall and gates and the *muhallas* with their built-form types and linkages were perceived as stumbling blocks that did not conform to Victorian planning regulations. The regulations centred on provision of wide roads, open spaces developed as public parks to act as lungs in the built fabric and built-form with unimpeded access to ventilation and light. The 1873 report by the Punjab Sanitary Commissioner was undoubtedly

---

242 Narayani Gupta, ‘The British Town-planners and India’ in Hasan and Gupta, ed., *op cit.*, 239
245 *Urdu Akhbaar*, 16 December, 1871 - cited in Prashad, *op cit.*, 124
246 Colonel Cracroft - cited in Goodfriend in Singh and Dhamija, *op cit.*, 28
inspired by the Victorian ideal as it observed that "it is a fundamental principle in town building that every house should have access to air in front and rear, and a small piece of ground at the back entirely unoccupied by buildings. [...] this principle cannot be neglected in towns without most serious injury to the health and physique of the population."\textsuperscript{248} It naturally followed that if the city was to conform to the Victorian model of a healthy place, transformations in its urban form were inevitable.

The city wall

The British perception of the city wall ranged from the military viewpoint of a security cordon to the civilian opinion of an obstacle in the realization of improvement schemes both for the city and hinterland. Delhi Municipality wanted the wall to go in the interest of public health as it was seen as an impediment to ventilating the city as per Victorian norms. Colonel Cracroft, Commissioner of Delhi in 1872, saw the wall as a hurdle in realizing his goal of making Delhi a more attractive city by effective development of the nazul property.\textsuperscript{249} His proposal for the hinterland entailed laying a public garden by removing the wall between Delhi Gate and Kabul Gate, and making available sites for building by bringing down the northern wall. The scheme could not see fruition as the military authorities were convinced of the wall’s utility as a fortification. The issue turned contentious as the Municipality disagreed with the army. The only concession granted by the military was filling up of the ditch outside the Ajmeri Gate.

The military demolished sections of the wall not for tackling health concerns, but for facilitating the railways. The Calcutta, Kabul and Mori Gates and portions of the wall along the Ajmeri Gate were removed. In 1881 when the Delhi Municipality cleared sections on either side of the Lahore Gate and also wanted to

\textsuperscript{247} Among the measures outlined by Chadwick were provision of water supply, drainage, refuse disposal and removal of functions like slaughter houses, leather factories and burial grounds away from habitable areas. Oldenburg, \textit{op cit.}, 98-99

\textsuperscript{248} Punjab Sanitary Commissioner's Report - cited in Goodfriend in Singh and Dhamija, \textit{op cit.}, 28

\textsuperscript{249} Gupta, \textit{op cit.}, 87-88
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demolish the Delhi Gate, permission was not given.\textsuperscript{250} Robert Clarke, another Municipal Commissioner like his predecessor Cracroft, proposed bringing down the wall and the Lahore Gate to enable linking Chandni Chauk and Sadar Bazaar via a grand street. His ambition remained unfulfilled as permission to remove the wall was not forthcoming. Clarke also suggested funding drainage works by selling sites that could be obtained by clearing the wall between the Lahore and Ajmeri Gates. Once again permission was not given. With time, the wall's historic value was also realised and it was also suggested that the section around the Kashmiri Gate be conserved for posterity.\textsuperscript{251} The Municipality managed to build a square, named Clarkeganj after its enterprising champion, beyond the wall in 1892. Clarkeganj's plots were auctioned by the Municipality over a period of ten years. Even as late as 1905 when the Municipality wanted to remove a section of the city wall between the Kabul and Ajmeri Gates, the railways presented a barrier that prevented a smooth transition from the city to the hinterland. Therefore the wall could not be removed due to lack of coordination between the Municipality and imperial government.

The muhallas

To make the ambitious goal of transforming Delhi into the healthiest city in India a reality, the urban form of the city warranted a close scrutiny. The muhallas were critically examined and discovered to be the biggest impediment towards achieving the Victorian civic ideal of improving public health. Although the British settlement in the hinterland was separated from the native quarters by an elaborate \textit{cordon sanitaire}, yet the native areas could not be entirely avoided as the Europeans frequented the civic space north of Chandni Chauk. The native quarter's urban form was regarded as haphazard with "an entire disregard for building regulations. People appear to build where they please without any regard to order or arrangement; houses stand higgledy-piggledy, with dark narrow

\textsuperscript{250} ibid., 88,170
\textsuperscript{251} ibid., 170-171
passages between them, inaccessible to light and air." An additional irritant were the ruins of razed structures and accumulated piles of debris as areas were cleared for military occupation and the railways. Debris removal was necessary before any interventions could be made on the cleared sites. The ill effects generated in the city's several muhallas were pervasive beyond their own domain affecting both native and European health.

The Delhi Municipality's mandate made it responsible for undertaking urban improvement measures. Improvements could not be taken up in earnest in the native quarters, especially in the early years of the Municipality's inception. As early as 1867 a Municipal decree authorised the Commissioner to order razing dilapidated property, while another order prohibited building thatched roofs as a precaution against fire, however, the orders were not implemented. On the contrary, building activity continued unabated and encroachments remained undetected till "they render large and wide streets narrow enough for cart traffic" In 1884, the Municipality was empowered to frame its own bylaws related to building and it came up with regulations pertaining to erection of buildings, shifting milch cattle to free plots outside the city and removal of slaughter houses and burial and cremation grounds. The plague scare of 1898 empowered the Municipality to implement regulations related to segregation, treatment and inspection of private premises to contain the threat.

Healthcare infrastructure

Hospitals were built by the government and through private enterprise. Military hospitals included a Station Hospital within the Fort precinct for British troops, a convalescent sanatorium in Hindu Rao's House, Indian Infantry Hospital at

---


253 Delhi Municipality's observation - cited in Gupta, op cit., 170

254 A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 194-195
The missions were also actively engaged in providing healthcare to the civilians both native and European. For the natives there was the Baptist Mission Hospital operating since 1876 from premises on the maidan fronting the Fort. The amalgamated S.P.G. and Cambridge Missions built a zenana hospital in Chandni Chauk in 1885 that was later shifted to a site carved out of the Tees Hazari Bagh. In 1906 individuals contributed to build a hospital, Victoria Zenana Hospital, for women from respectable Muslim families near the Jami Masjid. The most prominent civil hospital was the Delhi Civil Hospital, also called the Dufferin Hospital, built north of the Jami Masjid in 1892. The healthcare needs of European civilian population were met through the mission hospital shifted to the Tees Hazari Bagh. Plans were made for constructing a civil hospital and an Infectious Diseases Hospital in civil lines, but the schemes did not see fruition. Health of native sex workers, whose quarters were located on Esplanade Row, was also an area of concern and under the Cantonment Act of 1864 a Lock Hospital was opened for them in 1870. The Municipality also opened a poor house to cater to those who had been adversely affected during the famine years in the 1860s.

The provision of hospitals and the coercive persuasion to adopt western medical practices, for instance inoculation notwithstanding, the natives depended on the indigenous systems of medicine, Ayurvedic and Yunani, practiced by native

255 ibid, 214
256 ibid. 214-215
257 Gupta, op cit., 165
258 Under the Cantonment Act of 1864, all prostitutes, who were registered with the government and provided services to Europeans, particularly troops, were entitled to treatment for venereal diseases at Lock Hospitals. In Delhi, the quarters of the prostitutes were located in Esplanade Row, a newly built thoroughfare, facing the Fort and its barracks. Kenneth Ballhatchet, Race, Sex and Class under the Raj—Imperial attitudes and policies and their critics, 1793-1905, (London, 1980), 58-59
259 Incentives were offered to natives to get inoculated, with the city's elite being roped in to make the programme a success. Gupta, op cit., 165
physicians, both *Vails* and *Hakims*. Personalised pharmacies such as the Hindustani Dawakhana in Ballimaran handed out remedies.

**Water Supply**

Clean potable water was an essential requirement for keeping good health as it kept water-borne diseases in check. Both the city and civil lines continued to rely on water from the canal, wells and tanks, in the 1860s and 1870s, despite the supply being scarce, erratic and not potable. Considering the havoc that unclean water could play with the health of troops, the Punjab Sanitary Committee recommended the installation of a new water works system in 1869. The scheme, found unanimous support from native elite and was implemented in 1889. The Jamuna water was filtered and stored in a reservoir at Chandrawal from where it was pumped and lifted to another storage tank built on the Ridge, near Hindu Rao’s House. Water was supplied to the city and later to its western hinterland. The water needs of civil lines were fulfilled by the canal and it did not benefit from the new scheme until 1911, the year coinciding with the 1911 Coronation Durbar. By early 20th century Delhi was being supplied with potable water, though the demand far exceeded the supply as the population rose and the role of water in sanitation was enhanced.

**Sanitation**

The Municipality declared the 17th century intramural drains of the city as obsolete. The Public Works Department engineers filled them up and replaced them with a network of surface drains that ran in the city’s *muhallas*. The scheme was locally opposed by both sweepers and natives with the latter refusing connections to the new network. In 1887, a sanitary inspector inspecting the city’s drains described them as “merely extended cesspools” from which a “black semi-
liquid deposit" emitted a noxious odour. Further, the openings to the drains allowed the "concentrated sewer gases" to escape thereby accounting for high death rate in the city.\textsuperscript{262} The new drains of the \textit{muhallas} and also those of the Daryaganj barracks were manually flushed to empty into two subsoil sewers, one running along the length of Chandni Chauk from the Fatehpuri Masjid to Delhi Gate, and the other encircling the city along the ditch to meet the first sewer at the Delhi Gate. Sewage was then discharged into the Jamuna with some sent to sullage farms near the District Jail for use in cultivation. The Chief Commissioner's Office ordered that discharge of sewage in the river was to take place south of the Fort and not near the bathing \textit{ghats} north of the Fort and water Bastion that were in close proximity to the European quarters. The Fort and the European quarter of the city were provided with an exclusive subsoil sewer that discharged at Salimgarh, with the explicit order that on no account "drainage from any native quarter [...] be allowed to enter Salimgarh Channel."\textsuperscript{263} The system was planned keeping an appreciable distance between civil lines and the points of discharge of sewage. An extramural drainage scheme was also planned for Sabzi Mandi, Sadar Bazaar and Paharganj. Plans to install a water carriage system were also on the anvil for civil lines as a matter of policy, while denying it to the city proper as it was felt that it would be wasted on natives.\textsuperscript{264}

The streets, particularly those frequented by Europeans such as Chandni Chauk were swept and watered. Refuse was collected and carried manually by sweepers to receptacles called \textit{dalaos} located at various points in the city, from where it was taken by bullock carts to the city periphery and left to be trenched and subsequently carted to farms. The process saw a brief technological input between 1890 and 1896 when the Municipality used a light tramway to carry refuse from the Ajmeri and Lahore Gates \textit{dalaos} to Malkaganj landfill. The scheme was

\textsuperscript{261} The canal was being used for bathing, while the well water had turned brackish. With the implementation of the new water supply system the Canal was built over in the 1880s.

\textsuperscript{262} Delhi Municipal Commission Proceedings, DMC Progs, 19 Sept. 1887 – cited in Prashad, \textit{op cit.}, 119

\textsuperscript{263} Gupta, \textit{op cit.}, 162
discarded owing to financial non-viability as economics took precedence over native health concerns and the manual system of refuse disposal was restored. The sanitary landfills that had been receiving refuse since the last phase were now critically examined as they were seen as health hazards. The Malkaganj landfill was singled out to be shifted owing to its proximity to civil lines. Its new location was proposed to be south of the city proper, as far removed physically from civil lines as possible.  

A further impetus to infrastructure came through the three Durbars, particularly the 1911 Coronation Durbar. Not only did the hinterland venue, but also civil lines and those sections of the city through which the imperial entourage was scheduled to pass, became recipients of improvements like water supply, sanitation, communication, road widening and encroachment removal. The bela since long identified as the source of chronic malaria received improvements in preparedness of the Durbar. Previously suggested measures to tackle malaria had involved either bringing the Jamuna back to its original course or draining the bela. These had been turned down for lack of funds. The Coronation Durbar propelled action as the bela was drained and planted to re-enact the Mughal ritual of darshan with British royalty as protagonists.

**Lighting**

Electric power came to the city during the 1903 Durbar. Before the advent of electric supply, the main streets of the city were lit with oil lamps, a practice that departed from the pre-Mutiny use of kerosene that had kept the streets brightly lit.

---

264 These plans were made in the early 20th century and also included New Delhi in their purview. Prashad, op cit., 123
265 Despite the traditional method of parading refuse throughout the city on bullock carts being visually offensive and a health hazard, when it came to the native city, economics won over health concerns. For a discussion, see, Prashad, ibid., 126-127
266 The new site was to become offensive to the British once New Delhi came up south of the indigenous city in the early 20th century.
267 The bela was a swamp that skirted the Fort's eastern side, after the Jamuna changed its course and flowed away from the city wall.
Inadequate lighting made the city dark and unsafe, thus inviting criticism of the Municipality’s selectiveness regarding the streets to be lit. By 1912, all the main roads in the city were electrically lit. Public buildings and houses in civil lines and those of native elite in the city were also provided electricity connections. The minor roads in the city and civil lines continued to be lit using kerosene.

Communication infrastructure

The Mutiny brought the issue of communication into spotlight. It was realised in retrospect that a good communication network of postal and telegraph system was needed in cities that had been centres of the revolt. In Delhi the number of telegraph offices, apart from the head office in civil lines behind Ludlow Castle, rose to nine. There were twenty-one post offices, with the head post office built on the site of the old magazine in the city, handling a bulk of the mail.268

3.8 Conclusion

This phase saw the restructuring of Delhi’s built-environment with the limited aim of making it conform to the British concept of a secure and healthy city in areas where the Europeans resided. The urban transformations were markers of British identity and made their presence felt throughout the city and the hinterland. Architecture, planning and urban design became tools that manipulated the city’s urban form first under a military policy of aggression and later under civilian rule with emphasis on civic improvements that were biased. With the passage of time as the Mutiny became history, architecture and planning ideas created spectacular public displays where the Raj’s unambiguous resolve to hold India was demonstrated. Delhi’s British durbars were instrumental in perpetuating the permanency of British rule.

268 A Gazetteer of Delhi (1912), op cit., 167
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4.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the built-environment associated with the institution of the durbar, a Mughal court ritual, in its reinterpreted incarnation under the British. In a departure from the Mutiny events where the natives had engaged in a fierce battle with the British, the natives now joined the British to participate in public spectacles in the form of the durbar. British durbars became markers of British identity following the immediate post-Mutiny years relying on architecture to instil in native consciousness the legitimacy of British rule. In a departure from the aggressive reprisals of the immediate post-Mutiny years, public displays of ceremony and festivity that underlined durbars became the new and equally effective medium of showcasing imperial authority. The durbars relied on British planning and architecture ideas to create the desired setting not only through permanent interventions but also more importantly, considering the event's transient nature, as temporary architecture for the enactment of durbar rituals. Their temporary nature notwithstanding, holding of durbars was projected as proof of British organisational skills as large unused tracts of land were appropriated and transformed into grand venues. Mock-up durbar cities while

recalling the disparity between the native and imperial territories of their permanent counterparts also were proof of the British ability to bring order into the landscape. Durbar architecture despite its provisional nature created an ambience of formality and grandeur and heralded the creation of a permanent British architectural identity that was to be manifested in New Delhi.

The chapter focuses on the prominent durbars held in Delhi in 1877, 1903 and 1911. Prompting Delhi's selection as the durbar venue was its traditional association as a Mughal seat of power. The centrality of Delhi brought it in closer proximity to the main centres of the revolt enabling the message of British supremacy to be delivered more effectively than from distant Presidency towns. The most significant reason perhaps was related to Delhi's role in the Mutiny as a major centre of the revolt and its eventual subjugation. The durbar served as a reminder of the British might as the revolt had been crushed. The chapter goes onto examine the concomitant transformation of Delhi's northern hinterland into a vast tented city through mobilisation of men and resources and changes in the city proper to establish the extent of the durbar's domain from the city proper to the ephemeral city in the hinterland.

4.2 Delhi as durbar venue

Before examining the Delhi Durbars in detail, it is pertinent to discuss the British interpretation of the institution of the durbar. In its Mughal format, a durbar was a public ritual enacted in the court by which the Mughal emperor strengthened his bond with his subjects. He drew them into the imperial fold through acts of incorporation externalised as rituals such as salutation, offerings and darshan. The British took a materialistic view of Mughal durbar ceremonies where acts of salutations and offerings were perceived as acts of payment for "rights relating to

---

2 For a detailed discussion on the Mughal durbar symbolism, see, Bernard S. Cohn, "Representing Authority in Victorian Britain" in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, ed., The Invention of Tradition, (Cambridge, 1983), 168-173
their trading activities." At the same time, they did not ignore the durbar’s potential as a medium of overt demonstration. From the 18th century till prior to the Mutiny, Company officials held meetings with natives that were loosely modelled on durbars but were reinterpreted as acts of subordination of natives. The resumption of durbars in the post-Mutiny era followed the 1858 proclamation marking the beginning of the Raj (Crown rule) and the emergence of a new relationship between the British Crown and its Indian subjects. It became imperative to eliminate any ambiguity regarding the British position as undisputed rulers of the subcontinent. In an immediate follow-up of their Mutiny triumph, the British held a durbar in Lucknow in 1859 to re-establish themselves as rulers of Avadh. With time, the repressive military measures of the immediate post-Mutiny years were replaced by durbars to legitimize British rule. The durbars were formalised and began to reflect the emerging new sensibility as the offerings included items imported from industrial Britain and the rituals comprised the granting of British titles and knighthoods.

The British association with Delhi’s durbars dates to the early 19th century when East India Company officials participated in the durbars of the Mughal rulers in the Qila. Non-observance of durbar protocol was viewed seriously as a Delhi Resident was removed from office among charges that he violated Mughal court etiquette by not dismounting at the Naqqarkhana and rode under its gateway. Post-Mutiny government durbars in Delhi were rooted in a new political context. As the myth of the Mughal emperor’s semi-divine persona lay shattered, the British hoped the 1877 durbar would “place the Queen’s authority upon the

---

3 ibid, 169
4 The Government of India Act of 2nd August 1858 transferred the East India Company’s rights in India to the British Crown.
6 The durbar procession of King Akbar Shah II in 1810 had Company representatives participating as honored guests, riding through the city on richly caparisoned elephants. Data drawn from a miniature ‘Akbar II’s Durbar Procession’ from the collection Delhi Vol. 3A 1911-1912 D.G.A.S.I. C222 - 432/2001 ASI Photo Archives
7 Carr Stephen, The Archaeological and Monumental Remains of Delhi, (Calcutta, 1876), 127
ancient throne of the Mughals, with which the imagination and tradition of [our] Indian subjects associate the splendour of supreme power."\(^8\)

Each of the three durbars organised in Delhi was in celebration of a historical event. The 1877 Imperial Assemblage was organised by Lord Lytton to declare Queen Victoria, adorned with the title Kaisar-e-Hind, as Empress of India. The 1903 Durbar marked the coronation of King-Emperor Edward VII and was organized at the behest of Viceroy Curzon. The 1911 Durbar was organized under Viceroy Hardinge to mark the coronation of King George V as Emperor and Queen Mary as Empress of India, in the royal couple’s presence.

4.3 Planning and building mock-up durbar cities

The durbars were not ad-hoc events but had spatial and functional pre-requisites that entailed laying out the venue as a temporary city. Sufficient area was needed to accommodate the expected assemblage ranging from over 84,000 people in 1877 to 250,000 in 1911.\(^9\) For the 1877 Durbar, camps covered a semi-circular area of 5 miles with the railway station in the city proper as the point of origin.\(^10\)

The spatial organisation of the camps was based on the observance of hierarchy. The durbar area tended to spill over from the physical confines of the hinterland venue into the surrounding urban space of the city. The city proper also hosted some durbar rituals for which the chosen venues had to be prepared. Considering the durbar’s spatial demands, it is worthwhile to consider whether any prototypes influenced the planning and architecture of the venue.

There is no recorded evidence of any influence, whether indigenous or European, that inspired the durbar layouts. However, it would not be anomalous to compare the exercise to two events that shared a similitude with the durbars thus bolstering their claim as possible prototypes. The first was the organisation of the Mughal

---

8 Lord Lytton in 1876, in a letter to Queen Victoria - cited in Cohn, op cit., 187-188
9 King, op cit., 228
10 Cohn, op cit., 195
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camp when the court was on the move, whose formal spatial delineation could have inspired the venue layout. The second were contemporaneous European, namely British and French, industrial exhibitions whose pageant-like nature relied on an overt display of innovative architectural and engineering enterprise to create public extravaganzas. Like the exhibitions that were based on the premise that a confident display of industrial technology would inspire customer confidence and transmit a feel-good impulse among customers, the British envisaged durbars as festive exhibitions designed to inspire confidence in their new subjects about British rule.

4.3.1 The durbar venue

The site that was selected as the durbar venue in 1877 was symbolically appropriate for hosting the event as it had been the ground of military action during the siege of Delhi and its association as a Mutiny site was bound to reinforce British authority. The site lay west of the Ridge, extending from the Jamuna edge at Wazirabad to Jagalpur, east to Haiderpur and south to Sabzi Mandi [Fig.4.1a, b]. It was retained for the durbars that followed the 1877 Durbar with addition of area to accommodate the increasing scale of events. Dotting the site were a hundred odd villages, including Dahirpur, Baroloe, Badlee, Malikpur, Jharodha, Mukundpur, Jahangirpur and Bhalswa that were cleared to prepare the site for the event. Given the transient nature of the durbar, interventions on the site were temporary and resulted in cardboard architecture.
4.3.2 The durbar layout

The durbar layout\(^{14}\) [Fig. 4.2] was dictated by formality and grandeur with the scheme's pride of place reserved for the highest representative of the British Crown, namely the Viceroy in 1877 and 1903 and the King-Emperor in 1911. Social and occupational hierarchy was adhered to through prescribed positioning of people and objects that recalled the inviolable Mughal court etiquette. Proximity to the Crown representative was indicative of enhanced status. Further, in a manner that echoed territorial delineations at the urban level, the durbar space was also divided into British and native sections. Camps of the British elite were concentrated on the site of the old Rajpur Cantonment with the Najafgarh Canal running through its middle. Here the centrally placed imperial camp established the camp's spatial order. Native participants were allocated sites at the fringes of the durbar area in 1877, the distance of each native camp from the imperial camp being in strict accordance with its participant's standing as a recipient of honours fixed by the British. In the 1903 Durbar native participants were allotted a site beyond Ferozabad, while in the 1911 Durbar a site northwest of the Ridge and west of the old Rajpur Cantonment was reserved for them.\(^{15}\)

The camp layout reflected the British and native approaches towards spatial planning [Fig. 4.3a, b]. Echoing the cantonment and civil station layouts, the British camps had straight roads with tents lining their edges and open spaces developed as lawns with flowers, some imported from Britain while some were supplied by the botanical gardens at Saharanpur and Delhi as in 1877. The native camps, reminiscent of the muhallas came up more spontaneously. Native participants had to carry their own equipage and had the option to lay out their camps as they deemed fit. Perhaps, the lack of enforcement of a unified system of planning was a deliberate act to bring to the fore the sharp contrast between the two approaches, thereby lending weight to the perception of the native approach as disorganised. Observers like Wheeler, official chronicler of the event, could not

\(^{14}\) Data drawn from Map Delhi Durbar 1911

\(^{15}\) ibid., 224
but comment on the vibrancy of the native camps. On the other hand, the native reaction can be gauged via the realm of fiction where the protagonist of an Urdu novel, Ibn-ul-Vagt, an invitee to the 1877 Durbar as a well-wisher of the British, was taken in by the "grand marquee and other tents, chairs and tables, chandeliers and pictures" and contrasting the spectacle with the Mughal court was convinced that "real grandeur consisted in simplicity and cleanliness." 

The areas for public functions were sited northwest of the British camps, on the vast plains beyond Wazirabad [Fig.4.4a, b]. This site was dotted with several villages that were cleared to provide the necessary infrastructure. Besides accommodation, areas housing facilities for the smooth conductance of durbar activities were also needed, such as the imperial and non-imperial staff offices, kitchens, stores, bazaars, troop accommodation and stables. The entire durbar site was encircled by contingents of troops who cast a mantle of security over the entire area, while maintaining the necessary buffer from the surrounding villages, the indigenous hinterland settlements and the walled city.

4.3.3 Built-form types

With the venue planned as a vast tented encampment, the quintessential built-form type was the tent. The imperial camp was the largest comprising areas for personal and official use and ancillary services. The imperial camp of 1877 Durbar covered an area of a mile and a half by a mile and a half to the northeast of the Ridge on the site of the pre-Mutiny cantonment. Wheeler described the imperial tents as "canvas houses" and the durbar tent, where the Viceroy held court as "a Palace." In 1911 the King-Emperor's camp covered an area of about 85 acres to accommodate his entourage with the head of state occupying the newly built
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16 J. Talboys Wheeler, correspondent of Central News - cited in Cohn, op cit., 197-198
17 Nazir Ahmad, Ibn-ul-Vagt (Son of the Moment), Mohammad Zakir, tr., (New Delhi, 2002), 28-29
18 The site was developed into a park, Coronation Park, in 1960s to hold colonial memorabilia removed from New Delhi following independence.
19 Wheeler - cited in Cohn, op cit., 196
Circuit House. An examination of a 1911 Durbar photograph reveals that the imperial camp had telephone and electricity lines and a network of straight and wide motorable roads. It also had a tall flag-mast and mounted canons as symbols of power. Surrounding the camp was an expanse of clear space to physically separate it from its environs.

Other built-form types included facilities for public events. The most prominent structure built for formal assembly was an amphitheatre, built north of Dahirpur [Fig.4.5]. It was a semi-circular grandstand for seating native rulers in regional groupings facing a hexagonal canopied and elevated dais for the Viceroy. Two spectator blocks for retainers and other visitors were also built facing the grandstand. The amphitheatre was enlarged to hold greater numbers in the subsequent durbars. In the 1903 Durbar, Curzon who found Lytton's western architectural theme of the amphitheatre inappropriate for his vision of a traditional India employed the well known advocate of Indian architecture, S.S. Jacob to redesign the amphitheatre that was now horseshoe shaped in plan with the imperial dais set against the inner rim. Both the imperial canopy and the grandstands were "built and decorated exclusively in the Mogul, or Indo-Saracenic style." The amphitheatre was linked to the imperial camp via two new roads, namely Kingsway and Princes' Road built in 1911. A commemorative column, the Coronation Memorial, marked the spot where the royal couple was enthroned [Fig.4.6a, b].

20 King, op cit., 224-225
21 Data drawn from installations visible in 1911 Durbar photographs, 'The King's Camp on the Ridge'; 'The King's Camp' from the Wilberforce-Bell Collection (Delhi Durbar 1911/12) 1/14 OIOC Collection
22 Data drawn from a drawing 'Enlarged plan of the Imperial Dais and Amphitheatre', Delhi Durbar, 1877 (National Army Museum, 5211/68) in King, op cit., Figure 9.4, 224
24 Data drawn from Map Delhi Durbar 1911
25 Memorial listed as Serial No. C-6 in INTACH, Delhi The Built Heritage A Listing, (Delhi, 1999), 2, 7
A Review Ground, for outdoor sports and recreational activities, lay west of the amphitheatre.\textsuperscript{26} It was an open tract cleared of villages, whose size was comparable to that of walled Delhi. By the 1911 Durbar, increasing demand for open area saw the Review Ground extend up to Badli with its west edge running parallel to the road from Karnal. Three polo grounds were added for outdoor activities occupying the site of the old cantonment racecourse and temporary stands built in a manner recalling English timber-frame construction were erected.\textsuperscript{27}

Considering the enormous scale of the operation, it is inevitable that the built-forms be bolstered by an effective services infrastructure to cater to the vast assemblage for the smooth conductance of the durbars.

4.3.4 Services

The durbar site became the recipient of European technological benefits in order to provide the British participants with conveniences they were accustomed to in Britain. From the British perspective, the services provided were a symbol of Britain's industrial prowess, while for the natives they constituted nothing short of exhibits akin to the architectural fantasies their European counterparts viewed in expositions in London and Paris.

The 1877 Durbar relied on and further built on the infrastructural base of the road network and water supply and sanitation systems that existed in the old British cantonment. Sanitary issues were of prime concern for the organisers as the large assembly of people with a fair representation of natives that too in relative proximity to the British was viewed as a potential threat to public health as the outbreak of an epidemic was feared.\textsuperscript{28} The 1903 Durbar saw the introduction of piped water supply, sanitation and electricity at the venue. A tram network for

\textsuperscript{26} Data drawn from drawing in King, \textit{op cit.}, Figure 9.4, 224

\textsuperscript{27} Stands visible in a photograph '11\textsuperscript{th} December 1911, the Polo Tournament, Delhi' from the Wilberforce-Bell Collection (Delhi Durbar 1911/12) 1/14 OIOC Collection

\textsuperscript{28} Cohn, \textit{op cit.}, 195
transportation became operational not only at the Durbar venue, but also in the city. The guest tents had fully furnished rooms with provision of stone-heating and electric lighting.

Considering the magnitude of the 1911 Durbar, it was only natural that the preparations were made on an unsurpassed scale. Extensive provisions were made for water supply and electricity. A telephone exchange also became operational for effective communication. The existing road network was enhanced by improving the older roads, namely Alipur Road, Mall Road and Grand Trunk Road. Besides, adding new roads that were named either after the area they led to, for example Polo Ground Road, or after its user, such as Spectators' Road, Kingsway and Military Road. Other new roads were Curzon Road, Chiefs' Road, and Princes' Road. The venue was also linked by both broad gauge and narrow gauge rail with its own railway station to ferry both men and material. The railway lines skirted the main venues, namely the Review Ground and amphitheatre, and also branched out to lead to the imperial camp. Public health issues were given priority as malaria prevention measures went underway whereby all ditches were filled. The depression of the bela was specially treated as its vegetation was removed, the area levelled and a portion set aside for cultivation. These interventions transformed the hinterland for “where there were cornfields there is now a large railway station with ten platforms, two polo grounds and sunken terraces. The King's Camp (covering 85 acres) was beautifully laid out with red roads, green lawns and roses brought from England.” Once the celebrations came to a close, much of the infrastructure including the railway was pulled down with only the road network and services being retained for future use.

29 King, op cit., 226, 228
30 Data drawn from Map 'Coronation Durbar, Delhi 1911' in King, op cit., 222, Fig 9.3
31 J. Renton-Denning, Delhi, The Imperial City, (Bombay 1911), 21-22
32 Hardinge, My Indian Years, (London, 1948) - cited in Narayani Gupta, Delhi Between Two Empires, 1803 - 1931, (Delhi, 1998), 175, Footnote 59
4.3.5 Architectural style

The durbars reflected prevalent political thinking and giving a tangible expression to the political thinking was the venue layout and its built-forms. Therefore the importance of the choice of an architectural style can hardly be overstated.

The 1877 Imperial Assemblage was "Britain's self-conscious presentation of itself as an imperial power." The durbars was accordingly based on a "Victorian Feudal" theme that was represented through use of decorative symbols namely buntings, flags, shields and streamers as can be seen in a photograph taken on the occasion [Fig.4.7]. Harriet Tytler, an eyewitness, described it as "the grandest sight ever seen in India since the start of our rule. [...] The proclamation was indeed a wonderful sight, a sort of Arabian night and fairy scene." The festivity was also not lost on Val Princep who, however, described the scene as being akin to a "gigantic circus and the decorations are in keeping." Considering that the 1877 Durbar was the first public opportunity that the British got to assert their power in Delhi after the Mutiny, an aggressive display of power was not misplaced. The actors in the event were British with descendants of former native ruling dynasties invited as spectators in an attempt to recreate the drama of a Roman triumph.

The 1903 Coronation Durbar organized by Curzon claimed tradition as its byword. It intended to impress upon native consciousness an image of the British regime as a seamless extension of Mughal rule. India was showcased to the world as a traditional country with its arts and crafts untouched by modern influences.
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33 Metcalfe, op cit., 56
34 Cohn, op cit., 199-200
35 Installations visible in a photograph "Delhi Darbar 1877" from Delhi Fort Archaeological Museum Collection Vol.7 1936-1940 D.G.A.S.I. J3 - 1416/91ASI Photo Archives
37 Val Princep was an artist commissioned to capture the event through a painting that was to be presented by the native rulers to the new Empress - cited in Cohn, op cit., 200
38 ibid., 193
and drawing attention to the government's responsibility to value and preserve these traditions. Understandably, Curzon departed from the 1877 Durbar theme that he criticized as inappropriate for "neither was there in the structural design or decorations anything suggestive of the East. So far as these features were concerned, the ceremony might equally well have taken place in Hyde Park." Instead he rooted for the Indo-Saracenic style that borrowed from Mughal architectural elements, and provided a "constructed stage setting, as one might call it, on which Indian princes and British officials could together enact the shared rituals that defined a 'traditional' India." An exhibition of Indian arts and crafts was organised by George Watt and Percy Brown, along the lines of the Indian section exhibited at the 1851 London Exhibition. The Durbar exhibition aimed at presenting an image of a traditional India with Britain as the legitimate guardian of its rich heritage. The exhibits were housed in a temporary pavilion of Indo-Saracenic conception, while their selection was based on the extent of their alienation from "modern foreign influences which have tended to debase the ancient indigenous arts of India." The presentation of India's image as being untouched by contemporary development and the British image as a benevolent patron, was in conformity with British political thinking.

The 1911 Coronation Durbar was Hardinge's brainchild and owing to the presence of royalty, it was planned most extensively. The examination of a photograph of the venue permits us to infer that the Durbar setting continued the Mughal theme with temporary installations carrying features like bulbous domes, bracket column capitals, chattris and jali parapets in geometrical design.

39 For a detailed discussion on the development of Indian arts and crafts under British rule, see, George Birdwood, The Industrial Arts of India, (London, 1880); Metcalfe, op cit., 141-175, 199-201
40 Minute by Curzon of 11 May 1902, and Supplementary Minute of 21 October 1902, IOR Curzon Papers MSS Eur. F.111/274 - cited in Metcalfe, op cit., 201
41 ibid., 202
42 ibid., 142-149
43 Curzon's speech on opening of the Indian Art Exhibition, on 30th December 1902. Thomas Raleigh ed., Curzon in India, (London, 1906), 204-8 - cited in Metcalfe, op cit., 200, Footnote 59
44 Installations visible in a photograph 'The Durbar' from the Wilberforce-Bell Collection (Delhi Durbar 1911/12) 1/14 OIOC Collection
Post-Mutiny Delhi Durbar as markers of British identity

[Fig. 4.8a, b]. As at the 1903 Durbar, active participation of the native ruling houses was planned with princes passing in parade through the city to the venue, paying homage to royalty and engaging in festivities. For the native spectators, the pursuance of a Mughal theme was apparently not enough, as adherence to Mughal protocol was important. This is evident from a lukewarm reception accorded to the King-Emperor as the assembled crowds failed to recognise him for he had breached established Mughal procedure by riding a horse instead of the customary elephant in the imperial procession. 45

Having discussed the hinterland transformations, we turn our attention to the city proper as it also hosted some durbar activities. Like the hinterland, the city venues also became recipients of transformations to provide the desired setting for select events.

4.4 Transformations in the city

The railway station in the heart of the city proper was the first encounter point between the durbar invitees and Delhi. The arrival of the highest imperial representative at the Delhi railway station marked the state entry and was the official commencement of the durbar. The route taken by the durbar cavalcade proceeded from the railway station through the city on its way to the hinterland. The city’s Mughal landmarks particularly the Fort and the Jami Masjid were incorporated into the ceremonial route to be showcased. The procession was adorned with all the trappings of power as the British and native troops, contingents of native princely troops and rulers made their way through the city to the hinterland [Fig. 4.9]. To ensure the smooth passage of the procession, the cleaning and widening roads that formed part of the ceremonial route was undertaken. 46 The roads identified for improvement included Mori Gate Road, Lothian Road, Kashmiri Gate Road and Queen’s Road. They were lined with

45 Andreas Volwahsen, Imperial Delhi: The British Capital of the Indian Empire, (Munich, 2002), 11
46 Renton-Denning, op cit., 21-22
raised footpaths for pedestrians besides being repaired and improved by measures like rounding off of dangerous corners and encroachment removal. Tiered spectator stands for natives lined the route as soldiers of the Indian army stood guarding the passing parade. Some areas of the city were chosen for specific events such as the Fort's maidan was used as a place for assembling troops for parade and reviewing and the Fort as a host of some ceremonies [Fig. 4.10].

4.4.1 The Fort as a host of durbar ceremonies

The durbar organisers acknowledged the symbolism of the Fort as a power centre despite its use as a garrison. Some ceremonies were organised on its precincts to perpetuate the Mughal-British continuum. In the 1877 Durbar it was decided to hold a ball in the Diwan-e Am and its supper served in the Diwan-e Khass in the honour of the Prince of Wales. The venue was prepared for the occasion by repainting the ceiling of the Diwan-e Khass with a new colour scheme using red, black and gold, with little regard to the original colour scheme and design. In 1903 Curzon brought his conception of a Mughal theme to fruition by organising the investiture ceremony for the Indian orders of knighthood in the Fort's Diwan-e Am. Not only was the symbolism recognised by the British in India, but it also met with approval in Britain as Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, commented on the appropriation of the Diwan-e Am where “the later Moghul emperors held their daily court, and it was eminently fitting that here should be held the court of the representative of an Emperor greater even than they of the house of Timour.” In a recreation of the ceremonial ambience of the Mughal court, Curzon had his seat for the ceremony placed directly below Emperor Shahjahan's original marble throne, though not on it for he found it to be too high. As he sat on an elevated position, the congregation comprising members of the orders was arranged

---

47 Data drawn from photograph ‘Durbar procession passing the Red Fort’, 1911 (IOL, Ph. 1/2/A) in King, op cit., 226, Figure 9.6
48 Louise Nicholson, The Red Fort, Delhi, (London, 1989), 111
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beneath. The spectators were accommodated in the Diwan-e Am pavilion and its quadrangle where an extension was built. The whole arrangement attempted to emulate Mughal space usage but the ambience was transformed into a “fairy palace” through electric lights. The Diwan-e Am extension was subsequently used for hosting the State Ball at the conclusion of the Durbar.

The Fort also hosted some events of the 1911 Durbar such as formal ceremonies and social functions. The Diwan-e Khass was used for the reception of the royal guests. The marble terrace between the Diwan-e Khass and the Mussaman Burj was used by the royal couple to show themselves to the natives gathered on the riverbank below in an emulation of the Mughal darshan ritual. The only points of departure of the ritual were non-usage of the imperial jharokha and non-observance of purdah by the Queen [Fig.4.11]. The Mumtaz Mahal was turned into an archaeology museum with exhibits on view at the time of the Durbar. The garden court of the Diwan-e Khass and the Hayat Baksh Bagh were chosen to host the Royal garden party where the British and native elite socialised. The Diwan-e Khass pavilion was used to lay out furniture items such as tables and chairs that were incongruent with the pavilion’s original function [Fig.4.12]. Tents were also put up in the precinct by some native ruling houses for the reception of the King-Emperor. One such camp belonging to the state of Bhawalpur was totally charred as a conflagration broke out.

4.4.2 The 1911 Durbar as a catalyst for the Fort’s conservation

The A.S.I.’s programme of restoration of some structures in the Fort’s Archaeological Area received an impetus when the Durbar organisers decided to host some ceremonies in the Fort. Sir John Hewett, President of the Delhi Durbar
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51 Archaeological Survey of India [henceforth ASI], Annual Report 1911-12, 14
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Committee, decided that a Royal garden party would be organised in the Hayat Baksh Bagh and the garden court of the Diwan-e Khass. Through the combined efforts of the Punjab Government and Hewett, funds to carry out restoration work were allocated. As has already been discussed in the last chapter, the conservation attempts had a distinct bias towards enhancing the appeal of the Fort as a host of Durbar ceremonies. Officials working on the conservation plan were probably convinced that “restoration of this kind would not have been undertaken, had not the Diwan-i-Aam, with its throne, been a building which would be used for the higher functions of state by the King or the Viceroy.” The directive issued to the ASI was that “whatever was done should be in perfect harmony with the palace buildings.” Gordon Sanderson’s 1902 conservation scheme was completed in time for the Durbar. A scrutiny of the A.S.I.’s Annual Report for the year 1911-12 furnishes valuable information about the implementation of the conservation scheme. Among the foremost tasks undertaken were readying the Hayat Baksh Bagh on which work was already underway, as has been discussed in the last chapter, and the garden court of the Diwan-e Khass for the royal tea party. The ASI’s scheme transformed the neglected and unkempt garden court of the Diwan-e Khass into two green lawns that were meant to be suggestive of the court fronting the pavilion and to provide “an admirable setting” for the British durbar rituals to unfold [Fig.4.13a, b]. Pathways crossed the lawns for access. The ceiling of the Diwan-e Khass pavilion was repainted under the supervision of Major Cole as per its original colour scheme in red, blue and green on a gold ground thus covering up the inappropriate attempt made in the 1903 Durbar. Other conservation measures that were undertaken to prepare the Fort for the forthcoming events included planting of flowering shrubs and trees to indicate positions of structures demolished in post-Mutiny reprisals; planting of creepers

56 The work was carried out by Messrs. Dishambar Nath and Locke and completed in record time - cited in ASI, ‘Annual Report of the Director General of Archaeology’ Part I, in Annual Report 1911-12, 3
57 ASI, Annual Report 1914-15, 20
58 ASI, Annual Report 1911-12, 13
59 ibid., 13-14
60 Nicholson, op cit., 117; ASI, Annual Report 1911-12, 14
over those old or new wall surfaces that were desired to be concealed; provision of a railing along the riverfront terrace; repair of the tank fronting the Rang Mahal; repair of central water channel in the Shah Burj; restoration of the Hayat Baksh Bagh fountains; and minor repair work of the Rang Mahal, the Diwan-e Khass, the Shah Burj and the Lahore Gate61 [Fig.4.14a-i]. By the time of the Durbar, parts of the Fort’s Archaeological Area had been organised to present a spatial ensemble in an attempt to recall the ambience of the pre-Mutiny days, but with barrack blocks forming the backdrop, the Fort’s use as a garrison could not be overlooked. Even as the ASI resorted to planting a screen that on attaining full growth would hide the barracks from view, the effect of the reception held on the premises was marred till “the kindly dusk shut out the iron railings and the ugly red and yellow walls. Then as the fire-fly lamps lit up the trees and the lights of the two pavilions gleamed under the falling spray, the old palace garden seemed once more a fitting place for an Indian king to greet his people.”62

The above discussion reveals that the built-environment of both the temporary and permanent durbar venues was transformed using planning and architecture ideas as tools to serve imperial ends. The discussion is now steered towards the durbar activities and their perception among the assemblage as they unfolded against the backdrop of the built-form intervention.

4.5 The durbar activities and public perception

The durbar activities were orchestrated as an exhibition of British military and cultural might in an amalgam of ceremonial and recreational performances. The former included a procession of the imperial cavalcade; parades; investiture ceremonies; holding of imperial court; and a state ball and receptions. The latter comprised popular sports like football, hockey, cricket, tent pegging and polo. Cavalry displays, band performances, a motley march-past of musicians, dancers,

62 Constance M. Villiers-Stuart, Gardens of the Great Mughals, (London, 1913), 121
wrestlers and mimics added to the festivity that concluded with a fireworks display.\textsuperscript{63} Arts and crafts exhibitions became part of the \textit{durbar} activities since 1903. The \textit{durbar} events were recorded for posterity as artists were commissioned to record \textit{durbar} scenes through drawing and later through photography. One such work was an album of sketches and drawings of the 1903 \textit{Durbar}, titled \textit{Sketches made at the Coronation Durbar, Delhi 29 December 1902 to 10 January 1903}\.\textsuperscript{64}

During the 1911 \textit{Durbar} a tourist handbook, \textit{All about Delhi: An Exhaustive Hand-book Complied from Authentic Sources}\textsuperscript{65} was published for the convenience of those coming to Delhi during the \textit{Durbar}. The \textit{durbar} indirectly abetted the maintenance of popular historic sites as the interest was likely to go up in Delhi's "memorials of ancientry by the large numbers who will be gathered at Delhi for the Coronation Durbar."\textsuperscript{66} Apart from the Fort, the historic remains of structures that had been integrated into the landscape of public parks became recipients of conservation measures.

The natives watched the build-up to the \textit{durbars} as a flurry of pre-\textit{durbar} activities that transformed the vast barren plain, north of Delhi into a tented city furnished with conveniences that were the norm in Britain. In an acknowledgement of the concomitant pageantry, the natives referred to the \textit{durbars} as "Badshahi Mele."\textsuperscript{67} Spectator value apart, the \textit{durbars} were also supportive of commercial enterprise as the native craftsmen, traders and merchants offered their services to all participants. The European \textit{durbar} perception dwelt on confidence over the display of British military might and the enactment of \textit{durbar} rituals where the carefully orchestrated native deference was seen as the taming of previously insurgent masses into a compliant ally.

The \textit{durbars} were also used as a platform for announcing public favours that varied from populist concessions like the 1877 declaration of reopening the Zinat

\textsuperscript{63} King, \textit{op cit.}, 226
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al-Masjid for worship and restoring the Fatehpuri Masjid to the Muslim community, to renewing past pledges and voicing hopes for the future. It followed that the favours that were to be granted echo the magnitude of the event. As a consequence, the 1911 Durbar that was graced by the King-Emperor, lead to a build-up of public expectation of an all time high windfall.

4.6 Conclusion

As political events orchestrated to reinforce British imperial identity, the durbars, were not likely to draw responses of anger and distress from the natives like the military's repressive measures of the immediate post-Mutiny years. With the British redefining their relationship with their Indian subjects, the durbars with their celebratory garb were just as effective in establishing British superiority as the military ventures. The King-Emperor, convinced of the durbar's efficacy as an exhibition of power, proposed that if he accompanied by the Queen, held "a Coronation Durbar at Delhi, where we should meet all the Princes, officials and vast numbers of the People, the greatest benefits would accrue to the Country at large." He was determined to use the event to grant favours to his Indian subjects on an unprecedented scale. During the 1911 Durbar, he declared, "We are pleased to announce to our people [...] we have decided upon the transfer of the Seat of the Government of India from Calcutta to the ancient Capital of Delhi." The foundation laying ceremony by the royal couple took place on a site in the imperial camp. The ceremony recalled the antiquity of Delhi as a power centre whose status would be enhanced by the British endeavour to build a city that surpassed its predecessors in terms of "greater permanence or of a more

68 For a detailed account of concessions awarded in 1911, see, R.E. Frykenberg, "The Coronation Durbar of 1911 Some Implications" in R.E. Frykenberg, ed., Delhi through the Ages, Selected Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society, (Delhi, 1993), 379
70 Government of India, The Historical Record of the Imperial Visit to India, 1911, (London, 1914) - cited in Frykenberg, op cit., 379
prosperous and glorious future." Thus on an occasion whose identity was transient and on a venue that was a temporary installation, the protagonist of the 1911 Durbar laid the foundation of a permanent British identity in the form of a new capital of British India.

---

71 Excerpts from the Governor-General's speech at the foundation ceremony in Government of India, The Historical Record of the Imperial Visit to India, 1911, (London, 1914), 208-211 - cited in Robert Grant Irving, Indian Summer. Lutyens, Baker, and Imperial Delhi, (London, 1981), 12
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5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the British response to Delhi, now referred to as Old Delhi, in light of the shift in focus to the new capital coming up in its vicinity to the south and to a temporary capital to the north. The symbolism of Delhi as a historic and imperial city coupled with British anxiousness to perpetuate the Mughal-British continuum, made Delhi the choice as capital of British India. Apart from its image, there was little else that Old Delhi was thought worthy of contributing towards planning and building New Delhi on a site in the southern hinterland maintaining the mandatory physical distance from Old Delhi. A few historic remnants in Old Delhi's southern hinterland were incorporated into the New Delhi layout as historic sites to contribute towards New Delhi's image as an imperial capital. The chapter examines the entire exercise of building New Delhi, from the move to Calcutta to formally inaugurating the capital, as a response that sought to undermine neighbouring Old Delhi. New Delhi's layout as implemented did not respond to Old Delhi's urban form but exhibited the colonial tripartite spatial delineation with the cantonment and civilian areas constituting New Delhi and Old Delhi, in entirety, assigned the status of a native quarter. The chapter focuses on the design features in the layout from the acropolis capitol and its ceremonial avenue to the architectural character of its built-form types that became the new
parameters for evaluating the built-environment of Old Delhi. New Delhi’s planning and architecture abetted the notion of Old Delhi being called a slum. The chapter also discusses the measures, such as implementation of piecemeal improvement schemes; sustained emphasis on confining ever-growing Old Delhi within its walls; and establishing a cordon sanitaire between the two cities, that were implemented with a view towards making Old Delhi a safe neighbour of New Delhi. Even as models of holistic town planning were introduced to the Subcontinent from the 1900s, the urban management policies regarding Old Delhi were fragmented. Old Delhi was allowed to expand but only under imperial supervision lest it impinged upon New Delhi and marred its setting.

5.2 Shifting the capital of British India

The King-Emperor’s seemingly impromptu announcement of the transfer made in the 1911 Coronation Durbar was not a novel idea but had been fermenting for nearly fifty years. Deliberations on shifting from Calcutta went back to 1782, springing from the realisation that Calcutta was found wanting, when in a minute Governor-General Hastings enumerated its defects as its climate and remoteness from rest of the country. He went on to recommend that an alternative site with a more salubrious climate and a central location be sought if the British were desirous of permanency of their occupation of India.1 Nearly fifty years had elapsed when Holt Mackenzie noted that “the Government of Calcutta […] cannot adequately superintend and control the details of civil government throughout the Presidency now extended, […] Calcutta is cut off by distance and climate […] in the (Governor-General’s) durbar a few Calcutta babus and vakils, generally of no consideration […] take the place of the man of rank and influence who would crowd from all parts of Hindustan to a court held at Delhi or Agra.”2 As an alternative Agra and Meerut were under consideration, but Calcutta remained

1 Hastings, Minute, dated June 4, 1782, cited in Robert Grant Irving, Indian Summer: Lutyens, Baker, and Imperial Delhi, (New Haven, 1981), 16
capital as its assets including an international port for trade and accessibility to British navy, far outweighed its failings.

Post-Mutiny introspection brought into sharp focus the difficulty of controlling the Subcontinent from Calcutta as it had a sense of being detached from the rest of the country. Governor-General Canning temporarily moved the government to a more central Allahabad where the Proclamation Durbar was hosted in 1858. The discussion on change of capital also surfaced during the two Delhi Durbars but remained inconclusive. In 1905 Calcutta’s claim as capital was further eroded politically as the city became a centre of unrest due to the partitioning of Bengal by Viceroy Curzon. Ramsay Macdonald summed up the British mood in a 1914 newspaper article that stated “we wanted and plugged our ears not to hear the voice of Bengal and so decided to gild again the throne of the Great Mogols and to sit on it.” Considerations of climate and the regional image of Calcutta also prompted the decision to shift. The idea of shifting also afforded the British an opportunity for petrifying their ideals of governance in India.

The deliberations make amply clear that the site of the proposed capital would not have any of Calcutta’s shortcomings. As the choice narrowed down to Delhi, a debate on its worthiness as a capital followed.

5.2.1 Debate on Delhi as an alternative

Charles Trevelyan’s post-Mutiny proposal had advocated Delhi as capital both on account of its relatively central location and its historical association with power.

3 For a detailed account of the political situation in Bengal, see, R.F. Frykenberg, ‘The Coronation Durbar of 1911: Some Implications’, in R.E. Frykenberg, ed., Delhi through the Ages, Selected Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society, (Delhi, 1993), 369-390
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Backing it up, the *Friend of India* suggested that as a punitive measure for the Mutiny, the people of Delhi pay for a new British capital that would evoke the “living, active Anglo-Saxon power.” Any serious claim by Delhi to replace Calcutta as capital was stymied by the city’s association with the Mutiny. John Lawrence, Chief Commissioner of Punjab, due to his long association with Delhi during the siege was loathe to see it become a power centre. Following his appointment as Governor-General in 1863, Lawrence tackled Calcutta’s unfriendly climate by initiating an annual summer move of the imperial government to Simla. A request to transfer the capital to Delhi also came from native rulers during the visit of Prince of Wales, future King-Emperor George V, to India in 1905-06, which explains his interest in Delhi. Delhi’s candidature received further impetus when in 1911 Home Member Jenkins argued that by holding *durbar* in Delhi, the government had legitimised its recognition as the “true capital, [....] and when a King or Prince of Wales again visited India he might be received not in a city of canvas tents but in a capital worthy of the Empire.”

The deliberations pertaining to the transfer gained tempo as plans for the upcoming Coronation *Durbar* were being made. In keeping with past practice, *durbar* officials were on the lookout for boons to be announced on the forthcoming occasion, only now it had to be something that complemented the status of the visiting dignitary. The *Durbar* was the perfect occasion for the King-Emperor to announce to the Empire’s expectant subjects, the package deal that had been proposed by Jenkins to the Viceroy in June 1911.

---

6 *Friend of India*, March 1858 - cited in Narayani Gupta, *Delhi Between Two Empires, 1803-1931* (Delhi, 1998), 26
7 Irving, *op cit.*, 16-17
9 J. Renton-Denning, *Delhi, The Imperial City*, (Bombay, 1911), 10
10 Sir Fleetwood Wilson, senior Member of the Governor-General’s Council, later recalled, “everyone was casting about for something which would appeal to the public imagination.” - cited in Irving, *op cit.*, 28
The proposal that was offered as a 1911 Coronation Durbar package entailed revoking the partition of Bengal and creating a unified Bengal Presidency; restoring the Chief Commissionership of Assam; making Bihar and Orissa into a Lieutenant-Governorship with a Legislative Council; building a new capital at Patna; and building an imperial capital at Delhi with the proposed city and neighbouring district administered directly by the imperial government.\(^{11}\)

Following the formal declaration of Delhi as capital, the issue remained hotly debated as the perception of Delhi as future capital varied as is discussed below.

### 5.2.2 Perception of Delhi as the future capital

Delhi was only a district-headquarter in 1911 but those supporting its claim as capital drew upon its assets to strengthen their assertion. In comparison to Calcutta, Delhi had a more central location that was particularly advantageous due to its proximity to the administratively significant Punjab and United Provinces. Besides it was also closer to the domains of several native rulers in north and central India. Delhi's easy accessibility by rail owing to six railway lines connecting the city also increased its attractiveness in terms of connectivity from areas as far flung as Madras. Delhi's advocates declared it to be relatively more salubrious than Calcutta, an added advantage being its greater proximity to Simla that made the imperial migration less time consuming and more economical.

Delhi also had a fair share of detractors in Calcutta's European community and the native elite and in Britain where former viceroys, Curzon, Lansdowne and Minto, dwelt in length on Delhi's shortcomings.\(^{12}\) The critics' remarks targeted Delhi's strategically vulnerable inland location, and its arsenal of diseases namely malaria, fever and Delhi Boil that gave it a reputation of being an unhygienic and unhealthy place. The critics were in agreement with the *Phoenix* that described

\(^{11}\) Irving, *op cit.*, 23

\(^{12}\) For a detailed discussion on Delhi's strengths and pitfalls, see, *ibid.*, 27-38
Delhi as an “almost lifeless backwater of the benighted Punjab, scarcely touched by progress.”  

Apart from the tangible aspects, Delhi’s claim as capital also emerged from its traditional association as a power centre, a consideration that was emphasized upon both by its supporters and detractors to strengthen their respective arguments.

5.2.3 Delhi’s historic image

In the opinion of its supporters, Delhi’s historic associations were deep-rooted and unmatched. Viceroy Hardinge in a missive to Lord Crewe, Secretary of State for India, declared Delhi to be “still a name to conjure with. It is intimately associated in the minds of the Hindus with sacred legends which go back even beyond the dawn of history [...] To the Mohammedans it would be a source of unbounded gratification to see the ancient capital of the Moguls restored to its proud position as the seat of the Empire.” The latter responded in the affirmative and acknowledged that the “ancient walls of Delhi enshrine an Imperial tradition comparable with that of Constantinople, or with that of Rome itself.” He believed that shifting to Delhi would result in “satisfying the historic sense of millions.”

Delhi’s critics projected its history as a burden and recalled the superstition of Delhi being a graveyard of dynasties thus portending a bleak future for the British government. The critics’ rebuttal notwithstanding, historic symbolism was inherent to the idea of an imperial capital. The British Empire in India was founded on the ruins of the Mughal empire and “the erection of a new capital among these ruins is historically necessary. It is a declaration and confirmation of the principle of legitimacy.”

---

13 Phoenix, December 16, 1911, (Bombay, 1911), from Bombay Native Newspaper Reports, L/R/5/166, no. 4, 14 - cited in Irving, op cit., 32
14 Hardinge to Crewe, 25 August 1911, Hardinge Papers, 113, 124-125, Crewe to Hardinge, 1 November 1911, Crewe Papers, 1/2(4), cited in Irving, op cit., 29
15 Ramsay Macdonald in Chakravarty, op cit., 288
The King-Emperor's Durbar proclamation remained irrevocable and the exercise to build the new capital was initiated. Initially the new capital was called 'Imperial Delhi' making its colonial amply clear. Imperial Delhi was changed to a less authoritarian 'New Delhi' in 1926 and to distinguish it from Emperor Shahjahan's city, now referred to as 'Old Delhi.'¹⁶ The change in appellation also underscored the contrast between the existing city and the British city-to-be, to the disadvantage of the former.

5.3 New Delhi: An exercise in image building and establishing new architectural parameters

Building a new capital was not a novel experiment in the colonial context as New Delhi had its counterparts in other European colonised territories such as French North Africa and British Australia. The entire exercise from the declaration of the transfer to planning and building the capital was evocative of British authority and an expression of the legitimacy of their rule for the "sheer capacity to move the seat of British India by royal decree would be taken as evidence of the empire's continued vitality."¹⁷

The planning and building of a new capital allowed the British to project an image of their rule in India. This fact becomes significant considering British settlements in India whether newly founded (Madras, Calcutta and Bombay) or pre-colonial (Agra, Delhi and Lahore) had not been based on a unified planning and architectural idea. New settlements had evolved from a core that grew with piecemeal additions using European planning and urban design principles and architectural elements for example Calcutta with its vista-forming avenues, squares, circuses and esplanades and Bombay where the street picture had been regulated through application of urban design controls in the form of building

¹⁶ The new capital is referred to as New Delhi in the study.
¹⁷ Lawrence J. Vale, Architecture, Power and National Identity, (New Haven, 1992), 90
setbacks and height regulations.\textsuperscript{18} In the case of pre-colonial settlements the native quarters posed the biggest constraint in realising any integrated architectural vision as the British consciously alienated themselves from the native quarters in the cantonment and civil station and the overall urban form of the settlement was distinctly fragmented into a British and native enclave.

5.3.1 A Vision for New Delhi

The idea of building a new capital in India was redolent with the possibility of planning a city in its entirety. It allowed the British to conceptualise an integrated vision of the city to exert total control over the built-environment with no room for unregulated development. The image of New Delhi in the minds of those associated with it in differing capacities was an outcome of a collective British identity as colonial rulers and personal predilection and ambition of those involved in the project. Jenkins was unequivocal in his visualization of the new capital as a “special enclave which was clearly set apart from provincial capitals and from other great commercial and industrial centres. Australia, Canada, South Africa, and the United States could be cited as successful examples.”\textsuperscript{19} New Delhi was clearly envisioned to be a symbol of British authority as can be judged from the following remarks.\textsuperscript{20} The King-Emperor, while laying the foundation stone in 1911, declared that the new capital would embody the “power of Western science, art, and civilization.” The Town Planning Committee, conscious of the Mughal-British continuum, visualised the capital as a “truly imperial city that absorbed the heritage of the many ancient capitals.” Viceroy Hardinge saw the new city as “a model and an example” and Sir George Birdwood was more explicit as he declared, “it is not a cantonment we have to lay out at Delhi, but an Imperial City

\textsuperscript{18} This was in contrast to French and Portuguese settlements in the Subcontinent that were coherently planned. Jon Lang, Madhavi Desai, Miki Desai, Architecture and Independence-The Search for Identity- India 1880 to 1980, (Delhi 1997), 53

\textsuperscript{19} Like New Delhi, Canberra, Ottawa, Pretoria and Washington were capital cities that were planned as independent entities. Jenkins to Hardinge, 14 February 1911, Hardinge Papers, 113 - cited in Frykenberg in Frykenberg, op cit., 374-375

\textsuperscript{20} All of the following notions of the new capital have been cited in Irving, op cit., 52, 87, 90
On the other hand, New Delhi’s architects had their own personal ambition and oeuvre to assert. Lutyens’ architectural experience did not draw from Britain’s colonialism. Architecture for him was above political considerations, in service of a loftier ideal. As an adherent of European classicism and an admirer of Wren, who in his opinion made classicism “sane for England”, Lutyens felt his calling was to make classicism “sane for India”. The capital project provided him the opportunity to evolve an architectural style for India that contributed to a “new and inspiring period in the history of her art.” Baker with his South African grounding in colonial architecture appreciated the role of architecture as a political symbol. Baker, like Lutyens, was inspired by European classicism being particularly inclined towards the idea of an acropolis capital based on the Athenian model. He also envisioned the capital to be the “sculptural monument of the good government and unity which India, for the first time in its history, has enjoyed under British rule.”

The vision of the capital and its imperial connotations, were probably lost on the natives who were shut out of the entire process of city building, being only recipients of the decisions made. There was a slim chance of their appreciating the symbolism of the European models, whether the Greek acropolis, Roman capitol or Parisian boulevards. Nevertheless, any European elements incorporated into the scheme were likely to be perceived as symbols of a progressive western civilization by the native elite.

21 For a discussion on Lutyens’ architectural predilections in the context of New Delhi, see, Thomas R. Metcalfe, ‘Architecture and Empire-Sir Herbert Baker and the building of New Delhi’ in Frykenberg, op cit., 391-400
22 Vale, op cit., 94
23 Herbert Baker was attached to the New Delhi project on Lutyens’ invitation.
5.3.2 New Delhi: a permanent setting for a durbar

New Delhi was to provide a befitting finale to the drama of the Delhi Durbars. It was to be the highest expression of imperial power exhibited through rituals of governance in a spatial setting where urban planning and architecture reinforced their efficacy. In the words of a critic, New Delhi was designed to act as a permanent setting for a durbar.

In emulation of the durbars, where British protagonists assigned roles to the native ruling elite and excluded the masses except as spectators, New Delhi catered to an exclusive group associated with governance. Bolstering the durbar analogy, the British and native elite that went about their task of running the Empire equipped with all the trappings of power in a highly formal environment that excluded all else. The government with its hierarchical set up of both British officials and native representatives was the only occupant of the city.

5.4 Building New Delhi

The foremost task was the constitution of the Town Planning Committee in 1912 with a three-fold mandate to select and delineate the site for the new capital; to plan and build the city and to provide the imperial government a temporary place for administering the country till such time New Delhi was completed.25

5.4.1 The site

The only stipulations made to the Town Planning Committee by the King-Emperor was that the Ridge was a scared site due to its Mutiny association, and

25 The Committee comprised a municipal engineer, John Brodie, an architect planner, Edwin Landseer Lutyens and a non-professional member, Captain George Swinton, Chairman of the London County Council with architect, H.V. Lanchester attached as a consultant for a month. Irving, op cit., 39-42
the Committee should not be constrained by the site where the foundation of the new capital had been laid and explore all possibilities. Apart from the practical considerations concerning finances, security and health, the selected site was expected to offer favourable locations for the principal government buildings and to enable the translation of the British vision of the new capital in an unencumbered manner.

The Committee surveyed the area around Old Delhi and by elimination narrowed down on two choices north and south of the city. The northern site did not find favour with the Committee on pragmatic grounds. It was felt that the presence of British buildings in the northern area would inevitably result in a “constricted city on the northern plains”, a far cry from New Delhi’s perception as “a model and an example.” The southern site lay near Malcha in an area of about 32 square miles and was separated from the south wall of Old Delhi by four miles. It was in Lutyens’ words, “a beautiful site – aspects, altitude, water, health, virgin soil, etc. right and views across old Delhi and that wilderness of ruined tombs that form the remains of the seven older Delhis.” During the course of preparation of the scheme, Hardinge rejected Malcha in favour of Raisina Hill and declared it to be the “most beautiful site of all.” The selection of Raisina Hill brought New Delhi physically closer to Old Delhi. Following the site selection, the Committee took up the task of locating the temporary quarters of the government in a stopgap capital as construction of New Delhi went underway.

26 ibid., 42
27 For a detailed discussion on the characteristics of the northern site under consideration, see, ibid., 46-52
28 Memorandum by Hardinge, March 4, 1913, in Crewe Papers, I.10(3)– cited in ibid., 52
29 For a detailed discussion on the characteristics of the southern site under consideration, see, Irving, op cit., 46-52
5.4.2 Setting up Temporary Delhi: stopgap capital (1912-1922)

The British regime was in a hurry to leave Calcutta and the turbulent Bengal situation for as soon as the declaration of the transfer was made, the imperial government machinery arrived in Delhi to take up temporary premises. A stopgap capital, referred to as “Temporary Delhi” or as Lutyens called it “Tin Delhi”, came up in 1912 till such time that New Delhi was partly built by 1922.

The Town Planning Committee’s selection of a site south of Old Delhi for New Delhi made available area north of Old Delhi for Temporary Delhi. Temporary Delhi came up on parts of Metcalfe’s estate, the pre-Mutiny cantonment and the Durbar site [Fig.5.2]. Together with civil lines, Temporary Delhi was made into a Notified Area Committee independent of Delhi Municipality’s jurisdiction. It followed that setting up Temporary Delhi would result in urban transformations in the area.

Urban transformations in Old Delhi’s northern hinterland

Civil lines received generous imperial grants to undertake improvements deemed necessary to make it a “better fitted place for the occupation of the Government of India.” At the same time, the imperial government was guarded against any criticism of “unnecessary expenditure on temporary Delhi.”

Advocates of Temporary Delhi argued that the infrastructure being raised would be meaningfully used once New Delhi was built.

The temporary capital relied on the existing infrastructure of civil lines to which some new structures were added. A few existing structures were readapted to meet

31 Lutyens - cited in Irving, op cit., 109
32 For a detailed account of the three proposals for Temporary Delhi, see, ibid., 109-110
33 Gupta, op cit., 188-189
34 Records of National Archives of India [henceforth N.A.I.], Home (Delhi), 38-41A/ July 1912 - cited ibid., 189
35 Harcourt Butler in N.A.I. Home (Delhi), 38-41A/ July 1912 - cited in ibid., 190
the demands of governance. The Circuit House built in the cantonment in 1902, where the King-Emperor was based during the Coronation *Durbar*, was taken over for conversion into the Viceroy's Government House. A Secretariat for the incoming bureaucracy was built in 1912 to a design by E. Montague Thomas, on a site forming part of Metcalfe House estate [Fig.5.3]. The offices of the Commander-in-Chief were also sited on Metcalfe estate to the south of the Secretariat. Accommodation for European officials was provided by taking civil lines bungalows on lease or building new ones. Hotels came up in civil lines and some shifted base from the Kashmiri Gate area to Temporary Delhi to add to the lodging infrastructure. The Swiss Hotel was created through the re-adaptation of the accommodation for the Viceroy in the 1903 *Durbar*, while hotels like United Services Hotel and Woodland Hotel moved to civil lines. In pursuance of the policy of territorial discrimination, accommodation for the lower staff was provided at the fringes of Temporary Delhi to the north as far as the village of Timarpur, and west beyond Najafgarh Drainage Canal. The Indian Cavalry Lines and open tract ensured the mandatory *cordon sanitaire* around the Government House. Provision was made for leisure via two clubs, the cantonment race course and three polo grounds that had been laid during the *durbars* and a new golf course, laid south of the old cantonment. In an attempt to perhaps lessen the dependency on Old Delhi, three places of worship and a market came up in the hinterland. These attempts notwithstanding, the residents of Temporary Delhi remained dependent on Old Delhi for their needs.

36 Irving, *op cit.*, 110
37 Gupta, *op cit.*, 190
39 Data drawn from Maps 'Delhi 1912' IOR X/9404 OIOC Collection; 'Map of Delhi and Vicinity, 1912' [henceforth Delhi 1912] OV1(C) in King, *op cit.*, 233, Figure 10.1
40 These were Methodist Church, St. Stephen's Hospital Chapel and Sylvester Thomas Home Chapel. Listed in INTACH, *Delhi The Built Heritage A Listing*, (Delhi, 1999), 1, 37, Serial No.C56; 40, Serial No.C61, 43, Serial No. C67, respectively.
41 Listed as Market in INTACH, *op cit.*, 1, 48, Serial No. C78
The Town Planning Committee remained true to the colonial practice of territorial alienation from the native settlement as Temporary Delhi retained the hundred year old buffer from Old Delhi’s northern edge through the Qudsiya and Nicholson Gardens, the cemetery, Police Lines and the Tees Hazari Maidan. Despite the physical segregation, Temporary Delhi continued to be dependent on Old Delhi as the latter’s bazaars and Kashmiri Gate’s European shops catered to the Europeans. The residents of Temporary Delhi also came to Old Delhi to fulfil some of their religious and recreational needs via Old Delhi’s churches and the Queen’s Gardens respectively. Above all, the railway station generated heavy to and fro movement between north Delhi and Temporary Delhi that was facilitated by the previously developed road network.

With the imperial government functioning from Temporary Delhi, the Committee turned its attention to planning and building New Delhi. The following discussion examines the issues involved in realising in a tangible form the “the idea of peaceful domination and dignified rule over the traditions and life of India by the British Raj.”

5.4.3 Antecedents of urban form

New Delhi was expected to embody the unchallenged position of the British in India, their worldwide image as a powerful colonising power and the vitality and dignity of their dominion. The probable prototypes for New Delhi were neither unique to the British Indian colonial context nor to the site in Delhi, rather they carried a universal appeal and were beyond all cultural or geographic considerations as they became colonial models for places as diverse as South Africa’s Pretoria, Australia’s Canberra and India’s New Delhi. The models under

---

42 Data drawn from Map Delhi 1912 in King, op cit., 233, Figure 10.1
43 Delhi Town Planning Committee, 'Final Report of the Delhi Town Planning Committee,' in Parliamentary Papers, Cd.6889, 2 - cited in Irving, op cit., 52
consideration for New Delhi's layout included Wren's unrealised plan for London after the Great Fire, Haussmann's restructured plan of Paris and L'Enfant's plan for Washington DC. The prototypes in turn derived from the layout at Versailles with its radial pattern of avenues and streets. 44

While the overall theme of the layout was based on European classicism, there were some specific influences derived from personal preferences. Hardinge while agreeing to a classical scheme thought it politically inexpedient to disregard indigenous influences and insisted on their inclusion. Lutyens' involvement in the Hampstead Garden City Project led him to incorporate some ideas of Howard's Garden City concept in New Delhi, though the open spaces were not based on the socialist ideal advocated by its protagonist but reflected colonial thinking. New Delhi's layout was both grand and garden-like. Its public domain was built in an imposing manner and the residential areas had a low density, park-like development. The layout also acknowledged western industrial communication and transportation technology as New Delhi was designed for the telephone and the automobile that facilitated a larger urban spread of area.

Despite the political demand for incorporation of native influences, no indigenous models were considered for the layout. Shahjahan's capital city in the vicinity hardly prompted New Delhi's architects to consider it as a model, though Akbar's Fatehpur-Sirki was recommended as a model worthy of emulation. Urged by the Viceroy the architects visited Agra, Jaipur, Mandu and Dhar in search of appropriate models. Further, Swinton Jacob, an ardent advocate of Indian traditional architecture, joined the New Delhi team as adviser. 45 At the individual building level, climatic considerations compelled the architects to incorporate time-tested indigenous design elements to mitigate the impact of Delhi's heat and humidity. The chajja, jali, verandah and colonnades that had a ubiquitous

44 Volwahsen, op cit., 33
45 Swinton Jacob had authored a six volume compilation of traditional construction details, called Jeypore Portfolio of Architectural Details
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presence in British colonial architecture in India over the ages found their way into New Delhi's buildings.

5.4.4 The scheme

From the first draft of July 1912 to the final layout of March 1913, the design evolution spanned a twelve stages process where proposals both for a north and south site were developed46 [Fig.5.4a-I]. All twelve stages had one feature in common, namely the inclusion of a formal axis originating from the Viceroy's Government House and oriented towards Delhi's Mughal and pre-Mughal remains. The following discussion examines the salient features of the scheme while contributing towards New Delhi's identity as a unified conception, also served as parameters of comparison between New Delhi and Old Delhi to the disadvantage of the latter.

The Central Vista or Kingsway

The ceremonial axial avenue as finally built recalled the formality of Paris's Champs Elysees47 and was called the Kingsway [Fig.5.5]. It took off from the Government House to lead to the site where Emperor Humayun and Sher Shah Suri built their respective capitals. The site's historicity was traced by legendary sources to Indraprastha of the Mahabharata period. In the earlier proposals the axis had terminated at Old Delhi's Jami Masjid, but the presence of Paharganj along its path caused it to be deflected towards southeast till it aligned with Indraprastha. This deflection brought relief to people living in the southwest vicinity of the mosque as they had been bothered "by the present rumour that there is a government project under consideration, contemplating connecting it (Jami Masjid) with the Government Secretariats by means of a straight road carried

46 For a detailed discussion on the twelve stages, see, Volwahsen, op cit., 198-207
47 Champs Elysees was considered by Lutyens' and his collaborator as a processional axis whose grandeur and formality were unmatched as it linked visually powerful symbols of imperialism along the way. ibid., 37
through a large number of houses." The axis as built was adorned with devices of classical provenance along the way. A grand plaza stood at the foot of Raisina Hill to break the avenue’s linearity. A cross-axis was formed by an intersecting formal avenue, called Queensway, and the crossing emphasized by locating important cultural institutions of the State. A memorial arch called the All India War Memorial Arch, a commemorative canopy honouring the King-Emperor and elements like pools, fountains, obelisks and urns were placed along the central avenue. Taking off from the Kingsway in a complex pattern of hexagons and triangles, that were reminiscent of both Washington and more contemporaneous Canberra, were diagonal avenues following a hierarchical pattern.

In comparison, Old Delhi had Chandni Chauk, the Mughal ceremonial avenue whose former stateliness had been marred by uncontrolled growth and had transformed the once processional avenue into a commercial hub.

The acropolis capitol

The traditional association of height with power was reaffirmed in New Delhi by building the capitol on the highest elevation atop Raisina Hill. The location exceeded the height of Old Delhi’s Jami Masjid [Fig.5.6a, b]. The site topography was altered by flattening the top of the hill to form a ridge for the placement of Lutyens’ Government House. The ridge was shared by Baker’s two Secretariat blocks resulting in a shift in the position of the Government House westwards that disrupted its original alignment with the Jami Masjid. To compensate for the loss of view of the Jami Masjid, one of the radial roads, from the commercial centre built to the north, was aligned towards it.

In comparison, the image of Old Delhi’s power centre, the Fort, had suffered a blow as its aura of invincibility had been severely jolted during the Mutiny and its aftermath. Its association with the military authorities remained intact as the

48 Aziz-ur-Rahman, History of Jama Masjid and Interpretation of Muslim Devotion, (Delhi, 1936), 7
military continued to occupy the premises. The areas conserved as an archaeological precinct imparted it a historic ambience but the overriding concern remained security as the military impinged on the jurisdiction of the ASI.

The Government House Garden

Lutyens’ scheme for the garden was meant to be “of the Moghal type.” It drew upon the gardens made by the Mughal royalty at Lahore and Kashmir and in the Forts at Agra and Delhi. Lutyens’ penchant for use of water in British garden design coupled with the usage of water in a Mughal garden resulted in the creation of a formal water garden for the Government House [Fig.5.7]. Like its Mughal prototypes, the garden was an introvert space creating its own private world of freshness, colour and verdure in contrast to the rocky and arid environs of the Ridge. In creating the garden, as in raising the city as a whole, the message of British resolve to create order was being sent out.

In comparison, gardens in Old Delhi and its hinterland had been appropriated, remodelled and incorporated into the British leisure circuit as public parks. The Fort gardens had been taken over by the ASI for conservation, with military considerations dominating any conservation attempt. While funerary gardens in Old Delhi’s southern hinterland were remodelled and incorporated into the New Delhi layout as parks as emblems of the past.

Urban institutions

The capital despite being a purely administrative enclave needed infrastructure to sustain it socially and economically. New Delhi had a civic hub with four important state institutions, namely archives and museum, a commercial centre called Connaught Place, and churches. From the acropolis, the city spread out in all directions with land-use being predominantly residential and interspersed with cultural institutions. In an interesting analysis, Volwahsen states that the
interrelationship between the Capitol and the urban institutions reflected Lutyens’ proclivity towards Freemasons, resulting in a scheme based on the hexagon and the triangle\(^{50}\) [Fig.5.8]. Catering to the retail needs of its residents, Connaught Place was built poised midway between the capital and Old Delhi. It was modelled on the classical circus pattern and was perhaps inspired by the Bath Circus [Fig.5.9]. The new railway station lay north of Connaught Place at the end of the cross-axis formed by intersection of Kingsway and Queensway. Churches came up both in the military and civilian areas of New Delhi [Fig.5.10a, b]. Additionally, the infrastructure of civil lines and Temporary Delhi acted as a facilitator.

As planners of New Delhi evinced little interest in making provision for commercial and industrial infrastructure in New Delhi, Old Delhi was increasingly allowed to turn into a commercial and industrial entrepot to provide the economic back up to New Delhi. Growth was unregulated as more and more building stock was added within the walled confines of Old Delhi through fragmentation of and addition to the built fabric causing overcrowding. The overall density of Old Delhi in 1930s was 300 persons per hectare in comparison to New Delhi’s 75 persons per hectare.

**Urban development pattern**

New Delhi’s urban layout was based on hierarchy with the Government House as the point of origin of the hierarchical pattern that followed an anti-clockwise path around it to terminate near Paharganj.\(^{51}\) The fringe area adjoining the open space separating Old Delhi from New Delhi contained the “laundry, Mohammedan cemetery, ‘Conservancy Depot’, peons’ quarters, [...] and quarters for the sweepers.”\(^{52}\) The bungalow was retained as the quintessential residential built-form type with plot sizes like the urban layout based on hierarchy. Five residential

\(^{49}\) Irving, *op cit.*, 215  
\(^{50}\) For a complete discussion, see, Volwahsen, *op cit.*, 64-65  
\(^{51}\) King, *op cit.*, 250-251
zones were created based on racial, social and occupational hierarchy [Fig.5.11a, b]. The stratification also extended to the network of avenues and roads whose physical character and names were hierarchical.53

The tripartite pattern of urban development was replicated with Old Delhi designated as the native city and separated from the British enclave of New Delhi whose military and civilian areas were clearly demarcated.54 British post-Mutiny preoccupation with countering of native threats to their safety remained on the forefront. Old Delhi was still regarded as a dangerous area whose influence was checked by the buffer maintained between the two Delhis and piecemeal improvement measures.55

The battle of styles and construction practices

The choice of architectural style and construction methods was a subject of debate as on the one hand, it was imperative to uphold imperial ideals, while on the other, the indigenous environment's climatic and cultural contexts could not be overlooked.56 The important question was, as Malay Chatterjee poses it, "how much indigenization could the British afford to indulge in without appearing to make political concessions to a subject people?" 57 Among the contending styles was Indo-Saracenic whose indigenous overtones appealed to the government that wanted the capital's buildings to have an Indian appearance. Akbar's Fatehpur-Sikri was recommended as a model, being a specimen of "true Indian style,

52 Ibid., 250
53 For a detailed account of the hierarchy in the road network, see, Ibid. 246-248
54 For a detailed discussion on how the spatial structure of New Delhi reflected colonial relationships, see, King, op cit., 240-246, 248-251
55 The interface between Old Delhi and New Delhi and the improvement measures have been discussed in a separate section later in the chapter.
56 For a detailed account of the debate on architectural style and building methods, see, G.H.R. Tillotson, The Tradition of Indian Architecture (Delhi, 1989), 108-117
bringing into happy union both Hindu and Muhammadan forms.” The advocates of classicism averred that the classical style’s sense of order, rationality and aesthetics were symbols of empire thus making it a strong contender for New Delhi’s architecture. Eventually, a compromise was struck where Indian design elements, namely chattri, chajja, jali, bracket capital and sculptures of elephant, snake, lotus bud and bell and chain motif, were introduced into a classical scheme.

New Delhi’s architectural character presented a unified theme against Old Delhi’s medley of indigenous styles and Victorian eclecticism.

When it came to construction methods, a group that supported the cause of the native craftsmen proposed that the construction of buildings be left to the native artisans or mistris working as per their traditional construction practices. However, the government not only denied the existence of traditional construction practices, but also considered mistris incapable of handling buildings, their methods in Baker’s words, being “primitive and charming.” The negation of a surviving craft tradition by the government also undermined the A.S.I.’s survey of craftsmen who were practicing their traditional skills. The mistris worked as masons and labourers to execute designs made by British architects under the supervision of British engineers.

Integrating Delhi’s built-heritage into the New Delhi layout

There was a conscious attempt to link Delhi’s historic sites with the new capital so that “the whole imperial history of Delhi was, symbolically, both conjoined and subjugated to the power of British Raj.” Symbolism apart, the incorporation of built-heritage sites of pre-Mughal and Mughal period as design elements enhanced

59 Baker - cited in Tillotson, op cit., 114
60 Vale, op cit., 92
the visual appeal of New Delhi’s vistas as the sites formed the culmination point of radial avenues.

Among the sites identified for incorporation was Old Delhi’s Jami Masjid whose link in the final scheme was reduced to a road leading in its direction from Connaught Place. The Jami Masjid was replaced by Indraprastha, a site with both Mughal and Hindu association, as the termination point of Kingsway. Historic sites like Emperor Humayun’s Tomb and Nawab Safdarjung’s Tomb complexes that had already received British interventions in the post-Mutiny years were incorporated in the layout [Fig.5.12]. New historic sites were also developed such as the Jantar Mantar Observatory that was developed into a public park along the edge of Connaught Place. The site was enclosed by a wall and a garden was laid out in axial alignment with the astronomical instruments that were treated as picturesque objects61 [Fig.5.13a, b]. Similarly, the Lodhi and Sayyid dynasties’ necropolis near Emperor Humayun’s Tomb complex was also incorporated into the layout. It was remodelled into a rolling landscape with the pre-Mughal tombs providing visual interest and the site was renamed Lady Willingdon Park [Fig.5.14a, b]. Sites held scared by both Hindus and Muslims for instance temples, mosques and graveyards were not demolished for political reasons and were accommodated in the layout. The archaeological parks were under the charge of the ASI and the New Capital Water Supply provided water to keep their environs in a state of verdure.62 It is ironical that while Old Delhi suffered due to an inadequate water supply, the government’s priorities lay elsewhere.

The Ridge was conserved as a natural heritage reserve, its Mutiny association making it sacred territory. It was designated as ‘Reserved Forest’ becoming off-limits to any man-made interventions and arboriculture was introduced63 [Fig.5.15]. A garden site lying between the Shalimar Bagh and Old Delhi called

61 For a detailed account of the observatory, see, Andreas Volwahsen, Cosmic Architecture in India, (Munich, 2001)
62 Archaeological Survey of India [henceforth ASI], Annual Report 1923-24 and 1924-25, 9, 10 respectively
63 King, op cit., 263
"Mulbarak Bagh"\textsuperscript{64} (perhaps an allusion to the Mubarak Bagh of Ochterlony) and owned by an Avadh Nawab was used as a botanical garden and nursery to supply the plantation of New Delhi.

The building of an acropolis capitol notwithstanding, the Mughal Fort's association as a place of ceremony endured as the premises continued to host official functions of the government. In 1921 the Duke of Connaught formally opened a Permanent Chamber of Princes in the Fort premises. The inaugural ceremony was very grand and the stage was set in the manner of Shahjahan's \textit{durbar} in the Diwan-e Am. A garden party was also hosted by the Ruling Princes in the Fort in the backdrop of the barracks.\textsuperscript{65} Some events of the 1931 inaugural celebrations of New Delhi were also organised in the Fort. The Viceroy presented himself at the \textit{jharokha} overlooking the \textit{bela} to witness a parade of elephants, camels and other animals. Some imperial pavilions were turned temporarily into stage-sets for a performance of 'Madame Butterfly', while some became the venue of broadsword dancing by Scottish Highlanders.\textsuperscript{66} The Fort also became a venue of a fete organised by the contractors who had worked on the New Delhi project. The celebrations were meant for the natives to whom access to the main celebrations in the new capital was denied.

The British attitude towards the built-heritage was selective as they concentrated only on sites south of New Delhi whose visual attributes could be used to project the capital's status as a carrier of history. Old Delhi, redolent with history, remained neglected and its historicity was overshadowed by its emerging role as a commercial and industrial hub, institutions that found no place in the New Delhi layout.

\textsuperscript{64} Constance M. Villiers-Sturat, \textit{Grades of the Great Mughals}, (London, 1913), 108

\textsuperscript{65} Data drawn from installations visible in photographs, 'Delhi, 1921: Inauguration of the Chamber of Princes by H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught'; 'Delhi, 1921: A garden party given by the Ruling Princes in the Fort' from the Wilberforce-Bell Collection (Delhi \textit{Durbar} 1911/12) 1/17 OIOC Collection
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5.5 Interventions in Old Delhi

Old Delhi lay between two imperial territories, Temporary Delhi to its north and its upcoming permanent version to the south. It lay as unwanted territory between the two British enclaves and its overcrowded and unsanitary living conditions were perceived as threats to both British settlements. Post-1911 the British interventions in Old Delhi continued to be fragmented as they were directed towards countering the threat to the health of the residents of British settlements both north and south of Old Delhi that was being rampantly commercialised.

5.5.1 Old Delhi as a service centre

Old Delhi became a service centre for Temporary Delhi and New Delhi through intensification of commercial and industrial landuse. The residents of both the British enclaves relied on Old Delhi's bazaars for example Chandni Chauk and the bazaar at Kashmiri Gate and the new bazaars such as those along Egerton Road and Nicholson Road, for their retail needs. The residential neighbourhoods were increasingly converted into commercial and industrial areas leading to overcrowding [Fig. 5.16a, b].

5.5.2 Old Delhi as a slum

Comparisons between New Delhi and Old Delhi were inevitable as the former dwarfed the old city on all counts. By the late 1920's the late 19th century notion of congestion in Old Delhi that had been ascribed to lack of ventilation due to unregulated growth underwent a change. Urban planning and design standards of New Delhi became the yardsticks for passing judgement on Old Delhi. Therefore "congestion as a concept now expanded to include building to land ratios, people

---

66 Nicholson, op cit., 111-112
to building ratios and people to land area density." 67 By the time New Delhi was completed, Old Delhi was condemned as a slum and the Chief Commissioner, Jenkins, observed with alarm that the "slum evil in Delhi City is (i) more widespread than originally supposed and (ii) growing rapidly." 68 Needless to say, the slum conditions were viewed as a potential health hazard to New Delhi thus prompting discussions on improving the situation.

### 5.5.3 Improvement measures: Old Delhi as a safe neighbour

With time the issue of improving Old Delhi gained currency as New Delhi could not afford to be "disfigured by a blot in the shape of Old Delhi." 69 More than a visual blight, Old Delhi had to be a safe neighbour and not pose a threat to the health of New Delhi's residents. Viceroy Irwin summed up the government's sentiment by wondering "how best the excessive congestion in Delhi city, and its consequent evils, can be remedied." 70

An integrated vision of urbanity relying on holistic urban planning and architectural and urban design interventions to decongest the city was lacking as such an approach was deemed as unpopular measures among native residents. Instead localised interventions were sought with the New Delhi Town Planning Committee recommending that the improvements in Old Delhi should pertain to drainage, sanitation and water supply. An official declared that the significance of "efficient scavenging with speedy and complete removal of all night soil and rubbish from the vicinity of habitations and its satisfactory disposal can hardly be exaggerated." 71 Acknowledgement of the need to undertake improvements apart, the improvement measures were not executed in the right spirit during

---


68 Jenkins, Office of Chief Commissioner Delhi, 1937, R & A Records, File B160, Delhi Archives - cited ibid., 30

69 Gupta, op cit., 186

70 Lord Irwin - cited in Gupta, op cit., 194

71 Office of Chief Commissioner, 1914, Education, File B183, Delhi Archives
implementation as the biases towards areas of European habitat prevailed. In 1913 a project to provide a water borne sanitation system was proposed for Old Delhi, New Delhi and Civil Lines that was implemented as a matter of policy in New Delhi and Civil Lines. Old Delhi was left out on grounds that the system would be “wasted on the natives, who would not even appreciate its economic value.”72 Similarly, refuse disposal in Old Delhi continued to rely on hand-drawn carts, even as New Delhi relied on technology, first via lorries and in 1933 a Refuse Train Scheme was initiated where refuse was disposed using trains, although it was not successful.73

Initiatives were made to record Delhi’s built-heritage. In 1910 the Delhi Municipality hired A.U. Wilson to survey the city and its hinterland to produce the first detailed record of the city as maps in 1911-12. The ASI undertook and published, from 1915-1922, a survey of “Hindu and Mohammadan Monuments” in the entire Delhi region under the supervision of Gordon Sanderson.74 The survey listed the built-heritage on the basis of its mohalla-wise location in the walled city and village-wise location in the hinterland. The listing format developed for the survey assigned each structure surveyed, a number in serial sequence, followed by its name, location, ownership, date and condition.75 It also specified if the structure was “Protected” under the 1904 Ancient Monuments Preservation Act or not. The use of the term “Unnecessary” implied that a structure’s protection under the Act was deemed unnecessary. Further, the listing also classified each structure as per the Government of India guidelines whereby three classes were identified namely Class-I, Class-II and Class-III of which the first two were subdivided into three subdivisions. The class of a structure determined whether it would receive any restorative intervention or not.76

73 For a detailed account, see, Prashad, ibid., 130-136
74 The survey was conducted by Maulvi Zafar Hasan and Pandit Y.R. Gupte for Muslim and Hindu monuments respectively.
75 For a detailed description of the format, see, ASI, List of Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments in Delhi Zail, (Calcutta, 1915-22), I, xxii, Reference
76 For a description of each Class, see, ASI, Listing, I-IV, Reference
of walled Delhi, the protection of a majority of monuments was considered "Unnecessary" thereby letting them decay with time. Of the 410 "Muhammadan and Hindu Monuments" listed in ASI's survey of walled Delhi, only 19 structures within the Fort precincts and three in the city were "Protected." Thus the survey that had the potential of underscoring the need to protect Delhi's built-heritage became the abettor of its decay. Sanderson also authored a comprehensive guide to the Fort that was based on ASI's Annual Reports.

Some transformations in Old Delhi echoed post-Mutiny reprisal measures. Following the assassination bid on Hardinge, during his 1912 state entry into Delhi, it was proposed to demolish the Chandni Chauk building from where the bomb was hurled. The building was spared but Chandni Chauk lost its old trees to clear the view and the canal was paved over. Some areas that had been exclusively under British use in the post-Mutiny period in the 19th century were now no longer in use such as the cordon sanitaire around the Fort that became redundant once the British moved to New Delhi. Even as more and more people crowded into the native quarters, the area around the Fort lay unused. Recreational sites like the Queen's Garden were taken over by the native elite who setup British style clubs along its northern edge. The open area around the Jami Masjid reverted to its pre-colonial use as a bazaar and meeting place of natives. In addition, the grounds became the venue of circuses, carnivals and theatrical productions attracting natives in large numbers.

The following discussion examines some improvement schemes launched in Old Delhi to make it a worthy neighbour of New Delhi. The schemes centred not only on the walled confines of the city but also explored the issue of its extension to the west while ensuring that the extension was as far removed from the vicinity of New Delhi as possible.

---

77 ibid., 1
78 Gordon Sanderson, The Red Fort, Delhi: A Guide to the Buildings and Gardens, (Delhi, 1937)
79 For a detailed account of the bazaar activities, see, Aziz-ur-Rahman, op cit., 39-46
Daryaganj Improvement Scheme

Daryaganj was used as a link between civil lines and New Delhi, particularly while Temporary Delhi supervised the construction of New Delhi, thus necessitating improvement measures in the area. The Delhi Municipality acquired the Daryaganj cantonment property, plotted it and sold the plots as shops, residences and educational institutions. The scheme also included a proposal entailing levelling of the Jami Masjid maidan and Parade Ground to lay four football fields and a road from Parade Ground to Chandni Chauk to facilitate Jain Rath-yatras.  

Scheme of Delhi Improvement Trust

To check the deterioration of Old Delhi, Delhi Improvement Trust was setup in 1937. It focussed essentially on the southern part of the city along the wall from the Ajmeri to Delhi Gates. This part of Old Delhi was perceived as the most critical area owing to its proximity to New Delhi. The Trust opined that unlike improvement measures in the past that were localised in nature, a more totalitarian approach was needed to improve the condition of the muhallas in this area. This entailed opening up of the area to permit adequate ventilation of the entire stretch along the south wall. The city wall was seen as a stumbling block whose presence physically obstructed ventilation. The issue of removing the wall became highly contentious with the Delhi Municipality wanting it to go and the New Delhi Municipality, that saw the wall as an effective shield, wanting it to remain. Lack of coordination between these agencies did not allow the improvement scheme to come to fruition.

---

80 Gupta, op cit., 192
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Localised attempts were made to reduce congestion in pockets of the city for example around the Khari Baoli area whose spill-over was accommodated along Burn Bastion Road.\textsuperscript{82}

**Extension of Old Delhi**

Even before the New Delhi project was undertaken, the Commissioner of Delhi had felt the urgency to address the idea of an extension to the city in 1906. Post-1911, expansion seemed inevitable as there was fear of Old Delhi, with its unregulated growth, spilling onto New Delhi. Old Delhi's overcrowded living conditions were perceived as a health hazard to New Delhi. The Town Planning Committee suggested that it would be worthwhile to confine improvements to those areas where Old Delhi and New Delhi confronted each other.\textsuperscript{83} It followed that Old Delhi be allowed to expand in a regulated manner with basic services with the limits of the proposed extension to be fixed, and beyond which would be "an open space to separate the Capital from the present city."\textsuperscript{84} The Committee recommended the provision of sanitary improvements and effective regulations to control building activity around New Delhi.\textsuperscript{85} It is evident that any scheme for the expansion of Old Delhi would be made keeping the interests of New Delhi in mind. It therefore does not come as a surprise that it was desired that the extension of Old Delhi be controlled by the imperial government instead of the Delhi Municipality.

\textsuperscript{82} Gupta, op cit., 191
\textsuperscript{83} ibid., 180
\textsuperscript{84} Montmorency - cited ibid., 181
\textsuperscript{85} Town Planning Committee, 'Final Report of Town Planning Committee', Parliamentary Papers, (1913), Cmd.6889, p.7 - cited in Gupta, op cit., 178
Lanchester's improvement scheme for Old Delhi

Lanchester proposed the extension area to the west and southwest of Sadar Bazaar. The proposal catered to all demands of urban living through provision of public buildings, worship places, factories and godowns, wholesale and retail bazaars and residences [Refer Fig.5.5a-c]. The built area was interspersed with open spaces to provide "adequate aeration" of the built-mass particularly the residential fabric. The street network was orthogonal with some curved streets added later to break the monotony of the grid. One of the streets extended eastwards to the Jami Masjid in walled Old Delhi linking the city and its extension. From the mosque, the street continued forth to the bela near the Fort. The bela was to be developed into a waterfront landscape with drives, parks and playfields.

Lanchester's scheme was not implemented as the presence of Paharganj along the path of the main ceremonial avenue from Government House to Jami Masjid was an impediment whose clearance entailed a prohibitive cost, besides displacing its residents. The subsequent turning of the axis towards southeast, made Lanchester's scheme meaningless thus eliminating a proposal that had endeavoured to link Old Delhi and New Delhi.

The Western Extension Area

Even though the final scheme for New Delhi departed from Lanchester's Old Delhi proposal, the need for allowing Old Delhi to grow in a regulated manner remained. Old Delhi's extension was developed after 1926 and was called the Western Extension Area (WEA). It included Karol Bagh, Siddipura, Naiwalan and Basti Rehgaran [Fig.5.17]. In a marked departure from Old Delhi, the WEA was

---

86 I.V. Lanchester's scheme has been classified by Volwahsen as "Option 2: Lanchester's Initial layout: Extension of the Indian City" and "Option 3: Lanchester's Revised Layout". For a detailed discussion, see, Volwahsen, op cit., 199, Irving, op cit., 57-58

87 Data drawn through superimposition of map 'Delhi and its Environs' from Imperial Gazetteer Atlas of India, Plate 55, over map, 'Delhi Guide Map' 3rd Edition, 1984, Survey of India
planned with straight roads that intersected each other at right angles recalling the pre-Mutiny attempts of enterprising individuals like Trevelyan in this area. The WEA accommodated people who had been displaced from the site of New Delhi and people from overcrowded Old Delhi. It also served as a link between civil lines and New Delhi as a wide road through Sadar Bazaar and Jhandewalan linked the two areas.\footnote{Today this road is called Rani Jhansi Marg.} The planning of WEA however, was a half-hearted measure for even as late as 1931, the area lacked basic infrastructure like water supply and drainage and a set of architectural controls to regulate growth.\footnote{Gupta, op cit., 182-183}

**Interface between New Delhi and Old Delhi**

In keeping with the colonial policy of territorial segregation, it is only to be expected that the New Delhi scheme would put in place measures that effectively segregated it from Old Delhi. Echoing the British reaction of the immediate post-Mutiny years, the most vulnerable area that lay at the interface of the two Delhis became the recipient of controls. The following discussion examines the measures that attempted to check any threat from Old Delhi to New Delhi.

**Closure of the Delhi Gate refuse dump**

Old Delhi’s southern hinterland had been a dumping ground for refuse from Old Delhi’s native quarters. The current location at the Delhi Gate had been deliberately chosen to locate the refuse site as far from the civil lines as possible. Some of the sewage had been finding its way to sewage farms around the District Jail and had supported some agricultural activity. With the building of New Delhi, dumping of refuse at the Delhi Gate became unacceptable as it posed a health risk to the new city. The New Delhi Municipality protested against this practice and lodged a complaint in 1927 stating that the practice defaced the new capital. The Deputy Commissioner declared that the dump was a “menace to the health of New
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Delhi. The 19th century sanitary landfill that had been moved from the Malkaganj site to its present location, on the pretext that its proximity to civil lines posed a health risk to the European residents of the area, now became an eyesore and health hazard to New Delhi.

The creation of a cordon sanitaire

The creation of a cordon sanitaire, integral to British thinking in the post-Mutiny era, effectively demarcated a physical no-mans land that kept unwanted natives out. The design elements enabling the formation of an effective barrier included open ground often treated as parks, walls and exclusive built-form types like railway stations that discouraged any other form of development.

Lutyens' cordon sanitaire separating New Delhi from Old Delhi relied on both open land and Old Delhi's enclosure wall as segregation tools. The open ground between New Delhi and the southern part of Old Delhi was levelled and planted with grass cover and ornamental and flowering plants to create semblance of a park and to be used as a playfield. In 1931, part of this area to the south that adjoined New Delhi was acquired for setting up residential quarters of native government servants [Fig. 5.18a, b].

The city wall added to the protection arsenal and there was a more valid ground than mere sentimentality of the post-Mutiny era for keeping the wall intact. The wall's usefulness as a "picturesque screen" was indubitable as Lutyens' declared it "would keep the rats of the old city out of the new." When Delhi Improvement Trust proposed the demolition of the wall to ventilate southern part of Old Delhi, it was made conditional by the New Delhi Municipality. Its President wrote to the Deputy Commissioner in no uncertain terms that "if ever the Government decided to demolish the wall, the New Delhi Municipal Committee would insist on an

90 Office of Chief Commissioner, DC Records, File 58, 1929, Delhi Archives
91 Lutyens - cited in Goodfriend in Singh and Dhamija, op cit., 30
absolute unclimbable fence being erected in its place, and erected before the wall was demolished."\(^{92}\) This proves beyond doubt the perception of the wall’s efficacy as a screening device. The New Delhi Railway Station was also strategically placed between Old and New Delhi and whose demand for operational land strengthened the buffer between the two cities.

5.6 Conclusion

A visitor to Delhi in the first half of the 20\(^{th}\) century drove “out of Old Delhi, past the Pearl Mosque (Jama Masjid) and the Fort. A flat country [...] lies on either side. [...] compared with the Roman Campagna: [...] witness to former Empires. The road describes a curve and embarks imperceptibly on a gradient. [...] on the right, a scape of towers and domes is lifted from the horizon, [...] grand as Rome. [...] Sloping gently upwards, runs a gravel way [...] at whose end, [...] glitters the seat of government, the seventh Delhi, [...] Here is something not merely worthy, but whose like has never been. With a shiver he shakes off contemporary standard, and makes ready to evoke those of Greece, the Renaissance, and the Moguls."\(^{93}\)

The decision to transfer the capital to Delhi had a significant bearing on the future of the relationship between the British and the city. The shift in British attention from Delhi to planning and building New Delhi was to the disadvantage of the former, to which the pre-fix Old was added to distinguish it from New Delhi. New Delhi’s planning norms and resultant urban form and design elements became an archetype for evaluating the built-environment of Old Delhi that was declared as a slum. Any planning and architectural interventions made in Old Delhi were aimed at ensuring that the city did not pose any hazard to the health of New Delhi’s residents and that it did not visually mar the environs of New Delhi. In effect, Old

\(^{92}\) Office of the Chief Commissioner, (Delhi, 1934), File B4 (187), Education, Delhi Archives - cited ibid, 30
Delhi was in entirety relegated to the status of a native quarter, thus sustaining the tradition of the tripartite demarcation of territory in the colonial city.

New Delhi was formally inaugurated with a grand Durbar in 1931 and was the culmination of the British image building exercise initiated in Delhi in the early 19th century as an understated architectural endeavour that evolved into an architecturally grand venture to showcase British power.
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