



## City Research Online

### City, University of London Institutional Repository

---

**Citation:** Davies, D. (2017). Imperial Infrastructure and Spatial Resistance in Colonial Literature, 1880-1930. In: Davies, D. (Ed.), Imperial Infrastructure and Spatial Resistance in Colonial Literature, 1880-1930. Race and Resistance Across Borders in the Long Twentieth Century. (pp. 1-55). Oxford: Peter Lang Limited, International Academic Publishers. ISBN 9781906165888

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

---

**Permanent repository link:** <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/21577/>

**Link to published version:**

**Copyright:** City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

**Reuse:** Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

---

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

[publications@city.ac.uk](mailto:publications@city.ac.uk)

---

## Introduction: Infrastructure, Resistance, Literature

### Infrastructure and the Networked World-System

Month by month the Earth shrinks actually, and, what is more important, in imagination. We know it by the slide and crash of unstable material all around us. For the moment, but only for the moment, the new machines are outstripping mankind. We have cut down enormously—we shall cut down inconceivably—the world-conception of time and space, which is the big flywheel of the world's progress. What wonder that the great world-engine, which we call Civilisation, should race and heat a little; or that the onlookers who see it take charge should be a little excited, and, therefore, inclined to scold. [...] For the moment the machines are developing more power than has been required for their duties. But just as soon as humanity can get its breath, the machines' load will be increased and they will settle smoothly to their load and most marvellous output. (Kipling, 2010: 241)

Speaking at the Royal Geographical Society in 1914, Rudyard Kipling described the British Empire as a networked world-system facilitated by the expansion of physical infrastructural technologies, 'great world-engine[s]' that were, for him, both literal and symbolic manifestations of 'Civilisation'. Kipling understands this 'world-engine', and according to the terminology of world-systems analysis that I will draw on throughout this book, Britain's 'world-empire' and the capitalist 'world-system', as a networked web of uneven and unstable core-periphery relations. For Immanuel Wallerstein, as Kipling already intuited, it is crucial to 'note the hyphen in world-system and its two subcategories, world-economies and world-empires', because what is under analysis is, in fact, not a 'social whole', but rather 'a spatial/temporal zone which cuts across many political and cultural units' (2004: 16-17). If Wallerstein's 'state-centric' map of the world-system ('core, semiperiphery, and periphery' (1991: 223-4)) is reductive, Neil Brenner's qualificatory focus on the 'historically specific socio-geographical infrastructures' that facilitated 'the annihilation of space through time' offers a more nuanced understanding of the 'historically specific patterns of uneven development' (2011: 103-6; Harvey, 1995: 205). Core-periphery relations developed not only between homogenous nation-states, but along and between the unevenly developing—and certainly proliferating—infrastructural routes such as railway, shipping and telegraph lines during the half-century between 1880 and 1930. Facilitating resource extraction and trade, enmeshing peripheral landscapes and populations into exploitative global economic and cultural relations, and offering imperial administrators, financial speculators and colonial writers alike with a symbolic reference point of civilisation and supposed 'modernity', imperial infrastructures played a fundamental role in shrinking the 'Earth' both 'actually' and 'in imagination' during the half-century that is the focus of this book.

Kipling's conceptual and physical map of the economic, social and cultural relations that gave shape to the British imperial project is, this book will show, embedded within and reproduced by a much wider literary production of colonial space during this time. As has been well documented, the 'bard of empire', who travelled imperialism's extensive networks of 'railways and sea-lanes' (Bubb, 2013: 391-394), stressed both the economic and cultural capital invested in them, as important 'in imagination' as they were in their physical and economic actuality (2010: 241). Writing some years earlier, Kipling reflected that the 'fifty thousand miles of railways laid down and ten thousand under survey' had transformed India into a landscape not only 'fit for permanent habitation' by its British rulers; these infrastructural circuitries enabled him to 'dream' of a networked world functioning on the principle of 'free trade' (Kipling, 1913: 233-5). His resulting fantasy—'one great iron band girdling the earth' (235)—is indicative of the way in which physical infrastructural systems gave imaginative shape to this world-system by providing a metaphoric language with which to describe it, a trope common to British colonial administrative writings to 'explain the ideal

of colonial government' (Mitchell, 1988: 157-8), but that also bleeds into much anglophone colonial *literary* writing of the British Empire.

It is in this body of writing, which I loosely bracket beneath the term 'colonial literature', infrastructures as embodiments of empire proliferate, repeatedly to make sense of the various geographies in which they are set: railways and trains, telegraph wires and telegrams, roads and bridges, steamships and shipping lines, canals and other forms of irrigation, cantonments, the colonial bungalow, and other kinds of colonial urban infrastructure—all these physical edifices and lines demarcate and break up the landscape to facilitate the literature's depiction and production of colonial space. For example, Edward Thompson's India is divided into urban and rural zones linked only by 'a single railway' (1931: 17); Edmund Candler's characters meander through the segregated urban environment of New Delhi; and in *Prester John* (1910), John Buchan's protagonist Davie Crawford locates himself in the Southern African terrain by drawing on the spatial referent of 'the railroad' as demarcated on his map (2008: 16-17).

As Colonial and Foreign Office archives make evident, and as numerous critics have pointed out, cartography was a practice fundamental to the imperial enterprise (Mitchell, 2002: 9; Boehmer, 1995: 13-14).<sup>1</sup> It allowed governmental administrators, surveyors and engineers, settler colonials and freelance capitalists, financial speculators, investors and travelling labourers all to 'conceptualise, codify and regulate' a 'vision of the land' (Huggan, 1994: xv). Unsurprisingly, this is a trend registered in a number of colonial literary texts. Conrad's Marlow famously has 'a passion for maps' as he gazes upon 'the many blank spaces on the earth' (2006: 7-8); Kipling's Kim has 'a great aptitude' for 'map-making' (2002: 139) and the novel is littered with '*kilta[s]* full of maps' (200). Franco Moretti, whom I follow in my application of world-systems analysis to a literary field (2000: 55-57), has argued that 'literary geography [...] can refer to two very different things': 'the study of *space in literature*; or else, the study of *literature in space*' (1998: 3). If they are 'essentially different', he continues, the 'two spaces may occasionally (and interestingly) overlap' (3). In this book, I develop a critical methodology that I call *infrastructural reading*, which connects the representations of infrastructure *in* colonial literary writing to the infrastructures *of* that writing. I will explain this methodology in more detail in this introduction before applying it to a selection of colonial literature across the book's four chapters. Its basic aim, however, is to emphasise these spatial 'overlaps' and thereby lever open a critical space within what is, predominantly, *pro*-imperial literature, in order to mobilise resistance to the various discriminatory ideologies that it propagates. But not only resistance to ideology—the aim of *infrastructural reading* as a critical practice is to heed Fredrick Cooper's warning that a focus on "'textual colonisation" or a "metaphoric colonisation" distinct from the institutions through which colonial power is exercised', and which he believes to have become something of 'a cliché in literary studies', 'risk making colonialism appear everywhere—and nowhere' (2005: 47). Connecting the infrastructures *in* and *of* these texts emphasises that literary writing set in specific *colonial* spaces (hence the '*colonial* literature' of this book's title) was deeply

---

<sup>1</sup> In his essay, 'Geography and Some Explorers', published in *National Geographic* in March 1924, Joseph Conrad reflected on this enthusiasm for map-making. But whilst Conrad considered 'the honest maps of the nineteenth century' to be 'the most blameless of sciences' (1926: 10-14), it is clear that their spatial representations were in fact 'linked overtly and covertly with imperial power' (Butlin, 2009: 277). Jane Carruthers explains how 'cartography configured the "imagined community" of a nation and placed it before an international audience in a scientifically acceptable way', whilst 'some groups, particularly African communities, were wiped off the map' (Carruthers, 2003: 956). Harvey, amongst others, has argued that 'India, as a coherent geographical entity, was [...] very much a British imperial rather than indigenous conception' and that 'the fundamental moment in this definition was the mapping of the subcontinent by British surveyors' (Harvey, 2009: 47-9; see also Tickell, 2004). Paul Carter identifies the implicit ideological systems inherent in maps of Australia, South Africa, the United States and Canada (Carter, 2002: 150-152), demonstrating how they informed infrastructural expansion across different colonial environments: 'we live in the maps that the colonial surveyors bequeathed us. Inside their cadastral enclosures we have settled down. The roads we drive, the prospects they open up, and the alignment of the walls inside which coming home we agree to reside and sleep are all the linear offspring of those rulers.' (2009: 17-19).

complicit with *imperialism* as a cross-national project of exploitation that exacerbated global uneven development and inequality.

Insert fig. 1

Cartographies of colonial space depended on arterial infrastructural routes to make sense of the landscape, producing maps repeatedly structured around these physical embodiments of empire that served, simultaneously, as ideological, political and economic reference points. Governmental and commercially funded maps of Southern Africa and India, surveyed and produced by colonial administrators and private companies alike, were repeatedly constructed around not only the lines of political borders, but also of the arterial infrastructures such as railway, telegraph and shipping lines that cut through and across them. This cartographic depiction of infrastructure betrays the political and economic motors of imperialism, as they collect and condense around resource rich areas (Kimberley and the Witwatersrand in South Africa) or politically contested spaces (the North-West Frontier in India), before linking them to cross-national trading and communication networks. Indeed, whilst members of the Royal Geographical Society provided ‘cartographic information and other knowledge for the organisation’ (and by proxy, imperial governance), these individuals also often contributed ‘capital through investment’ in ‘roads, railways, telegraphs, and administration systems’ (Butlin, 2009: 277-8).

A focus on infrastructure, which has gained increasing traction in the social sciences recently (see Larkin, 2013), thus reveals imperialism’s underlying dynamics. As Brett Fischman summarises in his overview of some ‘[s]tandard definitions of infrastructure’, these physical networks constitute ‘the underlying framework of a system’, ranging from ‘*transportation systems*’ and ‘*communication systems*’ to ‘*basic public services and governance systems*’ (2012: 3-4, emphasis in original); they are ‘a system of substrates’ that form ‘part of the background for other kinds of work’, even if they remain ‘by definition invisible’ (Star, 1999: 380). As Kipling intimated in 1914, the British empire should be understood as constituted not by the ideologically expansionist blocked out chunks of pink on the imperial map, but rather as the thin, though very physical, networked world-system of infrastructures that it built and that tied it together, and along and around which its exploitative trades and imperial armies were circulated.

Michael Rubenstein, one of the few critics to discuss specifically *literary* representations of infrastructure, observes that the word itself only ‘really comes into the English language after Roosevelt’s New Deal during the era of the Great Depression’ (2010: 6). For his study as for mine, then, the use of ‘infrastructure’ is ‘an anachronism in the historical and literary contexts in which I employ it’ (6). According to the *OED*, the term first appeared in *Chambers’s Journal of Popular Literature* on 14th May 1927 in a sentence that describing ‘tunnels, bridges, culverts and “infrastructure” work (infrastructure, n. *OED*, 1989). But it was not until 13 April 1963, in an edition of *The Economist*, that the first use of the adjectival derivative, ‘infrastructural’, occurred in a discussion of ‘various forms of infrastructural *development*’ (infrastructure, n. *OED*, 1989; my emphasis). Similarly, recent editions of the *Dictionary of Environment and Conservation*, the *Dictionary of Geography*, and the *Dictionary of Economics*, all foreground the terms ‘growth’ and ‘development’ under their definition of infrastructure (2007, 2009a, 2009b). Infrastructure became, in the second half of the twentieth century, a conveniently visible (and physical) way to create and stimulate, as well as to measure and monitor, development and economic growth, particularly in post-imperial nation-states. Furthermore, the *language* of infrastructural development has been contaminated by associations variously rooted in the often racist and certainly unequal ideological frameworks of imperialism, from the humanitarian paternalism of international NGOs (Barnett, 2014: 105-106) to the implementation of Structural Adjustment Plans (SAPs) that ‘became the favoured means of disciplining postcolonial states, domesticating them and rendering them subservient to the needs of the global market (Lazarus, 2011: 9).

This is unsurprising. Across the British Empire between 1880 and 1930, as I will explore, infrastructure functioned as a measure of ‘modernity’—‘a marker of Europe’s right to rule’ (Cooper, 2005: 115)—for colonial administrators, travel writers, financial speculators and capitalist investors alike, even if the term ‘public works’, used by Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* to describe ‘one of the most basic enabling institutions of capitalism’, was more commonly used at the time (Rubenstein, 2010: 4). I contend that a retrospective application of the term ‘infrastructure’ accurately isolates and identifies the importance of these projects, the uneven development of which sustained and challenged the world-system during this period of imperialism. In addition, it draws to the fore the way imperial infrastructures, through both their physical layouts and their associated ideologies (and which are, as I shall also demonstrate, intimately connected), continue to shape the twenty-first century world.

Infrastructural systems are ‘at the heart’ of ‘wealth creation and capital accumulation’ because they extend ‘control and appropriation of labour power and all sorts of resources over distant territories, people, and ecosystems’ (Graham, 2010: 4). A focus on the occurrence of infrastructure in imperial and colonial maps and, in turn, literary writing about these spaces, thus reveals the exploitative economic motor driving imperial expansion, even as fictional writing attempts to conceal these dynamics through the propagation of different pro-imperial ideologies. ‘The combination of being oppressed, being exploited, and being disregarded is best illustrated’, argued Walter Rodney in 1972, ‘by the pattern of economic infrastructure of African colonies: notably, their roads and railways’ (2012: 209). If, as Arjun Appadurai has commented, ‘to study infrastructure is, in truth, to study the technologies and techniques through which the visible and invisible are separated’ (2015: xiii), the study of literary representations of infrastructure allows for the excavation of a set of hidden ideological techniques and strategies that functioned as apologies for imperial exploitation. The damaging ramifications of the infrastructural circuitries laid during this period for the post-imperial world are matched only by the similarly dangerous ideologies that propagated their expansion, and with which they are still often associated. Of course, unequal infrastructural developments and ideological justifications for them have taken on new guises as planetary dynamics shift in the twenty-first century. However, a failure to acknowledge that ‘enduring consequences of empire can be implicated in creating and amplifying current problems’ simply contributes, as Paul Gilroy has convincingly demonstrated, to ‘an anxious, melancholic mood’ that has ‘become part of the cultural infrastructure’ of post-imperial countries such as Britain (2004: 2-15).

Functioning as fictional maps of a sort, it is important to emphasise that the literary depictions of colonial space with which I am concerned are, like colonial maps, repeatedly reliant on imperial infrastructures as a set of spatial and cultural reference points. Infrastructures are fundamental coordinates for the production of ‘*space in literature*’, whilst they simultaneously and historically facilitated the circulation of ‘*literature in space*’ (Moretti, 1998: 3). In the interests of scope, this book confines its analysis to colonial fiction set in parts of Southern Africa and the Indian subcontinent, but its overarching argument relies on the recurrence of representations of infrastructure across a much larger body of colonial literature. Returning once more to Moretti’s groundbreaking work, I am in part reliant on his notion of ‘distant reading’, where a quantitative analysis ‘allows you to focus on units that are much smaller or much larger than the text: devices, themes, tropes—or genres and systems’ (2000: 57). I therefore began this project by word searching a large body of anglophone colonial literature written by authors associated with the British Empire for different kinds of infrastructures (railways, telegraphs, cantonments, and so on). I included Kipling’s vast *oeuvre*, of course, and Conrad’s, but many others writers as well: G.A. Henty, W.C. Scully, J. Percy Fitzgerald, R.L. Stevenson, Maud Diver, Alice Perrin, Henry Lawson, Hugh Clifford, Henry Newbolt, and so on. In addition, I of course word searched the complete writings of the eight authors discussed in this book’s four chapters: Flora Annie Steel, H. Rider Haggard, Olive Schreiner, William Plomer, John Buchan, Edmund Candler, Edward Thompson and E.M. Forster. From this, I was able to build

a broad picture, or map, of the infrastructural network that runs, unevenly, through the literary geography of this colonial writing, tracing the patterns that emerged around infrastructure's repeated recurrence in this literature's spatial productions, but also noting its limitations.

I undertook this not simply to show that infrastructure is an important device for colonial literature, though it is worth clarifying that this is not an explicitly book historical project and that I have no desire to argue that this colonial writing is somehow a kind of 'world literature', agendas that inform Moretti's methodological approach. Rather, it is to show how a focus on these infrastructural networks allows for the excavation of anti-imperial resistance from what are mostly pro-imperial writings. This practice, as the book's four chapters demonstrate, needs to be conducted at a very close textual level. Though I explain the selection of texts and authors to be discussed in greater detail in the final section of this introduction, I have followed Moretti once more by choosing authors who are *not quite* canonised—in the sense that Kipling and Conrad are—and instead look at their '*rivals*: contemporaries who write more or less like canonical authors [...] but not quite', and who are perhaps 'the largest contingent of the "great unread"' (2008: PAGES). Whilst the practice of *infrastructural reading* needs to be undertaken at the level of close textual analysis, then, the general conclusions that these micro-analyses reveal, and that I set out here in my introduction, are, I am convinced, applicable to a much larger body of colonial literature, and I therefore use that much broader label throughout.

In this colonial writing, infrastructures are repeatedly invested with a symbolic capital that make them cultural equivalents of what might be understood as the economic 'core' in world-systems analysis, in relation to the (semi-)peripheral zones that they traverse. As Cara Murray argues, imperial 'traffic'—the numerous trade flows and infrastructural routes that cut across borders and constitute the circuitry of the world-economy—is enabled by the technologies of empire: 'roads, trains, telegraphs', but also 'novels', all of which 'give shape and form to landscapes' (2008: 12-13). Moretti implicitly connects the '[u]neven rhythm of literary evolution' to uneven infrastructural development, describing the European novel 'as a sort of literary railway' that weaves 'the network capable of covering a country in all its extension' (2008: PAGES). If this has, by the end of the nineteenth century, 'been basically accomplished' in Europe (PAGES), it begins with a new ferocity in Europe's colonial spaces in the 1880s, where it describes, whilst *also functioning as*, a 'sort of literary railway'. Colonial literature is engaged in processes of export and import, both describing and itself enacting the investment of economic and cultural capital abroad, processes that can be seen to occur with greater clarity, as I will repeatedly argue, when we focus on its depiction of physical infrastructures. Infrastructural routes take on a cultural 'coreness' in this literary writing, linked as they are to a set of 'core-like production processes' through the socioeconomic motions of the unevenly developing world-system that they historically enabled (Wallerstein, 2004: 17).

Wallerstein himself acknowledges that, whilst 'we talk of core areas or core zones, peripheral areas and peripheral zones,' without too much difficulty, an 'important confusion' arises when 'we talk of core states and peripheral states' because there is a 'lack of total coincidence between the economic processes and the state boundaries' (1982: 91-2). As Hopkins argues, the world-system's 'units are not "national societies"', but rather 'lower-level historical loci of the system's operation and development' (87). In my reading of colonial literature, the cores of the world-system, and more specifically, the British world-empire, are conceived as 'vast, uneven chains of integrated production structures brought together through a complex division of labour and extensive commercial exchange' (Robinson, 2011: 5). Core zones are not national blocks, but rather webs, networks or lines, what the social historian of technology and infrastructure, Daniel Headrick, describes titularly as *Tentacles of Progress* (1988). Colonial literature thus presents a conceptual (and physical) map of a networked core comprised of imperial infrastructures, marked by unevenly developed groupings, clusterings and lingering strands, variously patrolling and cutting through political borders and linking continental and oceanic spaces. In this sense, they are emblematic of what Herman Wittenberg identifies as the 'paradoxical notion' of 'imperial spatiality'; a spatiality somehow

'unitary and global', but also, and simultaneously, 'divided and fragmented' (1997: 130). As the Warwick Research Collective have recently argued by building on Fredric Jameson's notion of 'singular modernity' (which 'always had something to do with technology [...] and thus eventually with progress' (2012: 7), 'capitalist development does not smooth away but rather *produces* unevenness, systematically and as a matter of course' (WReC, 2015: 12): 'Capitalist modernisation entails development, yes—but this "development" takes on forms also of the development of underdevelopment, of maldevelopment and dependent development' (13).

This emphasis on infrastructural development's unevenness allows us to see that whilst colonial authors 'claimed that they were "opening" the African continent', the 'domination and exploitation' that resulted was 'lumpy to an extreme' (Cooper, 2005: 104-105). Indeed, whilst Cooper critiques what is, as he quite rightly argues, at times the deeply contested and even confused notion of 'modernity' (113-149), and though he finds the offerings of world-systems analysis dissatisfying and 'rigid' (44-45), I wish to retain his emphasis on the 'network concept' in my exploration of the way in which colonial literary writing used infrastructure as a physical demarcator of the unevenly developing world-system. This emphasis on *networks* not only more accurately describes imperial infrastructural developments as they were planned, constructed, mapped and reproduced in literary texts, but also works as a conceptual tool that is 'less sweeping, more precise', emphasising 'both the nature of spatial linkages and their limits' (93). Furthermore, it 'puts as much emphasis on nodes and blockages as on movement' and emphasises 'the wide variety of units of affinity and mobilisation, the kinds of subjective attachments people form and the collectives that are capable of action' (108). It levers open the complex spatiality not only of pro-imperial literature, but of anti-imperial *resistance*:

The spatial imagination of intellectuals, missionaries, and political activists, from the early nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century was [...] neither global nor local, but was built out of specific lines of connection and posited regional, continental, and transcontinental affinities. These spatial affinities could narrow, expand, and narrow again. (109)

So whilst Wittenberg is correct to observe the paradox of an imperial spatiality that attempts to integrate cultures and economies on a global scale in 'a fundamentally unequal way' (1997: 130), his spatial conception remains structured around a dual geographic binary 'between the colonial periphery and the metropolitan centre' (130). Such an approach is unable to move beyond the blocked out political borders of nation-states and colonial possessions. By contrast, I see the relationship between core and (semi-)peripheral zones to be occurring at the level of arterial and capillary infrastructural lines. From this perspective, the core of the world-system is comprised of networks with edges, but also with huge underdeveloped gaps in between and beyond it: the (semi-)periphery, realised not at the level of the exploited continent, subcontinent, region, city, or even town, but of the coalfield and the diamond mine, the slum and the village, the developed road and the underdeveloped sidewalk. It is the manifestation of the unevenness of the world-system at this micro-geographical scale, in which core infrastructural routes cut through peripheral spaces (usually in order to exploit them all the more), that shows up again and again in colonial literature. Just as the colonial map-maker makes sense of colonial space through the core-peripheral dynamics signified by infrastructural lines, the writers of colonial literature and their fictional protagonists look to the physical embodiments of imperial infrastructure to give shape to the peripheral, underdeveloped conditions of their surroundings.

Throughout I will emphasise the resistant flip side to colonial literature's reliance upon the infrastructural core of the world-system. In its repeated return to infrastructure, this literature is forced to acknowledge the unequal and uneven development produced by the imperial project, undermining the civilising, modernising and humanitarian rhetoric that it so frequently draws on to justify that development in the first place. It is here that the second concept that structures this

book—‘spatial resistance’—comes into play, one that is motivated on my part as a critic to re-politicise the body of fiction that I call ‘colonial literature’ by excavating moments in which it undoes the imperial hegemony to which it subscribes. If the imperial ideologies that colonial literature propagates have (in many cases ongoing) material consequences, it my hope that as a methodology, *infrastructural reading* is able to counter these with a material resistance of its own. *Infrastructural reading* is specifically designed to excavate the ideological anxieties, limitations and silences concealed within the textual creases of colonial literature, as well as to unearth the more direct objections to and violent defiances of imperial control and capitalist accumulation that on occasion emerge in it. It then gathers these varying cracks and crevices within imperial ideology together and mobilises them under the broad category of ‘resistance’. In this way, the book re-evaluates the capacity of colonial literature to reveal the limits of imperial ideology and to enact an anti-imperial resistance to it.

### **‘The Colonial Present’: Criticism as Resistance**

This book has two central objectives. The first begins with the premise that, while colonial literature is undoubtedly structured by (often ugly) racial, cultural and political hierarchies—a widely accepted argument since Edward Said’s foundational work (1993, 2003)—the subsequent avoidance of such texts can be defeatist. It leads only to the dismissal of these literary works, warning that critics who do engage with them might actually be in danger of perpetuating their ideological frameworks of inequality, discrimination and oppression. But to relinquish this body of fiction to the unread archive is, I believe, more dangerous: it ignores this literature’s rich stock of insight into and, on occasion, subversion of those very frameworks, many of which have unfortunate contemporary resonances. Indeed, there is a political imperative for the present here. As Gail Low argues, ‘the easy negation of such writing does not address the power of their myth-making’: ‘simply to point out the falsity’ of these imaginative fictions is to leave ‘untouched the psychic investments which determine the formation of the fictions that sustain the world we [continue to] live and act within’ (1996: 2). This book’s recovery of a series of critically under-read literary texts in order to excavate—rather than perpetuate—their complex ideological dynamics is, I argue, a project that might benefit the study of numerous, and in some cases ongoing, colonialisms.

The second central objective of the book is to develop a self-consciously political critical reading practice that might, perhaps, be considered a form of anti-imperial resistance in and of itself. Historians from Walter Rodney to Mike Davis have convincingly demonstrated that ‘what we today call the “third world”’ is a direct ‘outgrowth’ of the inequalities that were shaped ‘most decisively in the last quarter of the nineteenth century’ (Davis, 2010: 15-16; Rodney, 2012, 27). This book’s political work is similarly and self-confessedly motivated by the often violent and material implications of the world-system’s uneven and unequal development under the remit of the British Empire. The politics informing the development of its methodology are therefore affiliated with what Benita Parry describes as ‘the writings of liberation movements that had inaugurated the interrogation of colonialism and imperialism’ (2004: 6), from Frantz Fanon to Rodney himself, though of course I have no intention of comparing my contribution to their tremendously important work. Rather, I follow their example, responding to Parry’s call to historicise British imperialism and its literary accompaniments ‘within the determining instance of capitalism’s global trajectory’ (2004: 9). This task is, as I have already suggested, best achieved by focusing on colonial literature’s representation of imperial infrastructure. Whether looking to H. Rider Haggard’s ‘King Solomon’s road’ or Flora Annie Steel’s intermittent depiction of the telegraph, these texts can be made to confess that imperialism is about ‘the construction of minimal and strategic infrastructure’ designed to facilitate ‘capitalism’s urge to inset the non- or incipiently capitalist zones into its world-system’, despite their apparent propagation of pro-imperial ideologies suggesting the contrary (Parry, 2004: 9). It is through the ‘cartography of colonial ideology’ emerging from this book’s constitutive

chapters that I hope to practice a 'process of cultural resistance and cultural disruption', participating 'in writing a text that can answer colonialism back' (27-28).

For this book, then, mapping physical imperial infrastructure as it appears in colonial literature allows for the dismantling of colonial ideology. It is worth returning here to Fanon, for whom, as historian of colonial urbanism Anthony King observes, the infrastructural layout of 'the segregated city' epitomises 'the entire colonial relationship' (1976: 282-3). A project concerned with the politics of infrastructure in the fraught dynamics of the colonial environment must recall Fanon's words at its outset:

The colonial world is a world divided into compartments. [...] if we examine closely this system of compartments, we will at least be able to reveal the lines of force it implies. This approach to the colonial world, its ordering and its geographical layout will allow us to mark out the lines on which a decolonised society will be reorganised.

The colonial world is cut in two. The dividing line, the frontiers are shown by barracks and police stations. [...] The settler's town is a strongly-built town, all made of stone and steel [whilst the town of the colonised] is a world without spaciousness; men live there on top of each other, and their huts are built one on top of the other. (2001: 29).

Fanon here understands the core and peripheral zones of the world-system occurring not at the macro-level of nation-states, but rather between specific infrastructural routes, boundaries and borders. Explaining Fanon's thought within the terms of world-systems analysis, arterial infrastructures such as a railways or roads are invested with and facilitate the economic and cultural flows of the core. In turn, the surrounding area is relationally produced by the world-system as a peripheral zone (Wallerstein, 2004: 17). The resulting 'periphery is not a state but a process', for which 'we have the noun peripheralisation': 'the inclusion of a unit, or an area, which was not previously involved at all, into the functioning of the world-economy', or the intensification of this process 'in a more unequal direction' (Hopkins and Wallerstein, 1982: 98-9). Whilst I analyse colonial literature's problematic representation of 'underdeveloped societies', it is equally important to acknowledge the presence of what Walter D. Mignolo, another cultural theorist to self-confessedly 'piggyback' on world-systems analysis, calls 'silenced societies': geohistorical locations where 'talking and writing take place but which are not heard in the planetary production of knowledge' (2002: 18, 71). In so doing, this book repeatedly refuses to subscribe to colonial literature's often explicit claim to represent colonial landscapes and peoples in their entirety, whilst nevertheless arguing that it gives voice to more than it realises. The resistance recovered by this book frequently revolves around moments in which the colonial literature gestures towards those peripheral spaces of the world-system that exist beyond, beneath and between the infrastructural tentacles upon which it relies.

For Benedict Anderson, the novel as genre, form and material object is central to the way in which 'imagined communities' such as nations come into being (2006: 24-26), operating 'as a technology that functions like a railway or canal' by giving 'shape or form to landscapes' (Murray, 2008: 12-3). The infrastructural and governmental 'circuitry' of a colonising power can be damaging to the postcolonial government that inherits it, as it prescribes certain modes of governance and social interaction initially designed to facilitate the totalitarian rule and racially segregated living of the coloniser (Anderson, 2006: 160-1; Soja, 2010: 4). Fanon himself saw that colonialism's infrastructural organisation of physical space provided the coordinates on which the 'decolonised society' was 'reorganised' (2001: 29), and King further documents the way in which infrastructures of segregation and uneven development, both distinctive features of the colonial city, intensified spatial, social and economic inequalities in postcolonial nations (King, 1976: 283-287).

Reliant on infrastructure to give shape to the landscapes it depicts, colonial literature contributes to the production of imagined geographies inflected with imperial ideologies (cities

constructed around hierarchical zoning, regions demarcated along sectarian divisions), but that nevertheless find currency in early nationalist writings (a legacy explored at length in Chapter Four's discussion of nationalism in colonial fiction). It is therefore complicit in initiating and intensifying damaging cultural imaginings of these postcolonial spaces, from geographies of communalism, tribalism and sectarianism to infrastructures of inequality, hierarchy and corruption—physical and imaginative infrastructures that would, in many instances, have catastrophic consequences for the world's postcolonial citizens. Though a post-imperial analysis is beyond the scope of this book, it is these outgrowths and ongoing ramifications that inform the project's political urgency, remaining aware throughout of what Derek Gregory identifies as 'the continuities between the colonial past and the colonial present' (2004: 7). Fanon's words resonate throughout the following chapters, emphasising the inscription of inequality, oppression and exploitation into the infrastructures that gave shape to colonialism's physical spaces, whilst maintaining a combative and self-consciously resistant stance towards them.

It is thus for historical as well as methodological reasons that I subscribe to Fredric Jameson's call to engage with 'the political interpretation of literary texts', not as 'some supplementary method' but 'rather as the absolute horizon of all reading and interpretation' (2002: p.1). Tony Bennett, too, argues that 'the activity of criticism is itself a preeminently *political* exercise' (2003: 111). This book proceeds *not* from the question of 'what literature's political effects *are*', but rather 'what they might be *made to be*' (111). As another materialist critic, Pierre Macherey, comments, 'criticism immediately dissents from the empiricist fallacy', instead aspiring 'to indicate a possible alternative to the given' (1986: 15). Reading this colonial literature for that which 'lurks, deceptively, *behind* its real meaning' (22)—its 'political unconscious', as Jameson would call it (2002)—the book attempts to build an alternative, broad map of the colonial literary field through a series of highly focused and specific micro-analyses. It is important to stress, here, that the textual readings of which the chapters are comprised are indeed very 'close'—though Moretti has since advocated the practice of 'distant reading', he elsewhere emphasises that 'the *minutiae* of language reveals secrets that great ideas often mask [...] the false starts, the hesitations, the compromises' (2013: PAGES). It is my hope that when these attentive close readings are read cumulatively and across several colonial authors and texts, the larger map that I am attempting to sketch will emerge. But as I shall repeatedly demonstrate, the idea is not simply 'to tell the truth that colonial discourses did not tell'—not simply 'to tell the truth over lies', as Mignolo frames it—but rather 'to think otherwise' about colonial literature and the task of the literary critic reading it today; 'to change the terms, not just the content of the conversation' (2012: 69-70).

The tension between the book's broader mapping efforts and the close textual analysis of its constituent parts is contained by its methodological strategy. Throughout, I draw on a range of different, though related, materialist critics—from Macherey, Terry Eagleton and Barbara Harlow to Harvey, Parry and James C. Scott, amongst others. These critics and the reading techniques they have developed are selected tactically at each stage in order to 'make' the particular text under analysis "'reveal" or "distance" the dominant ideological forms to which they are *made* to "allude"', thereby mobilising 'them politically in stated directions' (Bennett, 2003: 114-115). This strategic use of different critical techniques across the four chapters is woven together through the framework of the networked world-system, which is retained as an analytical lens throughout. The resulting dual movement (close and distant) allows, I hope, for *infrastructural reading's* simultaneous close-textual nuance and wider generalisation, as well as its future applicability. Each chapter is organised around a specific theme, refracting the methodology through four of the period's most dominant ideological paradigms: 'humanitarianism', 'segregation', 'frontiers' and 'nationalism'. The chapters negotiate colonial literary texts that are mostly (though not strictly) arranged chronologically so that the book's broader methodological contribution builds cumulatively over the historical period as well as across these four themes. Whilst Chapters One and Three are author-specific studies (Flora Annie Steel and John Buchan respectively), Chapters Two and Four each offer comparative readings of multiple

authors (and are thus slightly lengthier) and are designed to bringing colonial literature's *recurrent* and *intersecting* trends, tropes and traumas to the surface. *Infrastructural reading* builds cumulatively as a coherent methodology throughout the book, but it is necessary to take the time to outline it in more detail now.

### **Infrastructural Reading: Critiquing Cross-National Capital in Colonial Literature**

The methodological reading practice that I call *infrastructural reading* is rooted in a dualistic, yet connected use of the word 'infrastructure' as a critical tool for opening up and comprehending a mutually sustaining relationship embedded within colonial literary narratives. The first is the use of infrastructure *in* the text, both physically and symbolically—what Sarah Nuttall would call the 'literary infrastructures', or 'imaginary infrastructures that surface in fiction' (2008: 198-200): roads, railways, cantonments, the colonial bungalow, and so on. This is, in many ways, the more conventional side of the infrastructural coin that informs this methodology, in that it simply means the occurrence of a certain type of infrastructure in the literary text. In South Africa, for example, Olive Schreiner's novel *Undine*, written during the 1870s, depicts mining headgear, a fundamental infrastructure for Kimberley's diamond industry, whilst William Plomer's short story, 'Ula Masondo' (1927), represents the urban infrastructural layout of walls, roads and compounds that were built in Johannesburg in the early twentieth century.

The second usage is the more complex notion of the infrastructure *of* the text. By this I mean the historical raw material, be it social, economic or geographic, out of which the literature, as a specific crystallisation of cultural patterns and trends, is carved. Given that world-systems analysis informs my approach, I perhaps unsurprisingly read these most often as the infrastructures *of* the unevenly developing cross-national capitalist economy during this period. As the close textual readings throughout this book demonstrate, the infrastructures *in* the text and the infrastructures *of* the text are intimately related. In the process of mapping colonial literature's narrative depiction of imperial infrastructures, I have consistently found that when they surface *in* the text, the economic and political infrastructures *of* imperialism (and the capitalist world-system) are *at least* acknowledged, if not explicitly engaged. This simultaneity of signification means that the imperial rhetoric of 'civilisation' and 'modernity', which was often sustained by those lines of physical infrastructure, collide with the socioeconomic and political realities of imperialism—that is, the processes of economic exploitation and uneven and underdevelopment that those infrastructures historically enabled. The result is a productive clash, or conflictual friction, that results in the production of gaps from within which various forms of anti-imperial resistance can be excavated and (re)mobilised.

Whilst infrastructure is fundamental to the way in which colonial literature *represents* colonial space, it also allows us to see how this literature might *produce* it. My use of the word *production* is taken here from the work of Henri Lefebvre in his landmark text, *La Production de L'Espace* (1974). Wallerstein has been rightly critiqued for conceiving of the world-system within a 'morphologically static territorial matrix', but combining his insights with Lefebvre allows for a more '*historical and dynamic*' conceptualisation 'of social space' (Brenner, 2011: 102). Within this framework, colonial literature produces what Lefebvre would call 'representational spaces', 'space as directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols and hence the space of its "inhabitants" and "users", but also of some artists and [of those] who describe and aspire to do no more than describe': the literature can therefore be conceived as cartographic productions that 'overlay physical space, making symbolic use of its objects' (1998: 39). For literary descriptions and surveys of the colonial landscape, the 'objects' most obviously available are those physical embodiments of empire: imperialism's physical infrastructures routes that carve up the geographical terrain, though as we shall see, specific topographical features also at times become important for this cartographic project. These literary productions therefore perpetuate the use of infrastructures as spatial sense-making technologies,

feeding back into the broader infrastructural strategies of the colonial project and, in the cross-national physical and economic circuitries of those infrastructures, an imperial one. Colonial literature can be understood as an intervention into 'the dialectical relationship that exists within the triad of the perceived, the conceived, and the lived' that necessarily always 'grasp[s]', but also produces, 'the concrete'—to reduce this dialectical relationship to nothing more than an 'abstract "model"' is, Lefebvre argues, to limit the process 'to no more than that of one ideological mediation amongst others' (38-40).

Read through this lens, colonial literature can be seen to have contributed materially to the imperialism's infrastructural development. As Neil Smith observes of Jameson's use of spatial terminology, space must not be reduced 'to metaphor' with its 'materiality still unrealised'; rather, it is imperative to understand 'the mutuality of material and metaphorical space' (Smith, 2008: 223). Anthropologist Brian Larkin, in his summary discussion of the recent critical reevaluation of infrastructure, argues that it is by 'being alive to the formal dimensions of infrastructures' that an understanding of the 'sort of semiotic objects they are' and an analysis of 'how they address and constitute subjects' can be developed (2013: 329). At close textual levels, colonial literature offers a crystallised moment in which the 'formal dimensions of infrastructures' are expressed. With a little 'reverse-engineering', as Moretti aptly calls it, it might therefore be made to reveal 'the problem it was designed to solve' (2013: PAGES). Studying occurrences of infrastructure in literature as momentary pauses in the Lefebvrian dialectic, it is possible 'to elucidate', to use Nirvana Tanoukhi's words, 'the diverse forms of entanglement between literary history and the history of the production of space' (2011: 94-5).

In this literature, fictional narrators repeatedly profess cartographic accuracy, whilst other characters constantly make use of maps and other spatially enabling technologies (such as compasses, field-glasses and so on). Practicing imperialism as a 'metaphoric and cartographic undertaking', observes Elleke Boehmer, 'colonisers relied on and scattered about them the stock descriptions and authoritative symbols that lay to hand' (1995: 13-14, 49). Extending Boehmer's metaphoric and symbolic fields to the physical infrastructures that shaped colonial spaces in uneven but deeply material ways, we can see how colonial literature, as it represents these infrastructures, participates in what Edward Soja, since Lefebvre, has called the 'socio-spatial dialectic' (2010: 4). As a spatial sense-making technology itself, colonial literature draws on infrastructures to give shape to its own representations, and in turn (re)produces a colonial landscape shaped by imperial ideologies and their subsequent socialities (racial and class hierarchies, for example). It is complicit in the production of what Jason Moore calls '*abstract social nature*', the 'family of processes through which states and capitalists map, identify, quantify, measure, and code human and extra-human natures in service to capital accumulation' (2015: 194). In this sense, colonial literature is one of imperialism's 'productive forces', 'tools and technological systems' that, like infrastructure itself, work 'toward definite ways of producing and reproducing life' (195). Running through the textual surface of colonial literature, these infrastructural networks give it social and economic shape; it follows that the exploitative dynamics of core-periphery relations are embedded in, if also thinly concealed by, its various narrative formations. Colonial literary texts can, then, on occasion, be made to confess their complicity with the uneven accumulation of capitalist imperialism: Buchan's Davie Crawford may use the railroad as a spatial referent and symbolic object that allows him to navigate the South African landscape, but the reason he travels that railroad in the first place is, after all, to 'open up new trade among the natives' (2008: 15).

It should be apparent by now that, by developing the methodology of *infrastructural reading*, I want to consider the way in which the literary and cultural terrain is interacting with the fraught territorial contest between methods of imperial expansion, exploitation and control, and resistance to these processes. If Edward Said reminds us that '[t]he actual geographical possession of land is what empire in the final analysis is all about', and that 'the culture associated with it affirms both the primacy of geography and an ideology about control of territory', for him, the 'territories, lands,

geographical domains, the actual geographic underpinnings of the imperial,' underly 'social space' and the 'the cultural contest' (1993: 93). The two terrains remain detached or separate, the former somehow located 'beneath' or 'below' the other. Infrastructure, as the physical, economic and symbolic scaffolding of empire, connects these multiple spheres, becoming, as my discussion will go on to show, the most fruitful point at which they can be seen to interconnect and collide. Political and ideological nuances coagulate around these infrastructural routes, creating textual moments in which they can most productively be captured, isolated and analysed.

As noted in this book's opening comments, processes of 'mapping' and 'map-making' are crucial here. Certainly, colonial literature 'functions as a form of mapping' by 'offering its readers descriptions of places, situating them in a kind of imaginary space, and providing points of reference by which they can orient themselves and understand the world' (Tally, 2013: 2). But it also maps something else: the literature charts the contours not only of imperial geographies, but also ideologies, revealing, to use Jameson's words, 'the limits of a specific ideological consciousness' and surveying 'the points beyond which that consciousness cannot go' (2002: 32). The literature's varying genres, forms and plot-sequences register, to varying degrees in different cases, these ideologies and their limits. An infrastructural analysis of colonial literature refutes the ostensible 'objectivity' of its geographical 'mapping' projects. Rather, the texts produce a politically charged landscape that binds different ideologies unevenly, and often tactically, to different segments of the colonial landscape. Space becomes, as Soja explains, 'predominantly related to the reproduction of the dominant system of social relations' (1989: 91). It is for this reason that I preface the four titular themes of each chapter with the word 'mapping', as each analyses both their infrastructural and ideological formations. For Edmund Candler, for example, nationalist resistance is restricted to the topographical feature of 'the cave', where it is spatially isolated and contained, no longer a threat to the Raj's hegemony. Haggard, too, positions Southern Africa's Black population in a geographical zone separated from white settler society. By contrast, William Plomer intertextually rewrites the imperial romance in order to subvert this segregationist ideology, thereby undermining 'the production of space, the territorial structure of exploitation and domination [and] the spatially controlled reproduction of the system as a whole' (Soja, 1989: p.92).

By demonstrating colonial literature's participation in the production of space, the book's mapping of a cultural onto a geographic and socioeconomic terrain avoids what John Tagg, in his discussion of a 'reductive and economistic Immanuel Wallerstein', calls 'the primitive architecture of the base and superstructure model of the social whole' (2000: 156). Though heeding this warning, the application of world-systems analysis to the dual, though deeply interconnected types of infrastructural networks—in and of—that run through this body of literature allows an assessment of the impact of physical embodiments of empire on its cultural corollary and vice versa. It becomes possible to assess the impact that cultural terrains, that I will show to be littered with fissures, tears and fragments of resistance, might have upon the physical geographies and the socioeconomies of imperialism. As Gramsci argued, though 'material forces are the content and ideologies are the form', this 'distinction has purely indicative value, since the material forces would be inconceivable historically without form and the ideologies would be individual fancies without the material forces' (1988: 200). I arrive here at Raymond William's replacement of 'the formula of base and superstructure with the more active idea of a field of mutually if also unevenly determining forces' (2005: 20). Though this study is clearly influenced by a number of 'postcolonial' critics, then, its focus on the infrastructure of the world-*system* thus rejects the 'antecedent lexicon of "post"-theory' and its preoccupation with the 'untotalisable fragment', instead following WReC's recent work that emphasises 'vertical and horizontal integration, connection and interconnection, structurality and organisation, internal differentiation, a hierarchy of constitutive elements governed by specific "logics" of determination and relationality' (2015: 6-8).

By emphasising imperialism's uneven infrastructural development, the uneven representational and production practices of colonial literature can be foregrounded and the

reproduction of its ideological frameworks—or, just as bad, the assimilation of anti-imperial resistance into its hegemonic apparatus—can be avoided. In order to initiate a resistance to, rather than a perpetuation of, imperial ideology, it is necessary both introduce the conceptual and political spaces that lie beyond its ideological and representational contours, whilst finding ways to prevent the assimilation of those spaces into its cartographic endeavours. If, according to Wallerstein and others, ‘[o]pposition to oppression is coterminous with the existence of hierarchical social systems’, even when it remains ‘latent’ (Arrighi et al., 2011: 29), literary representations of infrastructural networks should contain clues, at its sub-textual or marginal levels, of ongoing ‘anti-systemic’ resistance. Though ‘the work cannot speak of the more or less complex opposition which structures it’, the literary text, when read strategically, ‘manifests, uncovers, what it cannot say’ (Macherey, 1986: 84). The presence of resistance, if not the fully-fledged articulation of it, becomes configured within colonial literature’s mapping project: the frontispiece map in the opening pages of *King Solomon’s Mines* may depict an apparently consolidated, infrastructural route, but in order to do so it must also include the swathes of peripheral, unmapped landscape that surround it (Haggard, 2008: 21). Resistant spaces—or kinds of *spatial* resistance—are written into colonialism’s literary landscapes as they are dialectically produced by physical infrastructures and cultural representations of them.

### **Hobson, Luxemburg, Lenin: Why 1880 to 1930?**

The capitalist underpinnings of the British Empire, and the processes of ‘accumulation’ that I take to be the drivers of its uneven infrastructural development during this period, are grounded in theories of economic imperialism elaborated by a number of contemporaneous anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist thinkers. Though world-systems analysis provides the over-arching framework for *infrastructural reading*, using its diagnostic tools is by no means an entirely retrospective—nor anachronistic—act. Indeed, in this section I wish to stress the connections between anti-imperial critiques produced coterminously with British imperial hegemony and my own reassessment of colonial literature. For Soja, at the end of the nineteenth century ‘every scale of life was being restructured to meet the urgent demands of capitalism in crisis’, resulting in a new spatiality that manifested in ‘poetry and painting, in the writing of novels and literary criticism, in architecture and what then represented urban and regional planning’ (1989: 34). If in ‘social science and scientific socialism, a persistent historicism tended to obscure this insidious spatialisation’, there were exceptions: between them, these exceptions—‘Lenin, Luxemburg, Bukharin, Trotsky, and Bauer, the key figures leading the early twentieth-century modernisation of Marxism’—laid a ‘rich foundation for a Marxist theory of geographically (as well as historically) uneven development’ (32), and it is to two of these theorists in particular that I this section will turn.

First, however, we must begin with J.A. Hobson. Though not a Marxist as such, his influence on later Marxist writers and other anti-imperialist thinkers ‘cannot be ignored’ (Brewer, 2001: 73). Not coincidentally, Hobson’s critique of imperialism grew out of his experience as a journalist in South Africa, where he witnessed the swift but uneven infrastructural growth Johannesburg in 1899 firsthand: ‘the golden city of Africa, with its eighty miles of streets’, reached ‘out its tentacles on every side’ and connected the urban centre to ‘its mining villages’ (Hobson, 1900: 10). Vocal in his criticisms of the ‘encroachments of Great Britain to the north’ and ‘the annexation of the Kimberley diamond fields’ (130), Hobson highlighted the appetite for resource accumulation that drove the development of infrastructural networks such as the telegraph and railway northward into the African continent. He shed light on the way in which Cecil Rhodes and a cartel of other transnational capitalists had in the 1890s ‘designed to use the money of the British taxpayer to obtain for himself and fellow-capitalists that political control of the Transvaal which was essential to his economical and political ambitions’ (206-7). The Anglo-Boer War was, Hobson argued, ‘being waged in order to

secure for the mines a cheap adequate supply of labour' (231), an observation taken up in greater detail Chapters Two of this book.

The use of imperial rule to facilitate capital accumulation—in Wallerstein's terms, the world-system expanding under the political, though 'temporary hegemony' of the British 'imperium' (Hopkins and Wallerstein, 1982: 52)—underpinned Hobson's slightly later and more theoretical work, *Imperialism, A Study* (1902). There he defined imperialism as 'the use of the machinery of government by private interests, mainly capitalists, to secure for them economic gains outside their country' (1988: 94). The metabolisms of profitable capitalist industries fuelled imperial expansion, inverting the popular political 'dogma' of the time 'that "Trade follows the Flag"' (33). There was, Hobson writes, a 'great expenditure of public money upon ships, guns, military and naval equipment and stores', one that fed 'business and professional interests [...] in opposition to the common good' (48), producing underdeveloped zones and impoverished peoples not only in colonial spaces, but also in metropolitan Britain. For Hobson, the economic 'core' of the world-system is again more helpfully configured at the level of networked infrastructural development than at that of the nation-state. Capitalism survived, Hobson argued, by generating vast 'public debts' in the imperial centre and loaning these to 'colonies' and 'foreign countries that come under [Britain's] protectorate' through investments in 'rails, engines, guns' and the 'making of railways, canals, and other public works': that is, the fixed capital of imperialism's unevenly developing infrastructural projects (49).

Karl Marx first theorised the notion of 'the accumulation of capital' in Part IV, Volume 1 of *Capital* in 1867 (1999: 315-362), and more specifically the idea of 'primitive accumulation' in Part V (363-380). Though, as David McLellan points out, 'the phenomena of imperialism are largely absent from *Capital*' because 'the main colonial push came after its publication' (xxvi), Marx wrote numerous articles and letters that addressed imperialism's infiltration of the Indian subcontinent in the years leading up to the 1880s, building a 'critique of capital' that 'was far broader than is usually supposed' (Anderson, 2010: 237). Infrastructural development crucially informed his analysis of these processes of capital accumulation. Writing in an article published in August 1853, Marx foresaw that:

the English millocracy intend to endow India with railways with the exclusive view of extracting at diminished expenses, the cotton and other raw materials for their manufactures. But when you have once introduced machinery into the locomotion of a country, which possesses iron and coals, you are unable to withhold it from its fabrication. You cannot maintain a net of railways over an immense country without introducing all those industrial processes necessary to meet the immediate and current wants of railway locomotion, and out of which there must grow the application of machinery to those branches of industry not immediately connected with the railways. The railway system will therefore become, in India, truly the forerunner of modern industry. (2006: 48-9)

Marx theorised these insights a few years later in the *Grundrisse*, where he emphasised the importance of 'the physical conditions of exchange—of the means of communication and transport' to 'the annihilation of space by time', a process that facilitated capital's need to 'drive beyond every spatial barrier' (1993: 524). However, whilst Marx anticipated the expansion of the world-system through the construction of a variety of infrastructural and industrial technologies, it is Rosa Luxemburg who, in *The Accumulation of Capital* (published in 1913, midway through the half-century analysed here), applied it to a specifically imperial context. Luxemburg criticises Marx for failing to see that, as Iqbal Husain describes, 'surplus value in capitalist production could be "realised" by the capitalists only through the enforced system of commodity exchange with precapitalist (colonial and peasant) economies' (Marx, 2006: xlvi-xlvii). For Luxemburg, it was a geographically expansive process of 'accumulation' that was integral to 'feeding' capital's metabolism, a relationship that, she

argued, took place not *within* the capitalist system, but between that system and the pre- or non-capitalist societies that lay beyond it. The accumulation of capital, she wrote, ‘corrodes and assimilates’; it depends upon the ‘continuous and progressive disintegration of non-capitalist organisations’ (2003: 397-8)—it feeds ‘off its external environment. Its outside is essential’ (Hardt and Negri, 2001: 224). Of course, this binary configuration of accumulation taking place ‘between the ever-expanding domain of capital and the surrounding “medium and soil” of static, closed natural economies’ is, as Anthony Brewer argues, ‘surely too simple’ (2001: 68), and is productively complemented by the emphasis placed on *uneven* development as undertaken by more recent commentators, to which I shall return in a moment. However, Luxemburg still saw that these processes occurred ‘at the margin where capitalist and pre-capitalist economic systems meet’, a margin that ‘exists within countries rather than between them’ (72), emphasising the networked composition of the world-system’s core-periphery relations.

Luxemburg drew on the specific historical contexts of both South Africa and South Asia in order to develop her critique. Her analysis cut through ideologies of humanitarianism—what Pablo Mukherjee has called ‘palliative imperialism’ (2013: 18), discussed in greater detail in Chapter One and Four of this book—to conclude that ‘British capital had no object in giving the Indian communities economic support or helping them to survive. Quite the reverse, it aimed to destroy them and deprive them of their productive forces’ (Luxemburg, 2013: 356). Likewise, in South Africa after the discovery of the diamond and gold fields in 1867 and 1876 respectively, Luxemburg analysed the rise of ‘mining capital’ in the region: the Union of South Africa was a moment in which, with the formation of ‘a great modern state, as envisaged by Cecil Rhodes’ imperialist programme’, ‘capital officially took over the reins’ (396). For Luxemburg, infrastructure is again fundamental, the ‘forward thrusts of capital [...] approximately reflected in the development of the railway network’ (400). Infrastructures such as railways exported resources from and imported manufactures to the colonies, whilst also proving a ‘well-trying measure for civilising and pacifying the natives’ (395). However, whilst intimating a networked picture of the world-system, her spatial paradigm remained constituted of blocked out segments of landscapes rather than unevenly developing infrastructures. This led Luxemburg to conclude that once ‘external’ geographical spaces are assimilated into the world-system, capitalism would no longer survive. ‘Since’, she argued, ‘the earth is finite and the acquisition of new markets must some time come to an end, the time will come when the question can no longer simply be adjourned’ (223). Luxemburg failed to predict that capital was as much responsible for *underdevelopment* as it was development—that it’s development was uneven—and that it actively produced peripheral spaces to which it might return through a series of spatial expansions and contractions, manifesting often at the level of infrastructural development.

For Luxemburg, then, in the 1880s capital ran out of what Neil Smith calls ‘absolute’ space into which it could expand (2008: 134). According to Smith, by the final decades of the nineteenth century capital’s expansionist movement was restricted by solidifying political boundaries as they were drawn by competing imperial powers and, in turn, often adopted and imagined by emerging anti-colonial nationalisms:

The absolute expansion of nation states and of their colonies came to an end with the final partitioning of Africa in the 1880s. Certainly there were some internal islands of non-development, and indeed at the urban scale the process was not yet complete, but mopping these up would not on its own sustain the necessary economic expansion of capitalism. (2008: 119-120)

Smith refers here to the Berlin Conference of November 1884, when competing imperial powers partitioned Africa between themselves and planned the imposition of around 50,000 miles of colonial frontiers across the continent between 1885 and 1914 (Griffiths, 1995: 34; Pakenham, 2009). Meanwhile, in South Asia, we find the almost coterminous formation of the Indian National

Congress in Bombay in 1885, an organisation that would become ‘the focus of the longest-lived nationalist movement in the modern colonial world’ and the ‘model for nationalist movements everywhere, above all, South Africa’ (Metcalf and Metcalf, 2002: 136). On a global scale, in 1884 the world was demarcated into a system of time zones with the Greenwich Meridian at its centre, a process that cartographically positioned Britain at the heart of its world-empire—by 1913 this system spanned almost the entire face of the globe (Osterhammel and Petersson, 2003: 82-3). Despite these tectonic global shifts, however, for Headrick as for this book, the ‘most noticeable transformation of the late nineteenth century was the triumph of the technologies introduced in the previous 100 years’, of which ‘[r]ailroads and steamships were the most conspicuous’ (2009: 111).<sup>2</sup>

It is not my intention to argue whether or not capital did, indeed, run out of ‘absolute’ space in the 1880s. This timeline has been the explicit argument of geographers such as Smith, who maintains that at the end of the nineteenth century there was a ‘geographical transition from the absolute expansion of global capitalism to its internal expansion and differentiation, and the emergence of the classical pattern of uneven development’ (2005: 108-109). Clearly, however, Smith’s is a general rather than exact commentary: internal differentiation occurred prior to this moment and at the same time as global expansion, with that expansion itself developing unevenly in different regions at different times and speeds. More recently, critical contributions have argued for readjustments of the timescale of the instantiation and development of the capitalist world-system, de-emphasising ‘the immediate practices and structures of European imperialism’ and stressing that it was ‘the “new” imperialism of early modernity’, beginning with the Iberians in the late sixteenth century, that created ‘a new way of seeing and ordering reality’ (Moore, 2015: 190). For Wallerstein, ‘the pushing of outer boundaries of the world-economy to the limits of the earth’ were only just ‘being approached’ in the 1880s (1979: 278), but this fails to account for the ‘internal islands’, to use Smith’s phrase (2008: 120), not necessarily of ‘non-development’, but of underdevelopment. And clearly, ‘capitalist forms and relations exist alongside “archaic forms of economic life” and pre-existing social and class relations’ even today, speaking to the ‘combined’ aspect of what WReC, following Trotsky and others, have emphasised as capital’s ‘combined and uneven development’ (2015: 11). If, at ‘first glance, the new empires had more effective technological and organisational means of exerting and maintaining power’, Cooper maintains that what resulted was ‘a patchwork of economic exploitation rather than a systematic transformation’ (Cooper, 2005: 157). As he continues, all sorts of ‘varied networks shape the nature of capitalism and its highly uneven effects’, and there have been numerous ‘[c]ommunications revolutions, capital movements, and regulatory apparatuses’ that ‘all need to be studied’ (111-112). For this book, it is the infrastructural networks of British imperialism that are placed centre-stage, and an emphasis on their *unevenly networked* composition, rather than any hegemonic totality, that leaves room for complexities of alternate infrastructural activity and socioeconomic organisation in its methodological approach to colonial literature.

From this perspective, then, the motions of global capital were clearly foregrounded in the 1880s by the boom in communication and transport technologies, resulting in an acute unevenness that was most clearly demarcated by infrastructural development. This was in turn accompanied by an increase in the global imaginary of metropolitan and colonial subjects alike, or what Moore would call their ‘way of seeing and ordering reality’ (2015: 190), as Kipling observed so perceptively in 1914. In 1883, the historian John Seeley observed the ‘simple and obvious fact of the extension of the English name into other countries of the globe’ (1914: 9), an ideology of national expansion that could, albeit somewhat simplistically, be mapped onto economic terrain (see Sassen, 2006: 132). As Hannah Arendt argues: ‘imperialism, which grew out of colonialism and was caused by the

---

<sup>2</sup> Headrick points out elsewhere that this era of the ‘new imperialism’ coincided ‘with the creation of modern underdeveloped economies in Asia and Africa’, arguing that it is a ‘consideration of the technologies involved’, primarily manifested in imperial infrastructural developments, that ‘can shed some light on this question’ (1988: 4).

incongruity of the nation-state system with the economic and industrial developments in the last third of the nineteenth century, started its politics of expansion for expansion's sake no sooner than around 1884' (2004: 159). This 'new version of politics'—imperialism—is 'born', for Arendt as for Hobson, 'when the ruling class in capitalist production came up against national limitations to its economic expansion' (170). Significantly, like Hobson and Luxemburg, Arendt developed these ideas out of her analysis of the historical example of South Africa at the turn of the twentieth century, a 'sensitivity to the significance of the violence perpetrated at the colonial limit' that is 'part of Arendt's debt to the work of Rosa Luxemburg' (Caygill, 2013: 153).

Raymond Williams, too, argues that '[f]rom about 1880 there was then this dramatic extension of landscape and social relations [and] a marked development of the idea of England as "home"' (1973: 281). In this configuration, the developed and industrialised 'consuming capital' of London begins to be imagined in direct contrast to the 'rural' areas of colonial landscapes, transformed 'by economic and political force [into] plantation economies, mining areas [and] single-crop markets' (284), with an increased depth and virility, even if these relational dynamics had been in play since the fifteenth century (Rodney, 2012: 95-100). For the first time, Williams continues, 'a model of city and country' moves beyond 'the boundaries of the nation-state, and is seen but also challenged as a model of the world' (1973: 279). Williams's analysis, like Arendt's, build on Hobson's earlier contribution, highlighting the material underpinnings of 'political imperialism' and translating this into a view of the British Empire as an unevenly developed network of core-peripheral relations. Impoverished populations—'[t]he unemployed man from the slums of the cities, the superfluous landless worker, the dispossessed peasant'—are produced within *both* the colonised countries *and* imperial nation (283).<sup>3</sup> As Wallerstein concedes, core and periphery 'are simply phrases to locate one crucial part of the system of surplus appropriation by the bourgeoisie': if the 'proletarian is located in a different country from this bourgeoisie' this results 'in patterns of "uneven development"' (1991: 293). Core and periphery could be found, colonial literature reveals, to be distributed unevenly across the face of the globe, regardless of political and national borders, and was best measured through the symbolic objects of imperial infrastructure.

It is for these reasons that Smith, in his book-length discussion of uneven development, turns from Luxemburg's important theoretical contributions to focus instead on Lenin's later work, especially his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916). Lenin was attuned to the more *spatially* complex ways in which capital sustained its accumulative metabolism. As Lenin hypothesised, though 'the colonial policy of the capitalist countries has *completed* the seizure of the unoccupied territories on our planet' this does not mean that '*a new partition* is impossible—on the contrary, new partitions are possible and inevitable':

For the first time the world is completely shared out, so that in the future only *redivision is possible*; territories can only pass from one 'owner' to another, instead of passing as unowned territory to an 'owner'. (1987: 227)

This occurred, Lenin continues, during 'the period of the enormous expansion of colonial conquests [...] between 1860 and 1880, and it was also very considerable in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century' (228). As Smith reads Lenin, capitalist development therefore sustains itself 'not through absolute expansion in a given space but through the internal differentiation of global space, that is through the production of differentiated spaces' (2008: 120). Lenin begins to theorise the notion of uneven development across and between nations, but also at the lower geographical scales of the networked world-system: 'The uneven and spasmodic character of the development of

---

<sup>3</sup> Williams also emphasises the post-imperial outgrowths of the '[m]assive investments' in 'economic and political infrastructure' made during this period, often couched as 'aid', but that continues to develop peripheral 'economies towards metropolitan needs' through 'the preservation of markets and spheres of influence' or 'the continuation of indirect political control' (1973: 284).

individual enterprises, of individual branches of industry and individual countries, is inevitable under the capitalist system' (1987: 215). For Lenin, like Marx and Luxemburg before him, the physical infrastructures of imperial expansion were both the economic *and* symbolic expression of cross-national capitalism. He writes in the preface to the French and German editions of *Imperialism*, published slightly later in 1920:

Railways are the summation of the most important branches of capitalist industry, coal and iron; the summation and most striking indices of the development of the world trade and bourgeois-democratic civilisation. [...] The uneven distribution of the railways, their uneven development, are the summation of modern monopolist capitalism on a world scale. (1934: 10)

Both Smith and Harvey have since emphasised the centrality of infrastructure as enabling, expressing and reproducing the processes of uneven development. The 'frantic geographical expansion' of capital accumulation 'requires a continuous investment of capital in the creation of a built environment for production': 'Roads, railways, factories, fields, workshops, warehouses, wharves, sewers, canals, power stations'; infrastructures that function as 'geographically immobilised forms of fixed capital, so central to the progress of accumulation' (Smith, 2008: 159-60). As Harvey explains, 'capitalism seeks to overcome spatial barriers through the creation of physical infrastructures that are immobile in space'; infrastructures function as a 'spatial fix' that resolves—if only temporarily—the internal contradictions of capitalism' (1999: 379-80, 393). The 'concentrations of capital and labour' that congregate in metropolitan areas seesaws with 'sprawling far-flung development' into peripheral zones, as these infrastructures open up new pools of labour-power and material resources and offer financial capitalists the opportunity for speculative investment—'roads and railways litter a landscape that has been indelibly and irreversibly carved out according to the dictates of capitalism' (373). Seeking a spatial fix in the form of 'an immobile environment for production' (fixed infrastructure), 'external space' is unevenly produced '*within and as part of the global geography of capitalism*', manifesting as 'social inequality blazoned into the geographical landscape' (Smith, 2008: 187, 198, 206). At this spatial-historical crisis-point in the development of the world-system, as both contemporaneous and retrospective analysts here conceived it, the production of space—physically and economically, but also ideologically in ways that are registered and produced in the literary-cultural terrain—becomes fundamental to the resolution of capitalism's deep-set contradictions.

It is my argument, then, that the depiction of infrastructure in colonial literature from the 1880s onwards functions, correspondingly, as what Stephen Shapiro calls a 'cultural fix': 'Just as the spatial fix involves opening new geographies, the cultural fix, likewise, looks to establish new identities for control' (2014: 1262). Cultural fixes 'serve to normalise otherwise unacceptable appropriations of global natures, human and extra-human' (Moore, 2015: 199). Operating on a cultural terrain, colonial literature tries to 'fix' contradictions in imperial ideology by looking repeatedly to infrastructures as spatial reference points and (re)producing their uneven geographical developments. Colonial literature becomes obsessed with the production of spaces that might satiate the accumulative appetite of the capitalist world-system and resolve the ideological tensions this throws up, producing cultural maps of uneven infrastructural development in order to do so. *Infrastructural reading* focuses on the occurrence of infrastructure in colonial literature in order to unpick this 'cultural fix' as it manifests in textual form. Focusing on these representations of infrastructures allows us to see how they contribute to uneven geographical development within the imperial imagination and, through its (re)production of space, to the very material inequalities that shape the colonial environment; it is in these moments, and often despite its best efforts, that colonial literature confesses to imperialism's complicity in the 'development of underdevelopment' (WRcC, 2015: 13).

If Lenin concludes that imperialism, spatially conceived, 'means the partition of the world', his discussion of effective, revolutionary resistance is similarly spatial and rooted in material

geographic space—something that ‘the social-liberal Hobson is unable to perceive’ because, Lenin indicts, of his tendency ‘to substitute petty-bourgeois reformism for Marxism’ (1987: 249-50, 258). For Lenin, it is through both the formation of cohesive nationalist identities and anti-imperial solidarities unified by class-consciousness that resistance to imperialist world-economies can be conceived and effectively initiated.<sup>4</sup> Though I am primarily concerned with the excavation of elusive moments of resistance from colonial literature, I also want to emphasise that, especially in fiction written towards the end of the half-century of 1880 to 1930, the geographic and territorial shape of the post-imperial nation begins to haunt these cultural productions of space. What results is a fundamental contradiction that results in deep rift within the ideological fabric of colonial literature; as Hopkins and Wallerstein point out, ‘integrating production on a world-scale’ and the formation of ‘strong national-states’ are the world-system’s ‘two broad’, though ‘deeply contradictory’, ‘organising tendencies’ (1982: 43).

The conception of both South Africa and India as independent national units no longer under the political domain of the British world-empire occurs *not only* in nationalist and other anti-colonial writings, *but also* within colonial literary productions of space. As Anderson has demonstrated, the nation is ‘an imagined political community’ that comes into being as an ‘inherently limited and sovereign’ entity bound to a static geographical territory; the nation has to be ‘imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations’ (2006: pp.5-6). The contours of the imagined post-imperial nation are debated and shaped by contemporaneous anti-colonial and nationalist movements throughout the final decades of the British Empire’s global hegemonic supremacy, but this contest is also played out in the subtexts and infrastructural frameworks of much of this colonial literature. Colonial texts written and published in the 1910s and ‘20s are already preoccupied with the disintegration of formal British rule, the emergence of newly independent nations and the infrastructural foundations and geographical perimeters that will shape them. It is for this reason—as well, of course, simply for issues of scope and focus—that the book ends in 1930, rather than extending its analysis right up until, say, Indian independence in 1947.

The title of the latest novel discussed at length in this book, Thompson’s *A Farewell to India* (1931), is indicative of the concerns circulating at this time. Historically speaking, this is perhaps unsurprising. On 2 March 1930, then viceroy of India, Lord Irwin, ‘received an ultimatum in the form of a polite letter from Gandhi’ (Newsinger, 2010: 141). Ten days later, Gandhi began his famous march to the sea with the intention of breaking the ‘British enforced monopoly on the sale and production of salt’, ‘a masterpiece of political mobilisation’ that targeted exploitative economic policies of imperial administration (141). As Dietmar Rothermund has argued, this event, which led to the Civil Disobedience campaign of 1930-32, ‘recruited the younger generation of many groups who had not so far participated in nationalist politics’ (1970: 23), and in January 1930 that the Indian National Congress ‘celebrated “Independence Day” for the first time’ (Heehs, 2010: 172). This anti-imperial activism had been accelerated by the first Non-Cooperation campaign of 1920-22, the first time that, according to Jim Masselos, ‘grievances against the British had brought the country together in one movement under one leader’ (2010: 168-9). Though these resistant activities would ebb away through the mid-1920s, their return towards the end of the decade makes 1930 a poignant year with which to conclude this study.

Though less obviously a landmark date in South African history, 1930 can still be situated within the context of political unrest and anti-imperial resistance, though 1910 is of more central concern to authors such as Buchan. When ‘Boer Generals and the British capitalists swore blood-brotherhood in the Union of 1910’, the flames of both Afrikaner nationalism and Black activism were

---

<sup>4</sup> See specifically Lenin’s *State and Revolution* (1917), where he positions ‘the organisation of national unity’ as a core ingredient for his ideological vision that ‘totally rejects not only capitalism, but also all Western political forms and institutions’ (Lenin, 1987: 271, 308-10).

fed, leading in turn to the formation of the South African Natives National Congress (later the African National Congress) in 1912 and the gradual decline of British imperial influence in the region (McClintock, 1995: 368-9). However, Shula Marks and Richard Rathbone argue that the years between 1870 and 1930 were 'formative', 'dominated by the imperatives of mining capital' and with 'the thirties' constituting a suitable 'cut-off date' (1982: 11-12). Thomas Karis and Gwendolen Carter have noted the intensification of 'African protest' between 1920 and 1935, as efforts were made by Black Africans to challenge 'their growing disadvantages within the system' (1972: 148-9). These culminated in events such as 'the National European-Bantu Conferences', 'called yearly from 1929', and the Non-European Conferences, convened first in 1927 and then in 1930, 1931 and 1934, all with the aim of raising 'nonwhite grievances' and passing 'numerous resolutions recording opposition to government policy' (151-2).

Taking account of the increased vocalness of anti-imperial movements specific to various local and (sub)continental contexts on the one hand, then, 1930 was also a significant year for the waning of Britain's global hegemony. At the Imperial Conference of 1926, the dominions were pronounced 'autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status', and five years later, in 1931, 'the report was given legal status by the Statute of Westminster' (Johnson: 2003: 158). Economically speaking, the Great Depression of 1930 'forced Britain to abandon the gold standard in 1931 and free trade through the Import Duties Act in 1932' (166-8). It is for these reasons that, in his discussion of the 'cultural and spatial foundations of the world urban system', King cites 1931 as a landmark date for the height of British imperial economic hegemony, after which its supremacy began to dwindle (1991: 5-6).

Given the centrality of nationalism to this history, a final note is necessary on how it is factored into the methodology of *infrastructural reading*. For Partha Chatterjee, the 'perception of uneven development creates the possibility for nationalism; it is born when the more and the less advanced populations can be easily distinguished in cultural terms' (2011: 4). Mitchell similarly argues that in 'the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, practices such as the demarcation and policing of frontiers' (a recurring concern for colonial literature and studied in detail in Chapter Three), as well as 'the overcoming of distances through the construction of railways, roads, shipping canals, and telegraphs', created the nation as a 'postimperial political topography' (2002: 78-83). Indeed, as Wallerstein and others point out, 'antisystemic movements have more and more taken on the clothing of "national-liberation movements"' (2011: 27). I want to emphasise that nationalist resistance needs to be understood as more than simply a product of, or response to, uneven infrastructural expansion. Rather, nationalism plays an active role in the shaping of that unevenness. This reconfiguration embeds the presence of resistance, albeit implicitly, within, between and beyond the infrastructural networks that run through colonial literature, as a counteracting force rather than a passive byproduct or 'derivative discourse', in any simplistic sense (Anderson, 1988: 29).

Colonial literature registers on formal, thematic and symbolic levels, uneven and differentiated internal infrastructural development in the same moment that it negotiates the formation of the post-independent nations as distinct geographic and political entities. For example, in both *Siri Ram—Revolutionist* (1912) and *Abdication* (1922), Edmund Candler attempts to delegitimise the arguments of emerging nationalist movements whilst simultaneously producing the unevenly and unequally developed landscapes that justified many of their arguments in the first place. These are coterminous ideological projects that are inextricably woven together within colonial fiction's uneven literary geographies. Reading nationalisms through colonial literature in this way should not be seen as a 'backward projection of the post-1960s world of nation-states into a two-century-long path of inevitability', which of course limits 'the diversity of opposition' to imperialism (Cooper, 2005: 24)—of course, numerous anti-systemic movements have operated across and between the political borders of nation-states. Indeed, an assessment of colonial literature's engagement with early nationalisms reveals that, as Stephen Clingman has argued, the

national community (and, I would argue, territory) is ‘gapped, divided, and incoherent in ways Anderson’s model could not fully conceive’ (2009: 4). A focus on colonial literature’s depiction of infrastructures allows us to disaggregate the traditional cartography of geopolitical borders and global hierarchies as constructed by nineteenth-century imperialisms into a more complex, uneven geography. This understanding of the nation’s terrain reframes what is, for Clingman, a ‘fundamental question’: we should not ask ‘whether boundaries exist—because they do, they always do—but what kind of boundaries they are’ (4-5). Analysing colonial literature’s production of geographies of division, segregation and partition might, then, also contain clues for how nationalisms’ imaginative and physical ordering of the world, rooted in and building on the infrastructures that shape the way we still inhabit those national spaces today, can be transgressed, complicated and at times, undone.

### **Spatial ‘Resistance’: The Politics of a Term**

Throughout the book I wish to argue that the fissures, crevices and cracks in the ideological field of colonial literature can, in fact, be quantified as a mode of resistance, or even *mobilised* as an *actively resistant* force. However, whilst I do not wish ‘to romanticise anticolonial movements in their triumph’, I am troubled also by arguments that claim that ‘colonialism was as much threatened by fissures within its modes of action and representation as by the threat’ of anticolonial resistance (Cooper, 2005: 32). Though sticking with it, I am concerned throughout by the extent to which the use of the term ‘resistance’ overstates the gravity of that critical work that this book undertakes. In this section I will therefore expand upon my use of that hanging, qualificatory adjective included in this book’s title—‘*spatial* resistance’—and explain how this addresses some of these concerns, whilst further reflecting on the concept of ‘resistance’ more broadly. To begin, however, it is necessary to outline the four different kinds of resistance that I have found to occur with any significant regularity across the broad field of colonial literature:

1. Violent resistance, be it a coherent anti-imperial campaign (such as Zulu resistance to the British in South Africa in the 1870s and ‘80s) or a spontaneous outburst against imperial agents or infrastructures (for example, isolated acts of peasant resistance).
2. Non-violent resistance, from the passive blockage of imperial movement and infrastructural development to active interventions into those circuitries and the economic dynamics they facilitated (such as the *swadeshi* campaigns in India).
3. Emerging nationalist campaigns self-consciously mobilised against imperial rule with the ultimate aim of achieving independence from it (for example, Gandhi’s nationalist movement).
4. The representation of (semi-)peripheral zones signified by underdeveloped geographical space, indifferent colonised populations, and a range of alternative social, cultural and economic activities practiced regardless of the imperial presence (‘what Gramsci refers to as the “practical activities” of “the man in the mass”’ and ‘Lefebvre refers to as “everyday life”’ (Harvey, 2009: 238)).

Given the self-consciously pro-imperial agendas and historically racial, cultural and often economic privilege of so many of these colonial authors, the most frequently occurring kind of resistance is the fourth in this list. Often, anti-imperial resistance is situated *beyond*, or *on the cusp of*, the landscapes, plots and characters of these literary texts; it resides, latent, or implicit, in the subtextual constructions of the cultural and geographical terrain that colonial literature produces—it is *inscribed into colonial literature’s infrastructure*. This literature is reliant upon, but also restricted to, the world-system’s unevenly developed physical and symbolic infrastructural networks, and must therefore necessarily acknowledge the limits of its representations and productions of colonial landscapes. Highlighting these *spatial* limits and listening for the silences and stirrings that lie beyond them

allows us to map numerous moments of implicit subversion within colonial literature, even when these remain residual, abeyant, waiting to be reignited and re-mobilised. When read cumulatively out of several texts from a range of different geo-historical locations, these momentary subversions coalesce into a cartography of resistance that is embedded within the colonial literary terrain. This resistance is always spatial, in that it is in and through its dispersed, networked spatiality that imperialism—as a stage in the development of the world-system—is resisted.

Critical discussions of resistance repeatedly emphasise its ‘hiddenness’, or ‘evasiveness’, before developing specific techniques in order to make these hidden moments ‘speak’. Whether it is ‘Antonio Gramsci’s concept of counterhegemony, Karl Polanyi’s notion of countermovements, [or] James C. Scott’s idea of infrapolitics’, it is always necessary to ‘dig deep to excavate the everyday individual and collective activities that fall short of open opposition’ (Mittelman, 2000: 166). As Scott comments, ‘[i]f the decoding of power relations depended on full access to the more or less clandestine discourse of subordinate groups, students of power—both historical and contemporary—would face an impasse’ (1990: xii). Analysts must look for what Scott calls ‘the hidden transcript’ that, though located ‘beyond direct observation by powerholders’, remains present, ‘albeit in disguised form’ (xiii, 4-5). Theorists of resistance therefore frequently take gaps and ruptures in the archive of the dominant power to be symptomatic of more coherent systems of resistance existing beyond its purview. As Louise Amoore argues, ‘[w]here we do see the instances of open collective protest or the loud headline-grabbing demonstrations, these are but ripples on the surface of a deeper and more diffuse pattern of struggles’ (2005: 8). These ‘less visible practices of resistance’ are not ‘meaningfully separable from the overt expressions’—in fact, the opposite is often the case: it may be these day-to-day, invisible strategies that actually ‘make the grand gestures possible’ (8). Discussing of the colonial archive in particular, Ann Laura Stoler looks to the ‘storied edges’ where ‘the faultlines of colonial ethnography may more fully reside, in the interstices of sanctioned formulae, in the descriptions of what it meant to say’ (2002: 143-4); those ‘ragged edges of protocol’ that were produced by ‘the administrative apparatus as it opened to a space that extended beyond it’ (2009: 1-2). Likewise, the *Subaltern Studies* collective has sought to subject colonialism’s ‘hegemonic presumption to thoroughgoing critique’, reading between the archival lines to show that, in the Indian context, ‘there is nothing in the record of the Raj [...] to justify any pretension to a rule by consent’ (Guha, 1998: xviii). Our task, then, is to continually develop new ways of decoding latent forms of resistance, an ambition that motivates the practice of *infrastructural reading*.

Hopkins and Wallerstein argue that tracing the ‘phasings of formal colonisation and informal empire [...] for the system as a whole’ allows ‘the interrelations between these phasings and the presence or absence of various modes or forms of opposition—“primitive rebellion” (Hobsbawm), “wars of independence”, “wars of liberation”, “nationalist movements”, and the like—to be sketched’ (1982: 29). For Hobsbawm, the conditions to which this resistance reacts ‘comes to [oppressed groups] from outside, insidiously by the operation of economic forces which they do not understand and over which they have no control, or brazenly by conquest’ (1959: 30). However, this suggests that it is only with the arrival of imperial rule that resistance begins. It is framed only as a backlash to the imposition of imperial infrastructures, occurring temporally *after* or *in response* to their arrival. Conceived in this way, resistance is put on the back foot and its active agency reductively limited. Instead, as Steve Pile and Michael Keith have argued, ‘resistance needs to be considered on its own terms, and not as simply the underside of domination’ (1997: xi). Though of course anti-colonial struggles could not take place until the various territories to which they were home had been colonised, the construction and imposition of different kinds of imperial infrastructure took place historically *in response* to different kinds of resistance.

Howard Caygill, in a discussion of the criticisms levied against Michel Foucault for his apparent omission of resistant agencies, quotes an interview with the French historian that shows

how the biopolitical tactics of governmental rule are actually developed in response to the resistance they encounter:

if there was no resistance there would be no relations of power. Because everything would simply be a question of obedience. From the moment an individual is in the situation of not doing what they want, they must use relations of power. Resistance thus comes first, it remains above all the forces of the process, under its effect obliges relations of power to change. I thus consider the term 'resistance' to be the most important word, the key word of this dynamic. (Foucault, 2001: 1559-60; translated in Caygill, 2013: 8)

By reframing resistance in this way, traces of anti-imperial defiance can actually be found inscribed into and actively shaping the literary depictions of infrastructural networks analysed here. Colonial fiction's ideological strategies (its 'cultural fixes'), which congregate around its depiction of imperial infrastructure, do not occur temporally prior to anti-imperial resistance. Rather, they are already a response to resistance that has taken place and that is, in many cases, ongoing. As the individual chapter studies will show, resistance actually shapes the colonial narratives propagated by these texts. If resistance dictates the infrastructural shaping of an expanding capitalist world-system as it is read through this literary fiction, it is therefore most productively configured in its *spatial* manifestations.

A 'spatial understanding of resistance necessitates a radical reinterpretation and reevaluation of the concept' (Pile and Keith eds., 1997: xi): by conceiving of resistance as spatial, *infrastructural reading* shows how resistance inflects and gives shape to the infrastructures of the world-system whilst refusing to assimilate, and thus neutralise, its resistant potential. This highlights what Caygill calls '[t]he resistance of resistance to analysis' (2013: 7). For Caygill, resistance 'is rooted in practice and articulated in tactical statements and justifications addressing specific historical contexts', with the consequence that 'defining a concept of resistance' becomes a tricky, if not impossible task (6). However, this is 'not necessarily a disadvantage': defining resistance actually 'risks making it predictable, open to control and thus lowering its resistance' (6). In order to trace the contours of resistance it must be continually 'situated within a complex and dynamic spatio-temporal field' (2). This allows us to build a 'consistency' across occurrences of resistance (thereby revealing and emphasising the weight of their impact as a coherent sociopolitical force), without 'imposing unity' on those resistant occurrences (and thus defining, quantifying and limiting that same sociopolitical impact) (7). As Jopi Nyman and John Stotedbury argue, 'resistance emerges as a context-bound phenomenon solved differently in different spaces; there is no single centre to be resisted but many' (1999: 1). Similarly, Joanne Sharp and others 'talk about "entanglements" to indicate that the domination/resistance couplet is always played out in, across and through the many spaces of the world' (2005: 1). Predicated on a networked conception of an unevenly developing world-system, *infrastructural reading* can therefore trace, and subsequently analyse, multiple sites and forms of resistance as they shape colonial literature. It realises a level of cumulative 'consistency' across different geo-historical occurrences of resistance, whilst avoiding the imposition of a limiting, or oppressive unity upon them.

The spatiality of resistance therefore ensures it remains active and alive within the colonial literary archive. If Lenin and Luxemburg were important theorists of imperial exploitation, there work is similarly attentive to methods of resistance. All of Lenin's critical writings are motivated by and oriented toward a radical, anti-systemic politics. As Alex Callinicos argues, 'what Lenin showed more effectively than any other Marxist was the importance of theoretical analysis of capitalism in strategically situating political actors' (2007: 36). However, because of his formally political preoccupations, for Lenin resistance always manifests 'in terms of the clash of solids' necessarily constituted, as Caygill explains, amongst a community of 'integrated and conscious class subjects' (2013: 46-7). Lenin warns against '*spontaneous* development of the labour movement', its 'lack of

consciousness' meaning that it can be too easily 'subordinated to bourgeois ideology' (1987: 82-4). Conversely, for Luxemburg resistance does not need to 'fit into the kind of continuous logical and temporal narrative contrived by Lenin', instead operating 'as the movements of fluid forces made up of diverse currents moving at different velocities' (Caygill, 2013: 47). This is conveyed explicitly in her account of the 1905 Revolution, when social unrest spread across the Russian Empire. There she emphasises the 'spontaneous' nature of the revolutionaries' 'shaking and tugging' on the 'chains of capitalism' (1970: 171). These movements flow, Luxemburg writes,

like a broad billow over the whole kingdom, and now divides into a gigantic network of narrow streams; now it bubbles forth from under the ground like a fresh spring and now is completely lost under the earth [...] all these run through one another, run side by side, cross one another, flow in and over one another—it is a ceaselessly moving, changing sea of phenomena [...]. (182)

For Luxemburg, resistance is a dispersed and spatial, rather than linear and chronological, phenomenon, a conception more useful for this book's mapping of moments of resistance that remain uneven in their trajectories, manifestations and tactics across the colonial literary field. This recalls Gramsci's notion of the 'war of manoeuvre', in which 'different strategic options' are mobilised to increase their effectiveness in different contexts (Gramsci, 1988: 230; Caygill, 2013: 141). As David Lloyd argues in his reading of Gramsci, by defining the subaltern as 'that which resists or cannot be represented [...] its "episodic and fragmentary" history can be read as the sign of another *mode* of narrative, rather than an incomplete one' (1993: 127). Whilst a paradigm of uneven development informs the socioeconomic, physical and geographic infrastructures of colonial literature during this period, a scattering of uneven but ever-present modes of resistance likewise, and just as importantly, shape the world-system and, in turn, the literary field's mapping of it.

Of course, it is important to stress the limitations of such a project. I would not want to go so far as to reframe these often pro-imperial writings as what Barbara Harlow calls 'resistance literature' (though, as I will show, there are exceptions to this rule); regardless of the resistance practices latent within them, the texts studied here mostly fail to 'challenge both the monolithic historiographical practices of domination and the unidimensional responses of dogma to them' (1987: 30). Often, and especially at the levels of character and plot, colonial fiction struggles to maintain and perpetuate the various social and economic hierarchies that enabled imperial domination and capital accumulation. However, the critical methodology of *infrastructural reading* allows us to read colonial literature resistantly, to show how this literary archive can provide, to cite Harlow once more:

developed historical analyses of the circumstances of economic, political, and cultural domination and repression and through that analysis raises a systematic and concerted challenge to the imposed chronology of what Fredric Jameson has called 'master narratives', ideological paradigms which contain within their plots a predetermined ending. (1987: 78; see also Jameson, 1991: xi)

In its undertaking, then, this book joins other efforts to correct 'the revisionist accounts of imperial and colonial life that have proliferated in recent years', arguments that, as Paul Gilroy wrote at the beginning of the twenty-first century, 'compound the marginality of colonial history', 'spurn its substantive lessons' by 'making the formative experience of empire less profound', and whitewash its violent realities 'in order to promote imperialist nostalgia' (Gilroy, 2004: 2-3). Unfortunately, his commentary seems even more relevant as I write a decade on. What Renato Rosaldo once called 'imperial nostalgia'—an emotional fantasy that transforms 'the responsible colonial agent into an innocent bystander' (1989: 108)—appears to have returned with renewed aggression in recent years;

a 2014 poll revealed that 59% of respondents believed the British Empire was ‘something to be proud of’ (Andrews, 2016). If a critique of these contemporary repercussions of empire and colonialism are beyond the scope of this book, I wish to emphasise throughout that the four overarching ideologies that structure the book’s four chapters are *directly* related to current manifestations of post-imperial violence, from recent surges in racially motivated hate crimes to broader institutional and structural forms of discrimination (see Hall, 2016).

It is in this sense, then, that I *align* the book with, though importantly *do not* consider it a direct act of, contemporary praxis and practices of ‘decolonial resistance’. For Mignolo, decolonisation is not a one-off, historical event now passed, but rather an ongoing process that must be continually (re)mobilised: ‘While liberation framed the struggle of the oppressed in the “Third World” and the history of modern coloniality, decoloniality is an even larger project’ (2012: 457). If imperial nostalgia has intensified in recent years, so too have these decolonising efforts, especially on university campuses indelibly and infrastructurally marked by their imperial pasts—most notably the Universities of Cape Town (UCT) and Oxford. The ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ (RMF) campaign, which mobilised effectively around the removal of the statue of arch-imperialist Cecil Rhodes from the UCT campus, asserts a ‘decolonial gaze’ that ‘deliberately remembers the violence of colonialism, the exploitation of extractive settler economies [and] the disfigurement of African communities and culture—all of which are concealed by grand narratives of development and modernisation’ (Lockett, 2015: 416). As I will discuss throughout the book, by emphasising infrastructural development, imperialists such as Rhodes were able to promote a narrative that concealed colonial exploitation beneath a benevolent, “pastoral power” (that is not overtly authoritarian), which characterised an aspect of British imperialism’ (Kros, 2015: 156), and that is still repeated by critics of RMF today (see Lowry, 2016: 329-330).

Nevertheless, if infrastructure fixed, spatially and culturally, some of the key contradictions of imperial capitalism and its corresponding ideologies, critically focusing on them allows for the (re)disturbance of the smoothing over they facilitated and, in turn, creates space for resistance to them. *Infrastructural reading* creates crevices and fissures that make room for alternative histories and resistant practices previously silenced by the colonial archive—it allows us to read these archives “against the grain”; to challenge and expand them’ (Lockett, 2016: 425). Decolonial movements such as RMF are ‘about more than simply removing colonial and apartheid era symbols, increasing the number of black academics and including African texts in the curriculum’; they address ‘a violent phenomenon’ in order to look forward to ‘the creation of a new humanity’ (Prinsloo, 2016: 165). Whilst this book’s methodological effort thus embraces RMF’s ‘strong emphasis on the democratic potential around notions of voice, representation, and speaking up or talking back’ (Bosch, 2016: 9), my own position of socioeconomic, geographic, racial and institutional privilege necessitates an emphasis on *listening* for and to the silences in colonial literature, silences that, when ignored, can ‘become forms of violence against decolonisation’ (Pillay, 2016: 157): ‘it is not only important to speak’, notes Tanja Bosch, ‘but also to be heard’ (2016: 9-10). I am deeply conscious that this book might read as a ‘performance of White guilt’ that ‘does not challenge the dominance of Whiteness’, instead, simply and dangerously, presenting it as ‘benevolent’ (Prinsloo, 2016: 166). It is for this reason that, pedagogically, this book is viewed as an attempt to develop ‘the analytical and methodological tools for debating, challenging and deconstructing inherited canons’ (Lockett, 2016: 425) that can in turn be translated into ‘real action’ (Prinsloo, 2015: 166). To use Stuart Hall’s words, *infrastructural reading* should be accompanied by an ‘intellectual modesty’, conceived ‘as a practice which always thinks about its intervention in a world in which it would make some difference, in which it would have some effect’ (1992). For this reason, infrastructural reading should not itself be quantified as resistance, but rather seen as an effort to *create space for* resistance; to initiate, that is, a *spatial resistance*.

## Colonial Literature: Why These Texts?

Further to my opening remarks on the archive that I refer to as 'colonial literature', I wish to conclude this introduction by clarifying more exactly the parameters of this cultural field. Of course, Kipling's writing is arguably the most representative example of colonial literature, and it is indicative that it is obsessed with technological developments, imperial forms of infrastructure and literary depictions of them. However, 'postcolonial' commentaries on his fiction have gained significant traction since Edward Said's reading of *Kim* (1901) in *Culture and Imperialism* (1993: 159-196), as critics have thoroughly dismantled the pro-imperial ideologies propagated by his jingoistic poetry and reevaluated his prose for its more 'modernist', subversive content (Low, 1996; Randall, 2000; Nagai and Rooney eds., 2010). Indeed, in his 'Note on Modernism', Said distinguishes between the 'narrative progression and triumphalism' of texts such as Haggard's *She* (1887) and the 'extreme, unsettling anxiety' in the work of authors as wide-ranging as Conrad, Forster, Malraux, T.E. Lawrence, T.S. Eliot, Proust, Mann and Yeats. Undoubtedly, writings by these authors do exhibit the kinds of resistant strategies excavated by *infrastructural reading*, as numerous materialist and postcolonial critics have convincingly shown. Some of these studies have been concerned in particular with the 'spatiality' of these texts, emphasising the genre's preoccupation with 'absences and gaps to grids and maps' and their 'numerous abstract tropes and topographical stereotypes', many of which, this book will show, are characteristics of colonial literature more widely (Childs, 2007: 84). One collection has even linked the two spheres of 'modernism' and 'colonialism' via contemporaneous expansions in imperial infrastructures (Begam and Moses, 2007: 2). Perhaps most famously, however, is Fredric Jameson emphasis on the connection between the spatiality of modernist form and the coterminous period of Britain's accelerated expansionism in his essay, 'Modernism and Imperialism' (1990).

Here, Jameson's argues that when a 'significant structural segment of the economic system' is exported to an 'unknown and unimaginable' space 'over the water', the 'new spatial language' of 'modernist style' is produced (1990: 51-58). Unsurprisingly, this has been critiqued for relating modernism to imperialism through 'a single linear narrative of cause and effect' (Booth and Rigby, 2000: 6). However, Patrick Williams is sympathetic to the political import of Jameson's work. He acknowledges that Jameson's 'spatialising effect' is a product of 'the attempted mapping of the restructuring of the imperial world system' before turning to Said's more resistant work (2000: 21-3), which emphasises the 'disturbing effect' that modernism's spatiality might bring to 'imperial ideology' (Said, 1993: 226). Clearly, this effort to assess the historical impact that moments of what it seems might be described as a kind of 'spatial resistance' in modernist literature to imperial ideology is in line with this book's own critical task. Indeed, Williams concludes by complicating Jameson's paradigm through the application of a "'combined and uneven development" perspective' to 'modernism and imperialism', a theoretical shift that, as for this project, allows a more nuanced analysis of 'imperialism on a world scale' (2000: 32).

Though I arrive at the critical application of uneven development to a literary-cultural field through a different methodological route, there are many fruitful overlaps here and these should be seen as mutually constructive and, I would stress, political projects. The book does, however, make a crucial departure from this work: it is my contention that the world-system historically underpinning the British Empire is registered formally and generically *not only* by modernist literature. Instead, I follow Elleke Boehmer who, in the introduction to her book, *Empire Writing: An Anthology of Colonial Literature, 1870-1918*, defines some of the key traits of this alternate literary archive:

assumptions of supremacy and hierarchy captured in images of work, 'improvement', and 'progress'; visual bafflement at 'impenetrable' and apparently featureless foreign landscapes; stories and poems of encounter, conflict, and connection; and also preoccupations with cultural difference, dislocation, and 'taint' [...]. (1998: xix)

It is my contention that, when read *infrastructurally*, this colonial literature, which certainly does *not* exhibit typically ‘modernist’ formal and generic conventions, can also be made to reveal conflicts, tensions and fissures at the level of ideology. Colonial literature responds to a number of issues, from the hypocritical arguments of benevolent imperialisms, to the expansive processes of uneven capital accumulation and infrastructural development, to the presence of anti-imperial and nationalist resistance campaigns. It is for this reason, and despite the fact that they are similarly built around the representation of infrastructure, that I move away from much-studied ‘colonial’ novels such as *Kim* and *Heart of Darkness* (1899)—though because of Kipling’s undeniable importance, his writing shadows much of my discussion, and on occasion makes an explicit appearance.

Primarily, though, I turn my critical gaze to a much broader cross-section of what mostly remains *under-analysed* colonial literature. The work of writers such as Flora Annie Steel, John Buchan, Edward Thompson and Edmund Candler, studied here at length, has yet to receive sustained critical engagement, at least from postcolonial and materialist critics; and as discussed earlier, it is important to emphasise that these author-specific readings are undertaken against a back-drop of a much wider, ‘distantly read’ archive of colonial literary writings, many of which remain mostly forgotten and critically uninterrogated. There are exceptions; for example, I apply *infrastructural reading* to Rider Haggard’s much-discussed *King Solomon’s Mines*, which serves as an important reference point as the archetype of the imperial romance genre. The formal characteristics of the imperial romance recur throughout much under-read colonial literature and so using Haggard’s text as a reference point bolsters my arguments at various stages. Furthermore, despite my pronounced departure from conventionally modernist writers, I have also included two (proto-)modernist-colonial authors: Olive Schreiner and E.M. Forster, in the second and fourth chapters respectively. As with Haggard, I use these writers as contemporaneous inter-texts that, when juxtaposed with their more explicitly pro-imperial counterparts, serve to enhance the *infrastructural readings* that I undertake and to illuminate the resistance that remains latent within colonial literature.

It remains to be said that the colonial literature analysed throughout this book is almost always set in, or written from (or both), the socioeconomic and cultural context of the colonial environment.<sup>5</sup> This literature might also broadly be described as a form of ‘popular culture’—alongside other forms such as ‘the music hall’ and ‘the melodrama theatre’ (Bennett, 1982: 18)—and undoubtedly had a wide readership in Britain at the time. But it also circulated through the colonial spaces it depicts, ‘from company offices to the guest-rooms of government houses to the libraries of hill-stations’ (Boehmer, 1995: 55), feeding into, shaping and reproducing the imperial imagination of colonial space. It was also woven into more interdisciplinary colonial cartographic productions, as the literary text’s ‘verisimilitude was checked against other fabrications—the books, reports, surveys, army officers, missionaries, journalists, explorers and travellers’ (Parry, 2004: 18); as Boehmer observes, there was an ‘overproduction under colonial administration of reams of documentation, ethnographic and scientific studies, journals, accounts, censuses, dispatches, laws, etc. To colonise something was to pile writing upon it’ (1995: 97). This body of literature forms a disciplinary ‘territory’ that Parry identifies as ‘The Literature of Empire or The Colonial Fiction’ (2004: 17). Though I irreverently de-capitalise both the adjective and noun of this label throughout the book, Parry’s definitional criteria—that it is affiliated ‘to the hegemonic explanatory order and written within the same ideological code as the discourse of colonialism’ (17)—usefully groups the texts analysed here together.

---

<sup>5</sup> There is a notable exception to this: as Chapter Three’s discussion of John Buchan will show, the tropes of the South African frontier continue to pervade the political unconscious of his First World War novels that are set not in South Africa, but Europe and the Middle East, a geographical fusion that emphasises the ‘prominent, if under-recognised, role’ that Southern Africa has played ‘in British self-imagining, or “worlding”’ (Chrisman, 2003: 10).

As already mentioned, the book's four chapters are organised around four ideological paradigms that occur with especial potency in the texts analysed therein, offering a set of categorisations that help focus their respective *infrastructural readings*. Chapter One, 'Mapping Humanitarianism', focuses on the work of Flora Annie Steel. It begins with her most widely read 'Mutiny' novel, *On the Face of the Waters* (1896), which takes as its subject matter an event of concerted anti-imperial resistance—the Great Rebellion of 1857—in India. Historically, this event sparked a significant increase in infrastructural expansion across the subcontinent and, as Steel's novel shows, this act of violent, anti-imperial resistance came to dominate imperial consciousness throughout the half-century covered by this book. The chapter then turns to a selection of Steel's short stories, written throughout the 1880s and 1890s, to explore how notions of humanitarian development and famine relief, ideologies that justified infrastructural development, are actually subverted by Steel's anxieties about the socioeconomic conditions that those infrastructures actually facilitated. Drawing on Macherey and others, this chapter focuses on the 'silences' in colonial literature to show the ideological limits of Steel's texts, as it attempts, and fails, to justify the accumulative processes that wove, with increasing unevenness, the Indian subcontinent into the networks of the world-system.

Chapter Two, 'Mapping Segregation', turns to Southern Africa to explore the way in which different narrative forms and genres are deployed to map a landscape that throws up the polarities of core and periphery in particularly stark infrastructural manifestations and racial segregations. Here, I track the ways in which these narrative forms might themselves be resistant when their intertextual relations with one another are highlighted. Beginning with a study of the genre of the imperial romance through a reading of H. Rider Haggard's *King Solomon's Mines* (1885), the chapter first deconstructs that text by reading it topographically, excavating what James C. Scott would call its 'hidden transcript' and arguing that it is deeply preoccupied with the vast infrastructural projects taking place in South Africa during the period of its publication. It will then turn to the work of Olive Schreiner to show how her writings interrogate ideologies of segregation that had been generated by the specific context of the emerging mining industries. The chapter's reading of *The Story of an African Farm* (1883) alongside her other, critically neglected literary writings, demonstrates how Schreiner's mapping of a peripheral landscape enables the production of a meta-narrative that deconstructs the linear confidence of imperial romances such as Haggard's, as well as the arch-imperial infrastructure project of Cecil Rhodes' 'Cape-to-Cairo' railway route. Schreiner's resistant strategies are supplemented and emphasised by a turn to William Plomer's depiction of South Africa's specifically urban spaces in 'Ula Masondo' (1927). His short story directly resists the imperial imagining of South Africa's literary geographies through its explicit re-writing of the romance genre, whilst initiating through its resistant writing a range of what Harvey would call 'revolutionary trajectories' (2012: xvii).

Developing this focus on South Africa and the imperial romance, Chapter Three, 'Mapping Frontiers', embarks upon a study of the early fiction of John Buchan in order to isolate and dissect a very specific strand of imperial ideology. The chapter calls this 'frontier consciousness' and proceeds by isolating its key features, as well as excavating some of its central contradictions, through a reading of Buchan's first novel, *Prester John* (1910). A survey of the geographical and topographical space within and across which the novel's action takes place reveals that it is inflected with—indeed, has inscribed into its multi-dimensional infrastructure—the hallmarks of settler colonial ideology. Written slightly after the boom in imperial romance writing of the late-nineteenth century, and of which *King Solomon's Mines* is representative, Buchan's efforts to reproduce the frontier narrative can be read as a 'cultural fix' that tries—and fails—to smooth over a contradictory crisis in imperialism's uneven development. The chapter then moves away from South Africa to study Buchan's first two First World War novels, *The Thirty-Nine Steps* (1915) and *Greenmantle* (1916), arguing that the frontier consciousness epitomised in *Prester John* is present in these alternative, European geographical spaces. By mapping the production of peripheral zones *within* metropolitan countries, which are always linked in some way—most often through their topographical features

and frontier-like attributes—to the South African spaces of *Prester John*, this chapter highlights the importance of the conception of the networked world-system and reveals how uneven infrastructural development in cities such as London warp Buchan's literary form.

The book's fourth and final chapter, 'Mapping Nationalism', returns to the Indian subcontinent, bringing the insights of the previous three chapters together to explore the way in which colonial literature interacts with emerging nationalist movements through the work of E.M. Forster, Edmund Candler and Edward Thompson. By using Forster's novel, *A Passage to India* (1924), as a subversive intertext, the chapter follows on from its study of Buchan to highlight the way in which the geographical spaces of core and periphery produced by Candler and Thompson are inflected with the hierarchies of colonial ideology. Whereas the colonial literature studied in the previous three chapters has yet to come to terms with the disintegration of Britain's Empire, Candler and Thompson explicitly acknowledge the imminence of Indian independence. The shift of this political anxiety from subtext to surface shows how these later writings are concerned both to delegitimise nationalist movements, whilst simultaneously imagining the infrastructural coordinates of the world-system—primarily configured through a geographic split between rural and urban zones—that would linger after the formal dissolution of British rule. Despite these ideological efforts, the chapter argues, expressions of anti-imperial resistance can still be located in the contradictions and literary motifs that emerge in these late colonial writings.

Throughout these different studies, the axes of infrastructure and resistance, which come together to beneath the methodology of *infrastructural reading*, are deployed to activate a materialist critique of colonial literature. By highlighting the literature's complicity with the world-system and the physical infrastructures that facilitated its accumulative processes, a pattern of resistance emerges across the different chapter studies that build cumulatively to produce an alternative map of this literary field. Though the focus of the book is the way in which colonial literature helped to build the infrastructure of the contemporary world-system, as Kipling observed, both 'actually, and, what is more important, in imagination' (2010: 241), it shows how this system has always been riddled with locales, acts and expressions of anti-imperial resistance. The resulting survey thus charts not 'the high-glass print of history writ-large', but rather 'the space of its production, the darkroom negative'; following Stoler, it maps a set of 'historical negatives whose reverse-light traces disturbances in the colonial order of things, whose shadows trace the lineaments of potential dissent and current distress' (2009: 108-9). In conclusion, I will suggest that if the world-system remains entrenched in increasingly uneven and unequal ways in the twenty-first century, despite the dissolution of the British Empire's formal hegemony, *infrastructural reading* has much work left to do.