Aesthetic Bodies: Posing on Sites of Violence in India, 1857–1900

Sean Willcock

This article looks at how aesthetic concerns inflected the dynamic of imperial relations during the 1857 Indian Uprising and its aftermath. The invention of photography inaugurated a period in which aesthetic imperatives increasingly came to structure the engagement of colonial bodies with the traumas of warfare in British India. The formal conventions of image-making practices were not consigned to a discreet virtual sphere; they were channeled into the contested terrains of the subcontinent through the poses that figures were striking for the camera. I trace how one pictorial convention – picturesque *staffage* – had the capacity to engender politically and psychologically disruptive tableaus on the contested terrains of empire, as colonial photographers arranged for Indian figures to pose on landscapes that were marked by disturbing wartime violence.

Keywords: *William Hodges (1744–97), Carlo Marochetti (1806–67), Henry Yule (1820–89), John Edward Saché (1824–82), Felice Beato (1834–1909), Samuel Bourne (1834–1912), colonial photography,* colonial aesthetics*, British India, staffage,* Indian Uprising

This article explores the role played by photography in orchestrating the engagement of British and Indian bodies with the traumas of warfare both during and following the upheavals of the 1857 Indian Uprising, termed the Mutiny by the colonial British at the time and the First War of Indian Independence by some subsequent historians. In particular, I will be thinking about how colonial photographers incorporated Indian figures into economies of imperial triumphalism and mourning, posing them in potentially disturbing ways on landscapes marked by violence. More broadly, what I explore through such conflict imagery is how, from photography's 'invention' in 1839 onwards, the presence of the camera in certain circumstances created a demand for people to be positioned according to a specifically pictorial logic.[1] The pressure to situate the body according to the conventions of visual media introduced a powerful aesthetic element into social interaction, one that was sometimes discordant with the political and personal elements that also conditioned modes of encounter. I trace how one such convention – picturesque *staffage* – encouraged ways of engaging with landscapes of violence that could strain against political and ethical mores.

The basic question addressed throughout is very simple: What is the significance of the Indian figures that were repeatedly posed in an artful manner on sites of imperial conflict? Look, for instance, at the commercial photographer Samuel Bourne's view of a British war memorial in the garrison town of Cawnpore in northern India, *Memorial Well, with the Cawnpore Church in the Distance* (figure 1), in which three Indian men are arranged in a manner that makes plain their status as an aesthetic contrivance. One man stands upright, his verticality corresponding to the neatly-planted trees peppered throughout the park, while two other figures sit on either side of him, facing one another with mirrored poses. Behind this grouping of men is an octagonal Gothic screen designed by the Bengal Engineer Sir Henry Yule to

house the memorial garden's central monument, while on the right-hand side of the composition a neem tree gently frames the assembly of figures, cypresses and architecture. In the background, to the immediate right of the memorial, a church spire can be glimpsed, which imbues the scene with a sense of Christian spirituality. The ordered tranquility of the composition is typical of Bourne's work and had considerable appeal among his predominately British customer base. Distributed through the Calcutta-based company Bourne & Shepherd, Bourne's imagery circulated widely, helping to popularise his style among fellow photographers – both amateur and professional – on the subcontinent.

Indian *staffage* in photographs such as this is usually given limited thought beyond identifying it in terms of the picturesque landscape practices that had been popular with the British in South Asia since the eighteenth century. Early colonial artists such as William Hodges had utilised 'picturesque' strategies of representation that would continue to provide a crucial touchstone for artists and photographers in the region throughout the Victorian period (figure 2).[2] The picturesque – with its love of finding visual harmony in irregularity, variety and ruins – has been seen by scholars as an archetypically imperial aesthetic, domesticating alien terrains and working to provide a coherent expression of Britain's growing empire by making diverse landscapes submit to familiar visual schemata.[3] My argument below is that such aesthetic indifference to the specificities of a locale could also compromise the ethical codes particular to certain colonial spaces.

Issues of indolence, passivity and pastoralism have hitherto informed accounts of native figures in picturesque colonial photographs like Bourne's.[4] Yet what we encounter in such scenes are not only artistic motifs to be decoded. Real men were posing in this park in Cawnpore, and their flesh-and-blood performance of old

pictorial traditions on a hallowed spot of post-conflict remembrance placed aesthetics and politics into significant tension with one other. While picturesque conventions may have sanctioned an Indian presence on this spot, the politics of mourning that had prevailed in India following the 1857 Uprising had explicitly sought to sanctify the landscape through Indian *absence*. In what follows, I first elaborate the political logic that determined Cawnpore's culture of mourning, looking at how the trauma of wartime violence gave rise to commemorative practices whose geographical locus was a racially exclusive memorial. I then look at how the aesthetic logic of the picturesque genre, which was repeatedly adhered to by commercial photographers throughout the remaining century, affected the smooth running of such exclusionary politics.

Posing *staffage* was a process infused with significantly more psychological, political and ethical drama than has previously been claimed. The photographs looked at here testify to the authority that had accrued to the camera to intervene in the normal governance of bodies and spaces, to exert pressure on standard modes of conduct, and, in so doing, to generate degrees of interference within the 'distribution of the sensible' – I shall discuss Jacques Rancière's term in more depth later in the argument – that constituted the stratified social field of nineteenth-century British India.

Politics

The Cawnpore memorial site had been built in the aftermath of the catastrophic violence of the Indian Uprising (1857–58). The causes of that conflict were myriad: widespread Indian resentment over unchecked colonial power; Hindu and Muslim anxiety about the fervour of Christian proselytising; the erosion of privileges for

sepoys (Indian soldiers) in the English East India Company army; and the caste-breaking implications of those sepoys having to bite the new greased cartridges for their Enfield Rifles, which were widely rumoured to be coated in religiously offensive beef and pork fat.[5] Though termed 'the Mutiny' by most Britons at the time, the insurgency was actually formed of both soldiers and civilians, and was framed by many as a fight for India's political and religious autonomy.[6] In a counterinsurgency campaign of extraordinary brutality, the British would eventually suppress the insurrection, giving frenzied vent to their desire to exact a terrible vengeance on the Indian population for the insurgent atrocities (both real and imagined) committed against colonial men, women and children.[7] Indian civilians were terrorised, suspected collaborators or sympathisers were hanged by the dozen from makeshift gallows, and sepoy rebels were blown from the mouths of cannon in grisly spectacles of imperial justice.

For the British, the most traumatic episode of the war occurred on the spot in Cawnpore that Bourne's photograph aestheticises with its picturesque grouping of Indian figures. After a three-week period of siege there in June 1857, the vastly outnumbered colonial population – soldiers and civilians – surrendered to the rebel leader Nana Sahib, but only after they had received assurances from him that they would be granted safe passage up the Ganges to Allahabad. Upon boarding the boats prepared for them by the Indian rebels at the Satti Chaura Ghat (riverbank steps) for this purpose, however, the British were fired upon unexpectedly. A few colonials managed to escape down the river, but most were killed in the shooting; any men captured were summarily executed. This waterside grave (subsequently termed the 'Slaughter Ghat' by the British) was the subject of considerable photographic attention in the postwar climate of commemoration, its riverbank scene circulated in

commercial photographs, postcards and amateur images. But it was another

Cawnpore site that was destined to bear the full weight of imperial mourning.

The women and children who had been captured following the initial massacre

– about two hundred of them – were not executed alongside of the men. Instead, they

were imprisoned for days in a nearby bungalow, the 'Bibi Ghar', or 'House of the

Ladies'. A rescue mission of British troops was dispatched to liberate these captives,

but as it made its desperate and unforgiving way through the Indian countryside –

hanging anyone suspected of links with the insurgency as it went – word got back to

the rebel leaders in Cawnpore. Soon enough, a panicked order had been issued to kill

the colonial prisoners. The Indian sepoys charged with doing this were horrified; they

fired a few volleys into the house, but were unable to bring themselves to see the task

through. In the end, less scrupulous local butchers (by trade as well as temperament)

were brought in to finish the job, using meat cleavers to slaughter the sick, starving

and wounded women and children trapped inside.[8] Afterwards, the victims' bodies –

both dead and dying – were thrown into a nearby well.[9]

Such was the grisly tomb that became the focus for an obsessive project of

memorialisation and sanctification following its discovery by the horrified British.

European aesthetic practices – from picturesque landscape design to sculpture and

touristic photography – were mobilised to reframe the unsettling emblem of imperial

vulnerability. The well had first been covered up, cordoned off and sanctified via the

erection of a Christian cross in 1858, while war was still waging. Baron Carlo

Marochetti's mournful statue, *The Angel of Resurrection*, was placed there,

surrounded by Yule's octagonal Gothic screen, in 1863 (figure 3).[10] According to the

artist Edward Lear (1812–1888), the memorial well and gardens were reminiscent of

Hyde Park,[11] while another visitor claimed they were 'of such richness and beauty as

to be exceeded by none in England.'[12] The transplantation of an English park aesthetic to Indian terrain followed in the footsteps of picturesquely landscaped colonial gardens in Simla and Barrackpore.[13] But the Cawnpore gardens were unique in that they had been paid for by a punitive levy imposed on the local Indian population. Theoretically public, the space was in fact off-limits to all Indians unless they applied for a special permit from the authorities; even then, they were excluded from entering the structure housing the well itself.[14]

Cawnpore was just one of a number of war shrines that had emerged across northern India in the wake of the rebellion. Such post-conflict mnemonics of the Raj have been well documented in scholarship. For Ian Baucom, British war memorials encouraged acts of pilgrimage that wedded the practices of tourism to a cartography of warfare, ensuring the traveller in India was fed an emotive narrative of loyalty and betrayal, one which fostered an uneasy climate of 'perpetually remembering and awaiting an outbreak of violence'.[15] For Manu Goswami, the 'mutiny tours' communicated an idealised imperial history that foregrounded notions of heroic Christian masculinity.[16] Far from calling into question the sense of belonging that colonials felt in India, memories of the trials and traumas of the Uprising were highly instrumental in crystallising a sense of imperial identity and citizenship. Indeed, according to Andrew Ward, tourists visited the Cawnpore memorial park more often than they did the Taj Mahal in the decades following the rebellion, and it continued to be a popular location with colonials until it was rechristened the Nana Rao Park and filled with statues of prominent Indian fighters from the Uprising following Indian Independence in 1947.[17]

Photography played an important role within these imperial tourist networks. The image of the Cawnpore memorial in particular was consumed in highly diverse

ways: commercial operators like Samuel Bourne and John Edward Saché sold

photographs of the site; tourist postcards were sent with reproductions of such

commercial photographs; newspapers published woodcut illustrations of the

monument; travel guides and accounts frequently included engravings made after

photographs; and amateurs produced their own photographs.[18] More needs to be done

tracing the circulation and reception of this varied imagery across multiple forms of

media, but the focus of what follows is on a number of popular commercial scenes

that were produced by professional photographers for the British market – both within

India and back in Britain – and which have since become well known within

scholarship on nineteenth-century colonial photography.   In contrast to previous

accounts of these picturesque photographs, my emphasis is on the political, ethical

and psychological valences of such scenes at the point of image *production* in

Cawnpore – a darkly emotive site of war – rather than on the significant contexts of

image *reception*.

Numerous photographic processes were brought to bear on the memorial site,

from the paper negatives and wet collodion plates of the mid nineteenth century, to

the more convenient dry-plate methods of later years. Bourne alone used three

different types of camera to delineate aspects of Cawnpore during his 1865 visit to the

town (shortly after the construction of the gardens and monuments had been

completed), thereby yielding negatives of various sizes: five images were produced

with his largest camera (negatives of 12 x 10 inches); one with his panoramic camera

(negatives of 13 x 8 inches); and eight with a much smaller camera (negatives of 4 x 4

¼ inches).[19] However, whether it involved an elaborate set-up of tripods and noxious

chemicals mixed in portable darkroom tents, or simply an Eastman Kodak point-and-

shoot box camera, the act of photography mediated an emotionally volatile

experience. Such was the traumatic resonance of the Cawnpore site for the British

that it was claimed that grass would not grow over the graves of the massacred

children; and if colonials needed to pass by the entrance to the park, it was customary

to dismount from horse and carriage and walk as a signal of respect.[20]

Most important of all to preserving the sanctity of the space was its racial

exclusivity. Just as the British engagement with the memorial worked to foster

imperial citizenship by nurturing a sense of belonging to the landscape, so did the

restrictions on Indian access highlight the latter's uneasy status within the post-1857

imperial regime. For many colonial Britons, the restrictive permit system in effect at

Cawnpore was something to be cherished, and indeed did not go far enough: one

visitor wrote that 'it would be even more appropriate if they [Indians] were

peremptorily excluded'.[21] The perimeter of the park was thus an especially highly

charged manifestation of the spatial policing that was integral to the colonial

management of racial relations.[22]

The violence underpinning such policing was very clear: British soldiers

(rather than the Indian sepoys who would usually be given sentry duty such as this)

were assigned to guard the grounds throughout the remaining century. The first of

these was Private Murphy, one of very few British survivors of the wartime massacres

in Cawnpore. Murphy was said to be an 'inveterate drunkard' and temperamental to

boot; if we read between the lines, it looks as though he might have been suffering

from post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of his experiences in that brutal summer

of 1857.[23] He took his job of keeping Indians out of the park very seriously, boasting

to one approving British tourist of how he had 'not over-gently ejected' Indian men

on a couple of occasions, when, in addition to their illicit entry into the memorial

space, they had supposedly been displaying 'grossly disrespectful conduct and

deliberate levity in this sacred spot, directed […] at the Memorial itself'.[24] Nor was it only damaged veterans of the Uprising who viewed such incidents with grave concern. In 1902, a newspaper report about a group of Indians who had gained clandestine access to the park – and then supposedly taken photographs of themselves on the marble steps leading up to the memorial well's enclosure – was disturbing enough for the British to warrant anxious dispatches between high-level officials in the colonial government, who thought it was 'much to be regretted' if the claims were true.[25]

Aesthetics

Despite the prohibitive permit system, the zealous groundskeepers, and the overall colonial paranoia about Indian engagements with the site, a regular feature of popular commercial photographs of the well and gardens is actually the presence of Indian figures, and the almost total absence of Europeans. In Bourne's *The Memorial Well seen through the trees from the South*, for instance, an Indian man in the park peers over a fenced enclosure of decorative trees and bushes, only to see two more Indian men convening in close proximity to the shrine (figure 3). Colonial visitors whose own engagement with the memorial site had been sanctified by Indian absence would have formed a significant part of the customer base for such a seemingly incongruous commemorative imagery. Indeed, the Prussian-born photographer Saché – whose scene of Indian figures artfully composed in the gardens, *The Memorial Well, Cawnpore* (figure 4), reproduced the pictorial model established by Bourne – started explicitly targeting the Cawnpore tourist market from the mid 1870s onward, when he set up a seasonal studio there.[26] Considering that numerous colonial travel accounts make a point of noting the racial regulations of the park with approval, it would be

surprising if the disjunction between the ethics of exclusion and the aesthetics of *staffage* had not registered for at least some viewers, especially if their consumption of the photograph and their experience of the site were roughly coterminous.

Still, it is by no means certain that the Indian figures' disturbance of the racially pure aura of mourning at the site would have jarred for these colonials upon viewing the photographs. While the alien status of the Indian presence was indeed fundamental to the political organisation of the park, it is a presence that appears thoroughly naturalised in the attendant tourist imagery. This is because the colonial picturesque tradition of which these photographs were a part was one that so routinely incorporated Indian figures into the landscape, positioned as objects for the aesthetic delectation of the colonial viewer. Gary D. Sampson has already described the basic political tenor that such representations would have had for contemporary viewers, noting that Indian *staffage* was correlated with a long tradition of British landscape painting that situated its figures within a benign pastoral system, and which, in the post-conflict Indian context, 'restored' tumultuous sites of warfare to 'idyllic calm'.[27] As a pictorial motif seen by viewers, then, these figures are relatively straightforward, easily explained by reference to a wealth of contemporaneous images that drew on the established tropes of the landscape genre. Any disruption they caused to the ethics of imperial mourning would likely have remained latent for viewers.

Yet what should we make of these figures' status as flesh-and-blood men, ones who performed the motif by posing in a racially policed park? I want to address this question from two angles: first, in terms of the British perspective on the Indian presence; and second, in terms of the possible Indian perspective on the fraught photographic encounter. There are a number of western accounts that allude to Indian

engagements with the park under a variety of circumstances; the common theme of these is that, to a greater or lesser extent, the Indian presence is troubling.

I have already mentioned two examples of Indian men reportedly sneaking into the park: one account from the mid 1860s in which the British soldier on guard roughly escorted '"respectable" natives out of the enclosure for grossly disrespectful conduct and deliberate levity in this sacred spot',[28] and another from the early 1900s in which an Indian group had been seen taking illicit photographs of themselves in front of the monument (leading to anxious official dispatches within government). Such stories introduce elements of criminal breach, political subversion and violent policing into the drama of post-conflict imperial mourning in Cawnpore. Yet the significance of Indian access could be more complex than this. When, in 1902, a campaigner for temperance called Mr Smedley attempted to enter the park with his Indian friend, the soldier on guard 'rushed on' the Indian man 'and informed him of his imminent hauling up before the Magistrate'. An incensed Smedley pointed out that the gardens were maintained with public money, and 'it was an absurdity not to allow those to enter in who contribute the greater portion of the cost in the shape of taxes'. In this instance, the Superintendent of the park, Mr Mayers, was called on to arbitrate. He eventually relented and allowed the Indian man access: an admission which, considering Smedley's argument, was conducted under the sign of political enfranchisement.[29] No taxation without assimilation.

So, the Indian presence was politically resonant in colonial accounts, ranging in significance from a deliberate act of subversion to a tacit assertion of the rights of imperial citizenship. Such instances can be seen as ripples within the smooth functioning of what Christopher Pinney, following Pierre Bourdieu, has termed the 'colonial *habitus*': a matrix of colonial permissions, bureaucracy, finance, transport

and consumerism that worked to structure the social environment in ways that were foreseeable, 'taken-for-granted', and thus more or less harmonious with the reigning ideology. [30] I shall return to the notion of the colonial *habitus* later, but first of all it is worth stating the stakes of the Indian presence in politically symbolic space in terms of the work of Jacques Rancière, whose vocabulary can help highlight the potentially antagonistic role played by photography within a *habitus*. For Rancière, aesthetics is understood in terms of a 'distribution of the sensible', something that parcels out bodies, voices and roles in space and time, determining what is, and what is not, visible, sayable or audible within society: the very parameters or horizons of perception, the locations and locutions determining political participation. [31] Aesthetics is therefore inherently political and political practices are inherently aesthetic for Rancière; but here 'politics' is understood differently from standard accounts of the term. What Rancière calls 'politics' is a process of making things count that had not previously been counted; it is about re-distributing the sensible world in emancipatory ways. It is thus a mode of distribution of the sensible that stands opposed to what is called the 'police' order of distribution, which usually determines the 'correct' places and roles of a population.

Within Rancière's framework, politics and aesthetics operate as 'two forms of distribution of the sensible, both of which are dependent on a specific regime of identification'. [32] Yet while politics and aesthetics can operate according to different logics, they fundamentally perform the same function: that of a 'dissensus' upsetting the sensible texture of the 'police' state. They confront established orders of distribution with the inadmissible and bring things into view which had been occluded, whether that be in terms of new subject matter being incorporated into art forms that had once been structured by various exclusions, or the sudden visibility of

hitherto marginalised peoples making claims to political subjectivity, occupying the

public sphere, and so on. Rancière's redefinition of politics as an inherently

emancipatory (and inherently aesthetic) form of anti-'police' praxis is slightly

confusing for my purposes here, as I have hitherto been using the term 'politics' in

accordance with its usual, less specific meaning, and I wish to maintain this

traditional usage in what follows. I think that politics as a term is more helpful when

it cuts both ways and signifies something that can be emancipatory or repressive.

Nevertheless, it is not difficult to see the racially exclusive practices integral to

the Cawnpore memorial as an example of Rancière's 'police' partitioning of social

roles, whereby some people are deemed admissible and others inadmissible to a zone

that, as noted, was constitutive of colonial citizenship. The question I want to engage

with is therefore whether or not we can see the artistically motivated placement of an

Indian figure in that restricted space as an example of 'dissensus', as a distribution of

the sensible that upsets the visual order of the colonial regime? On one level it clearly

does not disrupt imperial business-as-usual: quite the opposite, in fact. As Sampson's

Orientalist reading of the Indian figure (briefly outlined above) has demonstrated,

staffage is legible as a colonial political strategy that constructs the Indian subject as

docile and unthreatening. Even so, however, the *staffage* here still points to a stark

disjunction between two modes of 'distribution of the sensible': an artistic drive

towards populating the Cawnpore space with picturesque Indian figures, and a

'police' drive to exclude those Indian figures. The technomaterial demand of

photography (that the virtual trope of picturesque *staffage* be acted out in real space

before the lens) meant that the camera constituted a contact zone between those two

regimes of distribution, negotiating the requirements of an aesthetic genre within the

restrictions of a police system.

Of course, the picturesque aesthetic was not inherently in tension with the park's regulations. The construction of the gardens according to picturesque principles of landscape design had worked to Europeanise the location in a way that arguably gave formal expression to the Indian exclusion, so that picturesque aesthetics and political segregation dovetailed nicely. As Tapatai Guha-Thakurta has noted, for the colonial British in the nineteenth century, the picturesque aesthetic was a 'compulsion' of visual representation that had grown from 'a filter […] into a frame, inscribing itself into the body of the physical space and its structures', and it is this compulsive inscribing of the landscape with European tropes of the picturesque which is at work in the Cawnpore memorial and its attendant imagery.[33]

Yet clearly, in some instances, such a channeling of aesthetic form into physical terrain had the potential to produce pockets of turbulence within the surrounding political climate. Ultimately, the presence of *staffage* in these photographs is testament to the extraordinary potency of aesthetic templates for organising Anglo-Indian relations: the relevant permits for Indian access to the park were presumably acquired by photographers, and Indian men consequently posed on restricted ground, all in order to conform to a compositional mould that undermined the cherished exclusionary ethos of the gardens. So while the letter of the law within the colonial *habitus* was obeyed, the exclusive spirit of the site – the 'tacit system of codes which quietly encode a lifeworld' – was still flouted.[34] Indeed, the compulsion with which colonials appear to have been situating Indian figures in this landscape speaks to a certain diminution of imperial agency. (The extent to which *Indian* agency is legible within such images is another issue; certainly, at the very least, the blurring of the figures in some scenes signals a movement that was pictorially disruptive – and which colonial photographers found incredibly frustrating).[35] Photography was here

exerting a considerable pressure on the movement and interaction of bodies in India, intervening in the stratified post-conflict landscape in a manner that was not necessarily in harmony with the personal or political views of commercial photographers, and certainly not in harmony with the sensibilities of the garden's grief-regime.

A quixotic reading of all of this might therefore view the aesthetic sense that Indians necessarily belonged in the landscape as an implicit challenge to the political consensus on segregation; or, to state it in Rancière's terms, at least as a 'contingent suspension of the rules governing normal experience', which might equate to a 'dissensus' within the 'police' visual order.[36] Such a democratising effect of photography speaks in some way to Ariella Azoulay's influential recent work on the 'civil contract of photography,' where she argues that the medium opens up a sphere of anti-hierarchical and de-territorialised social relations – a 'citizenry of photography' – that operates outside of the control of state power. For Azoulay, this is because of the medium's endlessly reproducible nature, which frustrates individual claims to ownership or mastery, and means that 'photography's form of political relations' is 'not organized around a sovereign power'.[37] Neither the photographer, the sitter, the state, nor the viewer are completely in control of the production or significance of the photograph, which, by being irreducible to any single sovereign guarantor of meaning (that is, to a single unified *habitus*), and by being so open to re-contextualisation and re-interpretation, heralds a transnational and democratic form of 'citizenry'.

Certainly, the overthrow of political partitions that is achieved by the *staffage* in the Cawnpore memorial imagery does raise questions about the different types of relationships such Indian men might have had to imperial sovereign power: one of

political belonging as citizens with freedom of movement (as Mr Smedley implied above); one of subversion that calls into question the capacity of the state to police its sacred spaces (as the cantankerous sentries saw the matter); or one based on a general colonial aesthetic sensibility (as commercial photographers may understand it) that was more or less sealed off from these politics of (dis)enfranchisement. Yet to assess how the Indian presence would have registered for colonials – as well as for the Indian men themselves – first some more needs to be said about the intended symbolism of the Cawnpore memorial itself.

For many Britons, the sepulchral well was a potent signifier of violent 'betrayal', and as such it worked to frame the Anglo-Indian relationship in an intensely Manichean way. As one poem written during the Uprising had it:

> Let *us* swear by that well e'en the Hindoo unborn
>
> Shall have cause to remember Cawnpore
>
> For vengeance the blood of the massacred cry,
>
> For vengeance each true British heart beateth high,
>
> Who would not for vengeance be willing to die
>
> When he thinks of that well at Cawnpore?[38]

Notable here is that even unborn Indians – unambiguously guiltless – are the targets of Britain's extraordinary retributive impulse; as far as the writer is concerned, all Indians inherit a complicity in the massacre that took place in Cawnpore. This was no fleeting feeling, either. More than thirty years after the war, one visitor noted that the memory of the 1857 massacre 'seems to hang over Cawnpore like a cloud even to this day, and to cause bitterness in the minds of Englishmen, who everywhere else regard

the natives about them with no other feelings than of the kindliest possible nature'.[39]

In other words, Cawnpore was a place in which the nuances of Indian identity and complicity in British eyes were put under a certain amount of pressure. The duty of the memorial park's British sentry was 'to see that no native, be he humble coolie or high-born rajah, sets foot even upon that hallowed place'.[40] One visitor, noting the local tendency towards dedifferentiation, felt the need to make a countervailing plea: 'let us not attribute all this wickedness [i.e. the massacre], by an indiscriminate or hasty generalisation, to "the natives"'.[41] Such an entreaty confronted views like those of the fierce old colonial Frederick F. Wyman, who thought that all Indians should partake in the shame of the crime (but believed that, regretfully, they did not), and left the memorial gardens feeling both regretful and thankful: 'regret that the deed had been so feebly avenged, but thankfulness that it still pleased God to bless our arms, and spread fear of our name amongst a people who, had they but half the courage that they have duplicity and wickedness, would long since have driven us from the land'. Getting into his stride, Wyman continues: 'The friend of the black will tell you, at Exeter Hall, that he is your equal, and deserves to be treated as such. […] I may say, from an experience of many years amongst the natives of India, that they are not […]. How can one deem as equals a class swayed by no moral perceptions […]?'[42]

Bitter sentiments persisted until the end of the century. In a fin-de-siècle account of the cities most associated with the events of the Uprising, Emily A. Richings claimed that in Cawnpore 'no opportunity is lost of engraving the shameful story of the past indelibly on native memory as a future warning to the people'. 'The nature of our Oriental fellow subjects may be better understood at the present time than the preceding generation', the author admitted, 'but the subtle Hindu temperament contains an element of perpetual danger'; the account therefore slips

from an apprehension of Oriental complexity to an assertion of an unchangingly dangerous essence.[43] The 'better understanding' Richings is referring to would have been facilitated by postwar anthropological practices that commonly utilised photography to delineate Indian castes and tribes, situating them within a taxonomic system structured by 'a concern with political loyalty (or its lack) and an ongoing desire to provide practical clues to the identification' of allies and enemies.[44] Supplemental to this comparatively nuanced ethnography of guilt, however, was a certain geography of complicity in which 'the magnitude of the crime' committed in significant wartime locales was 'impressed upon the native mind by every means which the Government can devise', so that 'the natives of Lucknow [the site of a major siege during the rebellion] and Cawnpore show an awe of their conquerors which denotes the severity of the lesson so deeply scored on mind and memory'.[45] Mutiny memorials carried 'the threat of renewed punishment' and as such worked to void the possibility of friendly relations between British and Indian inhabitants.[46]

In what ways did this imperial pedagogy of crime and punishment invest the Cawnpore memorial photography with its meaning? For commercial photographers like Bourne, the camera carried a potent symbolism that can be seen as complementary to the punitive spectacle of such war shrines:

the curious tripod, with its mysterious chamber and mouth of brass, taught the natives of this country that their conquerors were the inventors of other instruments besides the formidable guns of their artillery, which, though as suspicious perhaps in appearance, attained their object with less noise and smoke.[47]

Photography is weaponised by Bourne here, drawing strength from its associations with a broader imperial arsenal. The wet collodion process used at this time was fairly laborious, involving complicated apparatuses, multiple glass plates, and boxes of noxious chemicals. The coating and sensitising of a glass-plate negative needed to happen immediately prior to its exposure in the camera, and so would have been witnessed by any sitters. After exposure, the plate had to be developed straight away, before the emulsion had a chance to dry; potentially, then, Indian figures would have seen their poses emerge as a negative image from the chemical mixture. An entire portable laboratory was needed on site for this purpose, usually in the form of a travelling tent or a horse drawn cart. Bourne had up to fifty 'coolies' to help him carry all of this (on one occasion, some had deserted him mid trip). Notable in the above quote is how Bourne characterises his practice in terms of its opaque materiality, as something intimidating but unknowable to the Indian figures caught in its sights. This raises the question: How *did* Indian sitters experience their role in the tableaus arranged by colonial photographers like Bourne?

Caught between the mysterious and possibly aggressive visual impact of the camera on the one hand, and the muscular mourning of an imperial war memorial on the other, Indian sitters would have been required to pose in stasis for long periods of time. It is impossible to know how much any awareness of European artistic traditions involving *staffage* informed their understanding of this ritual (no Indian accounts of such events exist), but the finished scenes were directed towards a British rather than an Indian market. Regardless, any Indian awareness of picturesqueness (or even of colonial aesthetic sensibilities more generally) cannot fully account for the psychology of such scenes; nor, indeed, as just seen, did aesthetics exhaust the significance of the act of photography for colonials like Bourne. The backdrop of

imperial techno-power behind the camera, and the series of massacres and counter-massacres that the Cawnpore memorial stood for, would surely not have been lost on the sitters. Elizabeth Edwards has described photography as a performance in which 'concentration or containment has a heightening effect on the subject-matter'.[48] While Edwards said this about the photograph itself, the comment maintains relevance when applied to the theatrical scene of photographic production: the intensity of focus on the site and its figures heightens the significance of the relationships forged therein – in this case, between the Indian sitters and the memorialised massacre. As Richard Wendorf has argued with regards to the theatricalised portrait sittings conducted by the painter Sir Joshua Reynolds in the eighteenth century, 'To find oneself posed in a certain way, within a particular setting […] let alone *as* someone else or embodying abstract qualities – is to see oneself anew'.[49]

So, while it is probable that the sitters in these scenes were often the photographers' servants, they were also being made to stand for a generalised figure of the 'native' in a process of abstraction that, given the resonance of Cawnpore, functioned to erode the distinction between them as individuals and the insurgents responsible for the memorialised killing – not literally, of course, but rather in terms of a British perception of an inherited Indian guilt, or a shared essence of rebelliousness. Cawnpore was a place in which a politically liberal conceptions of imperial relations was difficult to sustain; as one colonial put it following a visit to the town's war sites, it was easy to feel 'that fifty years of Western secular education, as assimilated by the Hindu, would not protect us from another outbreak of treacherous fanaticism'.[50] Precisely how much of this uneasy emotion was sensed by the sitters is unknowable, but, in the theatrical moment of posing, the Indian figure lacked a secure status as an innocent civilian: firstly because they were *persona non grata* in the

memorial gardens, and secondly because the Cawnpore site encouraged a deep British suspiciousness about the inherently violent tendencies of Indian men. The mournful tableaus laid out by photographers in the Cawnpore park could therefore work to insinuate the potential vulnerability of the posing Indian bodies to what literature scholar Alex Tickell has described as 'the fearful misrecognitions of a militia-led colonial society [...which] involve the potential interchangeability of any Indian man with a "mutinous" racial Other who is potentially *beyond* the law as a racially-coded version of *bare life*'.[51]

Thus, while the camera meant that aesthetic conventions were adhered to in ways that were potentially disruptive to the 'police' order of Cawnpore, the shadow of the Uprising was more likely to cast these Indians in the role of potential insurgents, and not potential citizens. I have referred to Rancière's term 'distribution of the sensible' to describe photography's agency in administering the movement of bodies here. However, I have so far been talking about such a distribution crudely, as a literal arrangement of bodily positions in space, without signaling the deeper element to Rancière's framework. At a more fundamental level, what we perceive as politically salient is dependent on a prior set of aesthetic categories that constitute an order of recognition and perceptibility. In other words, things can be there, available to be seen, without us necessarily registering them. Jay Berstein has described this in terms of Wittgenstein's work on aspect-blindness and aspect-dawning; referring to the famous 'duck-rabbit' drawing in which one can see either a duck or a rabbit, Bernstein explains that 'politics' in Rancière's sense (as a disruptive, anti-police praxis) 'occurs through the dawning of sensible aspects. At one moment what appears is the duck of white middle-class contentment; at the next moment what appears is the rabbit of black working-class suffering. [Art] is about reconfiguring the

sensible world so it appears differently [...] more democratic, more egalitarian'.[52]

To sum up this section, then, in light of the above refinement of Rancière, the rituals of the pose that had developed in landscape photography were potent, persistently adhered to across diverse times and spaces, and disjunctive in their relationship to other modes of composing the social field. In Cawnpore, an artistic logic brought the Indian figure into a space that was constitutive of colonial citizenship, with the camera's need to concretise aesthetic conventions leading to a transgressively egalitarian distribution of bodies. But the transgression lacked a corresponding shift in a wider order of recognition that would mean the Indian figures could register in terms of a challenge to exclusionary policies; there would be no 'aspect-dawning' of this. Rather, the aspect-shifts would have been between the tranquil resonance of the picturesque on the one hand (making them pacific bodies voided of threatening agency), and the war memorial's troublingly violent associations on the other (making them potentially criminal bodies to be policed).

All of which amounts to a fairly classic colonialist reading of the images: imperial photographers marshaling the Indian body and framing it ambivalently as an object of both condescension and fear. Yet what I also hope to have shown is that, in this process, colonials were operating under a sort of aesthetic compulsion: a pressure to reify *staffage* that compromised the ability of the colonial system to police the Indian body in accordance with imperial sensibilities. Thus while my reading is pessimistic in its assessment of Indian political agency being legible in these images, it also seeks to highlight the compromised nature of colonial agency when negotiating discrepant regimes of distributing bodies.

With this qualification of imperial agency in mind, I now turn to some colonial images that situate the Indian body in more direct and immediate relation to violence

than do the Cawnpore memorial photographs, and which consequently seem to epitomise the notion expressed by John Tagg, following Bourne, that 'in India, some [Indians] stood before cannon and others before cameras' in the fallout from the Uprising.[53] The camera-as-gun trope is often left unpacked, a vague analogy between different sorts of 'shooting'. In what follows, therefore, I further probe how this slippage between violent spectacle and technologies of imperial vision may have actually registered for British and Indian participants in the photographic event.

Precarity and the Pose

Colonials like Bourne might have fantasied about their cameras aping the affective power of artillery, but photography's capacity to terrorise was contingent upon the moment and manner of framing. As my analysis of the Cawnpore memorial imagery has shown, to be posed as *staffage* did not have a uniform significance; its psychological and political valences developed within a specific context.

A striking example of photographic intimidation is provided by the most written about of the photographs from the rebellion, the Italian-British photographer Felice Beato's elaborately titled *The Inside of Secundra Bagh after the Slaughter of 2,000 Rebels by the 93rd Highlanders and the Punjab Regt. First Attack of Sir Colin Campbell in November 1857* (figure 6). At first glance, this looks like many of the rubble-strewn scenes of war-ravaged architecture replete with Indian *staffage* that Beato produced during the war. Indian figures stand in front of the crumbling façade of the Sikander Bagh complex, surrounded by the wreckage that dominates the middle ground between the building and the viewer. In the foreground, however, it is not debris that clutters the floor: it is the skeletal remains of the Indian insurgents that had been massacred there by British forces storming the building on 16 November 1857.

Skulls, ribcages, femurs, pelvises: all are scattered in a horrific explosion of bones, the viciousness of their deaths implied by the absence of any intact remains.

Beato – a commercial photographer who had come to India following a period documenting the Crimean War (1853–1856) – did not arrive at this site in Lucknow until March 1858 (many months after the massacre in the previous November).[54] So the photograph does not depict the immediate aftermath of the battle; in its own way, the scene that we see here is an authored memorial marking a past episode of violence, just as in Cawnpore. The judicial commissioner of Lucknow, Sir George Campbell, recalled that by the time Beato had arrived in the city, 'The great pile of bodies had been decently covered before the photographer could take them, but he insisted on having them uncovered to be photographed before they were finally disposed of'.[55] This disinterment thus took place under the watch of a prominent agent of the colonial state: Campbell was responsible for 'the exercise of judicial functions' and 'the management of jails', as well as having 'all the powers of a High Court', notably the final decision 'in matters of life and death and all criminal appeals'.[56] Campbell's awareness of Beato's grave digging signals the photographer's entanglement with the colonial *habitus*.[57] If the British had not permitted Beato, either tacitly or explicitly, to exhume the remains of massacred Indian men, then the photographer would not have been capable of doing so.

Yet the fact that the photographer was able to 'insist' on disinterring corpses that had once been 'decently' buried (note the distinction here between an aesthetic form of compositional authority on the one hand, and an ethical treatment of the landscape and its dead on the other) is something that points once again to the camera's role as a powerful spur to reorganise the distribution of bodies according to pictorial demands, even when such demands might be offensive to social decorum.

For Campbell, it was 'a very horrible' photograph that Beato took in Lucknow.[58] The colonial *habitus* did not secure perfect harmony between acts of photography and the ethics of managing a space; for one thing, imperial ethics were not uniform. While Campbell may have recoiled from the image, Beato was a commercial operator and had the British market – often soldiers – in mind. His work was popular.

Scholars have primarily discussed Beato's grisly reconstruction of the aftermath of battle with regard to issues of authenticity. Pinney has stressed the tension between the camera's fidelity to the scene it documents and our sense that the 'camera has lied' to us. Doubts about reliability are not assuaged by the indexicality of the medium, because such doubts are located in 'the gap between the event recorded in the photograph and the event to which the photograph seems to gesture […] between "micro event" and "historical event"'.[59] Yet what gets left behind in such talk about the nature of the photographic index with regard to 'truth' or 'accuracy' is the way in which the relationship between the 'micro event' and the 'historical event' – between the *mise-en-scène* and the massacre to which it gestures – was understood by those constructing it. When the photograph was being taken, the relationship between the macabre tableau and its history of violence was not defined by indexicality, but theatricality – that is, by the marshalling of bodies in alignment with colonial pictorial demands, and against a backdrop of punitive colonial violence.

To return, then, to the question posed earlier: How might the Indian sitters have experienced these acts of posing on sites of violence? Beato's act of photography was undertaken within a climate of counterinsurgent aggression. Another of Beato's photographs from this time, *Two Sepoys of the 31st Native Infantry Who Were Hanged at Lucknow,* (figure 7). was taken not far from the skeleton-peppered Sikander Bagh site and shows two suspected insurgents hanging from a

gallows, while a group of Indian figures look on As noted, photography involved an elaborate occupation of the landscape with portable studios, glass plates, tripods, cameras and servants; in other words, preparatory work was likely being done for this image while the condemned men were being hanged. An excited colonial eyewitness to the execution, Lieutenant Arthur Moffat Lang (who earlier had revelled in the brutality of the colonial re-capture of Lucknow) said this about Beato's intervention in the scene on 21 June 1858:

> I saw a crowd about the gallows in front of the Moti Mahal & riding up I saw a Sepoy & a Band Nauk of the 48th N.I. just swinging off, and the Photographer, Beato, with his apparatus arranged a few yards off! and I saw him go up & steady the bodies, when life was extinct, to be nicely photographed! I should think the Photographing must have impressed additional horrors on the scene to the natives.[60]

The photographic act could thus serve to amplify the 'horrors' of the execution for the Indians required to witness it, or was at least seen to do so by colonials. I would suggest that the horror that Lang attributes to these men was in part due to an apprehension that the photographer's manipulation of *dead* Indian bodies – in his diary, Lang described Beato 'running up to the Gallows & steadying them by holding their feet!' – was an extreme, intimidating and quite possibly prophetic form of the *living* Indian men's orchestration for the camera.[61] The photographic event intensified this punitive spectacle by asserting its own comparable mode of immobilising power.

The reconstructed Sikander Bagh scene should also, I think, be seen with Lang's perception of 'horror' here in mind. It is unlikely that Beato dug up the bodies

by himself. In fact, it is probable that the Indian men seen in the photograph had also

been required to gather the bones, then to distribute them according to the aesthetic

demands of Beato, and finally to pose alongside of them (and if not these particular

Indian men, then others standing outside of the frame). Dragging the skeletons of

battle back into the light of day for the camera created a sepulchral framework for

staffage. The three figures are arranged like so many more bones, forging a

threatening formal equivalence between living men and cadaverous props, as each is

turned into pictorial fodder. In both of Beato's photographs, I would suggest, the

horrifying, necrotic positioning of the Indian figures frames their lives in terms of

what Judith Butler has called 'precarity': a 'politically induced condition in which

certain populations […] become differentially exposed to injury, violence, and

death'.[62] As the Bengali writer Bholanauth Chunder would recall shortly after the

war, 'It mattered little who the red-coats killed – the innocent and the guilty, the loyal

and the disloyal, the well-wisher and the traitor, were confounded in one promiscuous

vengeance'.[63] The sense of generalised peril that Chunder evokes here is confirmed

by numerous colonial accounts that delight precisely in the *indiscriminate* nature of

Britain's vengeance.[64]

Again, then, while it is impossible to say how much a European art history of

staffage might have informed these Indian men's understanding of the poses they

were being asked to strike for colonial photographers on sites of war, the violent

resonance of the locations would not have been lost on them. And given the

frequently arbitrary nature of British attacks at the time, it is highly unlikely that such

Indian sitters felt securely exempt from the sort of violence that their bodies were

helping to commemorate. It is in moments such as these that we can see the camera

approximating the threat of the cannon: when it worked to freeze Indian bodies in

relation to acts of violence, to fix their attention on punitive spectacles, to refuse to allow disturbing slaughters to be part of a forgotten past.

Conclusion

The camera interpolated the contested terrains of nineteenth-century India with theatrical zones in which a widespread aesthetic compulsion towards *staffage* brought to the fore very specific, context-dependent issues concerning Indian identity and status within the imperial regime. At stake here for the Indian sitters was their culpability for insurgent violence, their vulnerability to imperial retribution, the very mode of their belonging, or not belonging, to a space. Far from being cloistered away in a virtual realm cut off from the flesh-and-blood heave of bodies, aesthetic conventions could serve to determine the engagement of figures with the landscape, and intensify their exposure to past and present aggression. Such photographic tableaus were clearly very potent stagings of imperial power over the Indian body, yet photography exerted considerable pressure on colonials as well. Just as Indian bodies were subjected to the demands of western pictorial traditions, so too were Europeans submitting to aesthetic conventions that re-distributed the Indian body in ways that were potentially unsettling to colonial sensibilities, whether that be through the exhumation of bones which were once 'decently' covered, or by the transgressions of racial regulations. Photography was not harnessed uncomplicatedly to the demands of imperial power, then, but was something that made its own demands on that power, its conventions more or less indifferent to the specificities of a locale, a potential disturbance to coloniser and colonised alike.

Captions.

Figure 1. Samuel Bourne, *Cawnpore: The Memorial Well, with the Cawnpore Church in the Distance,* albumen print from collodion-on-glass negative, 1865. The British Library.

Figure 2. William Hodges, *The Marmalong Bridge, with a Sepoy and Natives in the Foreground,* oil on canvas, c. 1783. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection.

Figure 3. Baron Carlo Marochetti, *Angel of Cawnpore*, marble statue, 1861. Photograph by Samuel Bourne, *The Memorial Well, the Marble Statue by Marochetti, from the entrance,* albumen print from collodion-on-glass negative, 1865. The British Library.

Figure 4. Samuel Bourne, *The Memorial Well seen through the trees from the South,* albumen print from collodion-on-glass negative, 1865.

Figure 5. John Edward Saché, *Memorial Well, Cawnpore*, albumen print from collodion-on-glass negative, c. 1875. The British Library.

Figure 6. Felice Beato, *The Inside of Secundra Bagh after the Slaughter of 2,000 Rebels by the 93rd Highlanders and the Punjab Regt. First Attack of Sir Colin Campbell in November 1857*, albumen print from collodion-on-glass negative, March-April 1858. The British Library.

Figure 7. Felice Beato, *Two Sepoys of the 31st Native Infantry Who Were Hanged at Lucknow,* albumen print from collodion-on-glass negative, June 1858. J. Paul Getty Museum.

[Please add here Sean, according to journal style]

---

1 – For an account of the myriad 'inventions' of photography, see Geoffrey Batchen, *Burning with Desire: The Conception of Photography*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press 1997, 3-24. relevant pages? [Please be specific regarding page range for sources where appropriate to do so – you're referring here to a particular chapter – but again, the page range.]

2 – Giles Tillotson, *The Artificial Empire: The Indian Landscapes of William Hodges*, Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press 2000.

3 – Jeffrey Auerbach, 'The Picturesque and the Homogenization of Empire', *The British Art Journal*, 5:1 (Spring/Summer 2004), 283–305.

4 – Gary D. Sampson, 'Unmasking the Colonial Picturesque: Samuel Bourne's Photographs of Barrackpore Park', in *Colonialist Photography: Imag(in)ing Race and*

Place, ed. Eleanor M. Hight and Gary D. Sampson, New York and Abingdon: Routledge 2004, 84-106.

5 – See Thomas Metcalf, *The Aftermath of Revolt: India, 1857–1870*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1964, 46–92.

6 – See William Dalrymple, *The Last Mughal: The Fall of a Dynasty, Delhi, 1857*, London: Bloomsbury 2006.

7 – See Christopher Herbert, *War of No Pity: The Indian Mutiny and Victorian Trauma*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2008.

8 John Clark Marsham, *Abridgement of the History of India from the Earliest Period to the Close of the East India Company's Government,* Spottiswoode and Co.: London, 1873, 505.
8 – For a detailed account of the Cawnpore siege and massacre, see Andrew Ward, *Our Bones Are Scattered: The Cawnpore Massacres and the Indian Mutiny of 1857*, John Murray: St Ives 2004.

9 – See Stephen Heathorn, 'Angel of Empire: The Cawnpore Memorial Well as a British Site of Imperial Remembrance', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 8:3 (Winter 2007), 14.

10 – Vidya Dehejia and Allen Stanley, *Impossible Picturesqueness: Edward Lear's Indian Watercolours, 1873–1875*, New York: Columbia University Press 1989, 7.

11 – C. F. Gordon Cumming, 'Cawnpore and Lucknow', *The Monthly Packet of Evening Readings for the Members of the English Church*, ed. Charlotte M. Yonge, vol. VIII, parts XLIII–XLVIII (July–December 1884), 358.

12 – See Romita Ray, *Under the Banyan Tree: Relocating the Picturesque in British India,* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press 2013, 125-145.

13 – For an account of the regulations for the Cawnpore memorial garden, see 'W. H. L. Impey, Chief Secretary to the Government of the North-Western Provinces and

Oudh, to Hewett, Esq., C.S.I., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated 15 January 1902', IOR/L/PJ/6/591, File 142: 20 February 1902, India Office Archive, British Library.

14 – Ian Baucom, *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1999, 111.

15 – Manu Goswami, '"Englishness" on the Imperial Circuit: Mutiny Tours in Colonial South Asia', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 9:1 (March 1996), 54.

16 – Ward, *Our Bones are Scattered,* 550.

17 – For an account of the dissemination of images of resonant sites from the 1857 Uprising, see Narayani Gupta, 'Pictorializing the "Mutiny" of 1857', in *Traces of India: Photography, Architecture, and the Politics of Representation, 1850–1900*, ed. Antonia Pelizzari, Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture; New Haven: Yale Center for British Art 2003, 216–39.

18 – Many thanks to my first reader in peer review for directing me towards this information, as well as towards other significant details about Bourne's practice. See *Photographic Journeys in the Himalyas*, ed Hugh Rayner, Bath: Pagoda Tree Press 2001.

19 – 'An Old Indian' [Frederick F. Wyman], *From Calcutta to the Snowy Range; Being a Narrative of a Trip Through the Upper Provinces of India to the Himalayas, containing an Account of Monghyr, Benares, Allahabad, Cawnpore, Lucknow, Agra, Delhi, and Simla*, London: Tinsley Brothers; Calcutta: Wyman & Co. 1866, 81.

20 – 'Cawnpore', *Bow Bells: A Magazine of General Literature and Art for Family Reading*, 22:562 (1875), 414.

21 – Baucom, *Out of Place*, 102.

22 – A. Busteed, quoted in Ward, *Our Bones are Scattered,* 551.

23 – 'An Old Indian' [Frederick F. Wyman], *From Calcutta to the Snowy Range,* 81.

24 – 'Letter from J. P. Hewett to W. H. L. Impey, dated 15 February 1902, Calcutta', IOR/L/PJ/6/591, File 142: 20 February 1902, India Office Records, British Library.

25 – Saché also had seasonal studios in Meerut, Benares, Mussoorie, Nainital and Lucknow. See Stephanie Roy Bharath, 'John Edward Saché in India', *History of Photography,* 35: 2 (May 2011), 180-192, 182.

26 – Sampson, 'Unmasking the Colonial Picturesque', 96.

27 – 'An Old Indian' [Frederick F. Wyman], *From Calcutta to the Snowy Range,* 81.

28 – *Advocate* (8 December 1901), quoted in government correspondence on the issue, 'W. H. L. Impey, Chief Secretary to the Government of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, to Hewett, Esq., C.S.I., C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated 15 January 1902'. IOR/L/PJ/6/591, File 142: 20 February 1902, India Office Records, British Library.

29 – Christopher Pinney, *The Coming of Photography to India,* London: The British Library 2008, 30.

30 – Jacques Rancière, *Aesthetics and its Discontents*, trans. Steven Corcoran, Cambridge: Polity Press 2009, 25.

31 – Ibid., 26.

32 – Tapati Guha-Thakurta, 'The Compulsions of Visual Representation in Colonial India', in *Traces of India*, ed. Pelizzari, 116.

33 – Pinney, *The Coming of Photography to India*, 30.

34 – John Falconer has written about such frustrations with regard to the photographer James Waterhouse. See '"A Pure Labour of Love": A Publishing History of *The People of India*', in *Colonialist Photography: Imag(in)ing Race and Place*, ed. Eleanor M. Hight and Gary D. Sampson, New York: Routledge 2004, 51–83.

35 – Steven Corcoran, 'Editor's Introduction', in Jacques Rancière, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, ed. and trans. Steven Corcoran, London and New York: Continuum 2010, 1.

36 – Ariella Azoulay, *The Civil Contract of Photography*, trans. Rela Mazali and Ruvik Danieli, New York: Zone Books 2008, 112.

37 – J. R. B., 'The Well at Cawnpore', *The London University Magazine*, 3 (1858), 189. Emphasis in original.

38 – Thomas Stevens, *Around the World on A Bicycle: From Tehren to Yokohama*, vol. 2, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1889, 340.

39 – Gertrude Bacon, 'Echoes of the Great Rebellion', *The Ludgate*, 7 (1899), 362.

40 – Norman Macleod, *Peeps at the Far East: A Familiar Account of a Visit to India*, London: Stahan & Co. 1871, 280.

41 – 'An Old Indian' [Frederick F. Wyman], *From Calcutta to the Snowy Range*, 84.

42 – Emily A. Richings, 'Cities of the Mutiny', *Belgravia: A London Magazine,* 94 (September 1897), 23.

43 – Christopher Pinney, *Camera Indica: The Social Life of Indian Photographs*, Reaktion: London 1997, 34.

44 – Richings, 'Cities of the Mutiny', 23.

45 – Baucom, *Out of Place*, 111.

46 – Samuel Bourne, 'Photography in the East', *British Journal of Photography* (1 July 1863), 268.

47 – Elizabeth Edwards, *Raw Histories: Photography, Anthropology and Museums*, Oxford and New York: Berg 2001, 18.

48 – Richard Wendorf, *Sir Joshua Reynolds: The Painter in Society*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1996, 135. Emphasis in original.

49 – A. H. Hallam Murray, *The High Road of Empire: Water-colour and Pen-and-Ink Sketches in India*, New York: Dutton and Company, 1905, 154.

50 – Alex Tickell, *Terrorism, Insurgency and Indian-English Literature*, *1830–1947,* New York: Routledge 2012, 92.

51 – Jay Bernstein, 'Theoretical Positions: Rancière, Deleuze, Relational Aesthetics', in *Beyond the Aesthetic and the Anti-Aesthetic*, ed. James Elkins and Harper Montgomery, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press 2013, 77–78.

52 – John Tagg, 'The Mute Testimony of the Picture', in *Photography's Orientalism: New Essays on Colonial Representation*, ed. Ali Behdad and Luke Gartlan, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute 2013, 194.

53 – See John Fraser, 'Beato's Photograph of the Interior of the Sikanderbagh at Lucknow', *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, 59 (1981), 51–55.

54 – Sir George Campbell, *Memoirs of my Indian Career*, ed. Sir Charles E. Bernard, vol. 2, London: Macmillan and Co. 1893, 4. Emphasis added.

55 – Ibid., vol. 2, 37.

56 – Pinney, *The Coming of Photography to India*, 30.

57 – Campbell, *Memoirs of my Indian Career*, vol. 2, 37. [Vol. 1 or 2 Sean – please double check these sources]

58 – Christopher Pinney, 'Seven Theses on Photography', *Thesis Eleven*, 113:1 (December 2012), 144.

59 – 'Letter of A. M. Lang to his brother, Mathew', dated 21 June 1858. Add. MS 43822, f.100, Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library. Emphasis added. I am indebted to John Fraser for this reference.

60 – Arthur Moffat Lang, *The Diary of A. M. Lang*, 21 June 1858. Add. MS 43825, f. 36. Western Manuscripts Collection, British Library.

61 – Judith Butler, *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?*, London: Verso 2009, 25.

62 – Bhonlanauth Chunder, *The Travels of a Hindoo to Various Parts of Bengal and Upper India*, vol. 1, London: N. Trubner & Co. 1869, xii.

63 – A letter from a British soldier to *The Bombay Telegraph* told of going around houses in Delhi and killing those found inside: "'They were not mutineers,' he claimed, 'but residents of the city, who trusted to our well-known mild rule for pardon. I am glad to say that they were to be disappointed'". Quoted in William Dalrymple, *The Last Mughal,* 369.