

eventually nationalized in 1972 (p. 157), the control of Kirkuk fell into the hands of Baghdad, governed by an Arab state that sought to further eviscerate any remnants of hybridity. Arabian homogeneity became ascendant and, to this day, remains hegemonic.

To illustrate these arguments, *City of Black Gold* is divided into six chapters, sandwiched between an introduction and a conclusion. The introduction sets the scene, highlights the key arguments and maps out the structure of the book. Chapter 1 is about the making of Iraq as a nation-state. Chapter 2 details British meddling in, and control of, Iraq broadly and Kirkuk specifically. The discovery of oil and how it transformed Kirkuk are the focus of chapter 3. The specific ideology of urban development is discussed in chapter 4, while an analysis of conflicts among various groups in Iraq is detailed in chapter 5. Nationalization and the hegemony of the Arab identity are discussed in chapter 6.

Future editions could put Kirkuk in a wider conversation with other oil cities in Iraq, elsewhere in the Global South and around the world. As noted by Ferdinand Braudel, 'I doubt that a study of a city...can be the object of...enquiry...without inserting it in the historical long-term...within the context of the countryside that surrounds it, and...within those archipelagos of neighboring cities.'<sup>1</sup>

Even so, this book had to be written. For historians of Iraq and Middle East specialists, every chapter in this book is a must read. For other readers, the introduction, chapters 3 ('Oil and urban growth'), and 4 ('The ideology of urban development') are particularly recommended. *City of Black Gold* is original in its sources of inspiration, creative in its approach and even-handed in its overarching treatises.

**Franklin Obeng-Odoom** 

University of Helsinki

[franklin.obeng-odoom@helsinki.fi](mailto:franklin.obeng-odoom@helsinki.fi)

**Ritajyoti Bandyopadhyay**, *Streets in Motion: The Making of Infrastructure, Property, and Political Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. xiv + 305pp. 5 maps. 13 tables. 12 images. Bibliography. £75.000 hbk.  
doi:[10.1017/S0963926824000348](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926824000348)

It is a commonplace in urban history that the project of making streets 'modern' relied on creating arterial networks conducive to capital accumulation: wide streets 'opened up' tightly knit neighbourhoods facilitating urban renewal, overhauling the population distribution of cities and ushering in new property relations. Evictions of poorer populations and racialized minorities were the norm in such modernization projects. Streets became critical elements for the movement of capital and vital infrastructural anchors for fixing it. Fast movement sped up production and itself became valorized as the essence of modernity. Waxing poetic about the newly constructed parkways in New York, Sigfried Gideon remarked that it is 'only by movement, by going along in a steady flow...the wheel under one's hand' that the space-time zeitgeist of the twentieth century could be realized. The counterpart of fluid movement, as Marshall Berman reflected, was the destruction of communities and bulldozing of neighbourhoods:

<sup>1</sup>F. Braudel and I. Wallerstein, 'History and the social sciences: the longue durée', *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 32 (2009), 171–203, at 186.

planners hacking their way through a crowded city 'with a meat axe'. The ubiquity of this phenomenon in cities across the globe has led urban history scholars to routinely include analysis of street planning in their accounts of city life. In discussing the experience of the city from the vantage of the street, scholars have leaned on critical theory à la Walter Benjamin, Hannah Arendt, Michel de Certeau and others. Few, however, have made the street *the* analytic focus for narrating the history of a twentieth-century city. Written within a framework of critical theory, Ritajyoti Bandyopadhyay's book, *Streets in Motion: The Making of Infrastructure, Property, and Political Culture*, addresses this lacuna and thus makes a significant contribution to urban history.

Taking the street as the subject of analysis to understand the relation between urbanization and capital accumulation in Calcutta/Kolkata in the long twentieth century, the book demonstrates how 'popular sovereignty materialized in space'. This story of political friction, obstruction, crowd action and the messiness of urban life that generate 'narratives of human belonging' aims to demystify 'motion' as it pertains to urban formations. Motion, Bandyopadhyay argues, is not the sole purview of the triad of the state, planner and capitalist. The modern street offers other vantages from which to read its affordances and mobilize.

With a substantial introductory chapter, five chapters and an epilogue, Bandyopadhyay leads the reader through three inter-related arguments: (1) contrary to the dominant representation of a city of failed urbanization, the 'people's economy' – urbanization without accumulation – kept Calcutta vibrant as a city; (2) streets were not merely epiphenomenon of property relations, but popular politics in and of the street 'reframed the contours of the city's political economy'; (3) the materiality of the street as public space during the twentieth century produced a distinct political vernacular shaped at the intersection of urban planning, resistance to new property relations and the limits of state authority and imagination of the modern city.

Chapter 1, 'The making of the modern street', juxtaposes two divergent views of the modern street – the authoritarian projection of an arterial network for unimpeded movement by planners acting under the aegis of the Calcutta Improvement Trust (CIT) established in 1911, against the commoning of the street by ordinary citizens as spaces of dwelling and livelihood and by protestors as political space between the 1920s and 1950s. The latter two collectively 'rescued the streets from an exclusive regime of property and exchange value', Bandyopadhyay notes. Chapter 2, 'The regime of the street', builds on the previous discussion of the CIT's plans with an in-depth examination of land acquisition for street improvement and extension. The unequal burden placed on the city's Muslim population by the new regime of property, and the communal conflicts that were created as a result are the key takeaways from this chapter. Urban renewal, Bandyopadhyay points out, facilitated communal polarization. Chapter 3, 'City as territory', extends the discussion of communal conflict to explain the new territorial template of Muslim ghettoization that the 'urban civil war' of the 1940s and 50s set in place, destroying the closely intermeshed fabric of multi-religious and multi-ethnic living. The path to majoritarianism forged at mid-century created a segregated real-estate market and cast a long shadow on how the city came to be perceived in terms of communal zones. Chapter 4, 'Frontier urbanization' discusses two modes of suburbanization: the development of the eastern and southern suburbs through platting by the CIT and land occupation by force (*jabardakhal*) by refugees from East Bengal and East Pakistan after the Partition of 1947. *Jabardakhal*, Bandyopadhyay explains, counteracted the property market created by planned suburban development resulting in the 'virtual withdrawal of urban property from the real estate

market for at least four decades'. Chapter 5, 'Durable obstructions, spatializing motion' narrates the story of street hawkers who claimed the public space of the street and sidewalk to make a living, and the repeated efforts by the state to clear such obstruction. There is room here, Bandyopadhyay suggests, to craft a grammar of inclusive urbanism. The Epilogue considers the contours of collective action in contemporary cities.

For scholars who work on Calcutta, Bandyopadhyay's book is an occasion to rejoice. He has introduced the Calcutta Hawker Sangram Committee archives and the hitherto nominally used archive of the CIT. These records bring to the discussion of the city's twentieth-century planning history new archival depth. Readers would also find much to contemplate as they navigate familiar landmarks and events through Bandyopadhyay's deft handling of archival research in relation to his ethnographic fieldwork. Urban scholars interested in cities beyond Calcutta will find inspiration in Bandyopadhyay's argument about 'urbanization without accumulation' and the sheer richness of the materiality of street life he shares in this book. The modern street is after all not a backdrop or negative space, nor a space of flow or speedy passage, but the enduring arena of popular sovereignty. *Streets in Motion* teaches us that it is in events of obstruction – everyday and epoch-shifting – that we recognize the eddies and whorls of popular politics.

**S. Chattopadhyay** 

University of California, Santa Barbara

[swati@arthistory.ucsb.edu](mailto:swati@arthistory.ucsb.edu)

**Quinn Slobodian**, *Crack-Up Capitalism: Market Radicals and the Dream of a World without Democracy*. London: Allen Lane, 2023. 352pp. 13 maps. Bibliography. £25.00 hbk. £10.99 pbk.  
doi:[10.1017/S0963926824000312](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926824000312)

Following on from his *Globalists: The End of Empire and the Birth of Neoliberalism*, Quinn Slobodian continues his exploration of how neoliberal individuals and organizations have shaped the world today. Whilst *Globalists* focused on the 'Geneva School' of neoliberal thinkers, *Crack-Up Capitalism* features wide-ranging case-studies and a cast of eclectic characters, from three generations of Friedmans (Milton, David, Patri) to Silicon Valley anarcho-capitalists. Per Slobodian, the Geneva School saw democracy as both a 'potential threat to the functioning of the market order' and dangerous in 'its legitimation of demands for redistribution' (*Globalists*, p. 272). Crack-up capitalists see political freedoms as preventing the proliferation of true freedom, which in their conception means economic freedom, for example through the unfettered mobility of capital.

Very recently, *Urban History* has seen an uptick in case-studies of a British crown colony on China's doorstep, Hong Kong. *Crack-Up Capitalism* echoes this interest. Hong Kong is frequently cited by Slobodian's market radicals; he ended *Globalists* in Hong Kong with a 1978 meeting of the Mont Pelerin Society, and he begins *Crack-Up Capitalism* with a chapter on 'Two, three, many Hong Kongs'.

At the heart of the book is the concept of 'zones', for which Hong Kong was *the* model. 'At its most basic', Slobodian explains, a zone 'is an enclave carved out of a nation and freed from ordinary forms of regulation', which could range from simple tax-free zones to full abdication of national sovereignty over a portion of land