

Working Paper No.12

Development Planning and 'Urban' Context: Reflections on the Indian Scene

Biswaroop Das



Centre for Social Studies
Veer Narmad South Gujarat University Campus,
Udhna-Magdalla Road, Surat – 395 007

April 2016

Abstract

Through a broad portrayal of character of its development, changing urban patterns, nature of urban economic structure and contents of urban development policies, this paper takes a political economy approach to examine the process of urbanization in India. It narrates as to how since the colonial period labour mobility across space and sectors was caused as well as triggered by marginalization of the peasantry and artisans through agencies of a growing capitalist economy. Instead of taking a systemic view, manifest expression of rural to urban migration in form of overcrowding as well as dense and unhygienic living conditions of the urban poor continued to be viewed as the 'primary' set of urban problems. As a result, efforts to address such problems by the state remained adhoc and piecemeal over the time. This is exemplified by changing approaches and policies of urban development in the country stated and noted in various plan documents and status papers. Veering between aims of 'inclusive growth' and grooming of select urban spaces for responding to global market changes, the concerns and components of urban planning have now been subverted by market forces in an irreversible manner. As a result, the urban development policies have become exclusively 'elitist', with the poor in cities left to fend for themselves in unprotected sectors of the economy and inhuman living conditions in slums, shanties and redeveloped 'informal' settlements.

JEL Classification : O20

Key words : Urban, Development, Planning, Industry, Labour.

Development Planning and 'Urban' Context: Reflections on the Indian Scene

*Biswaroop Das**

Development reflects conflicting as well as complimenting forces of the social history of a nation. It is thus pertinent to recognize that geographic spaces or regions organized around the hegemony of a particular system of social control often plays to the tune of a dominant system. The proposition negates the existence of 'universal' concepts associated with characterizing regions as rural or urban. Viewed in this fashion, it is useful to trace the development processes first, and then analyze their manifest forms over geographic spaces within the changing social context of a nation or region.

Before locating the development processes and understanding specific *sectors* within an economy, it may be of use to look at some of the major perspectives around which the concept of development has been debated. The orthodox developmentalists, who also were more 'modernists', viewed nations in a modern-traditional continuum with its core in the western industrial world. That this traversed path needs to be emulated for development and modernity is at the centre of such a perspective. This was accompanied and followed by the *dependency* perspective with a burgeoning literature on themes such as unequal development, development of underdevelopment, unequal exchange, dependency etc. (Frank 1966, 1967, 1978; Wallerstein 1974; Amin 1974, 1976, 1977; Emanuel 1977). Protagonists of this perspective explain underdevelopment as a process perpetuated, sustained and reinforced in the 'peripheral' or 'dependent' economies by the 'central' or the 'dominant' economies. To them, capitalism is the unifying force between development and underdevelopment and at the same time a prime force behind the development of underdevelopment in dependent economies. In essence, the dependency paradigm as a critique to the modernization perspective views the development process in terms of appropriation of

* Former Professor, Centre for Social Studies, Surat.

surplus from the third world under the hegemony of 'central' capitalism. Character of underdevelopment in dependent economies is hence viewed as a manifestation of this bondage of dependency. As a corollary to this perspective was the analysis of development in terms of 'world systems', reemphasizing the forms created by the world surplus distribution through multinational relations (Wallerstein, 1974 and 1974a). The marxist perspective on the other hand, identifies the world development dynamics in terms of modes of production and class conflicts with imperialism as one of its central agencies (Petras and Trachte, 1979).

The limits and contradictions across and among these perspectives make it difficult and complex to opt for any one approach to examine the development process within a nation-state. This paper takes a perspective of political economy to examine the urbanization process within India through a broad portrayal of the character of its 'development', 'urbanisation', nature of the 'urban' economic structure and the overall focus ingrained in its 'urban' development perspectives. Such an approach has been adopted because of its colonial past, its initial slant towards a neo-colonial dependent type of development and a more contemporary neo-liberal market orientation. It is within this context that the paper looks at the trajectory of developmental planning and situates the Indian urban context within that.

I

Initial Patterns in 'Urban' Economic Expansion

Prior to the entry and consolidation of colonial interests, dominant socio-political institutions in the country were a mix of feudal and semi-feudal relations in production, punctuated by trade-centric mercantile arrangements in specific pockets especially along its western and southern coastlines. While it is difficult to trace the origin of the first 'urban' location in the country, they may have emerged in the valley systems able to sustain agricultural surplus; at locations on tracks of specific trade routes as 'kasba' towns or as centres of religious pilgrimage and points where social and economic exchange between communities took place at local and micro levels. However, it is only since the

medieval period that Indian urban history becomes clear with different territories and regions witnessing growth and development of such pockets as expressions of wars, rivalries, political subjugations, commerce and merchandise. The economic structure and associated growth patterns in the west coast and southern kingdoms of the sub-continent, though different from the systems in the Deccan and the North, continued to witness changes through trade, commerce, religious patronage and growth in agriculture.

Exceptions apart, it is mainly through colonialism that much of India got linked and integrated with the world capitalist system. It was not only being used as a market that Britain needed but more as a pool from which raw materials were extracted for the 'imperial' and international markets. Colonial penetration and its institutionalization initiated processes of transformation in the traditional industrial as well as urban structures, organized so far around different socio-economic arrangements. Beginning with Bengal, parts of India were steered towards what may be termed as a *presidency* form of urban system. While engrafting of newer institutional arrangements and technology introduced in specific sectors had begun to initiate changes in the relations of production, it also unleashed processes effecting the labour in various sectors and avenues in the economy. Concomitant changes in agrarian arrangement and the tenets of a colonial economy were instrumental in triggering the processes of marginalizing a section of the agricultural labourers and pushing them on to other sectors. Shifts and reshuffle of labour across and between sectors and a city ward migration from select regions, led to the emergence of an urban context that was essentially colonial. This had however not eroded the base of the earlier structure entirely, but gradually transformed their character to remain linked with newer networks of relations in production and trade. Though asymmetrical, the process created a hierarchy of locations with elements of 'primary' and 'subordinate' ranks within the broader context of a colonial arrangement. Locations dealing with petty trade and commerce in specific regions remained more or less autonomous for long, and so did the religious and pilgrim centres. Over such locations, new railway and road systems were implanted which not only had begun to 'deindustrialize' parts of the

subcontinent, but also initiated growth impulses in the primate cities in ways typical of the South Asian urban colonial enclaves.

Emergence of institutions supporting the needs of a colonial economy particularly in the sectors of finance, bureaucracy, transshipment, brokerage, insurance etc. created demand for specific skills and types of labour different from the work force located within the interlinked occupations of a feudal system. The process, while linking intermediate locations and the metropolitan economy with the colonial hinterland, initiated a gradual shift of productive forces towards a commercialization process that was linked with the interests of colonial power. Over the time, this appeared as a major cause leading to the rise of what is often termed as the 'urban informal labour market' in today's context. This was a result of casualization of labour in agriculture, reinforced albeit by reorganization of the rural sector¹ for surplus appropriation through trade in goods and products. Figures quoted by Dutt from a 1911 document giving an estimate of the total British capital invested in India and Ceylon during 1909-10, suggest that as much as 97 per cent of such capital was meant for 'purposes auxiliary to the commercial penetration of India' (Dutt 1970:137).²

Industrial growth in India up to 1914 had been on a low ebb confined mainly to cotton, jute and railway repairs. Labour was concentrated in the primate cities and commercially linked rural hinterlands. Years during the first World War had put a constraint to the entry of manufacturing goods from England and Europe. As a result, the first Industrial Commission was set up in 1916 to sustain British monopoly in the Indian market and safeguarding it from other foreign advances, especially after the war (Dutt, 1970: 151). Successive growth in industries however remained concentrated in select sectors of jute and cotton with manufacturing still to emerge prominently. "It was not until the second World War that a serious engineering industry was established, to supply machinery to existing industries like the cotton and jute mills, and aircraft and other requirements for the war against Japan. After Independence in 1947, tariff protection and government assistance led to the first real expansion and diversification of Indian industries since the nineteenth century, into light and heavy engineering, chemicals, cement and new

steel works, and later into electronics and pharmaceuticals. Yet this expansion too, though remarkable, was held up at intervals by crises and depressions” (Holmström 1984:43).

II

Colonial Context, Labour Shifts and ‘Urban’ Problems

Given the contours around which industry and trade in India were tied by 'colonial' ways of organizing production, coupled albeit with intermittent phases of booms, crises and wars, we may now take a look at the nature and character of labour and labour shifts. Though difficult to ascertain the limits of labour mobility during the time, it can be said that it (a) added to the pressure on land, initially by displacing and eventually uprooting a substantive part of the rural traditional manufacturing sector, and (b) initiated labour shifts from marginalized sectors of the economy as well as agriculture to new occupations. Migration of labour from rural areas to commercial hubs though had already begun, the process was not ad hoc or haphazard. The jute mills in cities like Calcutta and Cotton mills in Bombay and Ahmedabad were already receiving labour from sections of the peasantry and small landholders in the countryside. Recruited frequently by *jobbers* and *mukadams*, this labour was generally unskilled and vulnerable in their new settings. Part of this labour shifted to petty contract jobs and the self-employed sector, while a section with some craft based skills entered in ‘workshop’ related activities of ports, railways and associated manufacturing firms and units.

Triggered by a dominance of commerce cum business interests, labour was drawn from various rural and semi-rural pockets in the country. Such labour shifts however followed certain patterns. Large proportions of the mill workforce in Bombay especially during 1911-'20 came from the Ratnagiri region and the districts in Konkan in the south and the Deccan plateau. By 1921, proportion of such migrant workforce from this immediate hinterland had dropped with the rise of labour migration from the United Provinces (Morris 1965: 63-64).³ A similar process was also evident in eastern India where migrant workers came to the jute mills of Calcutta first from within the districts of Bengal for around a decade and

then from districts in Bihar, U.P. and Orissa especially after 1900. Growing industries in Ahmedabad and Kanpur on the contrary continued to receive larger shares of their migrant population from surrounding districts. Even southern cities like Coimbatore and Madras appear to have attracted large proportions of industrial workforce (especially in textiles) from surrounding hinterlands during these decades.⁴

It is however difficult to obtain a correct estimate of the quantum of industrial labour force during the time in the country, though the related figures reached by Dutt (1970: 385) based on the 1921 industrial census and 1931 estimates are useful. Out of the estimated 3.5 million, 58 per cent was in the factory sector (medium as well as large), 12 per cent in mining, 20 per cent in railways and 10 per cent as dockers, seamen etc. Workers in petty manufacturing activities and enterprises without power were not included in this estimate for lack of data, though Dutt added another figure of over one million workers in the plantations to finally arrive at a figure of about five million workers associated directly with the colonial economy located mainly in urban as well as semi-urban centres and pockets.⁵

Blended with the priorities of a colonial trade system, policies of the 1916 Industrial Commission helped movement of rural migrant workers to some of the dominant sectors in the economy. Besides a distressed rural peasantry, such work-force also included groups which perceived wage differentials between rural and urban areas and 'traditional' and modern industries a reason to migrate. The latter group, not always very poor, was often part of 'middle caste' households having some assets in form of land in the countryside. It is however rather difficult to ascertain as to who and what proportion among them got located in the 'organized' industries and who in the 'unorganized' sector(s) of petty sales, production and services. Between these, there was also a group employed in various unregistered factories, warehouses and workshops frequently characterized by a near absence of wage as well as job security.

Major urban centres in the country by this time had begun to emerge as configurations of demographic and economic growth supporting the colonial economy and at the same time facilitating the gradual rise of a

'national' bourgeoisie. Spatial expressions of such industrial growth appeared in terms of a labour mobility having traces of intra as well as inter-sectoral shifts across and within regions, specific capital-labour relations, and an emergence of firm or activity centric working class localities in cities. The urban economic structure and corresponding labour markets at the time thus revolved around four major groups, viz. (a) the 'British mercantile' interests supported by agencies and a corresponding bureaucracy working for enhancement of surplus through investments in profitable sectors; (b) an emerging 'national bourgeoisie', though not solely based on indigenous capital; (c) middle line functionaries within the 'newly' emerged financial, bureaucratic, brokerage and service sectors; and (d) the working class located in plantation, transshipment and industrial and mining sectors.⁶ Part of the traditional peasantry on the other hand, though affected by the colonial economy, remained in rural areas characterized by a range of pre-capitalist social organization of production.

In an aggregate sense, these processes contributed to a gradual socio-economic transformation of different regions in the country. Many such changes, especially those essentially economic in nature, were mainly guided by colonial interests as well as an emerging market and a changing gentry. A summation of all these in terms of a growing mercantile capitalism while influencing the domestic market was also leading to fragmentation of labour in urban as well as rural areas. Though not mutually exclusive, the 'urban' and 'rural' were frequently sites of engaging with productive forces responding to the core features of the ongoing economy. This is what shaped the internal patterns, social ecology, and lay-outs of cities associated with such transformation.⁷ Workers in the foundries, plantations, mills, factories and other allied sectors continued to get located in areas and dwellings provided at times by the employers and at other times shaped and constructed at 'convenient' locations by themselves. Those with higher surplus and appropriate social networks and opportunities carved out newer spaces for themselves. Interplay of social and market forces made way for speculations and segregations that determined the demand and value of urban land and property. For those working in the unregistered industrial, petty commodity production or the unorganized 'street' sector, the priority

was to earn and not the conditions of living on which they hardly had any control. This was further reinforced by an increasing supply of labour. Significantly, these groups though varied in terms of their locations in the labour market and manner of coping with jobs and wages, eventually got labeled as the generic category of 'urban poor' as against the rest. While the mill-hands and factory workers emerged as the working class in major cities and articulated their political solidarity under the patronage of nationalist and leftist political groups, they were not able to carve out appropriate housing spaces for themselves. Areas occupied by them remained segregated from sites that were emerging as enclaves of elites and upper middle class locations. Cities like Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Ahmedabad are examples of such phenomena and associated processes.

Workers and the Cities

Increasing migration, rising growth of 'pushed-out' labour from rural areas and location specific concentration of capital led to a perpetual growth of inhuman living conditions for the working class in general. An acute shortage of workers' housing had already surfaced in Bombay as early as by 1860, where part of the initial housing need of factory workers was met by accommodating them in *chawls*.⁸ Such sub-standard dwellings, eventually became an essential part of Bombay's industrial and civic history. Similarly, the Bombay Port Trust (BPT) and the Bombay Development Directorate (BDD) too constructed chawls to house part of their workers, further legitimizing the construction of dwellings with lesser amenities and restricted floor space per unit. Though with varying intensity, conditions in other urban centres such as Calcutta, Kanpur, Ahmedabad, Madras and even Coimbatore were as bad as in Bombay or sometimes worse as was the case in Calcutta; which had to accommodate the distress population escaping the countryside during the Great Bengal Famine and the partition at a later date. Studies on the living and economic conditions of workers, invariably sum up the situations to be extremely gloomy, filthy, inhuman and insanitary amidst appalling poverty. Even the Whitley Commission reporting on urban housing and environmental conditions in 1930 reported, "that the neglect of sanitation was often evidenced by heaps of rotting garbage and pools

of sewerage, while the absence of latrines enhanced the general pollution of air and soil. Houses, many without plinths, windows and adequate ventilation, usually consisted of a single 'small room' in which the only opening was a doorway often too low to enter without stooping. In order to secure some privacy, old Kerosene tins and gunny bags were used to form screens which further restricted the entrance of light and air. In dwellings such as these, human beings are born, sleep, eat, live and die". And this can, by and large be taken as a fair representation of the then prevailing conditions of the poor and working class localities in all large urban centres and primate cities in the country.

Response of the Authorities

Amidst growth of commerce and industry, the social ecology of major cities continued to undergo changes in their internal distribution of social groups and economic functions. Over the time, a progressive rate of city-ward migration and the consequent swelling of labour supply in the urban labour market, made way for a constant growth of working population. Urban problems were perceived by the State as outcomes of overcrowding and sanitation. This led to the formation of Sanitary Commissions in Bombay, Bengal and Madras Presidencies and Improvement Trusts in cities like Lucknow, Kanpur, Allahabad and others. These institutions, besides some random city level development works, contributed to the enhancement of urban land value by improving plots and leasing them out to private developers. In other words, while strengthening the effects of market forces especially on urban land, these led to the rise of urban land speculators. Subsequently, the first Town Planning Act was passed in 1915 (The Bombay Town Planning Act) mainly to regulate city level constructions, diversions, alterations, drainage, sewerage, water-supply and preservations of historical monuments. This historic Act too eventually led to sustaining the grip of market forces on urban land. Related to space-specific arrangements, these initial steps were by and large attendant features of the growth trends in industry and commerce, promoting their conglomerations over cities and thereby determining the locations and spatial spread of the workforce. No efforts were made to form and realize any policy that could provide the surplus work force avenues of employment and

earning. Efforts of creating dwellings for themselves and negotiating with loose tertiary and 'service' jobs thus emerged as a constant phenomenon for part of a growing pool of surplus labour. A large section among them continued to remain insulated within a situation of 'no-employment' to 'under-employment'.

III

Post Colonial Era and the Development Process

The Five-Year Plans - Components, Perspective and Essence

Independence had several effects on India's urban growth, commerce and industrial expansion. On the one hand it meant easing of constraints imposed by the British capital while on the other it generated conditions of capital scarcity. Migration triggered by partition too made some areas emerge as labour-surplus spaces exerting pressure on the already fragmented labour markets.⁹ In such a situation, economic reconstruction of the country was perceived in terms of facilitating growth in agriculture and helping industries grow in a few select sectors while supporting a range of small scale industries. The two prominent ideologies of the time were the Gandhian and the Nehruvian with the former advocating a system of production and consumption within a context of decentralized 'village republics', and the latter emphasizing on modernization through adoption of newer technologies and institutions. Expressions of different development perspectives had already emerged as the Bombay Plan, People's Plan, Post-war Reconstruction Plan etc. during 1943-'45. What thus emerged as an aggregate expression of various perspectives in the first Five Year Plan was an emphasis on welfare programmes and growth in agriculture as well as small-scale industry sectors with the latter being prompted by the Economic Programmes Committee of the AICC backed by the Congress policy.¹⁰ The growth that followed was however a mix of positions of the Gandhian perspective and the Nehruvian framework that found expressions in form of the Cottage Industries Board and the Small Scale Industries Board.

Drawn within confines of a narrow economic and limited political options, the first Five Year Plan (FYP) placed a higher emphasis on the revival of rural economy through growth in agriculture, followed by the second FYP that stressed on distributional aspects of a broad 'socialist' model. "Shifting focus from state-assisted private ventures to extending the public sector, emphasis on embellishment of a 'socialist pattern' kept appearing in the succeeding plans... It helped the spurt of private enterprises, often in cooperation with the state. The pursuit of socialist objectives through 'capitalist' means eventually led to an increasing control of private capital on the public sector itself" (Das 1982: 21).

Emphasis on enhancing capital intensity in industry continued to strengthen the inherited spatial structure, resulting in higher mobility of capital and labour mainly across major urban nodes and specific regions in the country. The mode of addressing this appeared in form of injecting and inducing growth through creation of more industrial and agro-industrial pockets which could respond to market forces working within the framework of an emergent capitalist system. And this, in a nutshell initiated the shift of focus from 'community' to 'area' - from 'people' to 'region'.¹¹

By the late nineteen fifties, emphasis on commercializing agriculture and providing a leverage to small-scale industries had become an important instrument for growth. "Directions of this shift can be seen from the main features of the second FYP which included - a large increase in planned effort, particularly in the public sector; large expansion of public utilities and the heavy industries field" (Gadgil 1972: 113). The early nineteen 'sixties witnessed another phase of commercializing the agricultural sector through Intensive Agricultural Development Programme (IADP) to increase production through irrigation, cooperatives and a high yielding varieties programme (HYVP). By 1969, 'area' had already become the major focus and 'growth centres' an accepted means of distributing and regulating growth in the countryside. A spate of literature that emerged on the efficacy of such an instrument favoured promotion of capital intensive growth in both the agro-industrial and industrial sectors. As an extension of this, the 'green' revolution though helped in raising the growth rate in agriculture also accentuated the problem of skewed asset

distribution in the countryside with its ramifications in urban areas while also contributing to marginalizing the peasantry.¹²

Until the late nineteen sixties, a growth oriented emphasis remained predominant in the plans. Growth in industries was thought to be capable of absorbing the rural migrants as well as the urban poor - an assumption strengthened by the Fei-Ranis (1964) and Todaro (1969) models (Fei & Ranis 1964; Todaro, 1969). Implied was that growth impulses would trickle down to the lowest segments of the population. This however was far from true, for a considerable body of literature appearing particularly during the late nineteen sixties and mid seventies showed the opposite. Evidently, despite growth, poverty in urban as well as rural areas continued to rise with rural and urban poverty being products of the same system.¹³

Despite realizations about growing poverty, marginalization of the peasantry and the urban working class along with shrinkage of labour market in specific sectors, the FYPs of the country remained by and large 'growth' centric. Aspects related to distribution was however emphasized in the fifth FYP in terms of developing backward areas, providing special incentives to private investments and meeting 'minimum needs' of the rural population. "The Draft Plan for 1978-83 reemphasized backward area development and identified the overpopulated Gangetic plain, areas with exceptionally low agricultural productivity, and tribal belts facing ecological problems for special attention. The method of propagation and diffusion of development continued to be provision of incentives towards industrial investment and feeding the backward areas with *social services packages*" (Das 1982: 23). The plan framework of 1980-'85, while stressing again on the need for progressive reduction in regional imbalances also recognized the role of capital-intensive industries in accentuating regional disparities. As a method of bringing 'distribution' closer to people and making it effective, it propagated a need for 'block' level planning. The plan noted that it would be imperative "to take note of the local resources, manpower, institutional strength and public participation for evolving a suitable programme of overall productivity with special emphasis on providing full employment to the rural population" (Sixth Plan Frame, GOI 1980).

With a focus on accelerated growth of industry during a perspective period up to 2000, the seventh FYP (1985-90) emphasized on increasing application of science and technology and suggested measures for reducing agglomerative tendencies of the larger cities. It advocated the need for complementarity between physical and investment planning by locating industries within specific regional and urban contexts. The eighth FYP (1992-1997) reemphasized the approach of the seventh Plan and laid emphasis on development of smaller towns and cities as links between rural areas and large urban centres. Growth of productive activities was to be based on locations which could sustain 'decentralized concentration' of growth impulses. In spite of efforts that dealt with enhancing investments in poorer and backward regions, the rural hinterland continued to add to the urban migrants especially in 'metros', bigger cities as well as towns attracting higher investments and growth. Even across many 'formal' sector firms and industries, production organization at different levels was characterized with informal arrangements and contracts. It is within this context that the ninth FYP (1997-2002) placed an emphasis on further development of avenues of income and opportunities in rural areas through 'farm' as well as 'non-farm' sectors. It was felt that an effective and viable urban strategy and programmes needed appropriate inclusion through linking those living in the rural areas. Continuation of a similar emphasis is found in the tenth FYP (2002-2007) which talks about growth of sectors having potentials of creating gainful employment through agriculture, construction, tourism, transport, small-scale industries, retailing, information technology and communication. In addition, it talked about designated programmes for special target groups. The basic focus had however been on enhanced industrial growth, especially within the context of an open economy giving boost to private capital and a pan-Indian liberal industrial growth policy. Coupled with an emphasis on increasing small scale industries, such a policy was to facilitate growth particularly in larger urban centres having appropriate links with the changing facets of a re-designated neo-liberal economy. The eleventh plan (2007-2012), though continued its focus on growth, placed its major emphasis on 'inclusive' growth with a vision of 'social justice' and a strategy of sustaining 'inclusiveness' at the macro as well as micro levels simultaneously. Within the context of an open economy and a liberal

frame of 'public-private partnership', the plan strategy included approaches to growth in agriculture and industry; physical, social and economic infrastructure; energy and science and technology with decentralized delivery mechanisms. Corresponding manifestations of such an approach in the cities and towns are expected to be dealt with and negotiated through provision of urban infrastructure and programmes as well as schemes of poverty alleviation. Significantly, the eleventh plan also places an emphasis on developing satellite towns and 'improving' those urban centres that are commercially vibrant or have potentials to be linked with the global economy.

IV

Urban, Industry and Labour Nexus — Processes and Products

It is within the above context that one may situate and sieve out the 'urban' side of the phenomenon in a somewhat more coherent manner. As noted earlier, the colonial urban structure was generally characterized with economic alignments that kept the economy in a state of subservience to the 'metropolis'. As a consequence, emerged an urban settlement pattern with a fixed set of identifiable components. 'Nodal primacy' and 'enclave' like growth emerged as dominant spatial expressions of urban network. Commercialization of agriculture suited the needs of the 'metropolis' and while contributing to growth, marginalized the workforce further. Labour migration to mines, foundries, intermediate spaces and large urban areas became an inevitable outcome of the system itself. This led to distress labour migration making such workers often part of productive forces within the marginal sectors in a changing economy.

What thus is commonly viewed as rural to urban exodus, was an expression of labour displacements caused by economic transformation and the changes in social relations in production. Viewed in this manner, the post-Independence urbanisation pattern in India during its initial phase continued to reflect similarities of the colonial era. Skill as well as labour continued to concentrate over spaces that had performed nodal functions of the colonial urban structure where industry and manu-

facturing had an already established basis to grow. "The emphasis on industrial development since the second FYP helped the spurt of enterprises in both private and public sectors. The components of this process penetrated the countryside too, initiating adjustments in the economic structure of rural India by commercialising its dominant sectors... To a significant extent, such factors, intertwined with increasing diversification of the urban economic mosaic, contributed to the initial demographic snowballing of such specific points in the country" (Das 1985: 17).

The pattern and rate of industrial growth however did not emerge in consonance with the supply and increasing reserves of labour. Sectoral bottlenecks began to appear as a common phenomenon since the early days. Even on the eve of Independence, the industrial base in the country was narrow. Cotton, jute and transport-specific engineering works were still dominant. Primacy of jute and also to some extent cotton gone after Independence, response to new industrial policies related to public investments, substitution of imports and allocation of resources emerged strong. Resultant was a growth in engineering and chemicals accompanied by the entry of a wider range of technology in the market. "The new or expanding industries included machine tools and other machinery, agricultural equipment, fertilizers, electrical equipment, aluminium, petroleum products, rubber, paper and transport equipment including bicycles, scooters, cars, lorries and tractors; from the 1960s onwards, consumer goods for the home market and for export--plastics, synthetic fabrics, pharmaceuticals, detergents, radios and domestic appliances; and most recently the fast growing electronic industry" (Holmström 1984: 78). This widening base of the economy provided some scope for growth of smaller ancillary. This small-scale sector continued to receive government patronage while also taking advantage of modern technology and their 'small' size. Elasticity of government policies helped growth of owner-entrepreneurship for the urban as well as rural markets. Growth of the service sector and direct as well as indirect subsidies helped institutionalization of this 'small-sector' mainly within a growing realm of capital intensive ventures and related markets.¹⁴ "Registered small enterprises seem to have grown relatively rapidly after the mid-'sixties. And this is more true in the modern industries like

engineering, chemicals and plastics. Further, these industries are also the ones which form a greater part of the value added in the small-scale sector compared to the traditional industries like handloom though they have a greater share in terms of number" (Nagaraj, R. 1985). "While the available data are far from adequate, they do show that significant change has taken place in terms of a relative reduction in the size of the traditional, household forms of production; a marked expansion in the non-household form of enterprise; and a tendency of greater concentration of manufacturing activity as a whole in urban areas" (Vaidyanathan, A., Eapen M. 1984).¹⁵

Ramifications of the changing content of industrial structure and its growth however did not remain enclosed only within urban areas. Market forces and mechanisms within which dominant sectors of the economy worked, witnessed a growth of non-agricultural workforce in rural areas, caused often by the nature and extent of agricultural commercialization (Sankaranarayanan, V. 1980). Comparing the '1961-'81 manufacturing workforce in the country, Vaidyanathan and Eapen (1984) record that the "total employment in manufacturing rose much faster in urban areas than in rural areas. As a result, the share of the latter in total industrial employment fell from 51 per cent in 1961 to 43 per cent in 1981. Much of this reflects the decline of rural household industry which fell by some 15 per cent between 1961 and 1981." Such trends continued over decades. Except for pockets sustaining 'commercialized agriculture and allied sectors', the farm sector began to first lag behind and then continued to stagnate. Caused by a further lowering of investment in infrastructure in the public sector particularly during the structural adjustment regime, which was followed by selective and intensive investments on urban infrastructure and industries, agriculture got pushed down further. Within these contexts, social relations in production continued to undergo adjustments and transformations depending not so much on the character (urban or rural) but the nature of activity in an area and intensity of its links with the dominant market forces.

Taking clue from Castells (Castells, M. 1977), the process of industrial and urban growth patterns in the country can broadly be viewed in a manner in which he phases out the character of 'dependent' urbanization.

Colonial period which can be identified as the first phase, helped emergence of an economic structure that was expressed and articulated in terms of a growth that revolved around a handful but specific sets of activities that continued to sustain and reinforce colonial interests through primacy and dominance of specific geographic nodes and particular economic sectors. Marginalization of peasantry and the artisan groups that emerged as a consequence of the phenomenon, faced problems of labour reabsorptions within the changing contours of the economy. Part of a response to such disturbances appeared in form of inter as well as intra-sectoral labour shifts within many rural, semi-urban and urban areas. A section of the unabsorbed work force continued to swell the ranks of urban labour reserves. Luckier among them could engage in the ranks of 'marginals' intermittently showing in and out of factories, newly emerging workshops and engineering firms as well as ancillaries coming up in the lanes and by-lanes of cities. Those who could not make it either way, made attempts of raising whatever possible from the last stretches of the unorganized sectors. The plethora of problems and their causes identified as to be located within major industrial and urban nodes were seen as an outcome of growing rates of rural to urban migration. Its physical manifestations were viewed in terms of insanitary living conditions. And, the attempts put forth to correct such distortions therefore were mainly 'area' and 'problem' specific, with their major causes linked with the systemic intent kept ignored.

Urban Space and the Economic Structure

At a macro level, growth and spread of industrial capitalism in India continued to penetrate the Indian economy steadily, albeit by diversifying its manufacturing sector since the early nineteen sixties. Emphasis on obtaining higher industrial and allied growth found its spatial expression on the one hand in the rise of metropolitan industrial complexes and corridors such as the Bombay-Ahmedabad industrial corridor, the Bombay-Thane-Pune belt, the Calcutta-Durgapur-Ranchi complex, the Delhi-Agra-Kanpur-Lucknow zone, Madras, Coimbatore, Hyderabad and Bangalore pockets etc., while on the other there emerged a continuum of agro-based urban and semi-urban areas generally along agriculturally productive deltas, valleys and plains of major rivers, other commercially

productive tracts as well as prominent nodes of exchange and trade. Such development patterns appeared as aggregate expressions of forces that shaped the economic history of India in relatively recent times. Changing character of the Indian industrial as well as agricultural structure and the corresponding influences that they exerted together on its urban patterns during different phases, should however not be taken as exclusive from one another, for each of them successively carried the changing features of 'modernity' and industrial capitalism over the other. At the other extreme, remnants of the 'old' structure directly not at odds with the forces of capitalist development escaped such direct impositions. As a result, the emerging process appeared multi-dimensional with their explicit expressions in the 'superimposed' as well as 'subsidiary' components of the urban economy. Carefully planted industrial cities such as Durgapur, Bokaro, Bhilai, Rourkela and planned capitals like Gandhinagar, Bhuvaneshwar, Chandigarh etc. however appeared as near configurations of a 'modernist' growth.

Interplay of development forces that continued to transform as well as erode the very basis of the 'old' system, kept inserting changes in the social structure of the country. Move from the colonial 'merchandise' capitalism to a more open economy was a step towards responding to the international market and its mechanisms directly. This is how the Indian economy got integrated more deeply into the world capitalist system, providing leverage to the growth of an 'imperialist' domination of its economic development. Cities which continued to play the core and intermediary roles in such articulations, witnessed changes that these processes brought in their social structure and the overall economy.

The urban context situated within an aggregate sphere of such interactive forces received the ripples of these transformation processes intensely. An inherited social configuration and class-structure of the colonial days while getting reinforced also underwent transformation. With the British and its control gone, the 'national' bourgeoisie that was built upon the new and traditional alliances and strengthened by capitalist interests took over the economic nerve centre of the nation. Opportunities for wage-labour in agriculture, traditional industrial sector and allied activities had by now shrunk even more.

The swelling rates of unemployment thus began to shape the political economy of such development forces differently. A range of factors emanating out of these contributed to the crisis of the economy by marginalizing larger segments of population and divided the urban economic structure into two sub-sets, viz. (a) the labour market related to the modern industrial structure down to its last ancillary with different arrangement of labour recruitments that varied from formal to informal, and (b) the one related to possible adjustments stretched too far within the lower circuits of this structure with severe fluctuations in wages and income. All those attached to this 'net' of activities in one way or the other formed the range of 'productive' forces within the urban milieu. The two other distinct groups were the 'elite' and the 'paupers'. Capturing the 'urban' class-structure in such an abstract way though is to ignore substantial variations, but based on the past trends, it can be said that within the Indian urban context, class differentiation increased rapidly. Continued growth of slums, squatter housings, distorted wage structure in the 'informal' and 'fringe' sectors, pavement dwellings and even appropriation of state sponsored low-income housing by the rising middle and upper income groups indicate at these fast growing socio-economic disparities.¹⁶ Such processes got further intensified particularly after the nineteen nineties when select cities across different regions in the country required grooming through infrastructure development of a kind expected to respond aggressively to the demands of a changing global market.

Combating 'Urban' Chaos – The Contents and Essence of State Efforts

Let us now take a glance at the character and contents of the state efforts towards responding to the urban problems and the perspectives adapted towards shaping them, especially during the post-Independence period. Perceptions and solutions to urban problems during colonial days as noted earlier, revolved mainly around the narrow precept of an 'imbalanced population-infrastructure ratio' with corresponding attempts of correcting some insanitary conditions and providing a miniscule number of dwellings to workers in the port and textile sectors. Intent of the first Town Planning Act of 1915 by and large continued to determine

the elements of urban planning in India even during the post-Independence days. The Urban Community Development Programme launched during the early nineteen fifties too emerged with an elitist bias in its contents. Perceived as different from rural, the urban context thus kept gaining a separate status, legitimized by problems related to such spaces caused by increasing density of industrial and commercial activities. Simultaneously such pockets emerged as the prime refuge for labour entering new sectors. Influenced immensely by British concepts, the perspective Master Plans prioritized 'ring' towns, zonal regulations and administrative functions which had severe limitations in responding to the changing market forces. As a result, the establishment of several urban local bodies and extension of municipal limits were emphasized during the first half of the nineteen sixties.

Ironically, and particularly during the initial decades after Independence, ferreting out elements of a national urban development policy, even from plan documents, remains difficult. One can at best identify piecemeal efforts in response to specific problems rather than any carefully crafted approach guiding urban growth and development. In spite of a number of agencies and institutions meant to regulate urban growth within the larger context of national development, the approach seems to have remained unchanged for long. The problems were perceived within narrow as well as naive frames of 'space management' rather than locating them within larger socio-economic contexts. The first and the second Five Year Plans emphasized, though a bit paradoxically, on housing and slum-clearance. The third plan emphasized that industry must serve as the focal point of regional development so as to reduce the burden of rising unemployment in the agricultural sector. Industrial dispersal appeared as the key-word for absorbing labour and decongesting the urban areas during the decade. Towards the end of this plan, State governments readily accepted the Planning Commission's proposal of preparing City Development Plans. Much of these plans however became obsolete over time, for they were not shaped by appropriate emphasis on tendencies and rates of changes that cities continued to experience. Amidst programmes of city beautification and provision of some very limited housing for the urban poor; coupled with overlapping of functions amongst multiple number of executive agencies, some new towns were built under the banner of

'middle-class abode of comforts'. These were generally a sum total of 'neighbourhood' sectors, green-belts, industrial, administrative and residential zones with wide roads, central business districts etc., with hardly any concern for or correspondence with features of the overwhelming urban poverty in the country.¹⁷

Fourth and the fifth plans emphasized on dispersal and decongestion aspects related mainly to the major cities. In case of other cities, it was specifically stated, that "future planning must be oriented towards stabilisation of population at a desirable optimum figure and towards planning suitable new centres in the region for the likely spill-over" (GOI 1970: 398).¹⁸ The sixth Plan while recognizing regional differentials in urban growth declared that "in the backward states the problem of urbanization are caused by stagnation while those in the more advanced states are caused by relatively rapid growth. The articulation of national urbanization policy should then involve specific consideration of regional problems and urban development in each region" (GOI 1980: 395). In essence, such a strategy was aimed at strengthening of industrial activities within 'lagging regions' in the countryside. This becomes more clear from what is stated further in the plan, that "the thrust of the urbanisation policy during the next decade would be to give greater emphasis to the provision of adequate infrastructural and other facilities in the small, medium and intermediate towns which have been neglected hitherto in this respect. The aim would be to strengthen these market centres to equip them to serve as growth and service centres for the rural hinterland" (ibid: 395). This, in other words meant that the process of urban development was to traverse back and forth through a chain of intermediate settlements to be eventually streamlined under one dominant mode of capital and its articulation over spaces.

The seventh plan with its core emphasis on poverty alleviation also adopted a 'micro' strategy to meet the mounting problem of urban unemployment. Such a focus appears to have been influenced by the 'reformist' perspective of development that began to gain popularity during the early nineteen seventies. Its underlying philosophy was to abstain from the approaches drawn from macro-level generalisations and shift to 'micro' level interventions. The 'discovery' and a re-definition of

'informal' sector and its role in employment generation and sustenance of the poor in cities and towns emerged as a new prescription for responding to crisis in the urban context of such social formations. The concept found a space for advocacy and selective realization while pushing the issue of systemic change under the carpet. The problem thus got once again placed within an instrumental logic of working out selective strategies by the policy makers, planners, governments and the donors. Additionally, it paved the path for debates on the potential of informal sector and associated questions of whether to integrate, subserviate or separate this sector in order to deal with its political potentials of assertion.¹⁹

Subsequent plan documents and their approaches continued to view cities as sites and engines of industrial growth and market nodes. Since the nineteen nineties, structural adjustment programmes and liberalization of the economy unleashed market forces to take control of the real estate sector as well as development patterns that were centered around efforts of enhancing linkages with the global economy. Regulations and planning for urban development became subservient to such agencies generating models of city planning based essentially on the principles of excluding the people and sectors unable to respond to the changing economy. Indeed, the approach has shifted from urban management to developing cities that would act as props to global market and emerge as parts of an intensive network of agencies and institutions that would support an aggressive 'neo-liberal economic regime' of growth and development. As a consequence, urban planning is now redefined as tasks associated with construction of spaces that are transnational and frequently shaped by private capital supported by the state itself. Cities are now groomed by factors that help the convergence of global capital and its attendant features. While on the one hand this has led to exclusive treatment for those 'able and potential cities' which can act as vehicles of such growth processes, on the other has neglected urban centres unable to do so. Driven by global capital and redefined priorities, select cities are gaining in infrastructure, witnessing growth of segregated elite housing and market complexes, experiencing a swelling real estate market, articulating new forms of 'gatedness', and aggressively 'sanitizing' urban landscapes by pushing the poor from out of site. City specific urban

vision and governance are converging to serve the global market and displacing those at the margins. The National Urban Renewal Mission (NURM)²⁰ is a case in point which aims at revitalizing select cities by reconstructing their spaces through speedy growth of infrastructure, selective regulation of urban growth and 'de' slumming' them. The agenda involves creation of 'global cities' expected to mediate international finance capital by replicating first world urban agencies and images. Essentially, the mission has helped private capital to appropriate public spaces, encouraged aggressive growth of real estate market, created a 'middle class' friendly ambience and redefined access of the poor to basic services. Though 'inclusive urban planning' maintains a façade of reaching the urban poor, in effect they are dislocated from their homes, hearths and job-sites. And a section among them able to gain from related schemes and programmes pushes the rest out leading to their cumulative marginalization within such cities.

Undoubtedly, subtle as well as explicit elements of market centric and 'elitist' approaches of city planning have pushed the poor further, of which the concept of transforming the major urban nodes as 'slum-free cities' is but one glaring example. Indeed, most cities now appear to be the stage for widening of economic disparities and pushing the poor out of the economic game and sustainable social security measures.

V

Conclusion

Variations in contexts over time have determined the response of state to development and planning and reinforced the gradual domination of market forces. The state in this context must be viewed as an apparatus and part of an economic and political milieu channelizing forces of specific socio-economic formations. Seen historically, the role of state in the Indian sub-continent substantiates this position. Under the garb of 'development' and 'welfare', the Indian state has continuously tried to play the role of troubleshooter by arbitrating social conflicts and assertions in order to keep its dominant interests alive. Colonialism that determined the initial development patterns, helped in strengthening and at the same

time creating a state structure that could respond to its systemic needs. Increasing dominance of capital and choice of technology brought changes in various sectors of the economy as well as the society. In addition to specific growth trajectories, expressions of such processes appeared in forms of marginalization and proletarianization of the peasantry and the working classes. Simultaneously, this also strengthened the dominance and control of the elite and the ruling classes.

In alliance with the dominant and ruling groups, the state continued to diffuse 'problems' that were but attendant features of the system itself. Whether these efforts were made effective through welfare measures during colonial days or during the post-Independence era through populist slogans of self-reliance, emphasis on infrastructure building, land reforms, redistribution with growth, poverty alleviation etc., in essence they have been similar in their approach and orientation. With mounting pressure of unemployment and crisis of the early nineteen seventies, rural development through populist welfare measures were re-stated. The Ford Foundation model of 'growth centres' still retaining its credence, the focus was on Green Revolution. Veering from one programme to another thus appeared as a continuing strategy on part of the state. It appeared in forms of community development, area development, special area development, regional development and welfare of the target groups. Target and area centric programmes were results of this strategy which played a role of 'managing the poor'.

The phenomenon has been similar in the urban context too. In the name of urban planning, decongestion and migration control has always been the state's priority and approach. This was centered around programmes veering between slum eradication and strengthening the rural economy by reinforcing commercialization of agriculture in the countryside. The process continued till such problems began to appear as insurmountable. The category of 'urban poor' received attention in the official parlance and got legitimacy in the government agenda. Populist contents of state programmes thus got interwoven with reformism, legitimized by the World Bank and ILO's 'new' perspectives. And this provided legitimacy to the hitherto ignored 'informal' tiers of the economy. The idea of 'informal sector' and its location in the urban economies of the third

world was made popular as an area needing attention. However, since the sector continued to remain unprotected lacking particularly in any wage or social security, enterprises and labour located within it became more vulnerable to the vagaries of fluctuating urban labour markets. Large cities, 'metros', big towns and industry as well as specialized factory cities and 'enclaves' continued to witness rising migrant population competing with each other for work, wages and survival. Subservient to the fast changing nature of the market, urban development programmes succumbed to the interests of an elite and the growing size of middle classes kept the poor under constant threat of policies and instruments that worked towards excluding and pushing them out in the margins. At the cross-roads of global market forces, currently the economy and polity of cities and spaces in the country appear unconcerned and hostile to the poor and the 'insecured' migrant wage workers. This is exemplified by the way that the urban poor has been left to fend for themselves in unprotected informal and fringe sectors of the urban economy as well as the manner in which 'slums' as a housing alternative for them has moved a full circle from removal to their re-development and environmental improvement, provision of basic infrastructure, poverty eradication and now to relocation for making 'slum free' cities. In the current global economic scenario, it is not only the large cities that are experiencing a rising distance and contradictions between the 'global' and the 'local', but also between cities having potentials of going global and those lacking in such capacities. Unabsorbed sufficiently in the growing service sectors and allied enterprises as well as pushed out simultaneously by the aggressively functioning real estate forces over urban land, a section among the migrants is changing their destinations to third and second tier cities and to sectors like mining and construction on a seasonal basis. Oblivious to all these, the policies and perspectives of current urban planning in India aims at production of spaces that can facilitate outcomes associated with the global finance capital.

Notes

1. For effects of colonialism on Indian economy and the penetration of imperialist relations, see especially, Dutt, (1970).
2. Quoting from a paper by Paish George (1911) in the *Journal of Royal Statistical Society*, 74, 1911, p.186, Dutt (1970) gives the following figures related to British capital invested on different heads during 1909-10.

<u>Head</u>	<u>Capital invested in £ million</u>
Government and Municipal	182.5
Railways	136.5
Plantations (tea, coffee, rubber)	24.2
Tramways	4.1
Mines	3.5
Banks	3.4
Oil	3.2
Commercial and Industrial	2.5
Finance, Land and Investment	1.8
Miscellaneous	<u>3.3</u>
Total	<u>365</u>

3. Moriss's analysis of which areas the Bombay mill hand and other immigrant work-force came during the first few decades of this century is based on the census reports of 1911, 1921 and 1931. For details, especially see chapter four (on supply of labour) of his book (Moriss, 1965:39-83).
4. Based on the census data (1871, 1931 and 1951) and few available studies, Holmstrom (1984) points at the regional differences in urban sex-ratios between cities in the south and rest of India, and suggests that the high frequency of *family* migration in the southern cities 'may have something to do with the high proportion of landless people in the south, southern family

structure or the greater traditional independence of the southern women' (Holmström, Mark 1985: 69).

5. The estimate by Dutt was however meant to identify the quantum of organisable strength of the Indian industrial working class. Figures related to agricultural labourers as per the 1931 census were over 31.5 million, of which according to an estimate 74 per cent was landless which could have formed the rural *informal* labour reserve of the time.
6. Growth of ports, railways and roads in the country during British times were in support of the colonial structure that linked the plantation, jute and cotton hinterlands with the ports by rail and roadways. The present day spatial network and organization of urban centres in the country owes much to its colonial history and modernization policies adapted by the government of India during later days.
7. It must however be kept in mind that besides the settlements much influenced by the colonial urban framework, there were numerous 'regional' towns in the country displaying different functional characteristics. This relatively autonomous growth of an internal *subsidiary* urban pattern though was not at odds with the colonial interests. For a discussion on this, see Das, Biswaroop (1985): "Urban Growth and Urban Planning: Some Reflections on Situation in India", *Mainstream*, Vol. XXIII, 47, pp. 15-19.
8. These were generally one storey tenements divided into units of uniform size (mostly 16' x 8') with a 3' wide verandah. Lavatories and baths always occupied one end of these structures. For details on slum localities, chawls and living conditions of the working class and urban poor especially prior to 1947, see, Kelman (1923),

Burnett - Hurst, A.R. (1925), Gupta(1930), Govt. of India (1931 and 1940), Mukherjee (1951)and Myers (1958) etc.

9. Delhi in the north and Calcutta in the east respectively received huge influx of displaced people from the west and east Pakistan during the partition which also gave a severe jolt particularly to the economy of its eastern region as the best jute growing areas got cut off from it.
10. By the fag-end of 1950, the initial emphasis began to shift rather swiftly from the government subsidized cottage industries to relatively modern small scale industries. While the 1948 Industrial Policy Resolution formed a preamble to this process, the 1956 Resolution helped in its institutionalization and growth. As a result, a number of Corporations to deal with small scale industry development and training were set up.
11. Almost coinciding with beginning of the plan era, the Community Development Programme was started in 1952. Influenced by the concept of extension, this was perceived to be an effective mechanism of spreading development among people in the rural areas. Essentially, it was a phased and systematic attempt to generate the elements of a modernization ideology in the countryside and enable locally 'competent' areas to contribute to the GNP.
12. On this and related themes see, Falcon (1970), Kumar (1970), Ladjenisky (1970), Frankel (1971), Jacoby (1974), Mencher (1974), Randhawa (1974), Hanumantha Rao (1975), Junankar (1975), Johl (1975) etc.

13. From a theoretical stand point, growing poverty and marginalization of the peasantry and the working class were viewed to be inherently subsumed within the capitalist system and the 'peripheral' status of the subcontinent.
14. Growth of small-scale industries and firms continued to get emphasis, since the adoption of Mahalanobis approach, which while emphasizing on heavy industries demarcated a transitory phase within which small-scale and household industries were to play an important role of creating as much employment as possible and also release capital for the heavy industries sector. It was also perceived that with the expansion of economy and eventual increase in power supply, machinery and other capital goods, low efficiency production would experience a corresponding decrease. Subsequently at later dates, statutory Commissions/Boards were formed to develop coir, handloom, silk etc. On the other hand modern manufacturing in the small industry sector was growing under the state patronage with provision of infrastructure, technical assistance, service and training institutes, concessional finance, long-term loans and, credit availability.
15. Using the 1961 Census Economic Tables, 1981 Census Key Population Statistics, Annual Statistics of Factories (registered under 1948 Factories Act) and the Annual Survey of Industries (ASI), Vaidyanathan and Eapen examined the growth trends in employment in manufacturing and suggested a likely scenario of faster employment growth in the 'small factories' compared to the large factory sector (also see, Eapen,1984).
16. Whereas a large body of literature exists on growth of slums, squatter settlements and also, though not many, on the pavement dwellers of specific cities, sketching their economic, social and

political profiles, studies on schemes of land allotments and their actual distribution influenced by market forces are few and far between. The phenomenon of LIG plots and dwellings going to higher income groups have become almost universal in most major cities in the country including New Delhi and Gandhinagar. For example, data given in the *Report of the Sub-Group on Urban Land Policy for Delhi*, (New Delhi, Ministry of Works and Housing, mimeo.), suggest that the allotment of land acquired by DDA for low income groups went heavily in favour of the higher income groups during 1961-'71. This phenomenon has been repeating since then across many cities in the country.

17. For example, in the State of Gujarat, Gandhinagar's land use pattern shows 24.7 per cent under residential purposes, 24.6 per cent under roads and 21 per cent for parks, play-grounds etc. Evidently in such exercises, frequently reiterated concepts of regional approach to development, balance between the space specific labour markets, integration of productive activities and the like, at best appear diffused in their meanings and contents.
18. High technology and capital intensity that characterise these new centres, in effect raises a doubt as to what extent they would be able to absorb the marginalized migrants within a few limited sectors. In fact, inspired by the London Regional Plan, the ring towns planted around Delhi were hardly able to help its swelling population. Ironically, the same concept is being revived again. If one assumes that a significant portion of migrants would be inappropriately skilled or even semi-skilled, they would tend to enter the 'metropolitan' labour market in Delhi and around. In addition, many cities in the National Capital Region (NCR) are expected to emerge as 'high-end' nodes of technology and mediators of global finance. With Delhi emerging as the residential enclave of these high skilled work force, it would

continue to experience a snowballing of growing demand for living spaces and the spiraling rise of its real-estate sector.

19. Listing of a wide ranging literature on informal sector, related especially to the urban context and development of the South African and Latin American nations that have appeared since the mid nineteen seventies has been dispensed with for want of space.
20. Known as the Jawaharlal Nehru National urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), this is a large scale government programme to ‘modernise’ cities and make them ‘economically productive, efficient, equitable and responsive’ through creation of economic infrastructure and providing basic services to their urban poor. Aimed at making a select number of 63 cities (7 mega cities, 28 million plus cities and another 28 less than one million urban agglomerations) ‘modernised’ and ‘sustainable’, 65 per cent of the mission funds is earmarked at infrastructure development and governance and the rest for provision and creation of basic services to the urban poor. The programme was launched by the UPA government at the Centre in 2005. The newly formed NDA government however plans to discontinue with the mission and instead work towards creating one hundred ‘smart cities’ across the country.

References

- Adishesiah, M.S. (Ed.). (1985). *Seventh Plan Perspectives*. New Delhi: Lancer International.
- Amin, Samir. (1974). *Accumulation on a World Scale*. Sussex: Harvester Press.
- _____. (1976). *Unequal Development*. Sussex: Harvester Press.
- _____. (1977). *Imperialism and Unequal Development*. Sussex: Harvester Press.
- Andrade, C.P. and Roy, P.C. (1969). *Preliminary Reports on Pilot Projects for Integrated Area Development*. New Delhi: Ford Foundation and Council for Social Development.
- Baran, Paul A. (1957). *The Political Economy of Growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Breman, Jan. (1976). "A Dualistic Labour System? A Critique of the 'Informal Sector' Concept". *Economic and Political Weekly*, 11, 48/49/50.
- _____. (1983). "The Bottom of the Urban Order in Asia: Impressions of Calcutta". *Development and Change*, 14(2).
- Burnett - Hurst, A.R. (1925). *Labour and Housing in Bombay*. London: P .S. King.
- Castells, M. (1977). *The Urban Question - A Marxist Approach*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Das, Biswaroop. (1981). "Urban Planning in India". *Social Scientist*, 9(12).
- _____. (1982). "Regional Planning in India - Precept and Practice". *State and Society*, 3(2).
- _____. (1985). "Urban Growth and Urban Planning: Some Reflections on Situation in India". *Mainstream*, 23(47).
- Dutt, R. Palme. (1970). *India Today*. Calcutta: Modern India Press.
- Eapen, M. (1984). "Structure of Manufacturing Work Force: A Preliminary Analysis of Emerging Tendencies". *Economic and Political Weekly*, 19 (31, 32, 33), pp. 1454-56.
- Emanuel, A. (1972). *Unequal Exchange*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Falcon, W. (1970). "The Green Revolution: Generation of Problems". *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 52, December.
- Fei, J.C. & Ranis, G. (1964). *Development of the Labour Surplus Economy: Theory and Policy*. Illinois: Homewood.

- Frank, A.G. (1966). *The Development of Underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- _____. (1967). *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- _____. (1978). *World Accumulation*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- _____. (1971). *India's Green Revolution, Economic Gains and Political Costs*. Bombay: Oxford.
- Gadgil, D.R. (1972). *Planning and Economic Policy in India*. Poona: Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics.
- Ghildayal, U.C. (1956). *Objectives of Community Development*. Hyderabad: NICD.
- Government of India. (1931). *Royal Commission on Labour in India*. Calcutta: Central Publications.
- _____. (1940). *Report of the Textile Labour Inquiry Committee*, Vol. II. Bombay: Govt. Central Press.
- _____. (1952). *First Five Year Plan* (Vol. I). New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1956). *Second Five Year Plan* (Summary) (New Delhi, Planning Commission).
- _____. (1961). *Third Five Year Plan*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1962). *Economic Development of Different Regions*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1969). *Identification of Backward Areas* (Report of the Working Group). New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1970). *Fourth Five Year Plan*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1975). *Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-'79)*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1980). *Sixth Five Year Plan(1980-85): A Framework*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1985). *Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-'90)*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1992). *Eight Five Year Plan (1992-'97)*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (1999). *Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002)*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.

- _____. (2002). *Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007)*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- _____. (2008). *Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007-2012)*. New Delhi: Planning Commission.
- Gupta, R.B. (1930). *Labour and Housing in India*. Calcutta: Longman Green.
- Hanumantha Rao, C.H. (1975). *Technological Change and Distribution of Gains in Indian Agriculture*. Delhi: Macmillan.
- Hart, Keith. (1973). "Informal Income Opportunities and Urban Employment in Ghana". *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 11(1).
- Holmström, Mark. (1985). *Industry and Inequality: The Social Anthropology of Indian Labour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacoby, E. H. (1974). "Structural Changes in Third World Agriculture as a Result of Neo-Capitalistic Development. *The Developing Economies*, 12(3).
- Johl, S.S. (1975). "Gains of the Green Revolution: How they have been shared in Punjab". *Journal of Development Studies*, 11(3).
- Junankar, P.N. (1975). "Green Revolution and Inequality". *Economic and Political Weekly*, 10(13).
- Kelman, J.H. (1923). *Labour in India: A Study of the Conditions of Indian Women in Modern Industry*. London: Alien & Unwin.
- Kumar, D. (1970). "Technical Change and Dualism within Agriculture in India". *Journal of Development Studies*, 7(1).
- Ladjenisky, W. (1970). "Ironies of India's Green Revolution". *Foreign Affairs*, 48(4).
- Mencher, J.P. (1974). "Conflicts and Contradictions in the 'Green Revolution'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 9(6/7/8).
- Misra, R. P. and Kamlesh Misra. (eds.). (1998). *Million Cities of India*. New Delhi: SDF.
- Misra, R.P. (1978). *Million Cities of India*. New Delhi: Vikas.
- Morris, M.D. (1965). *The Emergence of an Industrial Labour Force in India: A Study of the Bombay Cotton Mills, 1854-1947*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mukherjee, Radhakamal (1951). *The Indian Working Class*. Bombay: Hind Kitabs Ltd..
- Myers, Charles (1958). *Labour Problems in the Industrialization of India*. Cambridge: Mass., Harvard University Press.

- Nagaraj, R. (1985). "Some Aspects of Small Scale Industries in India". *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20(42).
- Patnaik, S.C. (1981). *Economics of Regional Development in Third World Countries*. New Delhi, Associated Publishing House.
- Petras, J. and Trachte, K. (1979). "Liberal, Structural and Radical Approaches to Political Economy: An Assessment and an Alternative". *Contemporary Crises*, 3.
- Randhawa, M.S. (1974). *Green Revolution: A Case Study of Punjab*. Delhi: Vikas.
- Rao Prakasa, V.L.S. (1983). *Urbanization in India: Spatial Dimensions*. New Delhi: Concept.
- Rudra, Ashok. (1978). *The Basic Needs Concept and Its Implementation in Indian Development Planning*. Bangkok: ILO - ARTEP.
- Safa, Helen, I. (1982). *Towards a Political Economy of Urbanisation in Third World Countries*. Delhi: Oxford.
- Sankaranarayanan, V. (1980). "Inter-State Variations in Rural Non-Agricultural Employment - Some Tentative Results". Working Paper No. 104. Trivandrum: Centre for Development Studies.
- Todaro, M. P. (1969). "A Model of Labour Migration and Urban Unemployment in Less Developed Countries". *The American Economic Review*, 59,138-148.
- Vaidyanathan, A. and Eapen, M. (1984). "Structure of Employment in Indian Industries". Working Paper No. 199. Trivandrum: Centre for Development Studies.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World System*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974a). "Rise and Demise of the World Capitalist System". *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 16, 1974, 387-415.
- Wishwakarma, R.K. (1981). *Urban and Regional Planning Policy in India*. New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House.