

Place of Poor in Urban Space

Manish K. Jha

Introduction

The dominant development paradigm in post-colonial India gave primacy to large scale infrastructure development, construction of big dams, establishment of heavy industries and the acceleration of mining and mineral appropriation for the 'growth' and 'development' of country. This paradigm has adversely impacted the poorer sections of the society in more than one ways. Recurring displacement and lack of proper rehabilitation, etc. has accentuated the vulnerabilities of poorer communities. State responsiveness to social claims and the ability of representatives of government to engage with poorer section of the society is extremely limited. The workers engaged in the urban informal work form the bulk of urban poor and they face the lack of housing and shelter, water, sanitation, health, education, social security and livelihood. These poor invariably live in slums, squatters and pavements in most squalid conditions. They are also the victims of 'spatial purification' and gentrification drive, often embarked upon under the aegis of urban elite and supported by state actors, and therefore insecurity becomes the defining characteristics of their everyday existence. The condition of urban poor in India in general and in Mumbai city in particular reflects the consolidation of new urban order which is legitimating the asymmetries of power. The neo-liberal influence is pervasive in the governing processes of state and its agencies. "Urban projects that are being implemented in Indian cities are essentially a material expression of the developmental logic that views mega projects and place-marketing as means for waging a competitive struggle to attract investment capital...The associated new urban policy, developing in parallel with the neoliberal economic policy thus squarely revolves around re-centring the city, replacing old forms, functions and organizational configuration by a new urbanity and assertive, entrepreneurial urban governance that will stand the test imposed by a global and neoliberal world order (Banerjee-Guha 2010:208-9). Mumbai, one of India's major metropolitan cities and an aspiring 'global city' (Evans, 2002; Sassen 1991 cited in Fernandes 2004:2417), is a central locus for the politics of visibility and forgetting (ibid). These contradictory socio-economic and political processes provide visibility of wealth and prosperity of miniscule urban elite by forgetting the poor who are continuously marginalised. These influences contradict the essence of democracy which is premised on the idea of Individual autonomy that views individuals as autonomous being, capable of rationale thought. The democratic values also require that all individuals should have an equal say in the determination of collective decisions which affect all of them equally, and so provides the fundamental rationale for the government by the people. The neo-liberal imagination of the city space serves the interest of developers, investors and elite and typically at the cost of toiling masses.

Last two decades have observed phenomenal change in the ways in which the state deals with the poorer citizen of the country and this has undoubtedly to do with the rapid force of

globalization under the obvious nexus between market and the state. A perceptible paradigmatic shift in the role of the state has raised serious concerns vis-à-vis governing in democracy. The poorer people in 'most of the world' (Chatterjee 2004:3) are very often compelled to meet the state as members of social groups 'that transgress the strict lines of legality in struggling to live and work' (ibid: 40). They inhabit, that is to say, rough and tumble worlds of political society, where governmental agencies are met with wit and stealth, and not uncommonly by violence. Civility and Pluralism are not the defining features of their lives (Corbridge et al 2005:2). The recent developments, such as demolition of slums and resettlement under the pretext of urban renewal, are testimonies of the fact that large numbers of people are excluded from the ambit of dialogue and deliberations on issues that impact their everyday existence. In a demolition drive that began on December 8, 2004 and still continues, the Maharashtra government and the Brihanmumbai Corporation demolished 70,000 shanties they claimed were illegal, clearing in the process as many as 306 acres of land, dislocating over 3 lakh people and affecting thousands of others (Kumar 2005:506). "This is a part of the joint strategy by Mumbai's municipal corporation and the State Government to send out a message that "illegal" encroachers will not be tolerated any more"(Sharma 2005). Assessing the situation of poor, Miloon Kothari, the special rapporteur for the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, expressed "they are now refugees in their own city. The new ghettoisation is between the rich and poor. It's new urban apartheid."¹ State responsiveness to social claims and the ability of representatives of government to engage with poorer section of the society is extremely limited.

Poor at Urban Margin

The paper seeks to understand the implications for democracy and particularities of citizenship vis-à-vis new forms of spatial governmentality that contribute to socio-spatial exclusions in an already highly segmented and polarized city. The spaces for urban poor and the processes of governance within it are enormously vexed issues. In the name of authority of government and responsibility of governance, the state sees evictions and demolitions as one of the major solutions to the "problems" of slums. The Slum Areas (Improvement and clearance) Act, 1956 defines slums as "areas where buildings (a) are in any respect unfit for human habitation;(b) are by reason of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangements and design of such buildings, narrowness or faulty arrangement of streets, lack of ventilation, light or sanitation facilities, or any combination of these factors are detrimental to safety, health or morale." According to a recent social and technical survey of all slums conducted by the Brihanmumbai Municipal Corporation (BMC) in 2001 under the Slum Sanitation Scheme (SSP), 1,959 slum settlements were counted with a total population of 62.47 lakh, this constituted 54 per cent of the city population (Sharma and Bhide 2005: 1784). In Mumbai, out of the total population of 13 million about 54% constitute its slum population, who occupy about 12.85 % of the city's total land area. However, the recent census data states that the slum population has crossed 60 % of the total population of Mumbai. More than half of the city's population lives in slums, characterized by the illegal occupation of land and absence or shortage of basic civic amenities such as water, sanitation and electricity" (Burra 2005:69). Despite the large slum population, the total area occupied by slum settlements is estimated around only 8 per cent of the city's land surface. Greater portions of the lands on which slums are located today were previously uninhabitable and it is through the efforts of the slum dwellers that these lands were "reclaimed" and rendered habitable. Approximately 7 to 7.5 million live in slums in the most unhygienic and filthy conditions and another one million live on the pavements. Mostly pavement dwellers are single male migrants living in

footpaths close to their place of occupation. Due to constant harassment and continuous fear of eviction, the condition of pavement dwellers is much more squalid than slum dwellers. Sanitation in slums is very poor as 73 per cent of slums depend on community toilets provided by the government, 28 per cent defecate in the open, 0.7 per cent slums have pay to use toilets managed by NGOs and only 1 per cent of slums have individual toilets. It is also estimated that nearly 2 million people live as tenants in rented premises, a large number of which are old and dilapidated structures, including 'chawls'. As a result we find that nearly 10 million of the city's population lives in sub-standard or unsafe housing conditions under the abuse and continuous threat of displacement. This housing situation blatantly exposes the continuing indifference, neglect and lack of the will of the government towards housing for urban poor. Their everyday life is defined by sense of insecurity and risk: temporary shacks may be demolished, slum lords may push them out, and the monsoon may wash out their make-shift shelter and belongings. In a city where ration cards, electricity bills, and rent receipts guarantee other rights to the benefit of citizenship, the inability to secure claims to proper housing and other political handicaps reinforce one another. On an everyday basis the displaced urban poor are struggling to validate and prove their claim of citizenship. 'Housing-and its lack- is the most public drama of disenfranchisement in Mumbai. Thus, the politics of housing can be argued to be the single most critical site of politics of citizenship in this city (Appadurai 2004:72).

The slums, where the working poor (engaged both in formal/informal, organized/unorganized) reside, are considered the causes of most of the problems faced by the city. "They generate filth, they breed criminals, and they usurp facilities that should have rightfully gone to the 'tax paying citizens. Whether slum dwellers are really responsible for such problems is never investigated but these vies become a convenient handle for demolishing slums to make way for 'cleaner' and better housing for the better-off" (Bhowmik 2010: 182). The Vision plan for Mumbai, prepared by corporate and state agencies, blames proliferation of slums for increasing violence and crime and for worsening quality of life. Reiterating the notion of 'spatiality of crime' the Vision Plan advocated a deeply interventionist agenda in justifying the need for maintaining private police forces for gated communities, welfare reform, community regeneration and designing public spaces with maximum surveillance. The objective of the plan was to drastically segregate the poor areas by intensifying militarization of the city space and increasing ghettoisation (Banerjee-Guha 2010:212). Therefore, the rights of slum dweller to shelter, basic amenities, etc. have been a peripheral concern of governance by the state. Dispossession through displacement has been increased all over the country in the last two decades and the appropriation of urban spaces by governing elite has become all the more insidious. In the name of increased capital inflows for infrastructural development, urban poor are being uprooted and evicted from their habitat and livelihood. Slum dwellers encounter the state in the form of eviction notices or in the form of bulldozer that is being driven. State-urban poor encounters are, more often than not, dictated by newer technologies of rule where the very existence of poor is being seen from the lens of illegality and therefore spaces of their participation disappears. The approach in which technologies of rule consolidates its authority depends on the method in which they are construed and put into practice by actors of governance. It is also important to realize why and how they are seized upon, understood as also contested by differently placed people within 'the poor'. The policies and programmes under the governance regime are taking place in contexts in which the contracting and retreating neoliberal state is increasingly exclusionary and apathetic towards the poor. This is exacerbated by the fact that large sections of the urban underclass are threatened against their claim of citizenship in the city due to polarization of groups around nativist rhetoric.

During the last two decades of the previous century, the magnitude of forced population displacement caused by development programmes was of the order of 10 million people each year, or some 200 million people globally during that period” (Cernea 2000:11). Mostly such displacements happen to facilitate the projects that include urban infrastructural development, urban renewal and housing schemes, transport systems, mining, construction of dams, etc. Through demolition of substandard slum settlement, a perceptible representation of poverty, the displacement of people for infrastructural development or other urban re-newel programs claims to improve the living condition of poor. All this happens through a well planned and organized policies and programmes so that the process of relocation can be smoothened and portrayed as state’s concern for the ‘well being’ of the poor. Unfortunately, such displacement has resulted in enormous adverse consequences for the impoverished population. Since most areas affected by such projects are inhabited by daily wage labourers engaged in construction, conservancy and other low paid jobs they are in a constant threat of losing their livelihood with displacement. “Sakharam Dabde, who was fired from his job at Nariman Point, believes the location of his house was responsible. ‘It takes a minimum of an hour to reach Kurla station, and there is just one bus which runs on erratic timings. We were happy in our slums at Sion’, said Dabde whose family was moved at a resettlement site to make way for a railway project at Sion”(Hindustan Times 2010: 5). In a relocated place they face a situation of unemployment, police repression, social breakdown, and loss of sense of belonging due to lack of collective identity. Most often than not, involuntary relocation increases people’s inability to access education facilities, health services, and livelihood opportunity and therefore their everyday life is marred with insecurity and struggle for survival. It has been observed that serious concerns and problems faced by the displaced population resulted in large scale mobilization of people that brought forth and critiqued the role of international financial agencies like World Bank (WB), which subsequently came up with stringent guidelines, to be adhered to by the state which seeks money from the bank for the development projects. ‘The World Bank’s new position was that no project site could be cleared without a resettlement and rehabilitation component’ (Burra 2005: 71). A substantive section of urban planners and policy analysts feel that WB guidelines, if adhered to, will reduce the relocation related problems and it can prove to improve their life conditions. However, the ground realities are far from such optimism. The process of relocation from the time of baseline survey for identification and deciding about people’s entitlement of tenement to their transfer in transit camps to the allotment of houses in relocated sites are marred with high handedness, corruption and insensitivity by the state and non state agencies.

A review of the resettlement process which involved the permanent resettlement of project affected people under the MUTP (Mumbai Urban Transport Project) in Mumbai brings forth a range of issues and concerns of the resettled urban poor (Sharma et al 2008). MUTP is one of the largest infrastructural programme in Mumbai with implication for resettlement of around 80,000 households. In a city like Mumbai, where the scope of expansion is limited, the pressure on claiming the space is enormous. The pace and frequency of relocating the poor for providing space for the use of upper echelon of the society is rampant and at times remains invisible and unrecognized. It always undermines communities’ relentless effort to make their space habitable by their labour and resources, bereft of any government assistance. The hard work of ‘squatters’ in creating homes, their love for their communities, their pride in creation and their struggles with government to gain recognition and concludes that in fact, squatters give reality to Henri Lefebvre’s concept of ‘right to the city’ (Neuwirth 2005). Elaborating on right to city, Harvey explains that to claim right to city is to claim some kind of shaping power over the processes of urbanization, over the ways in which our cities are made and re-made and to do so in a fundamental and radical way (Harvey 2010:18).

Unfortunately, the state agencies and market forces have violated poor people's right to the city as slums has been considered as an unintended part of the city, however, this has been a convenient mode of housing for the poor as the government could afford to remain deliberately oblivious of their needs and concerns. On the other hand, the contemporary gentrification accentuates displacement and dispossession of poor under the name of urban redevelopment. 'With the attempt to turn Mumbai into a global financial centre to rival Shanghai, the property development boom gathers pace and the land the slum dwellers occupy appears increasingly valuable. Financial powers backed by the state engage in forcible slum clearance, in some cases violently taking possession of a terrain occupied for a whole generation by the slum dwellers' (ibid:28). Since the agencies of government consider the slum population as illegal occupants and encroachers, they are therefore undeserving of entitlement, security and right. Even the apex court of the country opined that conceding the slum dwellers right to the city would be tantamount to rewarding pickpockets for their action. However, once the poor enhance the marketability of the place of their habitation, the legality and illegality of their occupancy is being ascertained through governmental technologies such as voter list, slum survey, PDS cards, etc. Mostly the importance of the space and subsequent discussion for eviction start happening once these erstwhile low priority lands are developed through the efforts of the residents, these are termed as illegal occupancy. It was observed that those who failed to provide documentary proof to support their credentials were unable to get their entitlement of housing in the relocated site. Some people have shifted on allocation of their entitled tenements to find that the new house they have been allotted does not support their livelihood and either sold or given on rent to go back to another site where they could match their life and livelihood. Some have not shifted to the allotted houses due to the fear of losing their present sources of livelihood. They are still living in the Transit Camps and waiting for another building to come up in the vicinity. In contrast to the above, there are a few complaints that some persons, out of turn, got favours either from the NGO or the Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority (MMRDA)³. In the process of relocation, the affected poor people suffer mostly in terms of losing either their main sources of livelihood or loss of supplementary income which has vital importance for survival. The spaces of urban poor keep within itself realities of despair, desperation and continuous struggle for survival.

Urban Poor and Governmentality

"Any squatter family that owns its structure and can prove that it has been there since January 1, 1995, will be given a new home at no cost if their community is targeted for a government aided project" (Neuwirth 2005:115). These magical dates determining their entitlement have been altered several times to accommodate the political pressures as a part of the vote bank politics concerning more than half of the city's population. By bringing cut-off date in the policy, government practiced old strategy of divide and rule by fixing entitlement for few and leaving out the others. It adversely impacted the housing rights movement in the city by fragmenting the community into those who are entitled and those who are not. However, such analysis is the prisoner of governmentality where state decides about the legality and illegality of people's right to movement and settle, a fundamental right under the constitution of India. The affected people might get new housing, but they have to move out of the community they built over decades and the space they feel at home. When it comes to displacing and evicting the poor, the state and its actors couch it in a manner as if they are guiding the 'ignorant' for their betterment. The state agencies, unsure of its ability to persuade people, recruit NGOs to convince the slum dwellers about the benefits of resettlement. The use of power as

guidance signifies that coercion or consensus is reformulated as means of government among others. While referring about Governmentality, Lemke refers Foucault's view that governing people is not a way to force people to do what the governor wants; it is always a versatile equilibrium, with complementarities and conflicts between techniques which assure coercion and processes through which the self is constructed or modified by himself (Lemke 2000:1). The term government to Foucault meant not so much the political or administrative structures of the modern state as the way in which the conduct of individuals or of groups may be directed. To analyse government is to analyse those mechanisms that try to shape, sculpt, mobilise and work through the choices, desires, aspirations, needs, wants and lifestyles of individuals and groups (Dean, 1999:12).

Though the state fails the poorer people on recurring basis, it still defines and dictates everyday life of people through diverse technologies of rule. The notion of 'developmental state' provides logic and rationale for application of technical means of governance. These technical mean include constructing the notion of 'population', as a totality of subjugated voices. Foucault maintained that there have been two major revolutions in the technologies of power since the classical age: the development of anatomo-political techniques aimed at the individual body and the development of bio-political techniques aimed at the collective or social body. Both sorts of techniques emerge from engagement with 'population'. Rule in modern societies, according to Foucault, is to be understood as triangulated around practices of sovereignty-discipline-government and to have as its essential object the population (Curtis 2002:506). Contemporary societies continue to contain struggles against direct domination and against capitalist exploitation, but increasingly they manifest social struggles against the form of subjection themselves...They possess a totalizing moment, in which states group subjects together in order to rule them, and an individualizing moment, in which subjects are separated as the objects of pastoral power (ibid: 527). The politics and practice of urban governance in Mumbai plays out individualization techniques and totalizing procedures as a nuanced strategy of state power. Techniques of individualization in the process of resettlement happen by individualised documentary proofs, justification of legality of habitation, ensuring individuals rights and entitlement for compensatory relocation, etc. The process of individualization in the context of slum dwellers of Mumbai can be understood by the fact that as early as in the year 1976, a census of huts on public land was conducted and 'photopasses' were issued to those who met certain criteria, prepared by the state to decide 'eligibility' for resettlement. The 'photopass' became a certified document with the individuals to claim their eligibility for resettlement if the land on which their habitat exists is required by the state for a 'public purpose'. More often than not, these passes are considered as a document for security of residence. However totalization procedure happens through demolition, collective eviction and shifting in transit camps and from there to relocated sites and several other forms. In deciding the entitlement, each and everyone is considered as PAPs⁴ and compensation is uniform and totalized, without recognizing the composition of families, the size of earlier tenements, etc. Besides, the charges for maintenance and other services in the relocated sites are the same for everyone irrespective of the economic status of the households. The influence of such processes is so overpowering that the 'population' had to take it as mandate of law and policy with no scope for negotiation or modification.

The analytics of government not only concentrates on the mechanism of the legitimization of domination or the masking of violence, beyond that it focuses on the knowledge that is part of the practices, the systematization and rationalization of a pragmatics of guidance. The conditions and constraints under which the poor negotiate with the state are the conditionality made as sacrosanct and given. The urban poor are frequently in a situation where the process of governance results in making them more insecure and deprived under the rubric of their 'illegality'. The logic and 'legality'

of urban governance leave the urban poor with no other choice but to rely on 'illegal' arrangements that the poor always have to make- illegal structure, illegal strategies, informal arrangements for basic civic services, etc; thereby making them a permanently vulnerable group at the hands of the agent of the state as also slum lords. As a result they are forced to operate in peculiar forms of temporality. Their everyday life operates in the situation of insecurity, urgency, and of emergency. In the process of resettlement of people from one location to another, the community network and social relationship often falls apart. The rupture in neighbourhood cohesion makes these vulnerable communities all the more insecure. For these slum dwellers and migrants, state and its actors symbolizes the carrier of emergent crisis. In the situation of duress, there is virtually no scope of claim making. The techniques of 'public hearing', 'grievance redressal' and 'induced participation' are used quite efficiently to blunt the process of claim making, if at all any. In some of the suburbs in Mumbai and Thane illegal buildings mushroom with tacit understandings between the builders and civic officials but still receive property tax bills with a stamp "unauthorized building".

The spatiality of neoliberalism is quite discernable in the cityscape of Mumbai as also in the other cities in India. In Mumbai, on one side there are Manhattan-type skyscrapers (mainly in the main city and along the coast in western suburb) while at the same time there are slum-dwellings on thousands of acres mainly in swampy lands and garbage dumps (in Govandi-Shivaji Nagar, Mankhurd and Dharavi) (Shaban 2008: 68). Space, which is socially produced and socially mediated, also symbolizes the power arrangements of a society. Cities are crucial as spatial constructs, because they condense and signify the affirmation and contestation of power relation of that society, and they do so because they concentrate within the same constricted geographical boundaries, the processes of production, and those of appropriation of space...city landscapes are thus designed by two parallel, yet contradictory processes, destined to be in a state of civil war with each other (Chandhoke 1993:66). However, under the tutelage of modern capitalist state, organized effort has been initiated to homogenize urban social order defined and dictated by neo liberal regime. It involves the construction of roles, it involves the insertion of people into predictable and safe ways of thinking and behaving, it involves the construction and constitution of communities and individuals, it involves disciplinary mechanisms as the researches of Foucault have showed us, it involves civilized behaviour, above all it simply involves the 'socialization' of people into the values of capitalist society (ibid: 67). The capitalist project of the state unfolds itself in a manner which forces dominated class to share the values and principles of dominant. This has profound impact on the liberal traditions of freedom – freedom to reside, move, visit, work in a particular area, etc. Developmental agenda on one hand increases the governmental power to reconfigure the space continually, and on the other hand it decreases the liberal space of freedom. Again we need to know how this began in independent India, its specific impact on the pattern of conflicts in society, and how it impacts on the relation between those who govern and those who are governed (Samaddar 2008).

The Place of Powerlessness

Lallubhai compound (L.C.) is located in Mankhurd, an area in the eastern suburb of Mumbai, which has become a hotspot for relocating urban poor from other parts of city. The area falls under M ward⁵, a ward infamous for relocating displaced poor people of the island city as the land where they lived were taken over in the name of urban development. M ward also houses one of Mumbai's two solid waste dumping grounds. 'Undesired people' are relocated near 'undesired spaces', such as dumping ground and slaughter house, which are defining milestones to locate Lallubhai compound (LC). LC is a relocation site where people from the slum areas of Kurla terminus, Chembur,

Matunga, Parel, P. D'Mello road near Chhatrpati Shivaji Terminus station and other places have been evicted either for Mumbai Urban Infrastructure Project (MUIP) or Mumbai Urban Transport Project (MUTP). The MUTP was required to relocate 20,000 families who lived on land near railway tracks and along some roads (Burra 2005:76). The MUIP was initiated to improve and widen roads that required relocation of 35,000 families. There are 86 buildings in total in LC, out of which 59 buildings are five storied whereas 27 are seven storied. Besides, there are some commercial shops which have been provided to those who owned commercial establishment in the place from where they have been shifted. Each residential house has a built in space of 225 sq feet. All these buildings are one after another with a very little space in between. Infamous by its propinquity to one of Mumbai's only operating open garbage dump and an abattoir, LC is surrounded by slums all around. The communities which were used to stay in a horizontal space of slums find it claustrophobic to be herded in the vertical space of building with a very narrow entry and exit points and serious problem of ventilation of air. The basic services like garbage collection, sanitation and overall engagement of municipal agencies are in disarray. LC as a 'place of powerless' is a fitting exemplar of forced ghettoization, away from the utopian site of a cosmopolitan Mumbai.

Longer distance to workplace, fewer public amenities and increased financial liabilities due to payment of services charges in the building as also for electricity bills has heightened everyday struggle of the resident of LC. While looking at the feasibility of relocation site, a World Bank panel investigating the MUTP observed that in selecting Mankhurd resettlement site in M ward, "no consideration was given to the proximity" of the site to Mumbai's largest solid waste dump or, "the implication of this...the environment assessment did not consider the ambient environmental and social conditions when identifying site for resettlement (World Bank 2005). There is complete lack of health facilities and educational institutions near the relocated sites. As a result people have to commute to their old location or faraway places to seek medical help and they have to incur huge expenditure in travelling. This has been highlighted by an Impact Assessment study, which states that liabilities have increased with people having to shell out more for house maintenance, transport, electricity and health. At the same time, displacement has led to loss of jobs like hawking or house help due to the lack of easy accessibility at the sites. The public transport system to the relocated site is only symbolic in nature and therefore people are forced to use auto rickshaw and taxi which is an additional burden on them. Increased financial liability has also resulted in increased indebtedness among the people. This has heightened the insecurity of already 'vulnerable' household. Vulnerability in the context of relocation is multi dimensional and it needs to be understood in relation with people's experiences and struggle for restoration of livelihood. Though causes of vulnerability are mostly due to economic reasons, relocation has accentuated it in certain situations. The above mentioned study highlights that the elder women find it very difficult to climb upper floors. Every small thing such as buying a match box requires them to go up and down the floors. The most challenging task for women was to carry water to the upper floors from water tankers when there is no municipal water supply (Sharma et al 2008).

A substantive number of household had specific sources of income in their earlier location, which has declined after the resettlement. Most of the women, who used to work as domestic help near their earlier sites, have lost it with relocation. Those involved in home-based work, such as papad-making, zari work, etc., also lost their livelihood because of inaccessibility of market and resources. The opportunity for such jobs in and around the LC resettlement site is very poor. It is evident that livelihood is a major concern for the people who have been resettled. It is quite evident that the process of resettling people was hurried up without making arrangements for vital services such as health facilities, primary and secondary education, public transport, voting rights, PDS shops

and transfer of BPL and APL cards to new sites. People have to run from pillar to post to prove their entitlements and claim their rights of basic services. Apart from above mentioned violations of their entitlements, the quality of construction of the new tenements is yet another matter of concern for several families relocated to this site. Most of the household complain about leakages, cracks in the wall and broken drainage pipes. Residents find electricity charges too high and many vulnerable households are immensely troubled by the same. The situation of vulnerable families demonstrates the multi-dimensionality of their impoverishment. The illustrative situations essentially underline the adverse condition compounded with general impoverishment leading to high vulnerability of families residing in slum settlements. Deserted women, elderly couples with an ailing earner, frustrated youth without an option to make a decent living, waste pickers, beggars, and others form a group of such households (and individuals) needing sustained effort for their rehabilitation. They are not in a position to pay user charges for basic services or meeting future contingencies. If not rehabilitated, they may not be able to retain their houses (ibid).

Furthermore, the relocation in a vertical structure has adversely affected community bonding and ties. Most of the residents feel that their interaction with neighbours and other building residents are minimal. Besides, there is a visible rupture in community relation as earlier inhabitants in the nearby areas consider themselves originals and claim first right over all basic services like water, electricity, etc. Due to lack of adequate water supply, there is a constant conflict between newly settled LC people with people who have been residing in neighbouring Tata Nagar from before. Any paucity of services is attributed on the new settlers and there is simmering tension in the area all the time. Recent months have also observed a community conflict between Matang and Muslims. There is a growing sense of insecurity among minority communities as communal past of the city keep haunting their psyche. Appropriation of common entrance, corridors and exit for celebrating or demonstrating religious affiliation is causing tension in the buildings. Their erstwhile horizontal space provided people personal space for religious practice which is difficult in the vertical building. The resettled families have not gone through the process of community organizing in the true sense of the term and therefore there is no shared mutual understanding. Quite frequently, the resettled communities are branded as anti-social, criminal and outsiders which have become a defining identity from the lens of others. On the whole, a negative image has got construed about the area and proneness to communal conflict, habitation of anti-social elements, lack of basic services have become the defining characteristics. A sense of mistrust and antipathy among outsiders as also among neighbours towards LC residents is easily discernable. Such understanding and image construction can be found in the manner media also depicts by using phrases/ caption like 'infamously famous Lallubhai Compound' and 'housing the refuse of the town', etc. The preparedness of the site, participation in the process of relocation, and the capacity building needed for holistic rehabilitation process are completely neglected.

The case illustration of LC poses a set of questions which requires attention and analysis. First of all, who shapes the city and what are the outcomes of a particular kind of spatial arrangement. Government policies and practices exclude the poor and marginalized from the 'sanitized' and 'gated' spaces through the 'legality and illegality of migrant population', land use policies, requirements of infrastructural projects, etc. The issue of recognizing the existence of slum dwellers on the basis of cut-off date of the arrival in Mumbai is one of the most shocking developments where the state comes across as an authoritarian agency which has little respect for the constitutional obligation of the nation towards its citizens. The urban poor of Mumbai are forced to prove their existence since prior to the year 1995, so that they can claim for alternative accommodation in case of eviction. Those who cannot prove that will automatically become outside

the purview of any consideration. The 'cut-off' dates determine whether the state is going to tolerate the urban poor within its limit or not. Under the Maharashtra Slum Areas (Improvement, Clearance and Redevelopment) Act 1971 if a person cannot prove that he/she has been residing in a slum structure prior to 1-1-1995 not only his/her structure will be demolished, but he/she is liable to punishment with imprisonment and fine. This imprisonment can be for the duration of two years. If one takes into account the people residing in slum localities settled after the year 1995, roughly 12 lakhs people are susceptible to imprisonment at any point in time. The criminalization of large section of urban poor is one of the strongest weapons in the hands of the state. The entire enumeration process undertaken by agencies like MMRDA and the issuance of identity numbers are the proof of peculiar forms of classification and surveillance which keep the insecure poor always on tenterhooks. Foucault and other contemporary scholars have also observed that the ideas of countable population are historic co-productions, premised alike on distinctively modern construction of governance, territory and citizenship. The biopolitical regulation of urban poor by using several governmental technologies manifests power play in a nuanced manner. In fact, data gathered in the realm of biopolitics constituted and manufactured 'truth' in a way whereby illegality and illegitimacy of urban poor become a logical and acceptable discourse. James Scott's highly influential book, *Seeing Like a State*, published in 1998, attempts to understand statecraft as a process of rendering populations 'legible'. Scott argues that this has been achieved through a series of disparate state practices of surveillance and control, including sedentarisation, the creation of permanent names, the establishment of cadastral surveys and population registers, the invention of freehold tenure, the standardisation of language and legal discourse, the design of cities and the organisation of transportation. These practices have functioned 'as attempts at legibility and simplification' (Robinson 2002:680).

The low-income urban margins such as LC are spaces in which the state recognizes an urgent need to intervene in order to control what are often seen to be violent, dangerous and unruly populations. The demolition and relocation of 'illegal slums' has been a standard measure of control over the 'dangerous underclasses' in Mumbai. Within this specialized scenario the state tends to be seen by the under-classes as a repressive external agency rather than a resource that is controllable and beneficial (Harvey 1985: 261). The class character of the state is quite apparent where deliberate attempt is made to insulate, spatially and socially, the bourgeoisie from undesirable others. The lives exist in places like LC become visible in the forms of bare life. The biopolitical dynamics stretches the field of political strategy whereby state activities penetrates into areas of life, hitherto largely lying outside the purview of political realm. In a way, biopolitics can be characterized as the gradual colonization of 'bare life' through institutional structure, law and manifestation of 'sovereign power'. The situation in LC depicts numerous processes by which life of urban poor and its everyday physicality becomes incorporated within the aegis of the state. It also illustrates how neo-liberal techniques of power links macro-political aims with micro-management of life. With the fracturing of the contemporary city that creates territorially demarcated population, the body has become subject to multiple and often conflicting jurisdictions. The urban polity or 'social body' from which power seeks its legitimacy and *raison d'être* has become ever more opaque (Gandy 2006:509). The dynamics of space and power also reveals duality over right to city for different segments of society. ...whilst citizens have the right to participate directly in the political affairs of the state, the rest of the population are relegated to the status of 'subjects', 'guests' or mere 'inhabitants' at the margins of society (Mamdani 1996 cited in Gandy 2006:502). The right to the city becomes illusive to the poor 'subjects'. The right to the city manifests itself as a superior form of rights: right to freedom, to individualization and socialization, to habitat and to inhabit (Lefebvre 1996:173). To exclude the

urban from groups, classes, individuals, is also to exclude them from civilization, if not from society itself. The *right* to the city legitimates the refusal to allow oneself to be removed from urban reality by a discriminatory and segregative organization (ibid: 195). The central and peripheral/marginal zoning of city space that takes place under sovereign power demonstrate governing of development democracy in a unique form. It therefore marks an excluded but included space within the topography of sovereign power, and potentially opens this topography to an expansion of bare life to more sections of the underprivileged population.

The process of control, discipline and dictated socialization of the urban poor through the technique of government is quite evident in the urban margins like LC. Unlike some of the European countries, where the state is actively engaged in housing projects, the government has no inclination to make any housing arrangements for the unorganized working class that forms the majority of the urban poor. Though the capitalist class and the state use their labour, urban poor have to situate themselves in whichever squatter they can. When these areas are being developed through their effort, in due course it becomes prime property which builders and corporate houses start eyeing at. Thereafter, the concern for legality of land comes in discussion. As most of land in Mumbai city is termed as public land, the poor might occupy it but they cannot own it. Through their own network and ties, they manage to occupy a space; however, they are in constant threat of demolition and eviction due to lack of ownership of land. All this forces them to accept state directed relocation. Rather than collective mobilization for assertion of land and property rights, the collectivization results in fighting for better transport, regularization of water and electricity, opening of Public Distribution System (PDS) shops etc. The people are made to behave as a consumer of capitalist society where their engagement is around a share in the state regulated services. This process helps in keeping the fundamentals of ownership and property rights of society untouched. There is hardly any movement to alter ownership rights; most of the micro movements revolve around a share in distribution.

Besides, the state claims that the recent relocations have been a participatory process where affected community engages in the entire phase of their 'development' and 'security'. The reality is otherwise. An uneven geographical development excludes the poor and the underprivileged through artificial enclosures and from 'privatopias' and 'gated communities'. While writing about the spaces of utopia through an example of Baltimore, Harvey highlights that 'exclusionary communitarianism, narrow vested interests, corporate profit hunger, financial myopia and developer greed all contribute to the difficulties'...Those who have the money power are free to choose among name brand commodities (including prestigious locations, properly secured, gated and serviced), but citizenry as a whole is denied any collective choice of political system, of ways of social relating, or of modes of production, consumption and exchange (Harvey 2000:154). The urban life and associated freedom and abundance of opportunities have always been overemphasized. It is true that rural poor encounter everyday repression due to unequal caste hierarchy and agrarian structure in the villages of India, and when they migrate they get an immediate sense of freedom and liberation. Unfortunately, they encounter the city as site of anomie, anxiety and insecurity of different nature or as Harvey refers 'site of an incomprehensible 'otherness''. The neoliberal utopianism of the market is instrumental in engaging the state proactively towards accentuating geographical inequalities pushing the poor on the brink of urban space.

The founding ideology of the new urbanism is both utopian and deeply fraught. In its practical materialization, the new urbanism builds an image of community and a rhetoric of place-based civic pride and consciousness for those who do not need it, while abandoning those that do to their 'underclass' fate (Harvey 2000: 170). The process of making urban poor 'underclass' and then

keeping them at the margin of space is best understood through Foucault's interpretation of the term 'heterotopia'. Hetherington (1997) summarizes this concept of heterotopias: as spaces of alternate ordering. Heterotopia organizes a bit of social world in a way different to that which surrounds them. That alternate ordering marks them out as Others and allows them to be seen as an example of an alternative way of doing things... Heterotopia, therefore, reveals the process of social ordering to be just that, a process rather than a thing (cited in Harvey 2000: 184). The otherness and alterity of such spaces help in creating alternatives which can critique existing norms and processes and therefore lend itself for disrupting the homogeneity to which society clings. The experiences of urban poor in Mumbai leave no space for such optimism. The technologies of rule and the process of bio-power have successfully fragmented the collectives and prospects of alternative social processes seem bleak. Elaborating further on heterotopia, Foucault writes "We can however classify them in two main categories. In the so-called primitive societies, there is a certain form of heterotopias that I would call crisis heterotopias, i.e., there are privileged or sacred or forbidden places, reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis: adolescent, menstruating women...But these heterotopias of crisis are disappearing today and are being replaced, I believe, by what we might call heterotopias of deviation: those in which individuals whose behaviour is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed. Cases of this are rest homes and psychiatric hospitals, and of course prison..." (Foucault & Miskowiec 1986:24-25). Foucault's analysis lends itself for interpretation in the context of the population who has been at the receiving end of spatial reconfiguration. Heterotopias presuppose a system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable. The geographical location and the identity marker of LC is a fitting example of isolation and penetration as per convenience of those who have right to city. The vulnerability and marginalization of poor has clear linkages with the trajectory of disempowered life and circumstances. Individual and community's life chances and their place in space have always been determined by their proximity or distance from the location of power.

Spaces of Resistance

Even though the visibility of these squatter settlements is constantly sought to be erased by moving them elsewhere, by bulldozing them, and by evicting the inhabitants, squatter settlements are spatial forms which make assertions, which contest dominant relations, and which make the dialectic between the forces of domination, and those of resistance starkly visible in a way no other medium can do. The production of space is inherently political process and it is symbolic of both power and resistance to these symbols of power (Chandhoke 1993: 640). The political power of place also comes from its unique ability to link the experiential (phenomenal), social and symbolic dimensions of space. Transformative politics comes from separating, juxtaposing, and recombining them. In order to challenge the dominant practice of society, there must be a space for subaltern resistance. Nancy Fraser argues that subaltern counterpublics can overcome the elitism and homogeneity that characterized the bourgeoisie public sphere in its golden age (Fraser 1992). To be effective politically, a subaltern counter public must be a space where groups can develop the resources to present a consistent challenge to dominant practices...It must provide, at least temporarily, a space protected from the dominant discourse in which an alternative can be imagined, lived, and articulated (Kohn 2001: 507).

In the neo liberal market regime, the scope of people's collective and movement has become limited for challenging the dominant paradigm ferociously. A strong sense of anger and frustration among a large segment of urban poor is enveloped within the circumstances of powerlessness where

even the idea of collective action gets marred in their everyday struggle for survival. In spite of ruthless demolition and eviction, collective mobilisation of urban poor has been few and far between. The failure of proactive movements and politics (for example, the labour movement, political parties) to counter economic exploitation, cultural domination, and political oppression, had left people (by the 1980s) with no other choice than either to surrender or to react on the basis of the most immediate source of self-recognition and autonomous organisation: their locality (Castells 1997: 61). Urban social movements do address the real issues of our time”, they do so on neither “the scale nor on the terms that are adequate to the task (ibid). Wherever some initiatives have been taken by the urban poor, the efficacy and strength of mobilization remained below the threshold level and it could not pressurize the state enough to recognize and respond to the concerns of people on the urban margin.

Even networks and alliances find it enormously difficult to strategize politically; most often than not it grows to be association of NGOs with limited space for resistance and protest. The extremely differentiated realities of slums, where datelines meant fractured constituencies, access to amenities varied wildly, and the threat of displacement was not always active, exposed the limitations of an articulation based in housing rights alone and deterred mobilisation effort...A ‘strong struggle of national stature was thus, reduced to tatters, even in their local terrains of specific cities (Bhide et al 2008). The technologies of rule were used to make people’s participation in governmental policies and programmes as panacea for all problems and NGOs were promoted as representatives of people and communities. Alliance building and networking among the NGOs became the buzzword among the agents of civil society. However, with slight variations most NGOs actively sought and accepted appointments as delivery agents of the state, they pacified and bargained with bureaucracy and political elite and they employed centralized decision making processes related to delivery (Ramanath 2005). Singular identities of affluent citizens that had in the past remained fluid or fuzzy, are now found to take on a more aggressive collective form, redirecting urban development debates on class lines, supporting strict zoning laws against hawkers or waste pickers, taking active part in elitist environmental movements...and bringing in new hegemonic discourses for a sanitized/anesthetized city space (Banerjee-Guha 2010:216). Some of the NGOs, representing the middle and upper middle class housing societies and calling themselves citizens’ group, are given undue importance by the state agencies and the pro poor *sangathans*’ views have often been ignored or overlooked. “...The demands of the so called citizens groups, despite their representing a microscopic minority of the city’s population, are taken up seriously by the administration resulting in greater insecurity to the majority of population through eviction, demolition and disruption in their livelihood” (Bhowmik 2010:188). The deliberate depoliticisation of disadvantaged communities and hapless life circumstances reduce possibility of grassroots mobilisation. There is deliberate attempt by the state to by-pass political societies and groups which keep articulating demands for housing rights for poor. Besides, state is quite watchful to prevent any community organization and agitation that may result due to dispossession and for this variety of technologies are being used. These are done by integrating surveillance in urban planning, by cleansing the material space of pavement dwellers, hawkers, informal workers and the homeless, relocating them in “special housing Zones” in peripheral lands, disregarding not only the issue of social justice but ecological consideration too (Banerjee-Guha 2009:104). The increasing legitimacy and realization of the need to segregate the city space and therefore justification for dislocation and dispossession of the poor squarely raises the question of ‘right to city’.

Conclusion

Through a case study of Mumbai city and LC resettlement colony, the paper highlighted the tribulation of poor in urban space. The experiences of recurring and multiple marginalities and vulnerabilities of poor in Mumbai city expose how the state, its policies and agencies treat different classes of citizens differently. Based on an empirical research and analysis of experiences and observations, the paper highlights numerous problems encountered by poor in slum settlement as also in relocation sites. One also observes that the citizens' group and neighbourhood associations often contribute in questioning the poor people's claim and right to city. The ground realities of urban poor unambiguously demonstrate that the present day urban plans, policies and programmes are blatantly accelerating the process of segregation of gated communities from the urban poor and it exposes the limits of *right to the city*.

Notes

¹ <http://www.outlookindia.com/article.aspx?226365>

² rental one room tenements with shared common lavatories constructed in Mumbai by factory owners and landowners for low income workers between 1920 and 1956

³ MMRDA is an authority to implement resettlement related project. It involves local NGO for facilitating the process by ensuring people's participation in the process.

⁴ Project affected persons

⁵ The city of Mumbai is geographically divided in several wards. Wards A to G are called island city where as wards H to T are called suburban districts. For administrative purpose, Greater Mumbai is divided in 6 zones, each consisting 3 to 5 wards named alphabetically.

References

- Appadurai, Arjun. (2004). 'The capacity To Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition' in Vijendra Rao and Michael Walton (Eds.). Culture and Public Action. pp 59-84.
- _____. (2002). Deep democracy: Urban Governmentality and the Horizon of Politics. Public Culture. Vol14, No1. pp 21-47.
- Banerjee-Guha, Swapna. (2009). Neoliberalising the 'Urban': New Geographies of Power and Injustice in Indian Cities. Economic and Political Weekly. Vol XLIV, No. 22. Pp 95-107.
- Banerjee-Guha, Swapna. (2010). Revisiting Accumulation by Dispossession. Swapna Banerjee-Guha (ed.) Accumulation By Dispossession. Sage: New Delhi.
- Bhide, A. and Neela Dabir. (2008) Staking Claims: Housing Rights of the Poor in Mumbai. Tata Institute of Social Sciences Research Report.
- Bhowmik, Sharik K. Urban Public Space and the Urban Poor. Swapna Banerjee-Guha (ed.) Accumulation by Dispossession. Sage: New Delhi.
- Bombay First. (2003). 'Vision Mumbai: Transforming Mumbai into a World Class City'. A Bombay First-McKinsey Report, Mumbai.
- Burra, Sundar. (2005). Towards a pro-poor framework for slum upgrading in Mumbai, India. Environment and Urbanization. Vol 17 No 1. April 2005. Pp 67-88.
- Castells, Manuel (1997). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Vol II*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cernea, M M (2000): 'Risks, Safeguards and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement' in Cernea, M M and C McDowell, (eds.), *Risks and Reconstruction – Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*, The World Bank, Washington.
- Chandhoke, Neera. (1993) On the Social Organisation of Urban Space: Subversion and Appropriations. Social Scientists, vol. 21, No 5/6. Pp 63-73.

-
- Chatterjee, Partha (ed.). (1998). *Wages of Freedom*. Oxford University Press: New Delhi.
- Corbridge, Stuart, Glyn Williams, Manoj Srivastava and Rene Veron. (2005). *Seeing the State: Governance and Governmentality in India*. Cambridge University Press.
- Curtis, Bruce. (2002) Foucault on Governmentality and Population: The Impossible Discovery. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*. Vol 27, No. Pp 505-533
- Dean, M. (1999) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Fernandes, Leela. (2004). The Politics of Forgetting: Class politics, State Power and the Restructuring of Urban Space in India. *Urban Studies*. Vol 41, No 12, Pp 2415-2430.
- Foucault, Michel and Jay Miskowiec. (1986). Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics*. Vol 16, No, pp 22-27
- Fraser, Nancy. (1992). Rethinking the Public Sphere in Craig Calhoun (ed.) *Habermas and The Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Pp 109-42.
- Fuller, C. and V. Beni (eds.). (2000). *The Everyday State and Society in Modern India*, New Delhi: Social Science Press.. Pp1-30
- Gandy, Matthew. (2006). Zones of indistinction: bio-political contestations in urban arena. *Cultural Geographies* Vol 13. No 4. Pp 497-516.
- Harvey, David. (2002). *Spaces of Hope*. Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.
- Harvey, David (2010). *The Right to the City in Swapna Banerjee-Guha (ed.) Accumulation by Dispossession*. Sage: New Delhi.
- Hindustan Times. Chembur's unwanted flats cheaper than slums. April 27, 2010. Pp 5.
- Kohn, Margaret. (2001). The Power of Place: The House of People as Counterpublic. *Polity*. Vol 33. No 4. pp 503-526
- Kopikkar, Smruti. Aamchi Soweto? <http://www.outlookindia.com/article.aspx?226365> (Accessed on 25-10-10)
- Kumar, Anu. Mumbai's Expendable Poor. *Economic and Political Weekly*. February 5, 2005. Pp 506-510
- Lefebvre, Henri. (1996). *Writings on Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lemke, Thomas. (2000). Foucault, Governmentality and Critique. Paper presented at the *Rethinking Marxism Conference*, University of Amherst (MA), September 21-24, (Retrieved from J Stor).
- Neuwirth, Robert. (2005). *Shadow Cities: A Billion Squatters, A New Urban World*. Routledge. New York.
- Pinder, David. (2005). *Visions of the City*. Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.
- Rabinow, P. (1986). *The Foucault Reader*. Penguin Books.
- Robins, Steven. (2002). At the Limits of Spatial Governmentality: A Message from the Tip of Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 4. Pp. 665-689.
- Samaddar, Ranabir. Public lecture on 'Development, Democracy and Governmentality', TISS, Mumbai (22-12-08)
- Shaban, Abdul. (2008). Ghettoisation, Crime and Punishment in Mumbai. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol 43, No 33. Pp 68-73.
- Sharma, Kalpana. (2005) Mumbai's Demolition Marathon. *The Hindu*. January 22.
- Sharma, R.N. and Amita Bhide (2005). World Bank Funded Slum Sanitation Programme in Mumbai. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 40 No 17. Pp 1784-1789.
- Sharma, R.N., Mouleshri Vyas, Manish Jha, A. Shaban. (2008) Impact Assessment of Resettlement Implementation under Mumbai Urban Transport Project (MUTP). Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai
- Thiele, Leslie Paul. (1986). Foucault's Triple Murder and the Modern Development of Power. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. Vol 19, No 2. Pp 243-260
- Victor Tadros. (1998). Between Governance and Discipline: The Law and Michel Foucault. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. Vol 18, No1. Pp 75-103.
- World Bank (2005). Report No 34725. *The Inspection Panel Investigation Report: India Mumbai Urban Transport Project*.