The study of social existence in city has been a major preoccupation of sociologists through the 20th century. Though urban studies date back to the 19th century, the specific field and its subfields of urban studies took shape only during twentieth century. One of the important aspects of the beginnings of field of urban sociology, and urban studies was the focus on the dynamics of city growth and expansion. Expanding city is a phenomenon generated by massive industrialization and its study has not been new. Right from the days of inception of urban sociology, expansion of the city has been a classic problem which urban sociologists have been articulating. Expanding city signifies two kinds of processes of urbanization and urban planning which are social processes and of state regulation. Increased urbanization and expansion of the cities into the extended urbanization of regions and their connections to the city regions elsewhere forming different kinds of networks, dependencies and interdependencies on various scales has been the focus of urban studies for quite sometime now.

The existence of the city is as old as the existence of human civilization dating back to ten thousand years. The oldest city Jericho (in Palestine) is about 7000 years old. The social organization of human life, in time and space, took a different turn over last two centuries. The changing mode of living, in the wake of major changes wrought by colonial occupations of various parts of the world on the one hand and industrialization process of the present “advanced societies” on the other, have in many ways been integrating the different socio-economic systems, at various points of time, in various degrees, into a “global ordering”. All these processes have been situated concentrated and stem from the concentrating and expanding spaces known as cities for the last two centuries. Cities grew into metropolises. By the beginning of the 20th century, several cities in the west had expanded into metropolitan regions and in the latter half of twentieth century such regions had started emerging in the third world too. Thus it became a world-wide phenomenon given the nature of structuring of political-
economic transnational integration processes. In recent times the factors configuring urban regions are understood to be the changes brought about by the “late capitalism” aided by new information technologies in the ‘advanced’ and other countries. City areas are more and more organized and integrated into the global capitalist system through the dispersal of economic activities into the newly industrializing countries. The “Global City” regions have acted as various kinds of production sites for “products” and “services” on the one hand and on the other the sites of centralized control and management for the dispersal of various industrial and financial activities. Brenner captures the new global phenomenon and characterizes it in Lefebvreian sense as “‘explosion of spaces’ in which established geographies of industrialization, state power, urbanism, and everyday life were being thoroughly destabilized and rewoven”. This new phase of expansion of economic activities in recent decades across the world is mediated and aided through a reorientation of the role of state to come to terms with the emerging global economic order. This reorientation has primarily been enabled by spatial strategies of political, economic restructuring operating through select key urban regions against the background of institutional shifts occurring due to ‘the crisis and reorganization of the Keynesian welfare national state, the increasing internationalization of national policy systems, the consolidation of new supranational institutional arrangements, and various putative challenges to national state power associated with geoeconomic integration’. Hitherto various terms of geographical scales of various dimensions of social, political, and economic life have been in vogue viz., ‘local’, ‘urban’, ‘regional’, ‘national’, ‘global’, etc., to grasp the “socio-territorial” processes as ‘localization’, ‘urbanization’, ‘regionalization’, ‘nationalization’, ‘globalization’, etc. However, though various socio-economic processes of growth and development intertwine local, regional, national, and international markets of different kinds, the “worldwide does not abolish the local...Social spaces interpenetrate one another and/or superimpose themselves upon one another.”

The objects of the present study are expanding city, land development and urban planning. Though of late, many of the works in urban studies concentrated on the scale of global processes and urban development, the present study would focus on the processes that have the local as a socio-territorially constitutes. Moreover, local planning and policies and law, and unplanned developments are more connected to local and regional socio-economic and political processes which have their own logic
and articulation. But these local processes are not insulated from the global socio-economic and political processes. Thus for Sassen, it is important to recover ‘place’ in the cities by undertaking ethnographies in the context of advent of ‘dominant forces’ like globalization and telecommunications which have had an impact of nullifying the significance of ‘place’ as a local spatial entity. Though the ‘macrosocial trends’ encompass most of the social conditions, still the ‘social reality probably corresponds to older continuing familiar trends. That is why much of urban sociology’s traditions and well-established sub-fields will remain important and constitute the heart of the discipline."^9

**Models of Urban Expansion**

The proliferation of urban areas and their expansions across the world through the 20th century have given rise to various kinds of explanations. Urban expansion over a period of time has been conceptualized and mapped in various ways. Various perspectives on urban growth establish causal relationships among various factors/aspects to explain the form, content, and dynamics of city/urban growth and expansion. From the point of the view of the present work, it would be useful to briefly take note of various models of urban expansion. The Chicago School drew upon spatial changes and expansion, for its purpose to demonstrate the ‘natural’ human condition. Chicago school was engaged with the concentration of populations and their movements in the expanding city. They were sketching the nature of the urban population- its activities, movements, relocation etc. In the course of their engagement of these subjects, space became an unintentional subject/object in their ‘urban’ study. The Chicago school viewed spatial changes in the urban scene as self-regulatory. For Park, physical growth of the cities occurs due to the changes brought about by the private enterprise. He says:

Physical geography, natural advantages and disadvantages, including means of transportation, determine in advance the general outlines of the urban plan. As the city increases in population, the subtler influences of sympathy, rivalry, and economic necessity tend to control the distribution of population. Business and industry seek advantageous locations and draw around them certain portions of the population. There spring up fashionable residence quarters from which the poorer classes are excluded because of the increased value of the land. Then there grow up slums which are inhabited by great numbers of the poorer classes who are unable to defend themselves from association with the derelict and vicious."^9
For Park, the city acquires the character and qualities of its residents over a period of time. The organization of the city and the character of the urban environment are determined by the size of the population, its concentration and distribution within the city area. Burgess’s study of the expansion and restructuring process in the city indicates the growth in the form of concentric circles. For Burgess, in each inner zone the tendency of ‘invasion’ over the zone next to it which is followed by ‘succession’ (Burgess 1974). Burgess’ model of “Concentric Zone Theory” of Chicago city’s growth and its attendant social processes focused on the local growth dominating the region. Population pressures cause the city expansion which in turn generate ‘a dual process of central agglomeration and commercial de-centralization’. New activities which seek the central areas of city give rise to competition for space. With the new activities occupying the central areas of the city, the already established activities in the central areas are repelled to the fringe areas, and competition in the fringe areas is further expanding the city in the shape of concentric circles. The activities which lost out in competition in Central Business District (CBD) are relocated to the shifting periphery. Contradicting the Concentric Zone model the “Sector Model” was proposed by Homer Hoyt. Homer Hoyt (1939) studied block by block, the residential patterns of high-rent districts in 142 cities. His study gave him a diversified comparative base to draw conclusions. He also examined his cities in three different time periods: 1900, 1915 and 1936. This added an important historical dimension. Hoyt’s another historical study of Chicago focused on the land prices of the previous century i.e., from the earlier period of 19th century to the earlier period of 20th century. Hoyt argued that cities fashioned were not in the form of concentric zones, but asymmetrically shaped sectors. Within these uneven sectors heterogeneous activities had developed propensity to converge. The underlying basis for congregation of activities was the competition for locations within a capitalist market in real estate which signified the functional needs which manifested in the form of land prices. Manufacturing and retail sectors chose their locations in outward expansions of cities, whereas functionally specialized economic activities were left behind at the central business district. Similarly Chauncy Harris and Edward Ullman’s ‘The Multiple Nuclei Model’ demonstrates the convergence of various activities in uneven sectors than in the shape of concentric zones, under pressure of real estate competition between users with different needs. This model too, views central business district to remain prominent. The central business district spins off activities which form in separate smaller centres. These smaller centres are
interrelated ‘homogeneous urban districts’ which are organized around central business
district.13

When compared to the other models of urban expansion, the ‘Central Place
Theory’ and ‘Growth Pole theory’ look beyond the city to explain urban spatial
structuring. Christaller (1933) and Losch’s (1945) central place theory provides two
explanations to the urban phenomenon: a. prevalence of urban hierarchy based on the
city’s rank in the hierarchy is determined by the highest number of functions in relation
to others and significance of those functions to other cities lower in the rank; and b.
spatial structure of the urban system i.e., the relationship between different cities in a
given region. In the French context, ‘regional growth poles’ perspective of urban
growth was advanced. An urban growth pole is one with existence of set of industries
that can propel growth in the economy. This model took into consideration the inter-
sectoral or inter-industry linkages. It ignored the external effects of flow of goods and
people. Growth poles were promoted for the deconcentration of urban areas.14

The 20th century urban expansion in Europe and the USA has been Multiple-
Centred Metropolitan Region and Polycentric Urban Regions. The urbanized regions
are characterized by different centres dominated by various functions viz., consumption,
white collar office operations, manufacturing of various kinds, residential areas,
recreational and leisure activities, etc. The traditional city’s core continues to play an
important role as place of business or consumption etc., without playing a predominant
role in the existence of the urban region. These extended urban regions were the result
of government programs of housing subsidies and expansion of highway and road
networks across the country. These twin processes aided the real-estate developments
and home-ownership and growth of towns in the hinterlands and usage of automobiles
to reach places across extended urban regions. Polycentric Urban Region in Europe is
viewed as a variant of Multi-Centered Metropolitan Region and it comprised of ‘a set of
neighbouring but spatially separate regions’. Two processes of de-centralization and
re-centralization give rise to the growth of the extended multi-centered metropolitan
regions. De-centralization happens due to total reduction of number of people and
activities from the traditional city, which signifies the dispersal of social organization.
Decentralization of various activities also leads to ‘leveling of population density’
which is termed as deconcentration. The forward link to the process of decentralization
is referred to as re-centralization process. Recentralization involves the reorganization of activities and people in relatively concentrated places with reworked form of social connections which reflects the ‘closer proximity’. The increasing concentration of population is termed as reconcentration.15

The Debate on the Theory of Urban Space and Land Development

Various kinds of social, economic, cultural and political processes characterize the urban areas. What kinds of processes do these theorizations of urban space articulate? What is the epistemological basis and ontological status given to the existence of the city or urban areas? What is the nature of physical/real space in the form of urban land? Before going into the idea and process of land development, it is important to take note of the articulations on space. The articulations on space and urban space were rendered by Marxists scholars.

Castells’ Theory of Space

The ecological view of Chicago School drew critique from Manuel Castells. We have taken note of how the Chicago School attributes expansion of the city to the increasing and expanding usage of land. Underlying the expansion of the city is an ecological/natural process of land use by various social groups. This view was critiqued by Manuel Castells. According to him, in the Chicago School, under the cover of ecological organicism, a fundamental feature of the human species is neglected, namely, the contradictory differentiation of social groups, the fact that the appropriation of space forms part of a process of struggle concerning the whole of the social product, and that this structure is not a matter of pure individual competition but that it sets in opposition the groups formed by the differential attribution of individuals to the various components of the social structure – whereas ‘the ecological complex presents a distinction without showing a difference.’16

Though Castells thought that the perspective of the ecological school was inadequate in its understanding of social structure, he considered its object of study useful for establishing a theory of space. For him, “Space is a material, in relation with other material elements – among others, men, who themselves enter into particular social relations, which give to space…a form, a function, a social signification”17.
Space is a historical ensemble in which a societal type is specified. Given those properties of space it was the task for Castells to discover the structural laws that govern the production and functioning of the spatial forms. Any thematic could be organized around the space of given social structure, because ‘the vagueness and the historical relativity of the criteria concerning the urban’.

For what is space? Whatever theoretical perspective one adopts, one will have to accept that all space is constructed and that, consequently, the theoretical non-delimitation of the space being dealt with (for example, by calling it urban space or the space of exchange, etc.) amounts to accepting a culturally prescribed (and therefore ideological) segmentation. Since physical space is the deployment of matter as a whole, a study ‘without ‘without a priori’ of any ‘spatial’ form and manifestation will amount to establishing a history of matter. By this reductio ad absurdum, Castells was trying to explode the evidence of this ‘space’ and to recall the following elementary epistemological postulate: the necessary construction, whether theoretical or ideological (when it is ‘given’) of any object of analysis.

Given that, urban space is organized by the social processes which are at work, at various points in time and expresses what determines in each historical type of social organization. For Castells the spatial aspect finds its meaning only in relation to fundamental instances of social structure. In that sense, ontologically space and social structure are indivisible. Then the specific ‘urban’ character of social structure is determined ideologically, by politico-juridical instance and by economic instance. The contemporary urban units are divided, determined and characterized by units of economic system. But, still what specifies the urban unit? Castells views organization of various means of production and labour power belonging to various realms as interrelated. The organization of means of production viz., technological elements of production, movements of capital, etc., is a regional question which develops in the historical process and the result of contradictions within the social formation, whereas the labour power and its reproduction characterizes the urban spatiality.

Castells' approach emphasizes the sociological analysis of the space connected to collective consumption. Within the classification of space the activities of production, consumption, exchange and management, are seen as elements in a given social system. In the urban system management plays a dominant role. Management is political intervention in urban affairs, i.e., the decisions on the control of the urban processes is centralized by the state. State intervention in the urban sphere is conceived in terms of Urban Planning. The process of planning: the intervention of the political in the different instances of a social formation (including the political) and/or in their
relations, which aim of assuring the extended reproduction of the system, of regulating the non-antagonistic relations and of repressing the antagonistic contradictions, thus assuring the interests of the dominant social class and the structural reproduction of the dominant mode of production.24

Urban planning is designed to provide for the goods and services of 'Collective Consumption'. The idea is that individuals or individual entrepreneurs do not volunteer to invest in the production of goods and services that are consumed collectively. It is very simple; capitalists are disinterested to produce/invest in such projects since profit margin is negligible. Goods and services consumed collectively, draws state's investment due to the inevitable nature of consumption daily. Without roads, electricity, water, hospital, housing, etc., life in the city would come to an end. Apart from that, the question of 'reproduction of labour power' and 'reproduction of means of production' are at stake since they are essential elements in the production process. Thus to maintain the capitalist production process, state invests in production of collectively consumed goods. Therefore the 'Urban Question' is about the organization of means of collective consumption. The concrete problems which crop up are related to those of collective means of consumption which underlie organization of daily life. Collective consumption reflects urban stratification and segregation and also new sources of inequality. Professional status, level of education, ethnic group, age group, opportunities, etc., are determinants of inequality. Zoning plays a major role in separating various groups of the urban social structure. The urban is not simple arrangement of social activities or groups over space. It signifies the process of collective treatment of the daily consumption patterns of households. The crisis in the deterioration of physical environment is not so deeply perceived. To understand that, it may be seen as 'framework of life' and 'the quality of life' signifying 'the way of living' and 'the very meaning of life' as structured unequally. The given locations of social groups are ordered hierarchically over space defining the degree of access to collective consumption; hence such inequalities give rise to contradictions.25 To sum up, Castell’s theory of space is characterized by Althusserian approach to explain production of the built environment, and ‘it represents an attempt to rescue the term "urban" by defining it theoretically as a spatial unit within the structural system which produces the built environment’.26
Lefebvre's Theory of Space

In contrast to Castells’ articulation of various elements of social structure as embedded in space, Lefebvre finds autonomy of space. Reduction of space to ‘social relations of property ownership is a problem, because space represents multiple ‘sociomaterial’ aspects viz., it is a ‘geographical site of action and possibility for engaging in action…it not only represents location where events take place (the container function) but also signifies the social permission to engage in these events (the social order function)’. At structural level it is at once a means of production as land and also part of the social forces of production as space. For Lefebvre, spatial design should be accounted as one of the significant elements among productive forces of society which include also technology, human knowledge, labour power, etc., which add to the “productive potential”. All properties of space accounted so far, are termed as ‘first nature of the role of space in production’. Beyond that, inherent to space is its ‘second nature’. That is the ‘dialectical properties of spatial relations articulate with the externalized properties of the mode of production at a number of levels’ which signify that the quest for the control over spatial relations and design holds equally revolutionary potential as the control over other means of production. Its material form determined by exchange value is a commodity but unlike any other commodity produced viz., sugar, cloth, etc. Nor is it like other commodities aggregated: Places or locations cannot be put together or heaped together. However, state and its institutions fashion space according to their requirements. Moreover, space is polyvalent in form. In terms of ownership of land space is inherent to property relationships, and is directly interwoven with the forces of production in terms of imposition of form on the land. This dual nature is at once formal and material. It is at once ‘externalized realization of human labor and the condensation of social relations of production’, again at once ‘medium of social actions because it structures them, and a product of those actions. There ‘space is produced as a multimanifested concrete abstraction’. According to Lefebvre:

Neither capitalism nor the state can maintain the chaotic, contradictory space they have produced. We witness, at all levels, this explosion of space. At the level of the immediate and the lived, space is exploding on all sides, whether this be living space, personal space, scholastic space, prison space, army space, or hospital space. Everywhere, people are realizing that spatial relations are also social relations. At the level of cities, we see not only the explosion of the historical city but also that of all the administrative frameworks in which they had wanted to enclose the urban phenomenon. At the level of regions, the peripheries are fighting
for their autonomy or for a certain degree of independence. Finally, at the international level, not only the actions of the so-called supranational companies, but also those of the great world strategies, prepare for and render inevitable new explosions of space.\textsuperscript{32} (emphasis added)

Explosion of spaces is a consequence of fragmentation or division of spaces at various levels and claims of space made by large number of actors and institutions. This represents the ‘the multiple articulation of stratified social relations with space’ which represents the chaos of contradictory space. Contradictory spaces generate sociospatial conflicts. These conflicts are not mere representations of class struggles or their relocation beyond the work site but are a reflection of ‘concrete difference between people as a consequence of the domination of abstract over social space’\textsuperscript{33}. Since the conflicts are not generated by relations of production only, spatial conflicts cut across the class lines. Central to spatial contradiction of society is the conflicts between ‘abstract space, or the externalization of economic and political practice originating with the capitalist class and the state, and social space, or the space of use values produced by the complex interaction of all classes in the pursuit of everyday life’\textsuperscript{34}. Given this spatial contradictions, Lefebvre thought that the prerequisites for revolutionary transformation of society are ‘the freedom to use space’, ‘the existential right to space’, ‘abolition of system of private property relations and institutional forms of regulating space which produces economic and political domination’, etc.\textsuperscript{35}

For Lefebvre, ‘transformation of modern society into a humanist society’ can come about through “urban revolution” i.e., by undoing the alienating spatial design. It involves “spatial praxis” which is a radical activity that reorganizes social relations. Such a view is supported by Marxian theory of space.\textsuperscript{36} Lefebvre thought that Marx’s work was incomplete, partially due to illness, but more significantly because for the reason that it did not address the problem of space.

This is especially needful at a time when capitalism, and more generally development, have demonstrated that their survival depends on their being able to extend their reach to space in its entirety: to the land (in the process absorbing the towns and agriculture, an outcome already foreseeable in the nineteenth century, but also, and less predictably, creating new sectors altogether – notably that of leisure); to the underground resources lying deep in the earth and beneath the sea-bed – energy, raw materials, and so on; and lastly to what might be called the above-ground sphere, i.e., to volumes or constructions considered in terms of their height, to the space of mountains and even of the planets.\textsuperscript{37}

Further Lefebvre says:

Space in the sense of the earth, the ground, has not disappeared, nor has it been incorporated into industrial production, on the contrary, once integrated into capitalism, it only gains in strength as a specific element or function in capitalism’s expansion. This expansion has been an active one, a forward leap of the forces of production, of new modalities of production, but it has occurred without breaking out of the mode and the relations of the capitalist production system; as a consequence, this extension of production and of the
productive forces has continued to be accompanied by a reproduction of the relations of production which cannot have failed to leave its imprint upon the total occupation of all pre-existing space and upon the production of a new space. Not only has capitalism laid hold of pre-existing space, of the Earth, but it also tends to produce a space of its own. How can this be? The answer is: through and by means of urbanization, under the pressure of the world market; and, in accordance with the law of the reproducible and the repetitive, by abolishing spatial and temporal differences, by destroying nature and nature’s time.38

Expanding urban areas, for Lefebvre, are the sites where capitalism is spatialized through production of space. Lefebvre was attempting at an understanding of cities in a new context. He says:

After all…the creation of new towns and the redevelopment of existing ones was quite a new approach compared with the classic descriptions of urban phenomena. However, my initiation was neither from the point of view of philosophy, nor sociology, though these were present implicitly, nor was it historical or geographical. Rather, it was the emergence of a new social and political practice.39

Lefebvre's idea of urban consciousness and decomposition of urban order is a running theme throughout his discourse of city. Interference of state and bureaucratic rationality and all other social elements in the public sphere, to alter the everyday life and process of industrialization, consequent changes in the everyday life and nature of urban life have been significant. It reflects the nature modernization of city and its human consciousness. It is a welter of classes’ strategy, state and planning strategy, consumption, modernity, etc., and influence of these aspects on the whole of ramified consciousness of everyday life and its transformation. He visualizes change in terms of transformation from, in the modern world, industrialized to the urbanized society. Urban society indicates the urbanization of whole society. It is also implicit in his analysis that it reflects a kind of a project of capitalist modernization being complete, by spreading, expanding and encompassing the whole of space, with its measure as exchange value, applied to a whole range of phenomenon.

Cities have been conceived as beautiful oeuvres. Lefebvre views city which is representational of use values as a place of money and commerce and exchange and products. ‘Oeuvre is a use value and the product is exchange value.’ Streets, squares, edifices, monuments, etc., are representational of the every day festival of unproductive consumption of space for pleasure and prestige signifying use values. These use values are replaced by the dominant tendency of industrialization ‘subordinating the city and urban reality’ signifying exchange values.40
Basically, Lefebvre conceives the transformation of the urban space, i.e., oeuvre (use value) with its own community sentiment ('social space') centred being converted into product (exchange value) fragmented and expansive city ('abstract space'), producing suburbanization. What it indicates is the city's transformation from-centredness to de-centredness, coherent-unified entity to fragmented entity and in general terms from concentration to expansion. In his urban discourse, concentration to expansion represents the changing nature of social formation generally and the rationality of the capitalist mode of production itself. Lefebvre’s advancement and acknowledgement is of the Engelsian understanding of political economy of urban development and its dynamics which is determined by rent, profit, value, the organic composition of capital, etc., which are the phenomenal form of factory space that signified the relations of capitalism for Marx. Engels studied in an extended form – the phenomenal form the production and consumption – in the 19th century industrial city which included housing and community life of various classes. According to Lefebvre, Engels’s formulation, apart from reflecting the industrial production, demonstrates that the economy has two sectors- the primary and secondary circuits of capital. Primary circuit of capital includes manufacturing, commercial banking, retailing, etc., and the secondary circuit of capital includes real estate industry- its banks and other financial conduits, real estate agents, owners of property and its markets, which are instrumental in bringing about changes in the metropolitan environments. The logic of secondary circuit of capital is relatively autonomous from the logic of primary production. The flow of capital in and out of second circuit compounds and complicates the crisis cycles in the primary circuit.41

“Real estate,” as they call it, plays the role of a second sector, of a parallel circuit to that of industrial production working for the market of nondurable “goods,” or at least those that are less durable than buildings. At times of depression capital flows in its direction. At first it makes fabulous profits, but soon it gets bogged down. In this sector the “multiplier” effects are weak: there is little secondary activity.

Capital is immobilized in building. The general (so-called national) economy soon suffers from this. However, the role and function of this sector never stops growing. To the extent that the principal circuit, that of the current industrial production of “movable” goods slows down, capital is invested in the second circuit, that of real estate. It can even happen that real estate speculation becomes the principal source, the almost exclusive place of the “formation of capital,” that is, of the realization of surplus value. While the part of overall surplus value formed and realized in industry decreases, the part of surplus value formed and realized in speculation and through construction increases. From the accidental it becomes the essential. But this is an unhealthy situation as the economists say.42

Lefebvre is worried about 'use value' being lost in the process of the growth industrialized city life to the new transformed, ever expanding urbanized society.
Industrialized society, for Lefebvre, in becoming a production centre has brought in its train new concentration of population and material and conditions of existence. The guiding principle of this new city habitation has been the exchange value which has replaced the use value/urban sense or what he otherwise terms it as oeuvre. Exchange value- the notion of product, permeates into all spheres of human activity.

For instance, he says that one of the underlying aspects of oeuvre, is the notion to inhabit i.e., "meant to take part in a social life, a community, village or city. Urban life had, among other qualities, this attribute. It gave the right to inhabit, it allowed townsment-citizens to inhabit." This was replaced by the notion of habitat. Habitat is created by the planned actions of the state by creating a space by expanding city, which happens in the form of suburbanization. Suburbanization reflects two things- firstly, society is oriented to focus on problems other than production. In the expansive city, people are ideologically oriented towards consumption. Secondly, suburbanizaion de-centres the city which breaks down the sense oeuvre and urban consciousness.

With 'suburbanization' a process is set into motion which de-centres the city. Isolated from the city, the proletariat will end its sense of the oeuvre. Isolated from places of production, available from a sector of habitation for scattered firms, the proletariat will allow its creative capacity to diminish in its conscience. Urban consciousness will vanish.

This process Lefebvre terms it as, whether done consciously or unconsciously, the class strategy. Coming to the notions of to inhabit and habitat, former indicates the plasticity in ordering and using space whereas latter restricts use of space and is ordered by speculation. So to inhabit reflects use value and the habitat- exchange value. Lefebvre treats these ideas in a refined manner by linking them to the ‘social space’. Both use values and exchange values derive from the same social space. The market is not inimical to everyday life; it only promotes a particular kind of form or style of living. The actual differences between the use and exchange values of space must be understood in terms of the way the state and capital produce or use space. The opposite of social space is the ‘abstract space’ which is ‘two-dimensional, instrumental space of planning, state intervention, and capitalist exploitation, ‘[i]t is when space, together with the daily life it represents, becomes an abstraction and an object of...
manipulation that it takes on its alienating form. Abstract space is the structural correlate of instrumental human action. It can be exploited through state intervention, as well as by capital.  

In the capitalist context, the general formulation of the land development process is associated with the idea of *abstract space* which is indicative of the role of state and the planning mechanism in producing space.

Further Lefebvre (1993) observes that abstract space is instrumental in its milieu and locus which is manipulated by the authorities who own up the capitalism which is on the ascendance that engenders ‘social entropy’ (pp.51-52). Capitalism and neo-capitalism has produced abstract space which includes the world of commodities and their logic, power of the state (ibid: 54). What is the nature of the abstract space? Lefebvre talks about “false consciousness” of abstract space and an “objective falseness of space”. In a way it stems from the “common sense” or an expression of “common sense” perception of the ‘visual order that reduces objects to specular and spectacular abstraction which is not different or distinct from analytical procedures of “scientific abstraction”. Therefore it is reductionist.

The fact is that this procedure abolishes differences from the outset, whereas descriptive approach preserves differences in their discreteness and then plunges into the poorly charted realm of the specific. In its most extreme form, reductionism entails the reduction of time to space, the reduction of use value to exchange value, the reduction of objects to signs, and the reduction of ‘reality’ to the semiosphere; it also means that the movement of the dialectic is reduced to a logic, and social space to purely formal mental space.  

Therefore there is a need to address the analysis of space by understanding it through the lens of political economy and it as a production activity. Thus the investigation has to focus on ‘social practice’ within ‘economic and political’ spheres (ibid: 298-299). But then what is this object ‘abstract space’ is? Abstract space can be conceived in terms of its ‘content’ i.e., ‘by means of a practice that deals with it’ and it contains contractions.
Abstract space can only be grasped abstractly by a thought that is prepared to separate logic from the dialectic, to reduce contradictions to a false coherence, and to confuse the residua of that reduction (for example, logic and social practice). Viewed as an instrument and not merely as social appearance -- abstract space is first of all the locus of nature, the tool that would dominate it and that therefore envisages its (ultimate) destruction. This same space corresponds to the broadening of that (social practice which gives rise to ever vaster and denser networks on the surface of the earth, as also above and below it.51

Properties of abstract space are- i. It is a medium of ‘exchange’ which tends to absorb ‘use’ interchangeably; ii. It has political use- it is a space where strategies of state domination and violence are put to effect. iii. It is space for the deployment of world of commodities which involves accumulation and growth, calculation, planning and programming; iv. It engenders the process of homogenization by erasure of the former meanings by the process of pressure tactics and repression and it creates a semantic void viz., plans play such a role which is distinct from the given social language and apart from that it is a space of bureaucracy with its inbuilt potential to create a ‘spectacle’ and ‘violence’ by using ‘hypertrophied analytic intellect’ and ‘pure knowledge and discourse of power’; and v. Thus actually it is political in the sense of the fusion of power & knowledge From the modern point of reference, the abstract space, has within it a legitimating ideology to justify and motivate actions by creation of ‘neutral medium’ which is primordial in character and employed to create fragmentary contents- the disjointed things, people and habitats.52 Thus the production of space creates disjunction rather than conjunction between abstract space and lived or everyday life.

Urban Land and Land Development

For Chicago/Ecological School the city would take a natural form of expansion mediated by the natural process of ‘selection’, ‘competition’, ‘invasion’, ‘succession’, etc., which configure and structure the land uses. During the heydays of Ecological/Chicago School of Urban Sociology William H. Form called for the need for a ‘sociological analysis of economic behaviour’ and take into account ‘social forces operating in the land market’ to understand urban land use. The reason for such exhortation came in the wake of Ecological School’s articulation of urban land use in terms of “sub-social non-organization orientations”. He observed:
number of interacting organizations. Most of the latter are formally organized, highly self-conscious, and purposeful in character. Although at times their values and interests are conflicting, they are often overlapping and harmonious. That is, their relationships tend to become structured over a period of time. From a study of this emerging structure one obtains a picture of the parameters of ecological behavior, the patterns of land use change, and the institutional pressure which maintain the ecological order.53

‘Land development is a process of land use change most often initiated by the private sector, managed by the public sector, and subject to intense social conflict as existing and future interests collide. This is almost always true, regardless of the place of land development—whether in an urban neighborhood or at the city’s edge.’54 Land development process takes place with different kinds of actors who have interest/use in land, these actors belong to private or public sector, and in the process of production of particular kinds of spaces.

These two different representative macro theories of urban space only articulate its ontologies and the urban processes that determine spatial configuration and vice versa. Both the theorists of space- Lefebvre and Castells have not addressed the question of urban land directly. Gottdiener says “our two main theorists of urban space, Lefebvre and Castells, have effectively sidestepped these issues [viz., rent, location, etc] by choosing not to address the question of the determination of urban land values at all”55. There are general approaches to land and urban land in particular: Harvey’s ‘capital accumulation and built-environment’ and Scott’s ‘urban land rent’ and Gottdiener’s ‘real-estate’.

**Harvey’s Production of Built Environment**

David Harvey’s explanation of the production of space, among other things, focuses on the capital accumulation in space. For Harvey, one of the manifestations of capital accumulation is the built environment in the city, which is the result of mobilization, extraction, geographic concentration and circulation of surplus value. These processes spatially pattern the city form which in turn is contingent on the social, economic, technological and institutional possibilities that govern the nature of management and generation of surplus value with it. ‘A different combination of these possibilities, therefore, would result in a different role for the city as a node in the space economy.’56 Thus they attain functional differences within the system of cities. The
drive for capital accumulation through the appropriation of surplus value generates conflicts with labour which in turn produces a complex social structure within the capitalist class by dividing them into various fractions. Capitalists are divided into three fractions who realize surplus value in space in the forms of rent, interest, and profit. These three fractions operate in the production of built environment.

The first fraction of capital concentrates on rent and appropriates it either directly, as in the case of landlords, or indirectly, as exhibited by financial interests which operate through real estate speculation. The second fraction of capital seeks both interest and profit through construction – adding directly to the built environment either by engaging in construction or financing the work of others. There is a third fraction of capital that operates in the interests of the class as a whole. Harvey calls this “capital in general,” because it regards the built environment as a site for the effective appropriation of surplus value, which supports capital accumulation. This last fraction is interventionist by nature, and it has operated…most directly through state-supported and state-administered a program which attempts to insure the survival of the capitalist class. 

Apart from the struggle at work place, the class conflict is displaced to the local community spaces too. Labour in seeking to improve their living standards would come into conflict over various issues of creation, management and use of built environment. How are these conflicts addressed? These conflicts are addressed by the intervention of the state. Since conflicts occur with different fractions of capital over the matters of ‘quality of life’ and the built environment. ‘Capital in general’ can ill-afford the outcome of struggle between labour and various fractions of capital. Therefore capital in general intervenes through the agency of the state. Harvey distinguishes between primary, secondary, and tertiary circuits of capital. Primary circuit is the organization of production by employing wage labour and application of machinery to produce commodities for profit. Capital in this circuit tends to overaccumulate. Over accumulation crisis is due to the individual capitalists who work in self-interest under the competitive conditions which runs counter to their class interests. The result appears in various ‘guises’: a. ‘Overproduction of commodities-a glut on the market’; b. ‘Falling rate of profit’- in terms of pricing; c. ‘Surplus capital’ can manifest in the form of ‘idle productive capacity’ or ‘money capital lacking opportunities for profitable employment; and d. ‘Surplus labour and/or rising rate of exploitation of labour power’. The temporary solution to the over accumulation of problem, which occurs periodically, would be the ‘switch of capital flows into the secondary circuit’. Secondary circuit is constituted of “built environment for production” and “built environment for consumption”. Built environment for production, also known as ‘fixed capital’, comprises of ‘physical framework for production’ and built environment for consumption provided ‘physical framework for
consumption’. ‘Investment in the built environment therefore entails the creation of a whole physical landscape for purpose of production, circulation, exchange, and consumption.’ There is one major constraint, i.e., the individual capitalists tending to under invest in the built environment and simultaneously they tend to over accumulate. For various reasons, individual capitalists cannot directly invest in the built environment because these investments are large-scale and long lasting. They cannot be priced in an ordinary way and many cases they are open to collective use by all capitalists. The switch of overaccumulated resources is contingent on the conversion mechanisms. The switch of overaccumulated capital can happen only through money supply and the credit system that creates ‘fictional capital’.

Though the financial and state institutions are autonomous, but in the times of crisis of over accumulation, these institutions play a coordinating and mediating role for smooth switch over from primary to secondary circuit. The idle capital is siphoned off via financial and state institutions and further into the generation of fictional capital in the credit system, which finds deployed in the built environment. State also invests in the tertiary circuits i.e., in science and technology and in social expenditures for the reproduction of labour power.

Further, to examine the “productivity” of the capital that is switched over to the secondary circuit from primary, Harvey postulates that

[The problem— which besets the capitalists as much as it confuses us—is to identify the conditions and means which will allow this potential to be realized…Investment in new machinery…is directly productive if it expands the basis of producing surplus value and unproductive if these benefits fail to materialize…But what of invest in roads, housing, health care and education, police forces and the military, and so on?…How can the capitalist class identify, with reasonable precision, the opportunities for indirectly and directly productive investment in the secondary and tertiary circuits of capital?]

Harvey answer these questions by taking note of the ‘main thrust of the modern commitment to planning (whether state or corporate level)’ testified by a whole apparatus of cost-benefit analysis, of programming and budgeting, analysis of social benefits, notions with regard to investments in human capital, etc., and is an indicator of the complexity of the problem. However the questions of ‘bad investment decision – investments which do not contribute directly or indirectly to accumulation of capital – must emerge somewhere’. The tendencies of overaccumulation, manifests in the form of “over-investment” in the secondary and tertiary circuits. Overinvestment is solely in connection to the needs of capital than to the needs of people, which certainly would
remain unfulfilled. Thus the crisis would arise in both secondary and tertiary circuits of capital. Crisis occurs with regard to ‘valuation of assets’. ‘Chronic overproduction’ in secondary and tertiary circuits leads to ‘devaluation of built environment for production and consumption’. This crisis in these spheres would automatically be ‘registered as a crisis within the financial and state structure’.64

**A Neoricardian Approach to Built Environment**

For Scott and Roweiss, the generation of rent, wage, price, and interest in relation to the production of built environment are epiphenomenal i.e., they are reified manifestations of the market relations, but what underlies all that are the relations of production and their reproduction particular to capitalism. Urbanization processes and urban land problems are not merely about ‘competitive bidding for land’. What underlies it is the ‘deep structure of urban property relations’. This perspective emphasizes the ‘contradictory nature of the value of urban land’. Cumulative consequences of countless individual, social and economic activities determine ‘use value’ of urban land. Generally land development in the first phase would be “unplanned and socially undecidable” in the initial phase of the city growth. Later the results of land-use are the ‘result of the political calculations of the state, which exerts direct control over the quality, location and time of public work’.65 Generally the process of land development in the first phase is triggered under the control of private, but the rationalization of the land development by the state intervention and control cannot salvage the use values of space from private expropriation. State regulation is in many ways and in various degrees fail. Therefore the urban land development process certainly would be ‘anarchical, and leads persistently to outcomes that are neither intended nor socially decided’.66

Scott's analysis points out the contradictions internal to the land development process itself. These are captured by what he calls the urban land nexus- the dense, embedded system of practices by which private and public decision making interact in a pattern which is contingent in nature. On the one hand: "This contingency of land-use outcomes in capitalist cities is the direct result of the existence of private, legal control. In brief, precisely because urban land development is privately controlled, the final aggregate outcomes of this process are necessarily and paradoxically out of control" (1980: 137). On the other hand, the state intervenes to offset the irrational nature of market processes, yet it is itself constrained by the social relations of capitalism from coordination in a way which can correct such inadequacies in the general interest.67

Further, the contingent, non-functional process of uneven development which is due to the contradictions inherent to capitalist production process generates asymmetrical
urban landscape. The occurrences of fluctuations in the property sector, differential spatial patterns of residential areas, speculation, etc., are all the result of the capitalist land development process which is uncoordinated and anarchical.68

How is land development process structured? Urban land development is structured by:
(a) A ‘larger cultural momentum that is itself embedded in, and grows out of, a global, social/historical process’- the intermeshing social, political and legal relations determine the production and exchange of urban land. Individual aspirations, intentions, choices, preferences, tastes, decisions and ‘life projects’ are moulded and derived within the context of a specific mode of production and social formation, than derived from a ‘capricious and abstract subjectivity’.69
(b) Social and property relations determine the production, exchange, and utilization of urban land. Though the space is collectively produced human product but the specific use values stem from the uncontrolled manner in which it is privately utilized. And collectively produced product yields rents which is appropriated privately.70
(c) The intervention of State depends on its constitutive nature and the ‘logic of public policy formulation’. State derives its rationality from the rationality of the civil society and is historically embedded within it. One the one hand, land holding and land development activities are only part of the broader capitalist logic and on the other are part of the juridical arrangements of liberal capitalist State.71

Then what is central to configuring of urban space? Central to the configuration urban space is the commodity production. It happens on the land. Urban space take shape through the land uses for ‘commodity production’ i.e., ‘production space’, ‘residential activity’ i.e., ‘reproduction space’ and for ‘transport’ i.e., ‘circulation space’. Value of the land depends on its relative location and determines its exchange price in terms of high or low. This is reflected in the rent differentials based on the locational advantages.72
Gottdiener’s Production of Urban Social Space and Wealth

According to Gottdiener, Lefebvre’s concerns were with the predominance of exchange over use values within the capitalist context. In spatial terms, this would mean a conflict between interests organized around social space, as the site of social use values and the deployment of communal relations in space, and around abstract space as the space of real estate development and government administration – the combined articulation between economic and political modes of domination. While this approach means that space involves many more aspects than those associated with landownership and development.73

Whereas for Marxists and others have restricted their understanding ‘to analyzing abstract space expressed as the economic contradictions which are internal to the process of capital accumulation and externalized in real estate development – that is, in a space reduced to land – the political economists’ built environment’. And other approaches to political economy focus on rent and economic analysis of land without taking into account the ‘struggle over social space’.74

For Gottdiener, Lefebvre’s articulation of secondary circuit of capital is of interest. In the advanced capitalist countries landownership is wide spread throughout the social order and provides scope for acquiring wealth in addition to the ‘institutionalized returns to capital and labour’. There a separate fraction of class or coalitions of class fractions and interests are organized and deal in land. These interests are socially produced property relations of capitalism which are organized around land and are one of the aspects of spatial relations. Space is a force of production and generates profit too. Land as ‘real estate’ is a spatial environment which comprises of developed and undeveloped land including, the structures built upon land and the infrastructural improvement. Real estate is a commodity within its own market. The determination of value of real estate is contingent on ‘sociospatial matrix of locations and activities associated with the production of wealth, which then endows particular urban sites with use value as a function of that socially determined spatial pattern rather than from an intrinsic quality of the resource’75. The returns from the monopolistic market of real estate is contingent on the capability of the various capitalists’ groups to coordinate the real estate activities by aligning with the state to pool resources and plan development in particular directions spatially. So the intervention of State aids not only in the non-monopolistic interests but also the monopolistic interests in real estate which
gain in the way land uses are planned and patterned. Both the non-monopolistic (various social groups) and monopolistic (fractions of real estate) interests work in alignments. ‘The property sector, therefore, involves both structural determinants and the social actions of groups; the synthesis which is to follow will capture the production of space in terms of this action-structure dialectic’\(^{76}\). The real estate market is diverse and heterogeneous in terms of pricing\(^{77}\), markets in land uses and users\(^{78}\) and strategies in land development. Same piece of land developed can assume variety of uses depending upon the social context. Some builders might invest in land and wait for longer duration for the returns whereas some might look for immediate returns. Some land investors use the sale of other assets to finance their ventures. While some may use other people’s money, engaging in a complex process of financing involving a variety of institutions such as banks, trust companies, savings and loan associations and development corporations\(^{79}\), and so on. Land development process has been observed to be uncoordinated and chaotic. This occurs in the context of rapidly expanding fringe of metropolitan regions. The turnover and development of land take place within a loose framework of business and institutional arrangements\(^{80}\). It is uncoordinated because essential apparatuses/arrangements to plan adequately do not exist (in the context of the United States of America).

Beyond the economic considerations, there is social space ‘which is defined more by culture and politics…which requires analysis in sociospatial conflict’\(^{81}\). ‘[I]t is only through an analysis of the interaction between class fractions and racial, gender, ethnic, and consumption groupings that the new sociospatial cleavages can be grasped.’\(^{82}\) ‘Community as social space’ sustains and survives on the basis of communal ties which are tempered by reciprocity, stability and affection. Community bondages cannot be reduced to the field of economic relations only. They are based on ‘communal values’ and ‘consociation’ which have their origins in the mode of social organization which predates capitalism. What sustains community relations are kinship bonds, spatial proximity, voluntary associations, shared political connections, recreation, religious participation, familial life, child rearing, etc., than the class. All these activities are dependent on shared common needs and therefore are irreducible to economic aspects. Struggles over ‘quality of life’ cut across class lines and are community based viz., the struggle between pro-growth and no-growth advocates, struggles over environmental quality, issues of pollution, crime, etc.\(^{83}\)
Urban Planning and Land Development

The theories of spaces address various aspects of intervention of the state in the urban sphere. Urban planning is viewed as a mechanism or the apparatus of the state to intervene in the anarchical or chaotic growth of the city, to offset the problems of the economy itself, to redistribute urban goods and services, etc. Urban policies of the state are planned before implementation. This brings us to the question of nature of planning and urban planning process, and the issues – theoretical or non-theoretical – involved. Urban planning borrows from the general theory and developments in the planning process of various fields and its literature, over a period of time. Thus planning and urban planning are used synonymously in the following text. As Peter Hall puts it- “it seems that urban planning…is a special case of general planning, which does include the plan-making, or representational, component”. He further says:

Broadly, in practice this does prove to be the case. It is simply impossible to think of this type of planning without some spatial representation- without a map, in other words. And whatever the precise organizational sequence of such planning, in practice it does tend to proceed from very general (and rather diagrammatic) maps to very precise ones, or blueprints. For the final output of such a process is the act of physical development (or, in some cases, the decision not to develop, but to leave the land as it is). And physical development, in the form of buildings, will require an exact design.

The focus of understanding of the urban planning field has been straddling between three areas of its concerns – theory, method and practice – given its quasi-academic or quasi-practical existence, and many kinds of actors involved in the field- academicians, businesspersons, planners working for the government, etc. In this section, the purpose is to delineate to some extent the models of planning as adopted in the urban planning process. One would outline here the articulation on the existing urban planning theories, and the approaches or the theoretical frameworks of urban planning itself.

Urban planning means “planning with a spatial or geographical component” with an objective for the creation of a spatial structure for the activities which is ‘better’ than the existing one. It is basically physical-spatial planning. Land use and development still play a major role in urban planning, though it was obscured by the
controversies with regard to the planning. It was insisted that planning should ‘concentrate much more on the broad principles rather on details; it should stress the process, or time sequence, by which the goal was to be reached, rather than present the desired end-state in detail; it should start from a highly generalized and diagrammatic picture of the spatial distributions at any point of time, only filling in the details as they needed to be filled in, bit by bit’.
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It is observed that the modern urban spatial planning exercise has progressed from the model-process of master planning to the systems planning and to a more complex transition to participative-conflict planning, with underlying different methods and conceptual frames. Master planning was modelled on the basis of the model invented by Patrick Geddes. In brief, to arrive at a plan the planners were supposed to undertake survey of a given urban spatial jurisdiction, analyze the data collected and then formulate or arrive at a plan accordingly. As Hall puts it- “The old planning tended to proceed through a simple sequence, best set out in the terse instructions of Patrick Geddes[89]; Survey-Analysis-Plan. The existing situation would be surveyed; analysis of the survey would show the remedial actions that needed to be taken; the fixed plan would embody these actions” (2002: 229).90 From such a modelling, the mode of planning experienced a gradual shift towards ‘systems planning’.91 According to this conception of planning, it pertained to the ‘management’ and ‘control’ of the urban and regional system. Planning was visualized as a continuous process which sought information of the functional aspects of the control system through the observation to ascertain the effectiveness of the control system or else to bring subsequent modifications to create a more effective control system. The old planning system that produced the master plans provided a comprehensive representation of preferred future end state which was to be achieved within a given period of time and master plan embodied within it the desired detailed land-use patterns and maps. In contrast to the master plan, the systems planning focused on the objectives of planning and alternative ways of achieving them. Planners have partial knowledge of urban development processes because of the plurality of policies and complexity of urban and regional systems. Therefore it is suggested that they should have a better or comprehensive knowledge of the overall development processes in the cities.92
What kinds of problems do these theories or perspectives of planning address? Mainly a whole lot of articulations on planning stem from the understanding that planners’ methods in conceiving the plans for the city lack social component for which it is being formulated. The advocates of various approaches to planning emphasize various aspects while representing the economic-political-social subjects who are at the receiving end in the condition of constant flux in which planning and the production of city has been taking place. The method and practice of urban planning, over time, has undergone major changes. Since the focus of the study being the sociological aspects of spatial planning, this section would take note of the models and processes of urban spatial planning.

In recent times, planning theories while addressing the modalities of planning have answered the question as to ‘how to plan?’ What are the core concerns and issues the planners have to take into consideration before they plan. Los makes a distinction between ‘theory in planning’ and ‘theory of planning’ to indicate the differences between ‘social knowledge’ about planning and ‘social action’ of planning at one level and the link between the two at the other level. Most of the literature on planning has been concerned about the theory of planning which is interested in ‘how planning ought to be done and a positive (or explanatory, or empirical) theory of planning concerned with how planning is being done or with the social nature of planning itself’94. Different approaches to planning are classified on the basis of emphasis each approach places on the issues for planning.

Models/Designs of Urban Planning

In Europe and the United States of America, in the 19th century and 20th centuries, there were various thought processes at play in planning cities as physical entities with people. Different models of city designs were proposed and advocated, and many of them lent themselves to the experiments or trials. Here it is important to take note of these urban models to see what they enunciate.

Social City
Ebenezer Howard is viewed as a pioneer of urban planning who for the first time articulated the plan and design for a town. Howard had proposed to decentralize
industry from the inner parts of the city. New towns were advocated to be built around
the industrial plants, combining working and living in a healthy environment. All that
meant cities and countryside had their own permanent mixture of advantages and
disadvantages. The advantages the city offered were in terms of job opportunities and
urban services, but the disadvantages arose from the anomalous natural environment.
The countryside offered the healthy natural environment but the disadvantage was that
it lacked job opportunities and urban services.  

Howard argued that a new type of settlement – Town–Country, or Garden City...so created would be
deliberately outside normal commuter range of the old city. It would be fairly small –Howard suggested
30,000 people – and it would be surrounded by a large green belt, easily accessible to everyone. Howard
advised that when the town was established, 6,000 acres (2,400 ha) should be purchased: of this, no less than
5,000 acres (2,000 ha) would be left as green belt, the town itself occupying the remainder... Howard called
this polycentric settlement the ‘Social City’... Social City could grow without limit.

Further, Howard was very explicit about how new communities could be
established. He emphasized that private enterprise could take up the task to establish
towns by borrowing money to buy cheap land in the open countryside for the town.
With the consequent effect the establishment of the town the land values would increase
which would make way for the new town company to repay the loans and the profits
could also be used for improvement of the town or add more units to the Social City.

Further, Howard’s ideas and work were carried forward by his followers
between 1900-1940, by further advancing it. Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker built
garden town in the significant suburbs of London. The feature of this town was its
experiment with the creation of a socially mixed community living in the skilfully
designed different types of housing. Though they varied in size but were compatible in
a locality, and were termed as ‘triumphs of twentieth century British design’. They
emphasized lower densities and need for ‘background of open space’. Barry Parker
introduced another significant idea of ‘neighbourhood unit’ into town-making which
was derived from Howard’s idea of Garden City. The neighbourhood unit would
contain certain services at a walking distance at the central place for a moderately small
local community of a few thousand people. Further Clarence Perry, as part of New York
Regional Plan during the 1920s, had developed ‘neighbourhood unit’ idea as not
merely a practical instrument, but ‘as a deliberate piece of social engineering which
would help people to achieve a sense of identity with the community and with the
place’. In response to ‘neighbourhood unit’ idea, Christopher Alexandar in his paper A
City Is Not a Tree exposed the falsity of the idea. He found that people had diversity of needs for local services, and ‘principle of choice’ was overriding in the context where complex settlement structure of the city needed overlapping fields of shops, schools, etc., So the planners should have ‘variety and freedom of choice’ as part of their goals. Neighbourhood concept was further improvised by Clarence Stein, an architect-planner working in the New York region. For him, in the age of mass ownership of a private car as means of transport, the need was felt to separate pedestrian routes for local journeys from routes used by car traffic.100

Settlement Patterns and Local Economic Environment: Patrick Geddes’ work Cities in Evolution published in 1915 focused on the forces shaping the growth and change in modern cities. The underlying idea was to demonstrate the human ecology: the relationship between humans and their environment. Geddes work underlined the symbiotic and delicate relationships that were present between human habitation and the land which was characterized through the local economy. Geddes’ work likened the P.G.F. le Play’s articulation of the relationship between Place-Work-Folk signifying the ‘people living in and on their land’. Thus planning was visualized pragmatically as embedded in reality. Thus focus was to find the empirical links between settlement patterns and local economic environment. Planning was to be associated with the broader phenomenon of region than only the town itself. Geddes developed a sequence of working methods to arrive at the actual plan. The first level involved a survey of the region in terms of its characteristics and trends. The second level involved the analysis of the survey and third, the generation of plan for the region. The growth in regions had generated suburban growth and the expansions had led to the growth of giant urban agglomerations or conurbations. Thus it was advocated that planning had to subsume town and country planning to plan for interrelated urban areas in a given region. Thus, this articulation gave logical structure to planning. Geddes logically concluded that due to pressure of economic and social forces, the growth and expansion of urban regions would continue. Therefore town and country had to be commonly planned on regional scale.101

The above ideas derived from various advocacies were adopted and grafted onto Greater London Plan of 1944 by Patrick Abercrombie.
Abercrombie’s great achievement was to weld this complex of ideas, from Howard through Geddes to Unwin, and turn them into a graphic blueprint for the future development of a great region – a region centred on the metropolis but extending for 30 miles (50 km) around it in every direction, and encompassing over 10 million people. The broad aim of the plan was essentially Howard’s: it was the planned decentralization of hundreds of thousands of people from an overcrowded giant city and their re-establishment in a great series of new planned communities, which from the beginning would be self-contained towns for living and working. The method was essentially Geddes’s survey of the area as it was, including the historical trends which could be observed, followed by systematic analysis of the problem, followed by production of the plan. But the great sweep of the study, its characteristic assurance, and its quality of almost cartoon-like clarity were essentially Abercrombie’s own.102

Frank Lloyd Wright’s Broadacre City: When all new advocacies and experiments in planning was taking place in England and North America, Frank Lloyd Wright was advocating another approach. Wright prescribed the conservation of independent rural life. When motor car was and put to use on a mass scale by farmers of North America’s countryside and with the availability of electricity at cheaper rates, he suggested that cities were to be allowed to be spread in countryside. Wright perceived that the days of concentration of activities in the centre of cities were over. The future would be patterned by low density dispersion of homes and jobs. Therefore it was thought that such developments had to be planned and termed them as Broadacre City103.

In France and Germany their own original models were developed and tried out.104 In Spain the Linear City model was proposed. The Linear city was to be developed along an axis of high-speed, high intensity transportation route from an existing city. Linear city was proposed to run across Europe with a total distance of 1,800 miles.105 The most famous and significant of all the urban planners was Le Corbusier’s work. Le Corbusier was one of the main creators of the modern movement in architecture. His famous works were the Villa Savoye at Passy (1929-30), the chapel of Notre Dame en Haut at Ronchamp near Belfort (1950-53), Unite d’Habitation (1946-52) at Marseilles in France, and the city of Chandigarh (1950-57). He viewed urban planning as a grand scale exercise. Peter Hall summarizes the ideas of his books – The City of Tomorrow (1922) and The Radiant City (1933) – in a few propositions. a. The traditional city has become functionally obsolete due to increasing size and congestion in the central city. It has become exceedingly difficult to maintain communications of the central areas due to the strain generated by congestion in the central business district where most of businesses seek accessibility. b. The problem of congestion can be solved by increasing the density of people in any given area. That is by increased density at one scale of analysis and decreased density at another. High densities can be locally maintained by building massive form of tall structures but in the surroundings of
these tall structures greater proportion of ground space should be left open/unused. c. Corbusier has proposed equal densities across the city. As a result the pressure on the central business district or anywhere in the city would disappear. d. This ‘new urban form could accommodate a new and highly efficient urban transportation system, incorporating both railway lines and completely segregated elevated motorways, running above the ground level, though of course, below the levels at which most people lived’.106

The models outlined so far were criticized for the following reasons- a. These models did not take into account the changing world in which they had to operate. They were only blueprints, or statements of the future end state of the city/region. Planner was perceived to have had all the knowledge to produce a new settlement form, by erasing the old, without s/he being brought into question. Planning was oblivious to the demands of mixed economy where private interests play a major role and in a participatory democracy differences in perceptions and views are bound to occur. Howard and Geddes were still exceptions, and Howard was a utopian, never forgot to bring his planning ideas down to practical details. Geddes advocated that planning should take stock of the world in terms of trends in economy and society, and begin with understanding of world the way it is, than imposing subjective view of the world. b. These pioneer planners were prophetic and their visions did not explore any other options. c. These planners were mainly physical planners, who offered only narrow physical or spatial solutions to the problems of the city/region.107

Critics and Advocacies of Planning

First critics of planning began with the attack on scientific claims of planning. Systems planning came under attack by some planners, in a way the critique nullified the scientific claims108 which the systems planning claimed. The planning which was conceived as scientific was non-participatory and apolitical in nature. The emphasis on the involvement of citizenry in the planning exercise by merely consulting them struck at the roots of the role of a planner being ‘superior’ ‘scientific expert’.109

Advocacy Planning: By the 1960s a greater need was felt in the emerging new socio-political context of ‘pluralist planning’ or ‘advocacy planning’ formulated by Paul
Davidoff. The other critiques brought out the non-participatory nature of planning. The involvement of the citizenry in the planning exercise for themselves, than merely consulting the public, made the planner a “superior”-scientific expert\textsuperscript{110}. In the 1960’s itself a greater need was felt in the given socio-political context for “pluralist planning” or “advocacy planning”. After the advent of advocacy planning, there was a clear picture of what planning has to consider. In other words it has been considered as a process involving non-technical realm/domain consisting of different kinds of actors which planners have to take into account. The question– ‘Planning for whom?’\textsuperscript{111} – became a serious question. Political and social equality became a central question for advocacy planning. Planners while planning the city had to take into consideration “new social goals” as enunciated by the Supreme Court of United States of America- “equal opportunity to all citizens” in initiating the welfare measures and while designing metropolitan system\textsuperscript{112}.

In reality the existence of diverse interest groups calls for “public interest” in the pluralist planning. What follows such a proposition is the advocacy for the “inclusiveness” of all interested groups or all the constituents concerned in the planning exercise. Welfare of all and the welfare of minorities should be the concern of the public authorities. ‘Planning must be so structured and so practiced as to account for this unavoidable bifurcation of the public interest.’\textsuperscript{113} What would be due process if all the interests are ought to be guarded or protected?

The idealized political process in a democracy serves the search for truth in much the same manner as due process in law. Fair notice and hearings, production of supporting evidence, cross-examination, reasoned decision are all means employed to arrive at relative truth, a just decision. Due process and two (or more) party political contention both rely heavily upon strong advocacy by a professional. The advocate represents an individual, group or organization. He affirms their position in language understandable to his client and to the decision makers he keeps to convince.\textsuperscript{114}

It is not only that citizens are heard but “also means allowing them to become well informed about the underlying reasons for planning proposals, and to respond to these in the technical language of professional planners”.\textsuperscript{115} This kind of planning is supposed to happen in the context of government planning. In this context work is to plead for his or his client’s point of view. An advocate who “would plead for his own and his client’s view of the society”, which actually means the planner would not be the rational technocrat but “a proponent of specific substantive solutions”.\textsuperscript{117}
The role of planning and the planner were conceived as a two way or an interactive, participatory and communicative process. But what was to be planned remained to be the prerogative of the planner representing the government. Advocacy was only for the participation of the citizens on the issues related to plans, plan proposals, which would actually mean negotiation, bargaining, dissent, opposition, etc., in the planning process which the planner had to take into consideration. Planning, the urban area was advocated to change the perspective from mere physical planning to social aspects in planning. Generally the historical approach of city planning profession has considered ‘physical structures and land as servants to those who use them’\(^{118}\).

Physical relations and conditions have no meaning or quality apart from the way they serve their uses. But this is forgotten every time a physical condition is described as good or bad without relation to a specified group of users. High density, low density, green belts, mixed uses, cluster developments, centralized or decentralized business centers as per se neither good nor bad. They describe physical relations or conditions but take on value only when has seen in terms of their social, economic, psychological, physiological, or aesthetic effects upon different uses.\(^{119}\)

This perspective that emphasized non-physical dimensions in addition to physical planning was considering several aspects of inclusion, participation, plurality of actions, relation between the planners and the aims of the social actors, the ideals of equality in planning, the social-legal meaning of the planning as reflected in the physical environment, public interest and the sociality involved in the whole planning exercise itself.

**Non-Euclidian Mode of Planning:** With the weakening of the argument for scientific planning which had stood for of value-neutrality, utopian or visionary nature of physical planning, for later academic theories of planning advanced the prescriptions for planners to follow. Friedman ([1993]2003) pointed out ‘the collapse of the Euclidian world order of stable entities and common sense assumptions which had ruled the imagination in the past two hundred years\(^{120}\). Thus the definition of planning was redefined- ‘Planning is that professional practice that specifically seeks to connect forms of knowledge with forms of actions in the public domain.’\(^{121}\) This definition was reconceived, and it was alternative to the definition of planning in engineering science\(^{122}\).

This non-Euclidian planning is not without the considerations of time and space. The non-Euclidian planning will have to function within the context of “contemporary collapse of time and space continuum”. Then what would be the “appropriate time-
space” for a non–Euclidian form of planning? ‘real time of everyday events rather than the imagined future time’. Central to a non-Euclidian planning model are planners acting as responsible, thinking urban professionals rather than as faceless bureaucrats engaged in the production of anonymous documents. Face-to-Face interaction in real time is the new model of planning’.\textsuperscript{123} Though planning will have to be futuristic, but at the same time planners will have to be operating in “actual or real-time”.

What about space? For Friedmann, space mainly represents the local and regional level. Planning must be sensitive to the local and regional differences; given the accepted decision-making process by involving the groups of the civil society, the local and regional levels become significant; region and localities are spaces where everyday life happens/takes place; and with focus as regional and localized planning efforts, planning itself becomes democratic.\textsuperscript{124}  

**Communicative Planning Theory:** Communicative planning theory mainly focuses on the urban environmental problems. Within the context of widespread consciousness about the changed economy – fragmented economic and political orders – the urban regions and city neighborhoods display greater diversity. The post-Fordist economy and social welfare strategies of governance have collapsed. Urban regions have become ‘containers’ of multiple social and economic relations and coexistence has engendered, consciously or unwittingly, tensions and conflicts over the opportunities. ‘Protest groups hold up the development process. Development projects trample on the finegrained neighborhood resources of those who move in a spatially confined lifeworld.’\textsuperscript{125} Development has led to the environmental degradation within the context where urban regions have become the locus of economic development and urban regions compete with other urban regions neglecting local economies and neighborhoods. Therefore, Healey ([1996] 2003) raises the questions: what kind of spatial strategy is necessary to overcome the problems? ‘How do we get to understand the complex and diffused dynamics of urban regions? How do we get to agree on what the problems are, and what we want to promote and safeguard? How can we translate agreement into influence on the ongoing flow of activities through which our regions are considerably being reshaped?’\textsuperscript{126}
For the above raised questions communicative planning is prescribed through “public argumentation and communicative policy”. This prescription is developed on the basis of a critique of the previous theories and critiques of urban planning. More important than its critique what it enunciates is significant. The communicative planning theory wants to bring out “the fine grain of economic and social relations, about the diversity of ways of using and valuing places, and were uncomfortable in the face of rising concern about the survival of the planet’s species mix”. So the communicative planning theorists were concerned with the “diversity”. Apart from such a macro focus, the communicative planning theory develops ‘potentially very varied ways of seeing the world, of identifying our interests and values, of reasoning about them, and of thinking about our relations with others’. Such diversity of interests, values, reasoning and relating to them in different ways by different groups of people is potential for conflict. Thus to resolve such problems of conflictual nature the communicative planning theory advocates discussion of issues in the public realms with various actors; based on normative principles to judge discussions and ‘build interrelations across the differences to undertake strategic consensus building work for the creation of interculturally sensitive strategies for managing for managing our common concerns in urban region space’.

Mainly the idea is to reconstruct the “democratic practice” to replace “paternalism” by making the planning process participatory and broad based i.e. “inclusionary augmentation”. The communicative theory of planning emphasizes (a) the role of community– in the sense that the place based ‘political community’ oriented to acting on a set of problems and as ‘the wider community of stakeholders’; (b) Given the diversity and differences of various sorts from the point of view of argumentative or dialogical approach it is not merely the “voices” need to be heard or voicing as a mere ritualistic exercise.

An inclusionary approach will therefore mean actively discussing and choosing a style of discussion, and recognizing that not everyone will be comfortable in it to begin with. The growth of facilitation in environmental mediation and community development is an illustration of the importance of this work, where such facilitation moves beyond getting the issues out to considering how to discuss them.

(c) The issue of language- Participants in a dialogue might find it hard to understand each other and “talk past” to each other by means of different ways of expressing and (d) the issue of how the members of a political community are accorded respect. Further arguments will have to be sorted out by acknowledging facts, different moral
and aesthetic values, and rights and the multiplicity of claims; grasping different points of views by being open to meaning with regard to various issues in a strategic spatial planning. Based on such an understanding one could ‘draw out common threads to work out what to do’.

Apart from communicative approach, the other approach to planning is termed ‘new urbanism’ which is a design-oriented approach to planned urban development. The new urbanists aim to create spatial relations which are in congruence with a ‘close-knit social community that allows diverse elements to interact’. According this arrangement an urban design includes a ‘variety of buildings types, mixed uses, intermingling of housing for different income groups, and a strong privileging of the “public realm”.’ The basic unit of planning is the neighborhood, which is limited in physical size, has a well defined edge and has a focused center: “The daily needs of life are accessible within the five minute –walk”. The justification for such a development is based on the critique of the suburbia which is not only creating traffic congestion on the freeway but also ‘aesthetically unappealing strip-mall development and also a producer of crime and anomie. New urbanism not only critiqued suburban development, but also was nostalgic about the traditional forms. Unlike communicative theorists, the new urbanists subscribe to the role of “persuasive sales persons for a particular point of view and deployers of strategies aimed at co-opting people”.

**Just City Advocacy:** The last model for consideration is the ‘Just City’ urban planning model. The just city model underlines the need to face the problem of formulating goals and identifying agents within the structure of social domination, the forces globalization, sectarianism and the repressive state apparatus which have rendered people defenseless. The people might offer some resistance whereas the macro forces viz., state, would work towards maintaining the stasis. The just city theory would view planning theorists’ role as advocates of a programme and not necessarily advocates of a particular group as enunciated by Davidoff’s planning theory. Just city theorists are classified into two categories- radical democrats and political economists. Radical democrats see a greater role for civil society with its direct involvement than as participatory stakeholders as viewed by communicative theorists’ and they accept conflictual views of society. They seek ‘progressive social change’ through the exercise of power by participating groups which were hitherto excluded from the governance
and planning. Second groups of theorists termed as political economy theorists take an exclusive normative position of distribution of social benefits while going beyond neo-Marxian view of analyzing distributive outcomes for various classes. Political economy theorists focus on non-economic forms of domination without merging with class categories. The main purpose of this set of theorists is to specify the nature of “good city”. The political economy theorists of the just city are concerned about the participation of powerless groups in decision making process and its equitable outcomes. They are concerned about economic outcomes of such decision making and are equally concerned with evaluation of outcomes with regard to groups defined by gender, race and secular orientation. They emphasize the role of an entrepreneurial state which not only provides welfare but also generates wealth.  

There are other issues, apart from the issues discussed above. For quite sometime now, normative and ethical-moral frameworks have become significant in the context of city growth/expansion and development, and the way public interest has been pursued by the planning agencies to justify their actions. The role of planners have become complex and uncertain in the stance taken between public and private sectors; the role of planners is divided between serving employers, fellow planners, and the public which brings into question the contested loyalties and “what remains of the once accepted cornerstone of planning: serving the public interest?” “what values and/or duties lie at the heart of the public interest and what does this imply for the goals and actions of politicians and professional staff?” And “what is the appropriate balance between the rights of property interests, the socially or economically excluded and the non-human world?” Broadly one could view it as an ‘appropriate relationship between state, society and the individual’.

Planning functions stretch beyond the simply technical functions in the context of social, economic and environmental challenges on the one hand and the values of democracy, equality and efficiency which are most of the times are in conflict. Thus planners have the task of reconciling the goals of economic development, social justice, and environmental protection. Given that, public interest continues to occupy the central place in the planning discourse.
What has endured is the persistent question of the public interest. Planning continues to face the central controversy of whether there is indeed a single public interest and of whether planners recognize and serve it. Incremental planners claimed that the excessive complexity of the comprehensive public interest prevented the planner from serving it directly, while advocate planners argued that what was portrayed as the public interest in fact represented merely the interests of the privileged. More recently, postmodernists have challenged the universal master narrative that gives voice to the public interest, seeing instead a heterogeneous public with many voices and interests. Finally, the persistence of fundamentalist thinking and community identity based on religious, rather than secular, municipal values undermines the ability to find a consensual public interest.147

Despite all those perspectival differences148, ‘[a] belief in the public interest is the foundation for a set of values that planners hold dear: equal protection and equal opportunity, public space, and a sense of civic community and social responsibility’149. All these issues are connected to political, legal and moral-ethical frameworks. (a) Planning is a ‘mechanism for social reform’ and ‘a device to facilitate market interests’ especially in the contexts concerning allocation of land uses and the need to mediate in land and property markets. Since it is basically a state-based activity which determines the individual’s access to resources through institutionalized practices or directly connected to party politics, it is political in nature. (b) Problematic concerning legal frameworks that support planning as a form of state regulation to guide the planners to act appropriately has been ‘partisan and ambiguous’ at the same time. Since law is fashioned by its context and reflects the dominant ideology. This dominant ideology is divided to three competing ideologies- (a) first concerning the importance given to the private property and its institutions; (b) ‘the public interest ideology, promotes the idea of the amelioration of private interest in order to safeguard collective goals through the power of professional/expert administrators’; (c) the radical alternative suggested against the dominant ideologies is the emphasis on public participation. Planning reflects the ideology of the governing elite which strives to maintain the status quo of the property relations. (c) Thus what follows are the ethics which are ‘fundamental to the daily practice of planning’ and ‘its underlying rationale’. Most significant of the themes in the ethical debates is the distinction between teleological and deontological frames of reference. The terms of teleological formulation concentrates on ‘outcomes of action’ as evaluated in terms of good or bad, whereas the deontological frame of reference focuses on the ‘rightness of the action’ itself. (i) Teleological formulation refers to the moral consequences of action which is evaluated in terms of ‘the balance of pleasure over pain’ which is measured in terms of ‘summation individual self-interests rather than by any broader notion of collective well being’ – it is signified in the classical utilitarian phrase – ‘the greatest happiness of the greatest number’ and when narrowed down to monetary values the ‘goodness’ of results are measured through the
method of cost-benefit analysis. (ii) Whereas, in distinction the deontological ethical frames of reference emphasizes individual rights, fairness of approach and justice all of which would boil down to procedural rules founded on the postulation that ‘the best means of achieving consistent, universal and impartial decisions and therefore of protecting individual rights’. Further advanced, deontological ethical formulation emphasizes ‘justice’ which is the ‘first virtue of social institutions’ which would mean that though in a ‘just society’ individuals could pursue their own ends in congruent with the analogous freedom for others to follow similarly but since individuals begin on unequal terms albeit individual liberty being maximized ‘the least advantaged should receive the greatest benefit’ from the planning and public policies.150

The planning perspectives in general have moved away from the ‘objective’ understanding or Euclidean/physical-geometrical way of perceiving and configuring the city. Mere physical configuring of the city by not taking into account the non-physical aspects of city formation has come into question across the perspectives. Over time the perspectives have been advancing or adding over under different labels. The idea and modes of democratic planning, issues of participation, negotiation, norms and ethics, justice, laws, communicative-argumentation, etc., have figured across the perspectives each emphasizing different issues in their own manner given their own social theoretical predilections. Thus in a way, the view that planning as a specialized scientific activity has been debunked. Apparent diversity of ethical perspectives/frameworks throw up few similarities across upon examination in terms of the domination of procedural questions in the articulations, ‘rejection of universalism in favour of relativity and subjectivity and focus on individual interests rather than a more general concern with the common good’. They do not touch upon the issues of ends and values151.

A whole lot of responses among academic theorists of planning have tried to reinvent, salvage, restitute, resuscitate and restore through a reformist trend in the field have been to save the day for planning from the anti-foundationalist trend unleashed by the post-modernist project which in a way is up to dislodge or dismantle planning (at least at the theoretical level). Despite such attempts by the reformist perspectives, they have succumbed to the post-modernist lure of relativism and subjectivity which are not in favour of universalism, homogeneity, objectivity, etc.152
Communicative planning theory has evaded the issue of universalism by developing a general procedural ethic without substantive content. The new urbanists claim that their design prescriptions incorporate diversity and provide people what they really want rather than what archaic zoning laws and greedy developers impose on them. Thus, even though they have been criticized for imposing a particular formula on others, they defend themselves by arguing that their conception incorporates difference. Just-city theorists work from “the basic premise…that any distributional conception of social justice will inevitably be linked to the broader way of life in which people engage”…The argument is that although there may be no universal standards of good and bad, there are criteria for judging better and worse.153

To build a “good city” the planning’s theoretical effort has taken the shape of advocacy in one form or other. How to plan? and, For whom to plan? are the significant questions in the context of different kinds of social asymmetries and problems in the city and city building. Therefore the questions of social equality, participation, dialogue, discussion, negotiation, distributive justice, etc., ought to be part of the materiality of city building and be inbuilt part of the technical decisions. That is advocacy; there exists pessimism with regard to whether the issues addressed by the planning theorists would be taken into account in the planning process earnestly. Then one could end up saying that- ‘It’s hard to produce a plan that at once captures the conditions of the citizens experiencing the problems society is mobilized to process. It’s hard to be both scopic and comprehensive and immediate and individually responsive.”154 And less pessimistic view takes note that in recent times the theory does not only focus on the critique but also in ‘offering a more appealing prospect of the future. But one could sustain such optimism only when the planning translates it into practice.155

What is the way out for practicing planners? For the planners who confront the everyday assignments related to the allocation of land uses, ‘[i]t is difficult to see how such frameworks would assist practicing planners to identify appropriate courses of action, faced as they are by a world of social exclusion, economic polarization and degradation of the non-human environment.156 Since the planning theories have had procedural focus for ethical guidance or advocacy, have not been able to make any difference to the planning practice. They have not been able to nullify the idea and practice of planning by underlining or privileging the relativism and subjectivity which would ‘reduce planning to an empty box’ because it negates the ideal of collective welfare or social justice for which the planning stands for. Planning is conceived to create a ‘better’ future. If one were to consider still larger issues like collective welfare or social justice which are important, it becomes imperative that planning has a greater
role to play. If planning has a role to play, how would one assess planning and make planning effectively work? It is argued that planning will have to be ‘judged by its outcomes’. 157

Then what are kinds of articulation on planning and land development? Planning and land development belong to the realm of spatiality. Planning is ‘a dialectically determined synchrony of public interventions generated by and in response to the order and chaos of the industrial city’ 158. Whether it is land use planning or comprehensive planning, it all belongs to the spatiality of planning 159. The spatial production of various sites- work places, homes, neighbourhoods, etc., is dependent on allocations of land for various uses/purposes and the way in which it is developed. The Planners just do not “make plans” viz., master plans, they “make space” which is at once a ‘facsimile of power and an act of exclusion and domination.’ 160 One of the resulting features in the production of abstract space is to bring in the logic of the commodity i.e., pricing or the exchange value (which is interchangeable to use too). Planning promotes land development which is described as secondary circuit of capital 161. Lefebvre terms it as “planning of developers”- ‘They conceive and realize without hiding it, for the market, with profit in mind. What is new and recent is that they are no longer selling housing or buildings, but planning. With or without ideology, planning becomes an exchange value.’ 162.

**Social production of urban space**- Land and property developments take place within the ever expanding metropolitan regions connected to various socio-economic processes on a global scale (Gottdiener 1997). Generally in the 20th century massive expansion of the urban areas in North America had given rise to urban land problems in its collective production and utilization in context of high economic growth. 163 The studies of land development across Atlantic have focused on the form of redevelopment- the creation of new built environment in the dilapidated or deteriorating cores of the cities. Thinning of the core areas and decentralization of functions to suburbia has been happening since the early 1970s to the densification/concentration of activities in the urban centers in the west. 164
Urbanization, Urban Planning and Land Development in the Developing Countries

The developing countries in the second half 20th century, have witnessed rapid expansion of their cities. ‘Megalopolises’ – not only in the developed world but also in the developing world have emerged. The urban problems of the developing world are related to expansion of the cities which have given rise to ‘demand for more utilities, housing, commercial and industrial sites- and with the increasing difficulties raised by the huge areas being incorporated in the metropolis, rather than with the niceties of redevelopment, aesthetic considerations and environmental reclamation’.

Governments in the developing countries design urban land policy objectives depending on wide range of policy tools and institutions to realize them. Planning agencies of the government prepare master plans, zoning regulations, subdivision regulations, building codes, and other public policies to give shape to urban development. The main aim of these regulations is to ‘protect the urban and natural environment, gear infrastructure investments with development, and maintain and enhance property values’ on the one hand and providing land to the poor, controlling land speculation, and land inflation on the other. Policy makers have mostly relied on the nationalization of land, public land development, and highly centralized property registration systems to control and monitor land ownership. They face crisis in land-use planning and regulations. The crisis is at the two levels- one at the level of logistics of planning and the other at the level of the state and its plan operationalizing institutions. The plans follow the ‘comprehensive approaches’ which are formulated on the basis of long-established paradigm of “survey- analysis-evaluation-plan-implement” model that evolved earlier in developed countries. This planning model is critiqued for being ‘technocratic, time-consuming, and rigid in terms of its procedures’. Planning models, commonly termed as ‘master plans’ which concentrate on physical planning have been termed as failures for the reasons that-

[T]hey are too static; place too much emphasis on detailed layouts and zoning of supposed future land use; take too long and cost too much to prepare; don’t offer guidance on the phasing or techniques of implementation; and ignore the costs, financing, or prioritization of proposals and seldom consider the city’s real economic potential. But most importantly, these planning approaches do not consider actual economic demands for space – they ignore the capacity of households and businesses to pay for land and properties.
Parastatal organizations carry out land development in developing countries with the aim of realizing three objectives: to make provision for land and housing at reasonable prices to low and moderate income households; to prevent private developers from appropriating valorized land with infrastructure provisions which enhance its value; and to provide for the important but risky projects undertaken by the state. It is assumed that land developed by the agencies would benefit low and moderate income households and public land development agencies are efficient. Though goals enunciated are supposed to be good but the success rate of these goals has been minimal. What are the reasons underlying such failures? Lowder (1993) observes:

Popular perception in Third World cities as to what planning can achieve ranges from a naïve faith that it can set aside land for low income residential use, to a cynical belief that planners are elites who design cities for other elites into which the rest of society must fit as best it can. The latter could be considered a succinct summary of the most ‘efficient’ socio-spatial ordering, if the role of the planner in a capitalist society be “confined to the task of defining and attempting to achieve a ‘successful’ ordering of the built environment” (Harvey, 1985, p. 165). Many Third World authorities proclaim their inability to serve their impoverished citizens to the extent of omitting the presence of unplanned districts from city maps. This is the logical outcome when the supportive ideology justifying and legitimising planning is shaped by a minority whose perceptions of and desires for the built environment rarely match those of the mass of the urban population, as is the case in societies where power and/or resources are very unevenly distributed.

Response of State is viewed as ‘reactive’ within the context of increasing social imbalances. The reactions have varied from ‘repression to upholding existing processes, through tire coopting of the few, to the integration of the many by some mechanism which widens access to land.’ In response, poor people resort to ‘civil disobedience – in the form of land invasions, squatting and illegal development – [which] is the only course left to the masses.’ The kind of physical subjugation of the masses not only strongly indicates the monetary cost but much more significantly is characterized by the ‘lack of legitimation’ of land development process within wider society. Under these conditions, to seek legitimacy for the legal land development process, majority of the states have sought ‘integrative measures’ to extend access to land to poorer people by relaxing procedures, extending the repayment period, reducing the eligibility criteria for credit, subsidies, etc. Nevertheless such measures cannot be easily be adopted by the state, because the profit margins of landowners, producers and builders would only indicate ‘scarcity and exclusivity’ of developed land, given the large number of intermediaries at various levels and, urban planners and local government involved in the process.
What has been the nature of urban expansion, planning, and land development in India? In Indian, post-independence period ushered new developments in a new era of urban expansion. Some of the major characteristics of Indian urbanization are- i. After partition refugees from Pakistan migrated to Delhi, Punjab, Haryana and to some extent to Western Uttar Pradesh. From East Pakistan refugees migrated to Calcutta, Assam, and Tripura which had an effect on the growth of the cities. ii. New State capitals like Chandigarh, Bhubaneshwar, Gandhinagar, etc., were created. iii. With the establishment of industries, several new industrial cities Rourkela, Durgapur, Bhilai, Bokaro, etc. like refinery towns like, Barauni, Noomati, Haldia, and Ankleshwar, etc.; fertilizer industries towns like Sindri, Mitrapuri, Nayanangal, etc port towns like Kandla have expanded rapidly. iv. Metropolitanization is one of the chief characteristics of Indian urbanization. There has been a rapid growth of cities with a population of more than a million. Due to the growth of the metropolitan areas the importance of small towns has been diminishing. v. There has been a rapid growth of slums in the urban centers and settlements on public or private lands. The expansion of the metropolitan areas has led to the growth of the rural-urban fringe. By 1991 25% of India’s population lived in urban areas and in 2001 27% of the population lived in the urban areas. In 1991 cities with a population over a million were 23 and by 2001 the number had increased to 35. The number of cities with population of over 5 million was 4 – Calcutta, Bombay, Delhi, and Madras – in 1991 and by 2001 it increased to 6 with Bangalore and Hyderabad joining the ranks.

The post-independence planning of the economy had significant effect on the growth and development of the cities. Planned large-scale public sector industries with the coexistence of private enterprises and privatized agriculture found significant amounts of investments. This influenced the development of small agricultural marketing towns and a few primate cities. In the states which were formed newly where primate cities did not exist, state governments took initiatives to ‘construct from scratch the architecture and infrastructure for monumental capitals, leading to planned cities such as Bhubaneswar in Orissa…Chandigarh in Punjab’. Significant aspect of the urbanization process in India has been the metropolitanization of cities. Industrial plants set up by both central and state governments hastened the growth of urban peripheries and industrial colonies, along with interstitial slums encouraging rural migration and an ‘informal economy’. Suburbanization in the major cities did not
reflect any major changes in the neighbourhood formation which transcend the class, caste, and religious barriers. Urban growth is viewed as ‘disharmonious’ and ‘imbalanced’ as very few cities absorb continuously the majority of the migrant population.

Town planning has been one of the major features in the post-independence period to come to terms with the expanding cities. Institutional support of both central and state governments provided to form metropolitan region development authorities across the country which gave scope for the growth of huge urban agglomerations. Thought and practice of urban planning in the first forty years of post-independence period was borrowed from the British system. The plans conceived in the 1940s for the spatial organization of County of London and Greater London for the stretch of 100 sq. kms. was adopted. Planning involved the setting up of a green belt which ‘separated the inner city from a suburban ring of new towns; it included the ‘urban survey’ developed by Patrick Geddes that related spatial organization to variables researched through interdisciplinary teams. The London plans rested on a premise of urban containment and relocation of population from the inner city to extensions of old towns and to new satellite towns, with ring roads handling suburban transportation issues. The main tool of the planner was the master plan or comprehensive development plan that plotted zones for intended land use. Further developments included the legal and organizational support/base with the enactment of the ‘Model Town Planning Act’ and setting up of the ‘Central Regional and Urban Planning Commission’ (later named as the Town and Country Planning Organisation). Later ‘parastatal’ authorities were created at the state levels for the state governments to control urban development and the service provisions.

Parastatal agencies in India are responsible in expanding city and civic services by allocating various land uses. These agencies have taken on the roles of planning and producing residential extensions, industrial zones, commercial zones, open spaces, parks, etc. Over a period of time, the growth and development of Delhi provides an example of such a process. Earliest of such a process is illustrated by Bose (1980) in the first two decades of the post-independence period. The expansion of Delhi was taking place through urban sprawl in both planned (legal) and unplanned (illegal) manner for various purposes. Land development was contingent on speculation.
Expansion of the city has been taking place by absorbing villages and their lands into its fold. Land acquisition has been part of the urban planning. Over a period of time village lands have been procured by the acquisition process for development, for various urban uses. This had the “negative” impact- i. of spawning number of ‘semi-planned’ and ‘unplanned’ housing colonies “without any civic authorization by unscrupulous real estate developers to the unsuspecting middle class…Subsequently ‘authorized’ on political consideration, they continue to be planners’ nightmare”; and, ii. private lands of the villages have been used by the single family tenements which are heterogeneous in character whereas the village pockets have remained intact with old houses and homogeneous communities. The way of coming to terms with these growths and developments was to bringing them into the urban planning fold. Policies and the master plans addressed the question of the urban villages by taking note of their livelihood questions and uncertain future. It was suggested to relocate the rural activities on the fringe of the city which was ‘impractical and condescending’. Land acquisition for the expansion of the city in itself became important since it was considered an administrative, legal and managerial issue. None of the objectives of tackling the uncertain future of villages was implemented. Adaptation of the village communities with lack of skills and orientation towards urban life complicates the problem despite being adequately compensated for land acquisition. From the point of view of the socio-economic and ecological organization, they get transformed into slums. The employment in the villages takes them to the informal sector.

The causes of the expansion of the city in the post independence period have been because of two major factors: in-migration and natural population growth. Governmental planning has been involved in the land development process directly with monopoly over the acquisition and supply of the developed land. Other kinds of developments taken up by the government are- building of flats to sell them to private households of different income groups, allotment of housing plots to the private households and housing co-operative societies, relocation and resettlement schemes for slum dwellers and squatters on the periphery of the cities. Notwithstanding all the planning interventions in the land developments, there have been the developments of new squatter settlements and unauthorized colonies. The main reason for the ‘undesirable’/‘unplanned’ developments has been the shortage in supply of land and housing to all the sections. Linked to this problem is the constant demographic pressure
on the city, exclusion of private sector in the land development process. The adoption of high standards of development and construction by the Master Plan has favoured a model of elitist urbanism, at the expense of the housing needs of the majority of lower income groups.\textsuperscript{184}

Given the kind of land development process, one could observe that the realities in the developing countries – demographic pressure, inadequate governmental investments, inappropriate planning frameworks, ideas and practices, adhoc/piecemeal solutions, etc. – characterize urbanization, urban planning and land development. Administrative or legal classifications or categorizations of the existing and emerging urban spaces – in terms legal or illegal, authorized or unauthorized, etc. – seem to be transitional and temporary. Concerned authorities negotiate with such a process mediated by political interventions and other extraneous considerations\textsuperscript{185} Regularization process of the unauthorized layouts is a case in point. It is nothing but rationalization as one would see later in the context of Bangalore’s land development process too.

**Review of Literature on Bangalore City**

Bangalore is one such city which has graduated over a period of time from a small town to an expanding metropolitan region. Bangalore city during the last two hundred years has evolved into a ‘Garden City’, ‘Industrial City’, ‘Science City’, ‘Silicon Valley’, etc. Except its garden city image, all other images have been expanding through times. These images indicate different expanding legacies of various regimes of the past into the present. Today all these images circulate on various occasions or on the same occasion when one talks about the city.

There are some studies of the expanding Bangalore city and its constitutive parts. However, our concern in this work is to explore the socio-spatial dimensions of the development process and the land development process which is fundamental to the urbanization process. Fazlul Hasan’s (1970) work\textsuperscript{186} chronologically lists the political and cultural events that made the city of Bangalore since its inception into the twentieth century. The work traces the development and expansion from the earlier times to the present times. Janaki Nair’s (1998) work\textsuperscript{187} titled *Miners and Millhands* maps the
The ecological structure of a city is a product of social, economic and locational characteristics of its inhabitants and their activities. The structure is stratified because the households of similar socio-economic status and similar activities tend to cluster at various locations in the city, and the locations are determined by social, economic, and historical factors. The end result is a tripartite structure: a combination of “zones”, “sectors”, and “nuclei”. Thus, a city’s ecological structure tends to be characterized by both socio-isomorphism and spatial stratifications/segregation.

The work profiles the socio-economic characteristics of the inhabitants – in terms of caste, income, employment, education, – at one level, and at another other
level, it attempts to fit these socio-economic characteristics of the population densities by identifying the process of ‘clustering’ and ‘segregation’ spatially in multiple zones. Apart from that, the work, details the pattern of spatial expansion pattern. Bangalore is characterized as a Garden City and Industrial City.

The intra-city dynamics, spatially, is explained in terms of the concentration of the population into trifocal centres- K.R. Market (Central Business District), Vidhana Soudha (Administrative Centre) and Russell Market (Business Centre).

The city’s ecological structure was found to be not simple…but complex: middle class city centre and both high status and low status periphery. The outward moving periphery left behind old peripheries and constituted a distinct intermediary zone in the ecological zone, with high congestion, concentration of trading castes and Lingayats [a caste], wholesale and retail trade, household industry, high percentage of women workers, and high residential migrant ratio. They city core had the maximum centripetal pull and dominance over the periphery mainly due to the concentration of work places, financial institutions, shopping areas, educational institutions, transport terminals, hospitals, and recreational and cultural centres.

Social mobility, in Bangalore city, is seen as the function of caste and the occupation-income structure which corresponds with the ‘traditional’ hierarchical social structure in terms of differences in education, occupation and income, for different castes and between different generations. The high status households shifted from intermediary and periphery, while low status households shifted from intermediary and periphery to core. The movement from core and periphery to intermediary consisted of mixed status groups.

This spatial formation and expansion of the city is mediated by the dynamics of demographic growth in migration and industrialization. The spatial expansion of Bangalore city is ‘characterized by residential leap frogging and residential infilling with ribbon shopping centres and commercial land-uses (phase 1), industrial leap frogging and residential infilling along and across the major transport routes (phase 2), and leapfrogging of institutional and industrial complexes and infilling of residential layouts (phase 3).’ Periphery has grown faster due to the development of migrant settlements.

There has been a long pause in the production of significant works on Bangalore city between The Structure of an Indian Metropolis... and recently published works- Network City- Planning the Information Society in Bangalore (2004) and The
Promise of the Metropolis- Bangalore’s Twentieth Century (2005). James Heitzman’s (2004) Network City traces the evolution of Bangalore city during various regimes with different kinds of ‘development’ – mainly planning – agendas and expanding constituents of the city on the one hand, and the underlying politics, in making of the city through times, on the other. By the end of the 20th century Bangalore had entered a new phase of development with the introduction of new economic policy. In that context of rapid transition from a relatively state controlled economy towards a liberal economy took place through new mode of ‘networking’ and ‘information flows’. The analysis of the role of governmental institutions and non-governmental organizations – Bangalore Mahanagara Palike (BMP), Bangalore Development Authority (BDA), Bangalore Metropolitan Development Authority (BMRDA), Bangalore Agenda Task Force (BATF- a conglomerate of governmental institutions, NGOs and Corporate Groups), CIVIC (NGO), etc., – and their organizational strategies and network of participatory planning and implementation in developing the city at the material level- in terms of infrastructure and services, demonstrated the new mode of development. The work takes note of the shift in the policy of the governing and planning institutions through new mode of networking strategies, for various inputs from NGOs, Corporate groups, private institutions like consultants, funding agencies- both national and international, individuals, etc.

Given this context, Network City explores the emerging approach and practice of ‘governance’ while tracing more than hundred years history and evolution of local self government through various Acts, Constitutional Amendments and modalities of reservations for Scheduled Castes and Tribes, Backward Classes and Women at various levels- national, regional and local. Towards the end of the century, involvement of NGOs and access to information in the governance process at local municipal level was appreciated. The nascent middle class ‘municipal socialism’- the NGO movement of participation, centered on system of ‘collective consumption’ and municipal services, are described. Finally the work deals with the informational city at two levels- one of Bangalore ‘becoming’ the Silicon Valley and two a technopole, within the context of the nature of the production and diffusion of knowledge through various scientific research and educational institutions over a period of time, and its uses/consequences- for industry, diffusion of information for various- institutions, organizations, etc.,
The Promise of the Metropolis covers a much wider expanse of issues and themes – planning, aesthetics, architecture, language, gender, etc. – with regard to the continuities and discontinuities and moments in the city’s growth and development, and multiple meanings it acquires in the context of social, economic, and political processes through the past to the present. Different political claims and cultural – ‘symbolic’ and ‘real’ – meanings attached to various spaces in Bangalore’s evolution are exhaustively explored. Of interest to us are the issues and conflicts over urban planning, law, and land development.

As we have seen the planning generally has stood as a technocratic exercise in most of the scenarios devoid of any social, political, and economic considerations which are viewed as extraneous to planning. Existence of and ever growing unauthorized constructions, revenue layouts, gramthana sites and slums are viewed as the evidence. In Bangalore’s context as anywhere else exactly there have been forces which have subverted the planning. There have been the advocates who identified problems in the effective implementation of various plans. Advocacy ranges from those who emphasize different aspects for more planning on the one hand and on the other arguments are for less planning. Advocates of intensive planning emphasize the following aspects: i. Stricter ‘enforcement of zoning regulations and building bye-laws to curb unwieldy growth. ii. One has to take into account the socio-economic forces and the development of the countryside otherwise the planning would be merely a ‘political administrative ritual’ iii. Emphasis on participation of the ‘locally relevant’ groups iv. Multiplicity of laws have been impeding the physical planning and the economic role of city should to be considered in the broader context of region, state and nation. v. social planning emphasis which is the ‘intuitive and experiential knowledge of communities’. On the advocates of limited planning fault the ‘master planning’ because it does not make space for the ‘local economies’. ‘Tiny and small enterprises’ which constitute local economies find space and thrive in the unplanned areas and illegal layouts. Master planning indirectly encourages the dualistic nature of spatial formation by illegalizing their existence, in terms of their land tenures and forced relocation of industries which work to their disadvantage. While master planning makes space at the institutional level for higher income groups and corporate economies, it neglects poorer sections and the economies which support them.
Janaki Nair (2005) argues that the critiques of limited planning have not taken note of ‘heterogeneous composition of the field of power’ and tend to view in simpler dual terms i.e., community against the state. ‘This field is shared by forces that one may distinguish as formal, informal, and illegal. These forces result in arrangements that do not strictly conform to elite/subaltern needs and interests in any simple dichotomous sense, and may even be mutually constitutive.’ Here one is trying to demonstrate that power operates through alignments and in a fragmented manner than in the simpler dual terms. Therefore, Nair sees the need to reveal the way ‘ideology of planning’ negotiates with the ‘complex field of forces’.

At various points in time, planning’s focus in the creation of social space has changed or evolved.

- Planning’s concern in the immediate post-independence period was to create housing for the industrial working classes because of the ‘threat posed by the laboring classes’. In the 1970s it was made mandatory for both government and private industrial enterprises alike, to provide housing for at least 50% of their workers to reduce pressure on housing in the city. Despite all those measures, a large proportion of the industrial working population living in the neighbouring villages, bought the revenue or gramathana sites which were available at affordable rates. There was a pressure from these revenue site-holders for regularization.

- By the 1970s planning’s focus shifted for improving amenities and services, establishment of ring towns and satellite towns, self-contained industrial townships, etc., to avert a ‘metropolitan disaster’ by restricting concentration of population. As a part of a much broader strategy to contain in migration of population, attempts were made to restrict expanding industrialization itself. In this context of changes planning was rethought. Planning was rethought for the emerging middle classes and industrial labour. This had consequences in the way space was to be structured in new ways for a kind of emerging semi-leisure oriented and consumerist society. The plan visualized fashionable shopping complexes, individual houses etc. The production of space for the middle classes by the planning agency did not meet the demand. Housing was to be
realized through the House Building Cooperative Societies and revenue layouts and later the private builder.

- Through the 1980s to the 1990s the socio-spatial structure conceived for planning favoured the middle classes and non-resident Indians (NRIs). The “Dollars Colony” was designed and, also the housing styles and the ‘quality’ of material built environment became a preference supplied by the builder/developer than the BDA’s land or housing. By the late 1990s NRIs and IT workers were claiming the different enclaves insulated/isolated from the main city. Apart from the built environment, whole planning process itself was going through a great change which was geared towards ‘growth’ to attract the foreign investments. In such a context, the alignments between state power and informal and illegal power-networks became accommodative of both the legal and illegal forms of urban space.201

In the chapter on law and the production of urban space, the author says that various constituents in the production of space – law, planning, politics, etc. – most of the times work in collusion with an underlying ‘ideology of private property in land and a market of housing’, though law and planning at times have demonstrated relative autonomy. The laws were formulated to aid a kind of production of space and its provisioning by public agencies on a large scale which would address needs of housing of various social constituents in the city with many of the social concerns like making space for economically weaker sections, SCs/STs, slum dwellers, etc. Thus laws also had another edge of preventing land hoarding or accumulation on larger scales. Circumventing and violation of such laws by both incumbents of the state and its institutions/agencies, and others who have been involved in the land development process has given birth to a greater marketization i.e., it has found its exchange value on a full scale. The discourse while addressing the shortages in the supply of land ultimately points towards the multiplicity of laws than the strict implementation of them.202

Even though there are already a few works on Bangalore, there is still a scope for more intensive studies of different aspects of urban life which have not been covered in the previous works.
The Problem and Its Context

Like most of the growing metropolitan regions in the world, Bangalore too, as an expanding and metropolitan region, has gone through similar phases and different kinds of *industrialization* and in *migration*. The discussion on urbanization of Bangalore in the following chapters would reveal the dramatic shift in its population, spatial expansion, interconnections between regions, nation and other nations during the post-independence period. The last two decades have witnessed the growth and spread of information technology industry in Bangalore. This has been enabled by the incentives given by the government to the information technology industry during this period. But the signs of its prominence came to be felt more during the 1990s. Though it was promoted locally its origins and development were globally determined. Preceding this phase of new industrial growth were phases of governmental industrialization, and private medium and small scale industrialization. In the initial phase, urbanization of Bangalore was directly guided by initiatives at the national level for large scale industrialization. Early industrialization of Bangalore happened in the context of establishment of scientific-institutions in the early part of 20th century initiated by Princely Mysore State. In the following decades, with the large scale industrialization, the subsidiary and ancillary industrial growth also took place. By the 1970s, Bangalore had a mixture of central/public sector, large scale industries, private subsidiary and ancillary industrial units and the emerging informal sector. The textile, automobile, electrical, and electronic industrial units too were based in the city by the 1970s. Apart from these, in the 1970s the governmental initiatives were aiming to create an environment and infrastructure to promote and develop high-technology electronics. The infrastructure created for the technological development gave a fillip to the growth of information technology on a large scale in the last decade of the 20th century, defining Bangalore as the ‘Silicon Valley of India’. The importance that Bangalore acquired now was at the global level and such claims were made repeatedly. For Bangalore to become an ‘industrial city’, planned financial allocations were made at both the national and the regional level to develop different industrial infrastructures. The planned industrial growth was conceived within the mixed economy under which certain strategic sectors of industry were to be developed by the State known as ‘public sector’ and certain other sectors of industrial growth were left to the private sector.
However, the major consequence of growth of industry was the development of linkages for multiple kinds of enterprises and services, and migration of people to the city, leading to the emergence of a metropolis.

Different kinds of industrial growth processes generated different socio-spatial developments. Planned townships were established for the workers of public-sector large scale industrial units. There were separate industrial estates designated by the government to segregate industrial activities from the human habitations. In the recent past new technology parks were setup for the IT industry. In spite of the existence of small scale industries/estates, small scale industrial units have come up in the areas designated for residential use. There have been industries, small scale and household industries found in the illegal and poorer inhabitations. The city had two central business districts in the mid-20th century. Now there are multiple centers. Apart from this we also find commercial malls and branded company sales outlets dotting the main roads of entire Bangalore city.

Residential areas of the city are of different kinds:

- There are residential layouts which were developed by the successive governments’ since the 1880s. There has been continuity in the governmental residential land development.
- Since the 1970s legally planned private housing developments have played an important role in the growth of high rise apartments and in developing land for leading horizontal expansion.
- The legal land development by Housing Cooperatives too has been significant in last four decades though it intensified since the 1980s through to the present times.

The gradual rise in the demand for residential land and the particular kind of development and distribution of the produced space has created asymmetries among people. This through the post-independence period has given way the ‘illegal’/unplanned layouts and termed as ‘slums’. All these clearly indicate the spatialization of mixed economy pattern and its ‘anomalous’ fall outs.
Bangalore which was predominantly an administrative-military town at the dawn of independence has been expanding at a very fast pace spread over hundreds of square kilometers (See Map 1.1). That expandability was facilitated by the processes and strategies of planning and law. The articulations of the need for expandability have been evolving with shifts in emphasis in the context of changing ideas, methods and visions of planning. In a way, all the developments at the local level were contingent on the legalization of space itself and had to be channelized through the coordinated practices of multiple legally instituted planning institutions at various levels. The adopted and amended laws meant for the city, the general laws of the colonial times and the new laws of the post-independence times had to work in broader unity for the integration of spatial planning, the modes of procuring land and the production of useable land for different constituents of urban population of Bangalore.
This process of legalization of land/space works on the principle of exclusion which generates not only the inaccessibility of the developed land to all the city dwellers, but also more importantly renders certain socio-spatial formations as illegal. These illegal/unplanned formations are a challenge to the law/planning, and need to be negotiated. The negotiation takes place through various means: imposition of plan vision on the unplanned space, legalization (in the governmental parlance-regularization) with a fine, and punitive actions, against those who have not adhered to the plan/law prescriptions. It can also lead to clearance/acquisition of such inhabitations, which are generally inhabited by the urban poor. Over a period of time, the government has been setting up various relatively autonomous sub-local
administrative mechanisms and municipal institutions to counter the tendencies of unplanned/illegal expansions and to implement regularization and other measures to acquire land to control the growth of undesired inhabitations. Illegal land development is not always about inaccessibility to developed land. It has been also about illegalities involved in a kind of quasi-legal planned residential land development which operates through the coercive modes of negotiating the procurement of land from its owners and distribution/sharing of land among the illegal members of legally promoted social associations’ viz., house building cooperative societies (HBCS) encouraged by the policies of the government.

Planned land development is completely dependent on the acquisitions of land for ‘public purpose’ by the government or through the government by proving the need of land for ‘public purpose’. In other words, any acquisition of land needs essential provability of ‘public purpose’ irrespective of public/private characteristic of its seekers. The acquisition laws contain undeclared sovereign powers of ‘eminent domain’ and endow it on the governments and its institutions to acquire land compulsorily if required for public purpose. Government generates its absolute powers to acquire lands which presuppose an essentially coercive nature of land acquisition and retribution for it. Generally, though government has absolute powers to acquire lands, there has been a considerable delay in acquisitions due to the disputes arising over issues of compensation. In such a context, the successive phases of land development have been mired in the complexities of faster conversions into unplanned/illegal land developments and built up areas; and consequent lack of availability of land. The reasons for the emergence of unplanned/illegal land development are nominal compensation to the land owners and prolonged process of land acquisition which actually leaves no option to buy property or land. The Government, under these conditions, right from the inception of planning, seeks private land development in a legally planned manner, which is actually a high investment proposition. Consequently it serves people who can afford to pay high price for developed land. Most of the land developments have conceived in terms of public purpose to check speculation about use and exchangeability of land. They are also indicative of Government’s lack of capital to acquire land and its development at the market rates. We see many a conflict between the Government or its bodies which are acquiring land and the land owners, whose land is acquired. The Government seems to be busy in exercising its sovereign
power over the land rather than addressing the concerns of the land losers through a clear cut policy which is mutually acceptable. The laws, by giving the power of land development and distribution at lower prices to the Government, were intended to check speculative investment in land by the private players. Most of employers in the city do not provide housing or house sites for their employees. In this context one can notice different kinds of land development evolving gradually in both planned and unplanned manner within the given dynamic of the fields of- the strategies of urban planning, planning for industrialization, the rural land owners and their life worlds, the dynamics of land market and speculation, etc. The dynamic factors that shape the land development process seem to be making it more challenging. This challenge emerges within the dynamic of state’s domination and interpenetration of interests of various fields. It also would reflect the- nature of alignments, contests- legal and others, competition, conflicts, strategies, adaptations, coercion, rules & laws, erasure, etc. The dynamics of land development seems to be establishing different kinds of heterogeneous spaces in the context of evolving industrial-urban society of legal vs illegal or planned vs unplanned land developments in the expandable order of the city.

**The Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study are:

1. To broadly outline the nature of urbanization of Bangalore over a period time to identify forces which have been structuring the city- industrialization, growth of population, migration and the kinds of social spaces, etc.
2. To understand the role of urban planning in addressing various aspects of urbanization including preparation of master plans taking into consideration increasing demand for different land uses, housing and slums and land development activities to secure land for various uses. An attempt will be made to trace the history of urban planning in Bangalore which includes planners’ vision of the city and strategies/methods adopted in tackling various urban issues. Attempts will also be made to study in detail the entire process of land development which includes different actors involved, nature of land developments and their consequences during the post independence period.
3. To understand the nature of laws and legal processes/strategies that underpin urban planning which is contingent on the procurement of land and the disputes arising out of it and their resolution within the complexities involved and their consequences for different kinds of land losing people.

4. To illustrate the spatial aspects of planning and legal processes/strategies and the responses from the locals, in two villages of Bangalore city namely, Jaraganahalli and Bilekahalli. These villages are representational of the processes of different kinds of land developments and social processes involved in the structuring and restructuring of the city.

**Methodology**

In this study, the research methods used are documentary research, surveys and participant observation. Documentary research is the systematic use of printed or written materials for investigation. A large number of published reports and records from the following offices were consulted.

1. Bangalore City Corporation: Administrative reports
2. Bangalore Development Authority: Comprehensive Development Plans, Administrative Reports, Maps and Records pertaining to formation of layouts
3. Directorate of Census Operations: Census Volumes
5. Karnataka High Court: Reported cases related to Bangalore and its land
6. IIM, Bangalore and ISEC Bangalore: Published works on Bangalore.

The study has treated the descriptions in various documents from their own points of view and has attempted to discover their epistemologies to explain the processes and phenomenon of the city expansion, planning and land development. These above catalogued materials represent the claims of administrative, legal, technical, academic, quasi-academic, etc., sources to make sense of the city with their own aims and purposes. These materials are produced by mostly the institutions of the states, though each of these institutions has relative autonomy. Knowledge of the city produced by the state, the institutions and planning bodies reflects how planners view
the city, its design, aesthetics and its socio-economic components. Generally discourses and practices generated by the state are most powerful than others. These discourses provide an overall framework and therefore analysis would result in discovering the underlying principles. The observations and classifications of space, population, laws, etc., were reexamined and adopted as it is many a time as indicators of a process or phenomenon, and wherever it was inadequate reclassifications were attempted to gain accuracy in the observations while using the given facts.

These researchable materials represent different types of data sets, but each of it, many a time, contains general information which is common to all the sets. The chapter on urbanization draws its information and facts from diverse sources of published books and articles, data extracts from Census of India pertaining to Bangalore city, BCC administrative reports, etc. The chapter on planning mainly relies on the post-independence period planning documents prepared by various committees, BDA, and the government. The chapter on legal processes finds its information and legal articulation from various general laws, acts, and rules, and majorly from the reported cases in the journals of the post-independence period. The chapter on strategies of land development draws its sources from the fieldwork done for the study.

To explore the kinds of land developments in the places, one had to choose the areas in Bangalore city. For the purpose the two places/villages- Jaraganahalli and Bilekahalli were chosen for the study. The rationale in selecting the places for the study are the following: (a) Planners by the 1970s had identified Bannerghatta Road and Kanakapura road for developments. Hitherto industrial growth was concentrated along the national and state highways in the north, west and east connecting the city. So the planners had felt that there was a need to allow industries to spread and grow in all directions. Therefore, the growth was to be concentrated along the highways in southern Bangalore (RCDP, 1976: 7-8). This phase of development of Bangalore has drawn our attention because Bilekahalli and Jaraganahalli (the former villages) which are situated along the above said main roads are adjacent to the city. Land developments, thus started taking shaping during 1970s and happened in many ways as we would see later. (b) These two places are representational of different dominant modes of land development. Bilekahalli has been part of two landmark legal disputes of land acquisition. They are *Narayan Raju v State of Karnataka & others (1988)* and
Narayana Reddy & Another v State of Karnataka and Others (1991). The former dispute clearly specified the sovereign rights and privileges of the Government in land acquisition and the latter showed that government-promoted legal cooperativism in land acquisition and development was generating widespread and large scale illegalities and were exploitative in nature as revealed in GVK Rao, Report (1988). Bilekahalli’s lands were acquired for different kinds of land acquisition in four phases for different purposes which are representational of different kinds of land developments. Other villages in the surrounding areas have not undergone such diverse developments. Jaraganahalli, typifies private small-scale land developments considered illegal, but presents an alternative to government-fashioned land developments. These places were villages before the village panchayats were abolished in the early 1980s surrounded by agricultural lands. Jaraganahalli is situated beside Kanakapura Main Road\(^{205}\), it is about ten kilometres from the business district Krishnaraja Market. Bilekahalli is situated on Bannerghatta Road\(^{206}\), eleven kilometres away from the city and is Russell Market/Cantoment Area.

The general categorizations like ‘authorized’ or ‘unauthorized’ or ‘legal’ or ‘illegal’ do not give a coalescent picture of the socio-spatial formations of the planning which characterize the city expansion as ‘outgrowths’. Before choosing the areas in the southern part of part of Bangalore city for the study, the pilot study was taken up. Broadly, the census and planning documents had given the indication of the existence of authorized and unauthorized settlements, planned developments, mixed land uses, etc., of the southern part of Bangalore city as anywhere else. During the last quarter of 20\(^{th}\) century southern part of Bangalore has experienced greater expansion. After the development of Jayanagar (mainly a residential areas) one of the largest residential, commercial and institutional areas, in the south during the third quarter of the last century, the expansion of the city saw the development of residential areas of Koramangala, Byrasandra-Thavarekere-Madivala in the south east, Jayaprakash Narayannagar (previously known as Sarrakki layout, now named as J.P. Nagar), and the growth of Banashankari during last quarter of the 20th century. These areas have been expanding over a period of time in phases as planned by the Bangalore Development Authority. Apart from the planned residential areas, there has been the growth of unauthorized layouts, small industrial areas, slums, house building cooperative societies, smaller commercial areas, etc. The ribbon developments along Kanakapura
Road and Bannerghatta Road had begun during the 1960s and continued in 1970s. By the mid-1990s many areas developed without any institutional legitimacy adjacent to the planned areas. Village settlements expanded and their reserved lands and unacquired lands became the source for new developments. From their point of view of planning this had reached unmanageable proportions, even the regularization process initiated for more than a decade and to plan the already developed areas well beyond fringes of the city, City Municipal Councils were established. In that process, the southern developments were included within the Bommanahalli City Municipal Council\textsuperscript{207}. 
Map 1.2

Bommanahalli City Municipal Council
Fieldwork for the study was conducted during 2002-2003. Sarakki, Sarakki Gardens, Jaraganahalli and Bilekahalli were narrowed down for the pilot study. Initial inquiries among random sample of fifteen respondents in each of the places was done. The investigation was about the land ownership and respondents involvement in different kinds of land developments and legal disputes. The pilot survey of Sarakki revealed that the former village pocket had already developed and most of its village lands had been acquired for the planned residential development and the rest had been developed into private/unplanned layouts. These Developments had taken place through the 1970s. Legal disputes were about enhancement of compensation and it was between the land acquiring agencies and the land owners. Sarakki Gardens were earlier homestead gardens. Since the late 1970s and through the 1980s they were converted into a residential private layout. Jaraganahalli and Bilekahalli began developing in 1970s. They typically represent more diverse kinds of developments – BDA planned layouts, housing building activities by HBCS, private housing estates, small private layouts, small-scale industrial areas, etc. – than the other two places. And these two places represent a kind of transition into new forms of spatial formation. Therefore Jaraganahalli and Bilekahalli were finally chosen for the study. They later became a part of the study became part of the ribbon developments initially and part of large-scale developments covering the whole of the village lands. What is significant about these places? Jaraganahalli represents dominantly the unplanned spatial formation, whereas Bilekahalli represents dominantly a planned spatial formation. Both of them are a mix of both the kinds of developments. Within the old village pockets, a survey was undertaken to identify the natives of the village, land ownership, legal disputes, different kinds of land development, etc.

At Bilekahalli, according to census taken up by the researcher for the survey in the year 2002 total of 350 households were residing in the old village. Of the 350 households 180 were the old native inhabitants and the remaining were migrants. Of the 180 households 112 belonged to Thigala caste, 52 to Adi-Karnataka, 6 to Gowda/Vokkaliga, 2 each to Mudaliar, Bestharu Golla, Bale-banajiga, and two did not reveal their caste. Given the nature of heterogeneous population and since most the villagers were involved in the land development process at one level or the other, stratified sampling was made to choose equal number of respondents from each caste group for detailed interviews. Total number of 90 old native inhabitant caste households (50%)
were finally sampled for interviews. Within each caste group random sampling was made for detailed interviews. Interview schedule was prepared for gathering further information/data which could be seen in the appendix at the end. Apart from that, many a time, general discussions with the old inhabitants at the Ashwatkatte (the village banyan tree with its deities and the platform- a religious and a common meeting place) and Veerabhadraswamy Devasthanada Katte (front portion of Veerabhadraswamy temple platform- a religious and a common meeting place) yielded some information on the changes taking place in the villages and its environment. Many respondents shared their old documents and information, and one of them had even maintained a small archive of the happenings in the village with regard to acquisitions, court proceedings, petitions to various officials, press clippings, etc. I had access to them.

At Jaraganahalli, according to census survey conducted in the year 2002, a total of 450 households were residing in the old village. Of the 450 households, 160 were the old inhabitants and the remaining were migrants. Of the 160 households, 126 belonged to Thigala caste, 2 each belonged to Adi-Karnataka, Bale-banajiga, Brahmans, Ganiga, Sadaru, and Agasa, 4 to Golla, 4 each belonged to Golla, Reddy, and Lingayat, and 10 to Achary Viswakarma. Given the nature of heterogeneous population and since most the villagers were involved in the land development process at one level or the other, stratified sampling was made to choose the equal number of respondents from each caste group for detailed interviews. Within each caste group random sampling was made for detailed interviews. Total number of 90 old native inhabitant caste households (50%) were finally sampled for interviews. Interview guide/schedule was prepared for gathering further information/data which could be seen in the appendix at the end.
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13 M. Gottdiener and Leslie Budd. Key Concepts in Urban Studies, p. 84.


18 Ibid: p. 124. Althusserian historical-materialist framework is employed to understand the urban socio-spatial forms. Briefly, it meant, “the historical articulation of several modes of production. By mode of production... [it is] the particular matrix of
combinations of the fundamental instances (systems of practices) of the social structure: essentially the economic, the politico-institutional and ideological. The economic, namely the way in which the ‘worker’, with the help of certain means of production, transforms nature (object of labour) in order to produce the commodities necessary for social existence, determines, in the final resort, a particular form of the matrix, that is to say, the laws of the mode of production. The combinations and transformations between the different systems and elements of structure are brought about by the mediation of the social practices, that is to say, by the action of men, determined by their particular location in the structure thus defined” (ibid: 125).

19 Ibid, 234.
21 Ibid, p. 115.
22 In ancient Greek polis and in the medieval cities the foundation of urban unit was politico-juridical apparatus, whereas in advanced capitalism, metropolitan regions are constituted prominently by economic instance than anything else (ibid: 235).
24 Manuel Castells The Urban Question, p. 261.
26 M. Gottdiener. The Social Production of Urban Space, pp. 118-119. See ibid: pp. 118-120, for extended polemical critique of the Castells’ idea of ‘crisis’ and ‘social pathology’ enunciated by Chicago School, insistence on the specificity of the ‘urban’, etc.
27 Ibid, p. 123.
30 Henri Lefebvre. The Production of Space, p. 85.
32 Lefebvre as quoted in M. Gottdiener. The Social Production of Urban Space, p. 127
33 Ibid, p. 126.
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37 Henri Lefebvre. The Production of Space, p. 325.
38 Henri Lefebvre. The Production of Space, pp. 325-326.
43 Henri Lefebvre 1996, Writings on Cities, p. 69.
44 Ibid, p. 76.
46 For Lefebvre, the nature of class strategy operates in the manner following: “Urban order thus decomposes into two stages: individual and owner-occupied houses and housing estates. But there is no society without order, signified, perceptible legible on the ground. Suburban owner-occupied detached houses and housing estates. This opposition tends to constitute a system of significations still urban even into de-urbanization. Each sector defines itself (by and in the consciousness of the inhabitants) in
relation to the other, against the other. The inhabitants themselves have little consciousness of the internal order of their sector, but
the people from the housing estates see and perceive themselves as not being dwellers. This is reciprocal. At the heart of this
opposition the people of the housing estates entrench themselves into the logic of the habitat and the people of owner-occupied
houses entrench themselves into the make-believe of habitat. For other it is the presence of the dream, of nature health, apart from
the bad and unhealthy city. But the logic of the habitat is only perceived in relation to make-believe, and make-believe in relation
to logic. People represent themselves to themselves by what they are lacking or believe to be lacking. In this relationship, the
imaginatory has more power. It overdetermines logic: the fact of inhabiting is perceived by reference to the owner-occupation of
detached dwellings. These dwellers regret the absence of a spatial logic which the people of the housing estates regret not knowing
the joys of living in a detached house...What should be noted is that consciousness of the city and of urban reality is dulled for one
or the other, so as to disappear...The suburbs are urban, within a dissociated morphology, the empire of separation and scission
between the elements of what had been created as unity and simultaneity“ (Lefebvre 1996: 80).

47 Ibid, p. 79.
52 Ibid, pp. 307-308.
60 Ibid, p. 11.
61 Ibid, pp. 11-12. Investments in science and technology are to revolutionize productive forces in society to increase production. The investments on labour reproduction are materialized in the form of investments in education, health, etc., for qualitative improvement and on the investments in co-option, integration, repression of labour force by ideological, military and other means (ibid: 12).
62 Ibid, p. 15.
63 Ibid, pp. 15-16.
64 Ibid, pp. 16-17.
68 Ibid, p. 102.
70 Ibid, p. 135.
Marc Los 1981, “Some Reflexions on Epistemology, Design and Planning Theory”. In *Urbanization and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society*, Micheal Dear (et.al.), London/New York: Methuen. The interest in the planning theory has had many origins. Marc Los traces it to ‘the desire of practicing planners to give a meaning and some usefulness to their role in society’. ‘Academic planners’ felt the need to comprehend the connection between methodology and theories of planning, actual planning practice as related to planning education, ‘the need felt by some planners to improve by means of planning the distribution of power in society’, and the need for the critical or radical view of planning practice and the theory and method (ibid: 63).

Peter Hall. 2002. *Urban and Regional Planning*. London/New York: Routledge. Peter Hall defines ‘planning as a general activity…[in] making of an orderly sequence of action that will lead to the achievement of a stated goal or goals. Its main techniques will be written statements, supplemented as appropriate by statistical projections, mathematical representations, quantified evaluations and diagrams illustrating relationships between different parts of the plan. It may, but need not necessarily, include physical blueprints of objects’ (ibid: 3). The ‘subject matter’ of planning includes whichever the object is to be planned, which includes the ‘process of planning’ the object and in ‘the way we assume control over physical and human matter, and process it to serve their defined ends’ (ibid: 5).

Geddes was influenced by French Sociologist P. G. F. le Play’s work which emphasized the “intimate and subtle relationships which existed between human settlement and the land, through the nature of the local economy” (Hall 1996: 49). Given that framework, Geddes based his study by observing ‘reality’ by ‘close analysis of settlement patterns and local economic environment’ and the expansion of the cities in their regions with the suburban growth which was first time termed as conurbations or agglomerations. Geddes’ approach to urban-region gave ‘planning a logical structure’ (ibid: 49).

System planning fashioned on the basis of the ideas derived from the latest science of the times- ‘cybernetics’. Though the subject matter of urban planning remained the same, the derived aspects of the cybernetics were to bring changes in the way existing knowledge was to be organized about the wide range of phenomena. “Its central notion is that many such phenomena – whether they are social, economic, biological or physical in character – can usefully be viewed as complex interacting systems...[with] their different parts can be separated, and the interactions between them can be analysed. Then, by introducing appropriate control mechanisms, the behavior of the system can be altered in specific ways, to achieve certain objective on the part of the controller” (Hall 1996: 229). Systems planning was not without critique. The critique concentrated on the planning decisions made, had to face unpredictable results due to the uncertainties created by the external environment and knowledge of it was inadequate viz., kinds of pollution; planning decisions might go wrong because of the complex interrelationships between various levels of the planning systems and the interrelationships between various elements at various levels in a given planning situation viz., the local priorities might not match with the regional or national level priorities of planning decisions; preparation of the complex planning takes years, but human values change faster so there is a gap between the two; and there is conflict between different sets of
values (ibid: 242-244). That apart, ‘planning decisions are political in nature’. ‘Unfortunately, as is well known, political decision-making is a highly imperfect art. Ordinary people are given the choice of voting every four or five years for a national government, and perhaps every three years [in India it remains to be five years at local level too] for a local government; in either case, they must vote on a confusing bundle of different policies, in which planning issues are well down the list…Pressure groups may achieve effective action on particular issues, but they tend to be formed and populated disproportionately by those groups in society that are better educated, better informed and better organized – which, in most cases, also means richer.’ (ibid: 245).


100 Ibid: pp. 33-34.
101 Ibid: p. 35.
102 Ibid: pp. 36-38.
103 Ibid: p. 43.
104 Ibid: p. 44.
105 “Here, each house would be surrounded by an acre of land, enough to grow crops on; the homes would be connected by superhighways, giving easy and fast travel by car in any direction. Along these highways he proposed a planned roadside civilization, in which the petrol (‘gas’) station would grow naturally into the emporium for a whole area; thus he anticipated the out-of-town shopping centre some twenty years before it actually arrived in North America… In fact, Wright’s description of Broadacre City proved to be an uncannily accurate picture of the typical settlement form of North America after the Second World War – except that today the big 1/2-acre or 1-acre (0.2–0.4 ha) lots grow very little food to support their families. The form developed without the underlying social basis that Wright so devoutly hoped for” (ibid: pp. 44-45).

106 Ibid: 48-49.
107 Ibid: 45.
110 Ibid: pp. 53-54.
111 Scientific epistemology was based on “the notion that it was scientific, in the sense that the world could be completely understood and its future states predicted; the notion that planning could be value-free, in that the planner could disinterestedly determine what was best for society; the notion that the planner was planning for a society that was a homogenous aggregate, in which the welfare of the entire people was to be maximized, without too much concern with distributional questions; and the notion that the task of planning was to come to terms with – which, in practice, meant adapting to – the facts of rapid growth and change” (Hall 1996: 246).

112 Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning formulated in the context of protests against racial discrimination in the USA and the subsequent specification by the US Supreme Court for equal protection by laws of all the citizens and the host of welfare measures, initiative adopted by the US congress.

113 Ibid, p. 212.
114 Ibid: 212.
115 Ibid: 212.
The “public reasoning” that accepts, the participation of all members of the political community and their argumentation which generates source of knowledge to arrive at solutions. Such participation would be a “better” argument for justification for the actions and solutions. Involved in the process are the diverse sources of social and intellectual capital, the deconstruction of the different kinds of language/discourse to unravel the hidden values in understanding and their power (Healey 2003: 238-239).

This articulation was influenced by Habermas’ concerns of reconstructing public realm which more fully reflects the range of our ways of knowing and reasoning than the narrow diminished world of instrumental rationality and the dominant interests of economic and bureaucratic power. He shows us that we are not autonomous subjects competitively pursuing our individual preferences, but that our sense of ourselves are socially constructed through our communication and in collaboration with others (Healey 2003: 239).

The communicative approach to planning spatial strategy moves away from the different kinds of language/discourse to unravel the hidden values in understanding and their power (Healey 2003: 238-239).
contradiction and conflict which drives various actors to explore the need to reflect on what they are doing, that they need to work with different people, that they need to evolve different processes. Significant among the critical resources is the ’capacity to read the cracks, to see the opportunities for doing things differently, and to be able to widen crack into a real potential for change’ (ibid: 244). In this connection the role of “leaders” from different institutional settings and relationships becomes important to make ‘an acute sense of the relation between the structural dynamics of local economic, social, and political relations and how the same manifests in what particular people in a place are bothered about’ (ibid: 244).

133 ibid, p. 246.

134 Such different expressions – as metaphors and images – are significant since they carry meaning within the particular meaning understood by placing it within the particular cultural frame of reference. Thus the planners should be sensitive to intercultural communication and local knowledge (Healey 2003: 247).

135 A ‘key quality of inclusionary strategic argumentation’ is the capacity to keep under explicit review the various ways the members of a political community describe, to each other, both themselves, and the others of significance to them, as they engage in discussion. This needs to be accompanied by the ability to maintain active respect and appreciation for those members who for one reason or another are “not present” (Healey 2003: 247).

136 What leads to development of a new discourse with new diverse understandings by exploring different ‘story lines’ ‘who belongs in a story’ and ‘acknowledging what is ignored in a strategy and why’, by the way of critique one would take into account the ‘explicit approach to conflict resolution’. To begin with, right to challenge the consensus built and such challenges that could be redeemed by creating space and opportunities by the way of ‘reflexive critique’– by continually monitoring to assess if a strategy would still make sense, ‘whether its storyline still rings true; whether a new story line has emerged over time, and whether this is as inclusionary as the old’ (Healey 2003: 247-251).


138 ibid, pp. 181-182.

139 ibid, p. 185.

140 While saying all that, just city theorists are conscious of certain dynamics of the operations within the system- (a) Utopian concepts that are sold have a force behind them which make ‘people think that they want what you are offering’; (b) Socialist understanding of economic growth simply as capital accumulation will fail despite its achievement of ‘greater equality without economic growth which would also benefit most of the people if redistributed; (c)Whereas the market model or neo-liberalism thrives popularly due to its influence of promise in the context of growing inequality; (d) despite participation is democratic process in the public decision making there is little likelihood to eschew dominance and provide greatest access to organizational and financial resources, freedom or self expression for the minorities; (e) and democratic principles could ‘easily accommodate ineffective or harmless minorities but flounder when confronted with right-wing militants, religious dogmatists and racial purists and democracy is not about a mere procedural norm but rather has a “substantive content”, both state and civil society may be – “good” and “bad”’(Fainstein,2003:185-188).


144 Ibid, 464.


146 In all the older debates on planning too – comprehensive versus incremental, top-down versus bottom-up leadership, and people oriented versus place oriented – public interest was central (Campbell & Fainstein 2003: 12).


148 Summary of the key ethical principles underlying theories of planning.


151 Ibid, p. 471.


153 Susan S. Fainstein (2003), New Directions in Planning Theory, p. 190.


155 Susan S. Fainstein (2003), New Directions in Planning Theory, p. 190.


157 “It is only defensible as an activity if it is believed that it will deliver a future that is ‘better’ than that which would result without. What is ‘better’ must confront substantive, but contestable, issues concerning what is good. In so doing it will involve critical questioning of the role and nature of the taken-for-granted pillars of planning such as the plan and also the relationship between planning and the democratic process. The lack of engagement with issues of value is in many ways paradoxical given that planning was founded on the belief that it could, at least, contribute to the creation of a better world. The acknowledgement of difference and respect for the individual is, of course important but we should be wary of falling into a trap where critical questioning of what is good, or for that matter right, becomes impossible. In considering future development in planning theory would endorse…[the] view that normative thinking need not be utopian in the sense of being unfeasible but can and should address the appropriateness of desirable alternatives” (Campbell & Marshall 1999: 476).

158 Planning is viewed as ‘response to the turmoil of modernization’. It has been responsive model of corporate capitalism and ‘a challenge to the worst excesses of the very forces of privatism’ (Perry [1995] 2003: 146).


163 The process was typically marked by the outward exodus from the central business districts by the middle classes and industry to the newer locations for which land was developed and was aided by the expanded transport networks, especially the roads and private ownership of the car. The result was the outward spread of the low density suburban areas which became costlier in terms of providing civic infrastructures and services and tax returns were low or rather taxes imposed were low resulting in the fiscal crisis. Whereas central business districts were overcrowded with the blue collared workers’ concentration and also added to the problem was the need to expand the parking facilities given the expanded transport pattern which was only creating acute shortage
of low-income housing. There were general shortages in the production of the peripheral land due to restricted expansion. The result was the increasing prices of land in the central business districts which contain the office activities and the retail business thus leading to the intensification of land uses and land hoarding. Such a process, on the one hand, has led to serious transport problems-overloaded transit systems, congested central streets, scarcity of parking facilities, etc., which calls attention of the public authorities through political pressures to plan to improve the transport networks. With the improvement in the transport networks the result is the creation of the locational advantages within the central business districts which further increase in the land prices and land use intensification. On the other hand, old residential neighbourhoods which encircle the central business core come under two kinds of pressures-1. With the increase in the land prices in the business core which increases the pressure to redevelop the encircling low-income residential properties into office and commercial space, and 2. With the increase in the proportion of the white-collar over the blue-collar employment in business core area, the middle-income families find encouraged to buy and renovate the existing old properties of low income neighbourhood surrounding business core area. The Consequence of these pressures would threaten the low income neighbourhoods of the dispossession of their housing properties and their relocation to the periphery. This whole process leads to the disruption and confrontation which further spirals the land prices and so on (Rowes & Scott 1981: 124-127).


165 Tony Champion and Graeme Hugo (eds) 2004, New Forms of Urbanization- Beyond the Urban-Rural Dichotomy, Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, p. 3. In most developed countries 75% percent of their aggregate population live in urban areas according to latest estimates. It is expected that by 2025 in Asia and Africa 50% of their aggregate populations would live in urban areas (ibid: p.11). In Latin America and the Caribbean greater proportion of their populations live and work in the urban areas. “Asia despite has the second lowest level of urbanization in the world (37.5 per cent of its population lived in urban areas in 2000), had the highest number of persons living in urban areas (1.4 billion). Europe (with 534 million urban dwellers), Latin America and the Caribbean (391 million) and Africa with 295 million follow as the major areas with the second to fourth largest urban populations in 2000” (Zlotnik 2004: pp. 47-48). Hania Zlotnik 2004, World Urbanization: Trends and Prospects. In Tony Champion and Graeme Hugo (eds) 2004, New Forms of Urbanization- Beyond the Urban-Rural Dichotomy, pp. 47-48. In the similar vein, in the context of urbanization in Philippines, Kelly (1999) argues that extended urban regions or mega-urban regions or ‘desakota’ have come into existence blurring the difference between urban and rural. Philip F. Kelly 1999, Everyday Urbanization: The Social Dynamics of Development in Manila’s Extended Metropolitan Region, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research June 1999 - Vol. 23 Issue 2 Page 201-414.
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197 In the context of ‘changes in the language of public management during the 1980s…Responding to a perceived crisis in the administration of the welfare state as a ‘steering’ agent, doubtful of the capacity of neo-liberal market forces to resolve social issues unilaterally, social theorists began to insert the nomenclature of complexity and networks within a cybernetic model of organization.’ What follows is the discourse which advocates the diffusion of power within the political system perceived as ‘a complex architecture of systems’ of ‘self-governing networks of actors’ than the concentration of power in a unitary political system. Such a discourse conceives the prerequisites for such a political system i.e., a ‘social economy’ involving voluntary organizations as well as privatization and outsourcing’ in governing and administering city’s infrastructure and services. Basically power is de-centered or rather is multi-centered in the affairs of governance which is termed as heterarchic form which is supposed to replace hierarchic form of government. The main function of such de-centering is to build a network to initiate a continuous dialogue to generate and exchange more information with institutional negotiations to mobilize consensus and build mutual understanding’; ‘democratic participation’; ‘transparency’ and ‘accountability’; participation of citizens in the decision-making process especially the marginalized groups; etc. Non-governmental organizations and Citizen Based Organizations are to take part in the governance process. (Heitzman 2000: 123-124)


199 ibid, p. 126.

200 ibid, pp. 126-127.

201 ibid, pp. 127-136. For further details see chapter ‘Conceiving the City: Master Planning and Informal Power’ pp. 121-165.

202 ibid, pp. 127-136. For further details see chapter ‘The Map is not the Territory: Law and the Production of Space’, ibid, pp. 166-199. For similar hypothesis, though it is formulated in the advanced capitalist context about the state intervention, see Shoukry T. Roweis and Allen J. Scott, 1981, *The Urban Land Question*, pp. 128-129.


204 Janaki Nair, 2005, *The Promise of the Metropolis*, p. 83

205 Kanakapura Main Road starts from the Western central part of the Bangalore city, extends towards Bangalore South Rural District, and touches the taluk headquarters of Kanakapura.
Banerghatta Main Road radiates out of the city from the Cantonment Area— the eastern central part of the Bangalore City. It extends towards Bangalore South Rural District and touches taluk headquarters of Anekal.

Bommanahalli Corporation Municipal Council consisted of cluster of villages located within the stretch of Sarjapur Road in the east and Kanakapura Road in the west. The CMC was divided into 31 wards. It had an urban population of 2,44,871 and its area was 43.57 square kilometres. Within the CMC limits major industries and information technology (IT) companies were located. http://www.bommanahallicity.gov.in_ accessed on 23/6/2007.