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The word ‘SLUM’ entered into the English usage somewhere around 1890. The first prominent use of the term seems to come from ‘Shaw’ (1898) when he made ‘slum Landlordism’ the subject of his play ‘Widower’s Houses’. The term has been in common and frequent usage since the beginning of the present century. They are described as ugly spots on the face of the cities; are perceived as a danger to the society at large, especially when located close to the commercial and high class residential areas; and are viewed as dens of vices.

Social scientists have approached slums from different dimensions, with their approach changing over-time. Initially the social scientists in the western world were informed by the ‘Chicago School of thought’, which had a negativistic, lowly opinion of squatter dwellings. Slums were considered as areas of darkness or disintegration, disorganisation or cancerous and parasitic growths in society (Gists and Halbert, 1956). These were conceived as areas of poor houses and poor people who were fatalists, lacked homogeneity and were of different castes, religions or occupations (Owen, 1887; Mackenzie, 1922; Zorbaugh, 1929; Frazier, 1939; Myrdal and Rose, 1944; Alam, 1950; Clinard, 1953; Glazer and Moynihan, 1953; Stokes, 1959). Social scientists in India who were influenced by this school of thought considered slums to be environmentally unhealthy and socially disintegrated (Alam, 1965; Gupta, 1968; Nayak, 1968; Madan, 1969; Desai and Pillai, 1970). Another group of social scientists considered slums to be structurally and culturally marginal settlements and demographically poor (Rias, 1890; McKenzie, 1922; Park,
1925; Burgess, 1925; Durkheim, 1933; Wirth and Worth, 1938; Redfield, 1941; Tonnies, 1955; Weber, 1958; D’Souza, 1978; World Health Organization, 1993).

Many social scientists do not affirm with the views of Chicago-school of thought. They do not see slums as pathological and diseased part of the city, rather they view them as creative, coping, city-building and the construction of new institutions (Trivedi, 1961; Singh, 1964; Singh, 1966). Bijlani and Roy (1991) in their work ‘SLUM HABITAT’ look at the spatial characteristics and socio-ecological characteristics of Ahmedabad, Bangalore and Delhi slums to point out that the slum dwellers contribute to the city’s economy and towards the economy of housing in terms of building material used by the slum dwellers. RAMACHANDRA (1967) provided the conceptual framework for analysing the growth of slums and their spatial structure.

Besides, the literature on above mentioned slum approaches, there is a whole range of studies that are sociologically and psychologically sensitive and deal with the impact of social change brought about by urbanisation on the slum dwellers (Clinard, 1966; Singh, 1978), comparison between slum life and rural life (Dattatri, 1970), self-help in house construction (Majumdar, 1978; Veena, 1983), mental and physical development of children growing up in slums (Mohsin, 1979), motivational background of school dropouts (Mani, 1980), social discriminations (Das, 1980), social and economic organisation (Vasavan, 1980), occupational characteristics (Yeswanth, 1988). Literature exists in the form of seminal works regarding the appreciation of the degree of organisation found in slums of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Likewise, literature highlighting a dynamic, continually evolving relationship between
organisations and social change which makes each slum locality unique, is in plenty (Clark & Gans, 1965; Turner, 1965; Kell, 1966; Liebow & Gusfield, 1967; Mangin, 1968-70; Audrey, 1975; Schwartz, 1975).

Every slum is unique in itself, there is no similarity between any two slums. Any generalised solution applied to all the slums is just wastage of resources. Every slum has its own psychology and specific locational, ethnic and cultural composition, hence before applying any strategy to any slum, they should be properly surveyed from the point of view of their different locational and socio-economic characteristics (Sandhu, 1984; Reddy, 1981; Dutta, 1980). Studies carried out within a socio-economic context of slums has poverty as the basic cause of their evolution. Some social scientists support the view that slums can be meaningfully studied in the framework of ‘Poverty’, since it is the basic cause of their evolution. They consider the terms ‘poor’ and ‘slum dwellers’ as synonymous (Morton, 1797; Engels, 1844; Frazier, 1939; Payne Toennie, 1955; Loonas, 1957; Redifeld, 1958; Feral Eke, 1981).

Oscar Lewis (1966) known for his concept of ‘culture of poverty’, describes it both as an adoption or a reaction by the poor to their marginal position in a class stratified, highly individualised and capitalistic society. Similar views are also put forward by (Clinard, 1966 and Feral Erk, 1981). The slum society is essentially in transition from rural way of life to the urban way of life and is trying to seek its identity. As old habits die hard, they cannot easily forsake their age-old habits developed in their rural social milieu and their hang over creates problems of social adjustments. The rural poor who have been pushed out of their ecological niche have carried with them not only poverty and squatter but also their drab social ethos which creates conflicts or
tensions. The rural migrants have been really thrown into the urban milieu as the 'scrap heap of humanity....' (Prasad, 1981; Singh, 1984). Many social scientists have adopted the welfare approach to study the slums (Samudson, 1972; Dictionaries of Economic terms; Bannock, Baxter & Rees, 1973). A helpful critique from the radical perspective alongside the neoclassical analysis is provided by ('Hunte and Sherman, 1972'). Brief introduction to welfare-economics of slum dwellers is included in the writings of Graff, 1957; Henderson, 1958; Quandt, 1958; Mishan, 1964, 1969; Nath, Mandel & Desai, 1973-74.

Initial contribution on slums by Geographers was marked by concern for 'social relevance' as a result of which the literature on social problems and welfare issues expanded rapidly. 'Poverty' formed the subject matter of two issues of 'ANTIPODE', a new radical journal (Peet, 1970, 1972). The first text in this problem series in Geography was contributed by Morrill and Woh Lenberg, 1971. Books on the 'Black Ghetto' (Rose, 1971); 'The Geography of Crime' (Harrie's, 1974) and Health Care in Oblique Areas of city (Shannon and Dever, 1974) and more literature appeared in the form of papers and seminal works, on these social issues regarding the amenities and service base etc. (Chisholm, 1971; Albaum, 1972; Smith, 1972; Harvey, 1973; Knox, 1975). It was noted that external factors as introduction of adult franchise, universal education, rapid industrialisation, economic growth, land reforms etc. had an influence on internal organisation of the urban poor dwellings. It did not result in social disorganisation as predicted earlier by the Chicago school of thought (Peet, ed., 1977).
Slums are considered to have their own specific type of organisation. Some classical works as ‘street corner society’ etc. support this view, along with case studies on cities of Venezuela etc. In general there might be some disorganisation in slum dwellings but, within this disorganisation always a specific pattern of organisational morphology is present. Perlman, 1976; Peattee and Aldreta, 1981 view slum dwellings not as problem but as a solution to their problems. There has been a considerable interest of geographers in the direction of monitoring the quality of life via survey research in the decade 1970-80 (Krieger, 1969; Stagner, 1970; Abrams, 1973; Dalkey and Rourke, 1973; Jameson, 1991; Sack, 1993).

Literature on slums then shifted from welfare approach to a more practical and detailed ‘spatial approach’. The Geography of post-modernist period, interestingly focused upon ‘social dynamics’ of space and the importance of localities (which in the present usage connote more microscale areal units than the conventional regions as well defined residential areas and identifiable clusters of villages etc.). The slum literature of post-modernist period has increasingly focused on local contexts of thought and action. Hence the geographers believe that each slum locality has its own distinct character and is unique in itself. They identify the landuse patterns of different slum localities on the basis of availability of various resources. A linkage is found between slum populations and industrial growth of the cities and on the other hand there is a functional linkage between the slum population and non-slum populations of the city. The expansion of the city is intimately related to the existing availability of resources (Seely, 1959; Nambari, 1961; Forrester, 1969; Khan, 1978; Ramachandra, 1982; Christopher Alexander, 1984; Banerji, 1985; Cooke (ed.), 1989; Munshi, ILGUS, 1992; Painter, 1994; Gregory, 1994).
The locality approach in urban studies was pioneered in Britain by Doreen Massey (1984), in her work 'Spatial division of Labour'. This study constituted a series of case studies of different slum localities. The overall objective of these studies was to explore the impact of economic restructuring at national and local levels and to assess the role of central and local government policies in establishing or constraining localities, through their various social and political organisation, to deal with the process of restructuring (Cox & Mair, 1989; Massey, 1991; Sack, 1993).

Geographers and other social scientists have given due importance to migration. Immigrants are lured by the job opportunities in industrial units of different types. Origin of slums is marked by influx of skilled and unskilled migrant workers. Research surveys of cities as Delhi, Siliguri, Vishakapatnam, Gulbarg etc. shows the growth of slums either during the time of wars, partition or settlement of boundary disputes. Besides various cities have also experienced phases of migration. These migration phases correspond with the phases of urbanisation and industrialisation of these cities. Slums are seen to be a by product of migration (Taneja, 1971; Tanuja, 1973; Lahaire, 1979; Krishan, 1991; Sarin, 1992).

Planners have also contributed substantially to the literature on slums. A planners task is basically in the form of improving the slums, suggesting strategies, bringing out typologies of slums, reviewing the existing slum situations. In developed countries the planners and administrators have felt concerned with the problems, policies and procedures of urban renewal or redevelopment. Urban renewal is a continuous process of housing and neighbourhood improvement and consists of three types of corrective action in
the form of conservation, rehabilitation and redevelopment (Modak, 1971). On the other hand, the focus of study in the developing countries was on urban housing, urban poverty and rural-urban migration (Dwyer, 1975; Payne, 1977; D’Souza, 1978). A far more serious concern was felt by the administrators and planners who found the process of slum formation intractable. They have resigned themselves to the fact that slums are inevitable. It is impractical to clear or relocate these. The only thing they can do is to improve or upgrade these localities.

In India in the Pre-Independence period a few municipal corporation acts showed concern for the growing slum problems and the land-lords were required to improve the living conditions in their slum areas. However their impact was marginal. It was limited to providing street lighting or handpumps only. But, with the strengthening of municipal bodies in 1920’s and 1930’s some attention was paid to slums (Riberio, 1982). After independence in the first five year plan (1951-56) slums did not attract any attention. However the slum clearance and improvement scheme introduced in 1956 made a breakthrough as it made provisions for acquisition of slums and rehousing of families whose monthly income was below Rs.350/-. During the second (1956-61) and third plan (1961-66) periods, the scheme was under the central government, but was implemented by the states. This dyarchy ended in April, 1969 when it was fully transferred to the states. In April, 1972 the government of India introduced the central scheme for ‘Environmental Improvement’ in slum areas or provided financial assistance to the states for launching slum improvement programmes in cities with a population of 8 lakhs and above i.e. Calcutta, Mumbai, Delhi, Chennai, Hyderabad, Banglore, Ahmedabad, Kanpur,
Pune, Nagpur and Lucknow. During 1972-73, the scheme was extended to cities as: Indore, Jaipur, Srinagar, Patna, Cochin, Ludhiana, Cuttack, Gauhati and Rohtak.

Different studies have been conducted on cities as Poona, Delhi, Chandigarh, Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bombay etc. and planners have been attracted by the deteriorating conditions of the housing in which old slum dwellers have been living since long. They suggest development oriented community programmes. They have analysed and given improved suggestions for the working of 'City Improvement trust boards'. They have suggested the need for a national urbanisation policy in the light of the constraints which must be taken into consideration while formulating such a policy. The policy of urbanisation must be seen as a means to tackle the socio-economic problems emerging from structural rigidities of Indian society (Gadgil, 1959; Singh, 1964; Chandra and Paunalekar, 1975; Gowda, 1977; Jain, Sivaramakrishna & Sundaram, 1978). Planners have also suggested preventive measures as removal of socio-economic imbalances, checks on sites which attract slum dwellings (Arunachalam, Mahadev, Sivaramakrishna, Raj and Mishra, 1978; Planning for housing: Guide: IS, 1993).

The literature contributed by administrators is in the form of reports and surveys, projects or courses on slums organised by different governmental organisations. They help in bringing into light the various policies, defects in planning, the past and the present conditions of different urban areas in general and specifically. Such an approach to slums has been adopted by certain non-governmental organisations (N.G.Os) and institutions also. Institutionally or organisationally conducted studies regarding slums are made in two
categories: studies conducted officially and studies conducted unofficially. The officially conducted studies were conducted for policy framing for census records and analysis etc.

Certain literature is in the form of studies conducted in relation to Indian census for example: studies regarding Chennai and Ahmedabad by P.K. Nambari (1970) and Trivedi (1970). In India we have literature regarding the creation of legal slums in cities as Chandigarh, Delhi etc. by the city administration itself (Sarin, 1992). According to Paul D. Wiebe these studies tell us about the physical, demographic, health and crowding conditions and distribution of resident people, according to variables such as place of origin, length of residence etc. Different city administrations have conducted analytical surveys through various commissions set up, regarding different cities as Calcutta, Bangalore, Madras, Delhi and urban scenario of India as a whole. Administrators have concluded certain facts regarding slums as: One fifth of India’s urban population lives in slums, this population is rising with time. Work done by the voluntary organisations have had a multi-dimensional approach, their work has the aims of improvement and betterment. This category of literature too is limited to important cities (Bharat Sewak Samaj, 1958; Bombay Tata Institute, 1958; Calcutta, Rama Krishna Mission, 1965; D’Souza, 1968; Sen, 1970; Gadgil, 1970; Shah, 1975).

Slum Typologies

A review of literature on slums of different countries of world brings out the nature of slums as revealed through the slum typologies suggested by social scientists and planners.
Abrams (1946) classified the slums of the United States into the following two types on the basis of overall nature of different kinds of slums. These are: (i) metropolitan slums; (ii) rural slums; (iii) ghetto; (iv) company slums; (v) perpetuated slum; (vi) depopulated slum (vii) overrun slum; (viii) hand me down slum; (ix) regenerated slum; (x) home-owned slum and (xi) potential slum.

Seelay (1956) classified the slum dwellers into four main types, using need and opportunity as the criteria: (i) permanent necessitations (the indolent poor); (ii) temporary necessitarians (the trapped but respectable poor); (iii) permanent opportunists (fugitives); and (iv) temporary opportune (beginners).

A four-fold classifications of the residents of the Boston’s West End is provided by Gans (1962). On the basis of their habits and behaviour, he groups them as: (i) routine seekers (who have stable jobs); (ii) actions seekers (who are frustrated by their least satisfying jobs and find thrill in fights, sexual interludes and drinking bouts); (iii) maladapted (the maladjusted people); and (iv) middle class mobiles (who strive to move out).

Stokes (Putnam et al. ed, 1970, 411-22) in his seminal work in 1962 on "A Theory of Slums" classified slums into four types based on the ability/income criteria and the barriers to entry in the labour market. These include (i) ‘Slums of hope and escalation’ - these slums will be integrated in the city’s housing market over time, fairly quickly; (ii) ‘Slums of hope and non-escalation’ - these slums will take little longer as the residents, despite possessing adequate ability, have to overcome the social barriers; (iii) ‘Slums of despair and escalation’ - these are inhabited by migrants without adequate skills (ability) for the urban labour market, but do not face any social barriers; (iv)
'Slums of despair and non-escalation' - inhabited by migrants who, due to their inability are unable to compete in the urban labour market and are denied access to work because of their particular race, ethnic group or class. Stokes advocated slum clearance and renewal for the latter two types of slums.

Khatu (1981) provides a geographic classification of the Indian slums on the basis of their location into nine types: (i) Core city slums (old dilapidated buildings); (ii) industrial slums (slum chawls or khadkis); (iii) inherited slums (metamorphosed village); (iv) squatters (hutments); (v) satellite slums (shanty townships); (vi) transit slums (construction labour, floating slums); (vii) terrace slums (in crowded city on multistoried buildings); (viii) imposed slum (misuse of buildings for houses, such as stables, warehouses); (ix) planned slums (low cost housing, incomplete and neglected).

Ribeiro (1981) has attempted a classification of slums and squatter settlements on the basis of ownership: (i) squatter settlements which include jhuggi-jhorpries in Delhi, in Madras and Jhoparpatties in Mumbai. They are colonies of individual hutments raised on the public land; (ii) squatter settlements with a little variation, where the hutment is owned by some one else and has been sublet; (iii) squatter settlements which grow suddenly and forcibly on the public land at the instigation of local leadership; (iv) settlements where the title to the land and structure is valid but it has been sub-divided into several units and subletted to a large number of families for example the chawls in Mumbai; (v) Tenancy settlements which include bustees in Calcutta and Ahalas in Kanpur, where the title to the land is held by one person, the structure belongs to the second person and the third person is dweller, who is a tenant.
Bunch (1996, 12-32) identified six types of slums on the basis of their physical ecology. These include general categories of slums on government and privately-owned land, "pucca" slums of better environmental conditions, very small and very large slums, and linear roadside slums.

A variety of classifications of slums are available in planning literature. The underlying considerations include: (i) identification of slums for coverage by a specific programme; (ii) determination of the legal status of the land occupied by slums, and (iii) finalisation of the appropriate strategy for their treatment. In respect of notification, slums can be categorised as: notified and unnotified. On legal basis, they are described as illegal, recognised, authorised and approved. In terms of treatment, slums are categorised as those fit for: (i) relocation, (ii) redevelopment, (iii) improvement and (iv) upgradation.

Lastly, during the process of delivering the UBS (Urban Basic Service) Programme in different cities of India, the government has been able to draw out a broad categorisation of slums in India:

1. Settled slums: (J.J. Colonies i.e. Jhuggi Jhopri colonies, resettlement colonies as Shramik Vihar in Faridabad).

2. Pavement dwellers.

3. Squatterers (are squatting on public or private land) but, such a classification of city slums is not very specified and will not help in proper investigation of slums.

These classifications are not exhaustive. Many more classifications can be designed depending upon the purpose and criterion.
Conclusions

Though slums have been in existence much earlier than the recent-past, yet the term has been in common and frequent usage since the beginning of the present century. In the post industrial era it is seen as a by-product of the industrial revolution. Massive rural-urban migration of the poor has been at the root of this slum formation.

It appeared first in the developed parts of the world and later diffused itself to the developing world. Though universally marked by substandard living conditions, slums are not viewed identically in the developed and developing countries. While in the former, these are located mostly in the interior parts of city and are inhabited by socially disadvantaged groups; in the latter, these are generally on the periphery of a city and are crowded of rural-urban migrants. Poverty is the basic condition determining their existence.

Classification of slums differ according to the nature of concerned disciplines. Sociologists generally base these on the criteria of their social organisation, geographers on locational attributes and planners on the desired treatment. Since slums pose a challenge to be dealt with, it will be pragmatic to classify these on the basis of their administrative/planning needs, keeping in view their geographical and sociological parameters.
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Slum Identification Procedure

This chapter describes the procedure by which the slums in Faridabad city were identified for the purpose of adoption of suitable research methodology and sample survey. For this we first examine some definitions of slums, applicable in the Indian context. This is followed by a description of the procedure which was adopted for the slum identification.

In 1952 'United Nations' defined slums as: "A building, a group of buildings, or an area characterised by overcrowding, deterioration, insanitary conditions or absence of facilities and amenities which, because of these conditions or any of them, endanger the health, safety or morals of its inhabitants or the community." (Anderson, 1959).

The dictionary of Human Geography, defined slum as: "An area of overcrowded and dilapidated, unusually old, housing, occupied by people who can afford only the cheapest dwellings available in an urban area, generally in or close to the inner city. The term usually implies both a poverty ridden population, an unhealthy environment and a district with crime and vice. (Johnston et al., 1994).

Ashish Bose (1995) defined slum as: ‘a deprived human settlement, a settlement which is demographically, economically and environmentally vulnerable. Its typical demographic features are: extreme over-crowding, high density and high levels of mortality and fertility. Economic features include a large unorganised sector, low levels of productivity and extreme poverty and the lack of access to basic needs like water, sanitation and clean environment makes these areas environmentally hazardous.’
Slums and the Indian Planning

The Government of India had been aware of the slum problem right since the First Plan (1951-56). During the Second Plan (1956-61) period, the Slum Area Act (1956) was passed with a view to clearing or relocating slums. A similar policy was followed under the Third Plan (1961-66). The measure met little success.

During the Fourth Plan (1969-74), the Government of India launched the 'Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums' programme in 1972. The thrust shifted from one of relocating or clearing slums to their environmental improvement. It was realised that slums had become an inevitable part of the Indian urban scene. Under the scheme, financial assistance was given to the states for provision and expansion of basic urban amenities in slum localities amenable to improvement. The scheme was initially introduced in 11 cities with a population of at least eight hundred thousand each. It was later extended to even smaller cities since some states had no city of the prescribed size.

During the Fifth Plan (1974-79), the scheme continued as a part of the Minimum Needs Programme. It was extended to all cities with a population of three hundred thousand and above and to at least one town each in states which did not have a town of this size (Government of India, 1974). The scheme continued under the Sixth (1980-85) Seventh Plan (1985-90) and Eighth Plan (1992-97) also.

At the time of its initiation in 1972, the cost of providing these civic amenities was fixed at Rs.120/- per slum dweller. It was revised to Rs.300 with effect from 1985-86.
The scheme was implementable only in those slums which had been duly identified by the state governments. This required an operational definition of a slum which could guide this process. The Government of India adopted the following definition for the purpose:

"A slum area means any area where such dwellings predominate which by reason of dilapidation, over crowding, faulty arrangement of design of building, narrowness or faulty arrangement of street, lack of ventilation, light or sanitation facilities, inadequacy of open spaces and community facilities or any combination of these factors, are detrimental to safety, health or morale. Any slum area selected for improvement under the scheme should have at least two-thirds of the slums families in the poor and low income groups with an income of less than Rs.250/- per month. Also, there should be no likelihood of any slum clearance or redevelopment programme being taken up in that area for a period of at least 15 years in case of pucca built slums and 10 years for hutment type slums, so that adequate benefit is secured from the money spent on improvement" (Town and Country Planning Organisation, 1985).

Identification of Faridabad Slums

In 1980, Faridabad Complex Administration was asked to recommend localities which could be covered by the Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums Programme. Such localities were stipulated as the ones where: (i) urban amenities of water, sewer, street lighting, and public latrine/bath were absent; (ii) houses had been constructed in a haphazard manner and majority of these were Kutch or substandard; (iii) streets and lanes were kuch. 62 jhugi-clusters with a total population of 70,430 in the form of 18934 families were identified by the detailed socio-economic survey conducted. 48.7 percent
of these families belonged to Scheduled caste/Scheduled tribe. Out of 18,934 families, 10,304 families belonged to the economically weaker section of population, 5990 under low income group and only 2640 had an income level of Rs.6000 and above.

The task of identifying such localities was not smooth and could not remain objective. In the first instance priority was to be given to larger slums including those which were planned not to be removed because their locations were affordable by the government. Local leaders and politicians saw this as an opportunity for establishing their vote bank. There were instances where residents of some localities, with houses constructed without sanctioned plans, got these identified as slums through political pressure. In the process, some undeserving localities such as Indira Nagar, Gandhi Nagar, Pakistani Colony, A.C/Neelam Bata Nagar which already had almost all the basic services were declared as slums while some others, which were genuine slums such as Ambedkar Nagar, Shiv Sharda Colony, Santosh Nagar etc. got overlooked.

Slum Identification in the Three Urban Zones

Old Faridabad Zone had 15 clusters, namely; (1) Azad Nagar, (2) Ekta Nagar (3) Swantantra Ekta Nagar, (4) Dayal Bagh, (5) Santosh Nagar, (6) Adivasi Basti, (7) Anangpur Jhuggies, (8) Lakkarpur Khan Mazdoor Colony, (9) Gurukul Camp, (10) Gadkhakhor Quarry Jhuggies, (11) Bhatta Colony, (12) Frick India Jhuggies, (13) Laxman Bagh, (14) Shamshan Ghat Jhuggies and (15) Rajiv Nagar. 4 clusters, i.e. clusters 7,8,9 and 10 were inhabited by 1,161 families and they were all rehabilitated in the largest cluster i.e. Gurukul Camp. But, soon the other three sites were again encroached upon by slum dwellers as they were left unattended and the slums re-emerged there. Two more clusters
were merged together, namely Santosh Nagar and Frick India Jhuggies, on a proposed site of 7 acres behind Frick India only, it was renamed as Subhash Nagar. It lies on the floodable nullah land. The site of rehabilitated Santosh Nagar slum has a re-emerged slum cluster again. Laxman Bagh cluster was removed and families rehabilitated in E.W.S. housing in Janta Colony (i.e. Shamshan Ghat Jhuggies).


These 11 clusters housed 3,775 families. Two small clusters at that time, namely Sanjay Nagar and Patel Nagar were removed. Rest of the clusters too were rehabilitated along cluster 11 on rehabilitation sites but the vacated sites again are sites of slum clusters. In the initial stages they did not have names but gradually the inhabitants, or M.C.F. or the local leaders gave the clusters names. Most of the clusters have names after our leaders or local leaders as: Tilak Nagar, Gandhi Nagar, Sanjay Nagar, Nehru Nagar, Azad Nagar. A few clusters get their nomenclature from the industrial units along which they are located for example; Goodyear basti, Eicher jhuggies, A.K. Mallot jhuggies, Bhatta colony etc. One cluster Adivasi Basti was inhabited by schedule tribes and Shamshan ghat jhuggies derived its name from its earlier land use.

N.I.T. zone it had 36 clusters out of which 10 were on park sites namely: 1-A Park, 1-A, 1-B park, 1-Kk Park, 1-F, 2-B, 2-C, 2-D, 2-E, 3-A. Most of these were having Kutcha structures in the form of jhuggies and wooded
khokhas and they were removed by the government. But 5 of these sites again have re-emerged as slum sites such as 2-C park, Part 1F, 5F and 5N, Kalyanpuri etc. Today except for the removed 5 clusters rest all still exist (they are enlisted in Annexure-I). Another 10 clusters in NIT, housed 6,341 families and were retained and provided upgradation and amenities. They were: (1) Neelam Bata Colony, (2) Gandhi Nagar (3) Sant Nagar (4) Harijan Basti (5) Gagan Theater (6) Indira Nagar (7) Shastri Colony (8) Adarsh Nagar (9) Krishna Colony (10) Pakistani Colony.

Slum colonies as Gandhi Nagar, Janta Colony, Sanjay Gandhi Memorial Nagar, Adarsh Nagar etc. were selected for building E.W.S. housing and rehabilitating the population from rest of the clusters. It has been observed that the vacated sites will exist as slums besides the EWS houses are also fully occupied.

Besides this another slum development scheme was taken over by the Government of Faridabad, namely Urban Basic Services Programme during 1987-90. Under this programme 28 clusters were selected, most of them were from N.I.T. Under this programme (the basis of selection of clusters was the governmental interest in them, their location on such sites that they could be retained, and their large size. (1) Neelam Bata (2) Nehru Colony (3) Indira Nagar (4) Subhash Nagar (5) Harijan Basti (6) Gandhi Colony (7) Goodyear Basti (8) Patel Nagar (9) Gandhi Colony (10) Azad Nagar (11) Adarsh Nagar (12) Gyakward Nagar (13) Sant Nagar (14) Dayal Nagar (15) Rajiv Nagar (16) Auto Pin Jhuggies (17) Milhard Colony (18) Bapu Nagar (19) Kalyan Puri (20) Gurukul Camp (21) Adivasi Basti (22) Kisan Mazdoor Colony (23) Swantantra Ekta Nagar (24) Rajiv Nagar (25) Ekta Nagar (26) Shiv Sharda Colony (27)
Ram Nagar (28) Krishna Colony.

Paradoxically, all the clusters covered under UBSP, except Millard Colony, Auto Pin, Kisan Mazoor Colony, and Ram Nagar, plus a few more were also included in the selection list of Urban Community Development Programme (1984-86) and Environmental Improvement Scheme (1981-84). Almost similar selection criterion were adopted by other schemes too, the most prominent one being their large size and political interest.

The proposed research exercise has been executed by adopting the following research methodology.

Methodology

A systematic research design was framed to achieve the objectives. The study covers all slums, notified and identified by Municipal Corporation Faridabad and also the unnotified ones. Information about the slum population, civic amenities and upgradation scheme etc. has been noted from the available records of the corporation.

For this research exercise two types of data was collected:

i. Secondary Data

ii. Primary Data

Secondary data was collected from the office of the Corporation. To collect the necessary additional information field work in the first stage was conducted. A survey of Faridabad slums was conducted and locational details were plotted on a base map obtained from office of the Municipal Corporation of Faridabad (Fig.2). Initially a survey of all the 67 slum clusters was conducted in November, 1997. This survey included 23 slum clusters of Old Faridabad Zone, 31 clusters of NIT zone and 13 clusters of Ballabgarh Zone. The survey
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was a questionnaire survey (Annexure-II) and the information for the questionnaire was received from either the ration depots of the slums or the headmen or voters list of cluster (if present). The questionnaire consisted of a list of questions, both quantitative and qualitative. The different types of informations were then coded and the master sheets were prepared.

The next step involved tabulation and the statistical representation of obtained data. The results stored in the master sheets were decoded and the different facts stored were tabulated. The tables gave quantitative form to the qualitative information regarding the slums of Faridabad city as a whole and also provided comparative figures for the slums of different zones of Faridabad city, namely old Faridabad; NIT (New Industrial Township) and Ballabgarh. For better understanding and comparative study, the results tabulated were plotted in the form of statistical diagrams and maps were prepared. With the help of results of the survey, slums were classified, on the basis of their morphology; administrative status; location and time. A holistic typology of Faridabad slums was obtained based on a combination of following characteristics:

a) Spatial (Locational site)
b) Administrative Status and
c) Temporal phase of origin.

This final multidimensional, geographical classification of Faridabad slums is stated in Annexure-I.

The second stage of data collection was targeted to collection of information from the sample of slums chosen for survey on the demographic characteristics, level of socio economic service base, their dwelling types,
inhabitant and occupational details etc. The sample survey was conducted in July, 1998. Before conducting the survey two exercises were conducted. They comprised of preparation of questionnaire (Annexure-III) and selection of sample. The following points were kept in view while selecting a sample:

1. Very large slums were not considered in the population, because it would have been very difficult to physically survey the large number of households present in them.

2. Moreover, the first survey gave a briefing on the morphology of large clusters. Most of them do not bear characteristics of a slum as they have multi-storied buildings, modern good houses, pucca lanes, electric connections, etc.

3. Therefore, only those slums are considered which fitted later the ethos of slums given in definitions provided.

4. Slums from each temporal phase, location/site and ownership are also taken into account while choosing a sample. While selecting the sample due attention was also given to the administrative status i.e. notification or unnotification of the slum clusters. In the first general survey it was decided to survey all the 67 clusters.

For the second detailed survey a sample of 25 percent slum clusters was decided, to be selected. It would mean that the sample would consist of 17 clusters to be surveyed. But, keeping the above mentioned points in mind the larger slum clusters are excluded from the population for sample selection. Hence 23 slum clusters out of 67 total clusters, are found to be appropriate for the purpose of our study (Table 2.1). These 23 slum clusters fulfilled all the above mentioned criterion. None of these 23 clusters, had more than
Table 2.1
Faridabad City: Small and Moderate Sized Marginal Slums, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Slum Cluster</th>
<th>Adm. Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Temporal Phase of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. N.I.T. Zone Clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Press Colony</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani Colony (Central Green Jh.)</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Park Site</td>
<td>1950-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjay Colony</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eicher Juggies</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalyan Puri</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Sporadic</td>
<td>1980-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shastri Colony</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Along transport line</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagat Singh Colony</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Along transport line</td>
<td>1980-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedore Huts</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milhard Huts</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harijan Basti</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Sporadic</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Old Faridabad Clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swatantra Ekta Nagar</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Along transport line</td>
<td>1980-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakkar Pur Khan Mazdoor Camp</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priyanka Nagar (Bali Nagar)</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisan Mazdoor Colony (Bhur Co.)</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Along canal</td>
<td>1980-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prem Nagar</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Along canal</td>
<td>1980-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azad Nagar</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatta Colony No.10</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santosh Nagar</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Along Nallah</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Ballabgarh Clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodyear Basti</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilak Nagar</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Along transport line</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajiv Nagar (T.T.C. Nagar)</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajiv Colony</td>
<td>Notified</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1980-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambedkar Nagar</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Along transport line</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiv Sharda Colony</td>
<td>Unnotified</td>
<td>Along transport line</td>
<td>1966-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Work
1000 dwelling units. They were small clusters having household size varying between (500-1000). They are marginal clusters belonging to the category of moderate and small clusters. They have an absolute slum morphology, are pictures of negation by the urbanities and authorities. They are also strategic sites which have a tendency to grow further. Out of these 23 clusters a sample of 25 percent slum clusters was selected, it came out to be six slum clusters (Fig.3). These six slum clusters were selected by giving equal weightage to temporal, location and administrative characters of slum clusters. The urban zone of Faridabad having maximum number of clusters was NIT (New Industrial Township). Hence the maximum number of sample slums were selected from NIT zone.

N.I.T. has 10 clusters, Old Faridabad zone has 8 clusters and Ballabgarh zone has 6 clusters. To give each zone a proportionate representation, it was decided to select a sample of 3:2:1, respectively. Three clusters were selected from NIT zone:

1. Pakistani Colony : It is a cluster located on a site which was earmarked for Central green (i.e. a park in the heart of the zone). It has the origin in the first temporal phase of slum evolution in Faridabad i.e. (1950-66). It is a notified slum.

2. Kalyan Puri : It is a cluster having a sporadic location. It originated in the temporal phase of (1980-97) and is a unnotified slum cluster.

3. Bhagat Singh Colony : This cluster is located along a road. It originated in the third temporal phase of origin of slums in Faridabad (i.e. 1980-1997). It is a notified slum cluster.
From Old-Faridabad Zone two slum clusters were selected as samples:

4. Priyanka Nagar: It is a cluster having an industrial location and it originated in the temporal phase of (1966-80). It is an unnotified slum cluster.

5. Santosh Nagar: It is an unnotified cluster, located along a drainage lane i.e. Budia Nallah. It is located on a floodable pasture land. Besides, it also has an industrial location, behind a group of industries. It originated in the temporal phase of (1966-80).

As Ballabgarh zone has the least number of clusters, therefore one (1) slum cluster was selected as a sample i.e.:

6. Shiv Sharda Colony: It is a slum cluster that originated in the second phase of evolution of slums in Faridabad i.e. (1966-80). It is located on Defence land and is just next to the main Ballabgarh Bus Stand.

The size of these 6 selected slum clusters was around 1000 dwellings. Infact they are the slums which are on margin of small and moderate clusters. The survey was a questionnaire survey and the questionnaire was to be filled door to door. It was not possible to survey all households of the six selected clusters. Hence there was need to select a 'Household Sample' from the total households in the six selected slum clusters. An even systematic selection of sample of every second or fifth or sixth etc. households was not justifiable. Therefore, the 'household sample' for survey was roughly in proportion to the share of population of the zone. For determining a sample of households, the following formula was used:

\[
\text{Household Sample} = \frac{\text{Population of the slum X}}{\text{Total Population of the Zone to which the slum belongs}} \times 100
\]
On this basis every sixth household was surveyed from the 6 selected clusters. The next exercise at hand was: Preparation of Questionnaire II. The questionnaire was framed to get detailed household information to judge the social, economic and service level of Faridabad slums, to have a clear picture of the demographic composition and qualitative aspects of Faridabad’s slum population. The information so collected was recorded and analysed.

Conclusions

Slums characterise settlements which are demographically, economically and environmentally vulnerable. These have been in existence for a long time. The Government of India did recognise their existence in the First Plan (1951-56). The policy to clear or relocate the slums did not succeed. However, the need for their official recognition and identification was felt only when the ‘Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums’ programme was implemented in Faridabad in 1980. The identification was done on the basis of the criteria laid down in the Slum Area Act of 1956. The Act itself followed the guidelines provided by the United Nations.

In all 62 slums were identified in Faridabad. The task of identifying such localities was not smooth and could not remain objective. Local leaders and politicians saw this as an opportunity for establishing their vote bank. Personal fieldwork revealed certain instances where some undeserving localities were declared as slums while the deserving cases were excluded. The Census of India however recognized only 29 slums in 1981 and 26 slums in 1991. Naturally, the huge cost involved inhibits the government from identifying slums.

Keeping in view the spirit of the work a suitable methodology was adopted to identify slums for survey purposes.