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CRITIQUE OF THE POST COLONIAL INDIAN CAPITAL CITY-STATE

Aspiration is one of the key factors that has been driving India’s urbanism since Independence. The whole idea of defining a new nation on modern cities, which was based on aspirations that swayed towards the skewed image of the developed world still holds true. Starting with the construction of an image for a city by the British to the post-independence predilection for modernity, Delhi today has reached a stage where almost every project by the authorities is geared towards an image makeover including the Master Plan.

Such aspirations have more physical manifestations in Indian context, as state and central government have more power in cities than the city government itself (even though 20 years have passed after 74th Constitutional Amendment). Delhi presents a special case as land is under control of the central government and Indian politics at the Centre has been for more than a decade now governed by mixed ideologies of the multi-party coalition system. Delhi’s urbanism is formulated in a system that completely circumvents democratic means and thus resulting in the civil society activism. Such activism combined with the media images constantly reinforces the aspiration of what a city should be. All these aspirations are mere images which some have enough faith to call a vision, but have no concrete grounding on what needs to be done resulting in urban blunders.

This paper investigates different aspects of urban development resulting from popular aspirational image.

1.0 BACKGROUND

“A village, normally speaking, is backward intellectually and culturally and no progress can be made from a backward environment” (Parel 1997) wrote Jawaharlal Nehru, who later became India’s first Prime Minister, in his letter to M K Gandhi in 1945. As opposed to the ‘village’ being backward, the city was seen by Nehru as a symbol of independent and modern India. Post independence while the nation was on a path to establish an Indian identity, the notion of the city was still a colonial construct. Even when Nehru’s self-reliance and import-substituting industrialization was in its prime, the impulse to make the Indian city a prototype of the first-world city was a fundamental one (Nigam 2001). Nehru embraced modernity and thought that as a model for the country to go forward, cities should become the laboratory and urban planning the tool. Planning was rational, could predict future scientifically and most importantly destiny was in man’s control. Thus, planning and designing cities became the epitome of modernity. The so called rational thinking of the west imposed the aspiration for India to have cities that resembled that of the developed world. This approach completely negates the complexities of the Indian cities and focuses on image building, which is resulting in cities moving away from being humane.
2.0 COLONIAL CONSTRUCT OF THE IMAGE FOR THE INDIAN CITY

Even though early enough, there was a general interest of the West in India, mainly through Arab scholars and later through the Asiatic Society, the standard reference for the imperialists to understand India was, 'The History of British India,' by political theorist James Mill published in 1817. “Mill disputed and dismissed practically every claim ever made on behalf of Indian culture and its intellectual traditions, concluding that it was totally primitive and rude. This diagnosis went well with Mill’s general attitude, which supported the idea of bringing a rather barbaric nation under the benign and reformist administration of the British Empire.” (A. Sen 2005) This understanding of India by the ruling British is the foundation for any urban reform being taken up in the colonial era.

Late 19th century was when the British started to ensure public health in their home land towns; they implemented the same in India, which became a starting point for the construction of an image on how a city ‘should’ be in India. “To institutionalize the ‘modern’ process of planning, the Public Works Department published ‘The Handbook on Town Planning in 1876’. The handbook contained guidelines for undertaking urban development projects all over the country and it is easy to trace the origins of many current professional philosophies and practices to this book” (Menon 2007). This imposed a post-industrial urban rationale on a pre-industrial Indian metropolis. Industries in Delhi were more craft based and thus lacked the so called disciplined rigor and order of an assembly line unit, so were the spaces which they occupied. The British parts, which were majorly cantonment areas, due to military presence had strict order and sanitized streets creating a sense of heterotopia for the natives. Since the colonizer lived in such a space, it automatically seeped into the psyche of the populous, on how an ideal city should look.

Pre-British, the city of Delhi (Shahjahahanabad) was more egalitarian at least in the spatial mix of different economic groups, mainly because of its size and the economic mix of the karkhana, along with other building blocks of the city. Even though the segregation existed, but everything was within the compact city of Shahjahanabad through a diverse mix in the karkhanas itself, thus geographical isolation of the economically weaker section was impossible.

Post the 1857 mutiny the British decided to segregate themselves and created separate quarters, where the Indian elite would also live. This led to a clear divide between the ‘natives’ and the ‘colonizer’ because of the size of the divided sector. Once the natives are grouped into one category it was easier to see them as one homogeneous entity. This became the beginning of the ‘colony’- ‘colonizer’ spatial divide. When the majestic city of New Delhi was getting planned in the early 20th Century, among other strategies, there was an intended open space (now called Ram Lila Maidan) left so as to keep a physical barrier between the natives and the colonizers. New Delhi was only for the colonizers and the royal and elite Indians, so the image of that became one that is to be aspired for - wide roads, clean lawns and under control & ‘disciplined’ urban spaces. The image of New Delhi added a progressive layer on top of the British cantonment image.

“Delhi, the walled city, rich with building traditions, and for Europeans, the quintessential Oriental landscape, encountered dramatic cultural upheavals in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Reason, science, and the universals of modernism in Europe arrived in India along with an authoritarian imperialism and exploitative capitalism. For their own economic and political ends, the new regime introduced, encouraged, and imposed modernisms which had arisen under different circumstances in Europe and which were presented as the only legitimate expressions to which Indians might aspire.” (Hosagrahar 2012)

After the mutiny of 1857 “the British realized that they had come within a hair’s breadth of losing their empire in urban areas because their organic morphology made them difficult to control. There was a concerted effort thereafter to
rebuild Indian towns on more familiar terms that they could ‘understand’” (Menon 2007). Almost every city in North India saw a ‘Nai Sadak’ meaning New Road in English, which cut through the organic fabric and created an axis, at the focus of which came the industrial icon, a clock tower; creating an apathy towards the organic and an aspiration for the geometrically laid city.

After the capital of British Empire was moved to New Delhi from Kolkata, there was a huge migration of people into the city. New Delhi designed on the concepts of garden city could not accommodate this immigration, so naturally the population was absorbed by the much organic and adaptable Old Delhi (Shahjahanabad). Old Delhi reflected poor living conditions prevalent in Europe during industrialization, thus government decided to analyze the situation. “On 3rd August 1935, Arthur Parke Hume was commissioned by the Government of India to write a report on the relief of urban congestion in Old Delhi” (Legg 2007).

It is an interesting correlation to read that the Hume report was formulated to study the ‘congestion’ in Old Delhi and the result of the Commission’s finding lead to the creation of Delhi Improvement Trust (DIT). Thus, the main focus of DIT was to ‘de-congest’ the native city. Phrases like ‘congestion’, ‘high density’ and ‘mixed use’ got included in the urban design and planning vocabulary with a negative connotation. Also, it is interesting to note that Delhi region having a hot and dry climate, shading of the built environment is very important, for habitable spaces. Thus a fine fabric with mutual shading is a natural built response, which started to picture itself as unhealthy and dirty. Typical typologies of buildings in Delhi were derivatives of a perimeter block, creating a vibrant and public street, except for iconic buildings like mosques, temples and palaces (or forts) etc. The image of a clean city has wiped out perimeter block as an architectural language and established a building practice which produces only free standing buildings in space, resulting in dead motor vehicle dominated roads and unsafe public domain, prevalent even today.

3.0 CASTING OF A DICTATOR – THE MASTER PLAN

By late 1940s DIT was under attack from popular media for adhoc developmental projects. One of the key problems was that, DIT along with few other private builders, operated in Delhi and did not contribute much to the city, especially with relation to the post 1947 partition led migration. Thus in 1951, Birla committee (also known as DIT enquiry committee) was established for looking into irregularities in development by DIT.

One of the main reasons considered for the failure of DIT was that it did piece meal development projects which at that time were juxtaposed against the ‘majestic’ and ‘planned’ New Delhi of the British. Thus, the obvious outcome of the committee was to formulate an umbrella organization which would look at the city of Delhi as a whole and develop a ‘master’ plan. This, as understood from Christopher Alexander’s ‘New Theory of Urban Design’, can easily be associated as a starting point for the city to degrade and lose its wholeness (Alexander 1987), as well as the custom of few officials deciding for the masses on what is good for them.

Indian Government in November 1955, as per the Birla Committee Report’s recommendations, created Delhi Development Authority (Provisional) and in 1957 came up with a Delhi Development Act, which gave Delhi Development Authority (DDA) a constitutional bearing. One of the main objectives of DDA was to develop land for various purposes in the city, so it became the largest speculator in the city, playing with the land dynamics, almost exclusively, for the first decade of its formation.

Organizational structure of DDA was such that it was placed directly under the central (federal) government, thus the development rights were under the Central Government, thus completely disassociating the city residents with the development process. The same structure is followed throughout India, for almost all other development agencies of cities, which are placed under the respective State Governments. This
structure gave exclusive and independent powers to DDA. “Underlying the power granted to technocratic elites and experts, such as Le Corbusier, was the understanding of urbanization as the pinnacle of a nation’s social and political development. This framework of thought positioned the state and its technocrats as agents of history, removing planning from the scrutiny of democratic politics.” (Prakash 2002) This also led to the unique situation in Delhi, wherein the development in the city became a showcase for the entire nation and the world to judge the performance and vision of the central government as Delhi was the only direct development-initiative laboratory available for the central government.

After the formation of DDA, the image for a city, which was a colonial construct, became stronger, so also the opinion that a Master Plan will ‘tame’ the city. One of the national dailies published in 1960 mentions - “If Delhi is to be planned into a well integrated city, and to be maintained as such, it needs inhabitants with a primary ‘urban’ psychology.” (Why a Master Plan for Delhi 1960) This is in tune with the thought process of Albert Mayer, the head of Ford planning team for Delhi’s first Master Plan, who cited village-like habits of migrants as one of the constraints in ‘master’ planning Delhi (Sundaram 2012). Hence the first Master Plan of Delhi, published in 1962, was essentially a creation of, an image for the city rather than a city for the people. Such an approach stages the Master Plan as a ‘regulatory’ document rather than a ‘facilitating’ agency framework. This regulatory framework fountainheads projects and regulations ranging from macro aspects like assigning specific use category to land, barricading the centre of the city to keep people out etc, to micro interventions like creating fences on road dividers to stop people from crossing the road at ‘non-designated’ spots, evacuating slums which don’t conform to the constructed image etc. The plan was based on land use zoning, which essentially designated separate areas for industrial and commercial purposes, which intended to have ‘clean’ residential and core city areas. This completely negates the fact that people working in these commercial and industrial zones also need a habitable environment, all to achieve the image constructed over a period of time for the perceived-core/important parts of the city.

Subsequent Master Plans started to refine this image based on the collective memory of the urban middle class, to an extent that the vision statement for the 2021 Master Plan is to create a ‘world class city’, even the core of the new plan is essentially that of the 1962 Master Plan. “In part, this desire of the city planners to make Delhi into another global metropolis, may be ascribed to the rapidly emerging ‘new global order’. In a sense, what marks this new global order is the ‘de-territorialization’ of the third-world metropolis, a sundering of its ties with its national location and its integration into the network of a handful of global cities.” (Nigam 2001) In that sense the image for the Indian metropolis is now being copied from global experiences.

4.0 ASPIRATIONAL URBANISM 6 AND ACTIVISM OF THE BOURGEOIS

Post liberalization of the economy in 1990s, the urban middle class became stronger and globally more connected to strengthen and skew the collective memory of the urban citizens. This collective memory is constructed over a period of time as discussed previously. The pre 1857 order and discipline in the British cantonment as oppose to the lively streets of katars and mohallas’; the legibility of axis and focal elements of post 1857 British interventions as opposed to the organic streets and climatologically responsive morphology; the autocratic and majestic image of New Delhi as opposed to the people oriented and democratic bazars; the fear of congestion imposed by Hume committee report and DIT as opposed to lively narrow streets with intense community bonding and mixed use; the master planned, grand and modern ‘spectacle’ city as opposed to incremental, user generated vernacular cities demonstrates the transition in city building process. This is now transformed into an image building exercise, the picture perfect, which is why blatant claims like
Delhi’s aspiration to be like Paris or London so often surface in the media. Such claims are nothing more than just a tangible image to the aspirational construct.

During the preparation for Commonwealth Games in Delhi in 2010, there was a massive plan to uproot slums and relocate them on the outskirts of the city. One particular example was that of Yamuna Pushta slum which was demolished by DDA in 2004 in a drive to make the river Yamuna’s flood plains encroachment free (Burke 11 July 2010), while on the other hand in 2009 Delhi Metro Rail Corporation started its yard and an interchange station on the very flood plains. Similar were the cases of Akshardham temple constructed in 2005 and Commonwealth games village constructed in 2010. It is interesting to note that slums created out of semi permanent construction materials would logically harm the river bed less than the massive concrete structures. It becomes very clear if this is read against another drive to visually cover the edges of slums in Delhi during the commonwealth games with flex-printed panels, so that the visitors won’t see the slums. These moves clearly suggest a notion of ‘shame’ because of the organic and informal nature of the slums versus the aspiration for a formal ‘picture perfect’ city.

As the development control rights lays with DDA and is headed by Lieutenant Governor appointed by the central government, the state government and the city governments have little or no say in development (except in road transport etc.) (Sixty Ninth Constitution Amendment Act 1991). This creates a situation where the development projects in Delhi are governed by the national aspirations of a world class city, a notional idea, rather than the local needs.

The general election is governed by the national issues while the state and municipal elections are seldom pinned on urbanization (except on basic urban services like water supply, electricity etc.). In 1992 the 74th Constitutional Amendment Act (74th CAA) gave local governments power to strengthen local governance but Delhi was deliberately kept out of it (India 1993). Thus, the system itself is programmed to slip the discussions on urban issues of the city in any democratic forum. Even though Delhi government launched Bhagidari (a scheme for local participation (Delhi Government n.d.) based on the participation by the Resident Welfare Associations (RWA)), it is usually termed as pseudo-democratic, because the RWA don’t have any mandate to be democratic and usually is dominated by retired residents of a neighborhood. Also it is against true democratic values, as it represents only property owning residents.

Thus, because of absolute lack of any democratic forum for urban discussions, the bourgeois have resorted to the court of law to resolve urban issues. This may seem like a good breakthrough in the democratic system, but this approach is taken only by the elite and in the process they are reinforcing and are governed by the colonial construct of aspirations and image of what a city should be. So now the judicial activism for urban issues becomes an act of cultural hegemony. It is quite evident from many court cases on how the judicial activism of the bourgeois is skewed, leading to an urbanism of aspiration.

In the famous 1996 MC Mehta case, environmentalist filed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) for removing polluting industries from Delhi (M C Mehta Vs Union of India & Ors 1996 Judgement). While it is completely logical to not have or regulate polluting industries, but because the aspirational image was at play, a demand was made to relocate the industries on the outskirts of the city. Technically if the industries are moved outside, the perceived-core city areas will have better order and will be cleaner as per the aspirational image of the city. With industries the people working in them will also move, effectively having almost no impact on the pollution levels, if not an increase because of the travel demand.

It is not just the case with individuals, even DDA’s moves are almost always governed by the aspiration image; e.g. “in 2003, the Ridge Bachao Andolan (Save the Ridge Movement) submitted a petition to the Supreme Court of
India challenging the construction of India’s largest shopping mall complex for being built on Delhi’s southern ridge, a protected green space, in the up-and-coming South Delhi colony of Vasant Kunj. This constituted a land use violation of the statutorily binding Delhi Master Plan. Expert testimony by the DDA defended the project in the Court for being ‘planned’ and thus legal because of the involvement of professional builders, its high-quality construction, and its strategic function in boosting Delhi’s architectural profile. Showing graphic models and architectural blueprints of the proposed development, emphasizing the project’s 300 million USD price tag, and describing the (shopping) mall as a ‘world class’ commercial complex, the DDA suggested that the visual appearance of the future mall was in itself enough to confirm the project’s planned-ness. How could a project of such strategic importance in Delhi’s effort to become a world-class consumer destination not be planned, the DDA’s lawyer argued. This was so even after its own ‘Expert Committee’ found the complex in ‘flagrant violation’ of planning law. During the course of the mall proceedings in the Supreme Court, an adjacent multi-generational slum settlement in conformance with the land use designation listed in the Master Plan was declared ‘unplanned’ and illegal by the DDA for being a ‘nuisance’ to the neighboring middle class residential colonies. Based on a set of photographs showing the ‘unsightly’ conditions in the slum and despite the absence of a survey or scientific evaluation of its so-called ‘nuisance-causing activities’, the DDA demolished the settlement without compensation, an action upheld by the court.” (Ghertner 2011)

Aspirational urbanism was at its prime during the preparation for Commonwealth Games in 2010 with many expensive projects launched, just to capture the constructed image described above (Ramesh 2008) e.g. the revitalization of Connaught Place (CP). CP was part of the British New Delhi and was built as a majestic white shopping arcade. With Commonwealth games in mind Rs. 6.71 billion (USD 111.4 million) was spent on making it look world class. While not much change can be seen at CP with respect to the urban issues that prevailed pre project conception, cosmetic treatment like façade re-plastering & re-painting and polished granite stone for paving, service trenches etc. were major initiatives. While discussing the making of ‘world class city’ Asher points out that, “public finances in early 2000s were gradually shifted away from education, public housing, healthcare and food subsidies towards large, highly visible and ‘modern’ infrastructure projects.” (Ghertner 2011)

It is also a problem that the developments in Delhi are governed by the aspirations of the urban middle class and is being reflected throughout urban India. Also it is an interesting fact that the voting population in urban middle class is extremely low as compared to the lower economic section of the society, thus resulting in a sort of a cultural hegemony by the bourgeois superimposing and exaggerating the ideal image of the ‘world class’. Now that Delhi’s urban development is not directed through a democratic apparatus, the resultant at least in perception is apolitical; this along with a multi party coalition at the centre makes the developments in Delhi politically quite easy to be reflected across India. From flyovers to metro rail projects happening in Delhi become an aspiration for the whole nation.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

It is not that the professionals are completely unaware of this skewed aspiration that is driving the urbanization of Delhi, but it is a highly charged political issue. Also newer projects, for instance, the Shahjahanabad renewal by INTACH (Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage) try to go back to the pre 1857 urban scenario breaking away from the aspirational construct. This approach of going back to the roots is also problematic; it is a reflection of the Hegelian idea of ‘absolute recall’, which Slovene philosopher and cultural critic Slavoj Žižek beautifully explains as ‘when we think we are returning to some roots, we are effectively creating in the very return what we are returning to.’ Thus, in either case of
following the general aspirational image or the effort to achieve pre 1857 urban scenario are both intrinsically a creation of a pseudo urban image.

“If cities are the crucibles of ideation (where the future is imagined), then that imagination needs to be debated quite separately from the politico-economic processes, if only to protect them as public places. The Indian city needs to be reimagined, from the grandiose Nehruvian symbol of ‘progress and scientific ideologies’ to a place where the quality of life is nurtured and reduced equitably, and where control over resources is vested in its citizens. The urban object needs to be relocated from being an epiphénomènomen of other forms of planning to a crucial, active agent that reinstates Eros as a prime deity in the city.” (Ravindran 1996) Cities are for people and biases of image on how it should be, completely negate the discussion for the development of new typologies that are required for the changing lifestyle and the emerging new urban social and economic order.

Metropolitan cities in India are growing at a very fast pace so is the change in the way people live. India is a developing nation with per capita income as low as 1/80th of that of USA and also there are other problems of a developing nation. All this calls for a new way to look at Indian metropolis, a way that can be devoid of constructed image biases. This way of looking at cities will intrinsically push for an egalitarian Indian metropolis, looking at the faults and rectification measures at the basic structure on which Delhi survives today and not at cosmetic treatment. It is time to re-think what Delhi is? New ways of hitherto unseen collective living can be seen in Delhi, both at groups of white collar employees as well as unskilled migrants, such and many similar changes in social relationships are not yet even acknowledged by development agencies, thus resulting in an urban space that is completely out of sync with the reality. Such out of sync development is what leads to anarchic ruptures in the city, from slums to gated communities, from high crime rates to domestic violence, all of which is a big hindrance to a creative society.

A city is definitely more than sum of its parts, and thus there is a need for city level planning and urban design, but the essential vision that needs to be achieved by this planning needs a complete re-thinking. India is going through a demographic dividend and majority of its younger population are moving quickly to urban areas. This demographic dividend will be of no use unless we conceive our cities in a manner that will facilitate development of creativity in individuals and happiness as a collective identity.

NOTES
1 As a consequence of inadequate Constitutional provision for the Local Self Government, democracy in municipal governance was not stable. The 74th Constitutional Amendment Act 1992, provides a constitutional bearing to urban local bodies and provide them with powers including financial autonomy. (India 1993)
2 Heterotopia as described by French philosopher & social theorist Michel Foucault where in the behavior of an individual is not normal as a result of the quality of the space.
3 Karkhana means a factory in Hindi. When Shahjahanabad was being developed, land parcels were given to rich traders and were called karkhanas. Each of these karkhanas accommodated the owner as well as the workers, bringing an economic mix in the building block of the city itself.
4 Shahjahanabad or today’s Old Delhi, is the city established by Mughal Emperor Shah Jahan in 1639 AD.
5 In 1857 there was a sepoy mutiny usually considered the first struggle for freedom, where the Indians in the British Army revolted and sided up with the local Kings/Queens to take over the colonial power. Post 1857 the rule of India was shifted from the British East India Company to the Crown of Britain.
6 Aspirational Urbanism is the term first used by author in his presentation titled ‘Invisible Man’ identifying the issues on homelessness, at ‘Digital Deliberations’, a one day workshop on digitization of identity and its impact on homeless masses: held at National Institute of Advanced Studies (NIAS), Bangalore, India, July 2012. The workshop was a CSOC (Centre for the Study of Culture and Society) - NIAS Urban Research and Policy Programme initiative.
7 Katras and mahallas are traditional neighborhood structure in Delhi that existed during and pre mughal era.
8 This conversion is on changing rates, so should be considered only to get a rough idea about the cost.
9 It is interesting to mention here that the metro rail in Kolkata started functioning as early as 1973, but the idea of a metro rail was never copied in any other city for decades even though cities like Mumbai, Chennai and Delhi were feasibly big. The metro rail in Delhi started to function in 2003 and by 2010 studies for feasibility for a metro rail system in more than 12 Indian cities began and operations started in the city of Bangalore in 2011.
10 This comparison is drawn just to position the economic condition of India, use of USA or that of per capita income have no other specific reason.
11 Based on field studies by author in Delhi during 2010-13.
12 Inspired from the ‘happiness quotient’ concept of Bhutan.
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