Civilizing the Political Society? Redevelopment Regime and Urban Poor's Rights in Mumbai

Rishi Jha, School of Social Work, Lund University, Sweden.

Abstract

This article is concerned with informality-state relations, subaltern politics and citizenship in the context of the urban redevelopment regime. Based on an empirical study of an NGO (SPARC)-mediated resettlement of Project Affected Persons (PAPs) in Mumbai, it explicates the incomplete 'civilizing of the political society' which engenders asymmetrical material and leadership enablement and differential subjectivities at the community levels. The state co-opts SPARC's institutional framework to mediate resettlement, engender limited traversal from 'population' to 'citizen', restrict democratic liberation and subject the PAPs to bifold governance against the antagonistic articulations of state-subaltern relations, viz. 'political society' and 'deep democracy'. SPARC's institutional claims of inclusion and community-centric resettlement, non-confrontational negotiations and politics of patience are materialized through institutional coercion, domesticated confrontations and inadequate compensation and are augmented by the PAPs' calculative rationalities, fear of homelessness and anticipation of urban citizenship. Against this backdrop and further post-resettlement marginalities that complicate housing-based 'substantive citizenship' amidst 'political society'-based mediation, this article calls for a re-politicization of the redevelopment discourse to seek alternate possibilities of urban citizenship for the urban subaltern.

Keywords: Urban Redevelopment, Political Society, Deep Democracy, Urban Citizenship, Urban Subaltern.

Introduction

The postcolonial megacity of Mumbai – the 12th richest city in the world, with over half of its denizens accommodated in over 4,000 *jhopadpatti* (slums) – is an exemplar of contestations around informality-state relations, subaltern politics and urban citizenship in the contemporary Global South. From the phase of unconditional demolitions (1960s), through the phase of slum improvement schemes (1970s-1980s), to the present phase of slum resettlement (since 1980s), the state's response to the urban subaltern question has traversed a long journey (Bhide, 2009). In the wake of the New Economic Policy (of 1990s), the state's orientation transmogrified into the Slum Resettlement Scheme (SRS), driven by an amalgamation of the neoliberal market-led 'cross-subsidy' model with populist politics of 'free-housing' for the 'legal' urban poor (based on cut-off years like 1995, 2000, 2005), and forged the vision of a slum-free Mumbai (Nainan, 2008). Furthering the agenda of neoliberal urbanism, the state inflicted mass demolitions to free up slum-land for commercial purposes, and mega-infrastructure and transport projects, adopted the free-housing logic for the Project Affected Persons (PAPs), and institutionalized NGO-mediated resettlement programmes.

Institutionalization of the urban poor and NGO-mediated resettlement offers an alternative standpoint of inclusion against the earlier spate of violent and regulatory slum clearances, security of tenure against uncompensated evictions, and housing-based urban citizenship against the slum's durable illegality, and guides our attention towards an apparent pro-poor redevelopment regime. The World Bank-financed biggest urban transport project in India-Mumbai Urban Transport Project (MUTP), which aimed to develop an 'efficient and sustainable urban transport system and enhance the quality of life in Mumbai' (World Bank, 2005), is one such case. The Bank and Government of Maharashtra's parastatal Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority (MMRDA) reworked SRS to formulate MUTP's resettlement policy, to include legitimate/documented owners of land and structures among the PAPs and to institutionalize an NGO, Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centres (SPARC) for resettlement (World Bank, 2005). The Bank claims MUTP's resettlement model as an exemplar of urban resettlement, which has provided over 100,000 PAPs , amongst 120,000-169,700 displaced (World Bank, 2005, p. 71), with tenurial security, financial security, social confidence, a safer community and a cultural network away from the systems of informality in the slums (Mishra and Srinivas, 2012).

MUTP's collaborating partner, SPARC Alliance (henceforth, SPARC) is an institutional ensemble of an urban NGO, SPARC and two grassroots collectives of urban poor, the National

Slum Dwellers Federation and Mahila Milan, that functions as a 'bridging organization' (Patel and Milton, 2001, p. 9) between MMRDA and the PAPs in the resettlement process. Appadurai (2001), Patel, d'Cruz, and Burra (2002) and Patel and Bartlett (2009) claim SPARC's community-centric strategies to be 'participatory' and its 'anti-elitist knowledge production' about the urban poor's needs, horizontal exchanges within the community and vertical negotiations with state institutions to be 'self-empowering'. McFarlane (2004) argues that its mediation creates pathways of inclusion, rights and citizenship for the urban poor in a city that remains strongly non-egalitarian. SPARC-mediated '[politics of] visibility' and 'people managed resettlement' redefines subaltern urban politics whereby the otherwise 'invisible citizens' negotiate for 'urban citizenship from below' (Appadurai, 2001, pp. 18-27). The emergence of 'spaces of political engagement' of struggle and negotiation between the state authorities and SPARC diversifies 'development positions', induces 'institutional pluralism' and offers a 'development alternative' for the urban poor (McFarlane, 2004, p. 910). Based on security of tenure in resettlement colonies and ensuing possibilities of civil, political, social, economic and cultural rights, SPARC's mediation has been claimed to offer 'substantive citizenship' to the resettled (McFarlane, 2004).

This article examines the interventional aspect of SPARC-mediated resettlement of MUTP's PAPs. How do SPARC's 'community-centric strategies', 'people-managed resettlement' (Patel, d'Cruz, and Burra, 2002; Patel and Milton, 2001), and 'housing based [politics of] citizenship' (Appadurai, 2001) unfold at the community levels? In what ways and to what extent does the resettlement regime and SPARC mediation 'civilize the political society' (Roy, 2009, p. 161; cf. Chatterjee, 2004) leading to the 'deepening of democracy' (Appadurai, 2001)? This article draws upon yet moves beyond two seminal conceptualizations of the state-urban subaltern relationship: Chatterjee's (2004) 'political society' and Appadurai's (2001) 'deep democracy'. While, Chatterjee (2004), articulates the urban subaltern as 'population' that are targets of 'governmentality from above', Appadurai (2001) posits SPARC's institutional mediation and bottom-up strategies as 'counter-governmentality' leading to the 'deepening of democracy'.

Governmentality, is a composite of processes and agencies, state, quasi-state and non-state, through which the conduct of a population is governed (Foucault, 2008; Dean, 2010). This article locates SPARC's 'bridging' as the 'correlate of the liberal art of government' (Foucault, 2008, p. 291) that 'de-statizes' (Rose, 1996, p. 56) the state's regulatory operations and endeavours to engage with the urban poor to achieve voluntary displacement through resettlement. SPARC's mediation establishes 'new connections and relationships' (Chatterjee,

2005, p. 206) between MMRDA and the PAPs and its intervention leads to the 'governmentalization of the state' (Dean, 2010, p. 223), whereby its grassroots initiatives recalibrate the state's resettlement policy and make it viable, acceptable and scalable at the community level. SPARC's engagement introduces new norms and regulations, practices for community mobilization and organization, and discourses across the 'heterogeneous construct of the social' (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 35) of the PAPs, i.e. activists, community leaders and members, and collectives, i.e. housing societies and Mahila Milan groups, through its modalities of differential inclusion and negotiation for resettlement.

Methodology

The analysis of this article is based on the data collected over six months of fieldwork conducted in March-July 2016 and July 2017 in the most prominent resettlement colony in Mumbai's M-East ward, Vashi Naka. M-East ward represents the underbelly of the megacity with hazardous industries like petroleum refineries and fertilizer factories, undesirable land uses like solid waste landfills and India's biggest abattoir, and correctional institutions like beggars' home and women's reception home. It is characterized by deplorable socio-economic conditions and 'the lowest human development indices in Mumbai' (MCGM, 2010) and could be called the 'slum ward', as three-fourth of its population lives in slum settlements. The availability of comparatively low-cost peripheral land in this stigmatized ecology, coupled with its potential for the cross-subsidy model, made M-East ward a favoured location for affordable resettlement by the state (Nainan, 2008), and made it , the 'resettlement ward' with maximum resettled PAPs housed in its thirteen resettlement sites, including six PAP townships or colonies.

Vashi Naka, located in the northeast periphery of the ward, with 143 buildings comprising of 10,662 units and PAPs from over 100 project locations, accommodates most of the MUTP PAPs, majorly in the MMRDA Colony and the New MMRDA Colony. Data collection aimed to obtain PAPs' diverse experiences through the completed phases, i.e. relocation and resettlement, and yet unfinished phase, i.e. rehabilitation, and the ensuing engagement with state institutions, viz. MMRDA and Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (MCGM), and SPARC. The data for this study has been triangulated using the following sources and methods: institutional and media reports; focus group discussions with leaders and members of co-operative housing societies (CHS) and Mahila Milan; in-depth semi-structured interviews with SPARC and Mahila Milan community workers, and activists; and field observations. The selection of respondents followed purposive sampling to increase diversity along four axes, i.e.

location of the projects, sites of displacement (highway and railway), type of community post-resettlement (heterogeneous or homogeneous) and various leadership roles, and accordingly, thirty-eight PAPs and four community workers from SPARC, NSDF and Mahila Milan participated in the research process. They represented diverse originating slum locations in Mumbai, Dahisar and Borivali in the north, Dadar, Vadala and Bandra in the south, and Bhandup and Vikhroli in the east, who were shifted to the transit camp in Kokari Agar in Vadala (during 2001-2003) and finally resettled in Vashi Naka (during 2003-2006). Among the research participants, twenty-two were men and sixteen were women, out of which eight men and three women were community leaders and four men and two women were activists. The collected data was transcribed, coded and analysed using the thematic framework, aided by the data analysis software Atlas.ti, to engender the following three themes: the 'politics of inclusion', the 'politics of relocation' and the 'politics of negotiation'.

Politics of inclusion: From illegality to community-managed resettlement

The informal settlements from where the respondents originated were spread adjacent to highways, arterial roads and suburban railways, and represented crowded and substandard living conditions, non-existent or dilapidated physical infrastructure and planning absenteeism (Davis, 2006). A community leader explained, 'We lived in a *jhopadpatti* (slum) for decades. *Sarkari sahayata* (state's services) were non-existent; however, we managed locally through *neta* (political leaders) and [political] *party*. Everyone had work, what else do you need [to live] in Mumbai? ... Demolitions were frequent during the last few years, but like always, we rebuilt our *jhopdas* (tenements) as a community'. Inhabitants of the slum settlements survived the state's indifference through everyday struggles, makeshift arrangements, and local mediations with politicians and political parties. Unlike citizens that have legal claims over the state, these slum inhabitants form the 'population' and utilize 'political society'-based patronage, horizontal mobilization, contextual and para-legal arrangements, and the 'moral' rhetoric of community for claim-making (Chatterjee, 2004). Meticulous use of 'political society'-based mediation enables them to bypass the state's schemes and defy brutal demolitions, employ horizontal mobilization to forge territorial claims, and appropriate local institutions and demonstrate 'occupancy urbanism' (Benjamin, 2008, p. 725). It is through this resilience that they not only survive for decades, but also sustain repeated demolitions.

The developmental state, in turn, applies classificatory schemes of legality and illegality against costs and benefits of welfare administration to make them governable (Chatterjee, 2004). While the slum inhabitants continuously reworked their urban belonging at local levels

and 'refuse to be disciplined' (Benjamin, 2008, p. 719), SPARC introduced an alternative amidst repeated demolitions and threats of evictions. 'SPARC declared, Come join us [SPARC]! If they [the police or the Railways] demolish your *jhopda* (tenement), we will provide you with a flat and amenities. Trust us; we have provided flats to many like you. If you join, everything will happen peacefully and the demolitions will stop!' a PAP recounted. Against the state's brutal demolitions, SPARC's non-violent approach offered the urban poor peaceful mediation with the state and resettlement in a flat with amenities, which formed a 'development alternative' (McFarlane, 2004), based on a different perspective of negotiated development, institutional pluralism and discourses of participation.

Diverse narratives of the respondents inform that the offered development alternative was articulated and operationalized through the discursive logic of the image of the slum versus the resettlement colony and the possibilities of urban citizenship through inclusion. It extends the image of the urban poor as an 'illegal encroacher' and the slum as a 'pathological space' (Legg, 2007) unfit for human inhabitation. Housing society leaders and Mahila Milan leaders narrated that SPARC's representatives and their community workers would teach them that, 'Living in filthy and insecure tenements was not good for them. Moreover, the land belonged to the state and they had illegally occupied it'. Besides, 'they needed to do progress and move into better, permanent place' (Interview quoted in Doshi, 2012, p. 13). Contrary to the slum's portrayed stigmatized ecology, the offered development alternative produces a compelling image of the resettlement colony as legal, permanent and hygienic, equipped with private flats and modern amenities, leading to an upgraded living standard, thus creating a space for the state's intervention and its acceptance by the urban poor.

The proposed development alternative lies in congruence with the state's developmentalism that locates economic growth and urban restructuration in the progress of the nation and its people (Chatterjee, 1998). It also normalizes the vision of a futuristic urban, based on the state's sovereign power over slum clearance-based urban planning and displacement-based urban redevelopment. This discursive logic produced a desire for resettlement among the urban poor who succumbed to this vision against possible eviction and homelessness. An activist PAP from Nivara Hakk Suraksha Samiti (NHSS), a right-to-house movement for the urban poor in Mumbai (Bhide, 2009), agreed, 'We did not want to be an obstacle in Mumbai's development. We are poor, how long could we have fought for *jameen* (land) and *jhopda* (tenement)? What could have been better than the flat and amenities that SPARC offered us in exchange of our *jhopdas*?' The internalization of the state's vision by the 'insurgent' (Holston, 2008) urban poor and their grassroots collectives complements SPARC's

assurances of material benefits upon participation. This diffuses possible confrontation and enables wider acceptance of SPARC-led community mobilization and collectivization initiatives.

Patel, d'Cruz, and Burra (2002) articulate SPARC's collectivization strategies as being based on the mobilization of 'new' communities, but this article divergently argues that SPARC's intervention, essentially co-opts and reworks the community's existing informal collectives, leaders and networks that earlier formed the rhetoric of 'political society' for its community organization and intervention. A Mahila Milan Leader detailed, 'SPARC representatives confederated women in *bachat-gats* (self-help groups) under Mahila Milan and active women were handpicked as leaders'. Explaining men's participation, she mentioned, 'They [Men] were initially skeptical about SPARC; they thought that participation would lead to eviction. Nevertheless, we persuaded them about the benefits of participation, after which they formed housing societies, which were led by our local leaders'. The reworking of informal leaders towards a formal orientation legitimizes target-oriented interventions, like resettlement, and acts as a site of power, decision-making, leadership and authority. The women leaders foster community participation based on their differential exercise of power and SPARC utilizes these gendered spaces to persuade the community about the benefits of participation under its representative authority (also see Doshi, 2012). Presumably participatory, such spaces of inclusion, in fact, co-opt subaltern leadership, like NHSS activists and reluctant members, for their voluntary participation. The institutional reworking of community relations through gendered mobilization and co-option ensures complete elimination of any 'threat of political reprisal' and engenders '[politics of] accommodation and non-confrontational negotiation' (Appadurai, 2001, p. 29).

In constructing a community that seeks relocation, SPARC introduced community-centric 'self-enumeration' and 'self-surveys' to estimate the communities' relocation needs (Patel, d'Cruz, and Burra, 2002; SPARC, n.d.). Appadurai (2001, pp. 34-35) articulates community-led self-enumeration strategies as an 'internal practice of democracy' that creates urban poor's 'own archive' which offers 'social visibility within the community' and 'invisibility in the eyes of the state' leading to empowerment and 'governmentality turned against itself'. In contrast, PAPs' experiences inform that SPARC operationalized its community-centric strategies in a hierarchical order under which 'they confederated and followed SPARC's representatives and community leaders' and 'engaged as directed by SPARC and Mahila Milan'. They also 'conducted community surveys under SPARC's technical expertise', 'demolished our tenements on SPARC's assurances of resettlement and rehabilitation', and 'voluntarily shifted

to the transit camp'. Unlike the institutional narratives which conforms to community-centric processes, the PAP's narratives suggest that SPARC-mediated enumerations and surveys function as an instrument of governmentality that 'render visible spaces over which government is to be exercised' (Rose, 1999, p. 36) and facilitate the conduct of the 'targeted population' (Dean, 2010, p. 196). These technologies of visibility, while being utilized by the neoliberal state for freeing the slum land for infrastructure projects, also attributes formal recognition and legality to the urban poor and enhances their 'agency' (Dean, 2010). The state's institutional recognition of and SPARC's hierarchical association with the PAPs reveals discursive empowerment practices, diverse negotiation pathways, and differential 'technologies of citizenship' (Cruikshank, 1994) in the following phases of resettlement.

Politics of relocation: Community negotiation and contested transfer

SPARC's institutional narrative explains that the transfer to the transit camp engenders an assurance of resettlement among the PAPs under which they 'willingly become full participants' (Patel, d'Cruz, and Burra, 2002, p. 171); however, it scarcely acknowledges diverse contestations, critiques and dissents that erupt in the process (Roy, 2009). Revising this debate, this article argues that the making of wilful participants happens in a 'versatile equilibrium, with complementarity and conflicts between techniques' (Foucault, 1993, p. 204) that enables the state's and SPARC's 'coercive exercise of power upon the subjectivities' (Cruikshank, 1994, p. 35) of the PAPs, who finally succumb to their decisions and conditions of transfer.

The transfer to the transit camp isolated the PAPs from their slum locations, rearranged them into single-room dwellings (of 11 square metres each) in lanes with common public utilities, induced social alienation and enforced their dependence on MMRDA and SPARC for their final resettlement and promised entitlements. While resettlement guidelines assured community consultation and allocation of resettlement colonies within convenient distances, within three kilometres from the eviction sites, MMRDA single-handedly allotted the peripheral Vashi Naka as their resettlement site, and shifted the responsibility of final transfer to SPARC. SPARC, on the other hand, surrendered its limited negotiation power to MMRDA's authoritative decision making. The alliance representatives acknowledged that more opposition could have risked violence and other forms of repression and thereby, remained in lien with the state for mutual advantages (Milton and Patel, 2005). In the words of a community worker, 'whatever resettlement colony MMRDA allots for the PAPs, SPARC undertakes resettlement in the same'. Following the terms of the institutional assemblage with MMRDA, SPARC

undertook the responsibility to coerce – morally and legally – the PAPs to peacefully accept the decisions made from them.

Experiencing authoritative rather than inclusive decision making, the displeased and protesting PAPs approached SPARC's representatives, who pacified them, 'Suppose you have to choose a girl amongst *gori* (fair), *sanwli* (dusky) and *kali* (dark) girls for marriage; whom would you choose? You will obviously marry *gori* (fair). Then, what will happen to the others? Don't compare Vashi Naka with other resettlement colonies. Amenities are being arranged there, go!' SPARC's moral coercion extended its gendered negotiation strategies to the materiality of resettlement, constructed resettlement colonies as gendered bodies, personified them as prospective brides and attached cultural attributes to them. This logic manipulated the protesting evictees to recognize and empathize with the symbolic, gendered and moral violence inflicted upon the 'dark' or 'not so desirable' resettlement colony, if it is not embraced.

Insurgent evictees, like NHSS activists, who had once imagined legalization of slum settlements and had later accepted SPARC's intervention, now struggled for alternative resettlement locations. SPARC, with its institutional linkage with MMRDA and acquired powers of legal coercion, threatened them to either accept resettlement or face the bulldozers, 'SPARC has not demolished your *jhopda* (tenement)! You have done it yourself! If you do not accept Vashi Naka, evacuate the transit camp, go back, rebuild your *jhopda* and face demolition! You will not get a flat either!' SPARC's coercive measures unequivocally domesticate the previously insurgent evictees for whom to confront, to disobey and to disjoint was to stand outside the offered development alternative and technologies of citizenship (Roy, 2009). Moreover, exclusively men-led housing society-based decision-making ignored Mahila Milan leaders and members, who explained their helplessness and compulsion in an FGD, 'We never wanted to go to Vashi Naka, but we were frightened on seeing our society leaders leaving us. What if we were denied a house if we did not follow them? We had no option other than to accept their [SPARC and housing society] conditions'. While Mahila Milan-led women-centric community practice ensured community mobilization and organization, the housing society ensured men-centric mediation, decision-making and governance of resettlement, largely excluding women, establishing 'gendered domesticity and silencing gendered subjectivities' (Doshi, 2012).

MMRDA's authoritative decision-making and SPARC's coercion techniques induced 'calculative rationalities' (Dean, 2010, p. 206) across the PAPs, who either grudgingly accepted the offered alternative or actively sought possibilities within it based on their hierarchical power positions. Housing society members accused their leaders of colluding with SPARC and

accepting peripheral resettlement for personal gains. Mahila Milan members condemned their leaders for utilizing the notion of 'gendered' participation largely for coercion and only slightly for negotiation. Others lamented that their 'active participation, beyond saving and lending, might have yielded better negotiation outcomes'. On the whole, failed negotiations, diverse modalities of coercion and apprehensions of possible homelessness among the evicted urban poor elicited their undisputed acceptance of MMRDA's allotted resettlement site and SPARC's conditions of transfer.

Conversely, the community leaders utilized their negotiation power for economic, leadership and material outcomes. As FGDs and interviews inform, a considerable number of the community leaders gained economic benefits, in terms of 'occasional support from SPARC', 'monetary benefit from Mahila Milan', 'contributions in religious functions' and 'assistance for family's ceremonies'. They also received leadership benefits in terms of 'better relations with MMRDA and SPARC', 'continued community representation since transfer' and 'involvement in SPARC's projects' and other benefits in terms of 'central locations within Vashi Naka', 'better physical environment', 'spacious compound and well-ventilated flats', and 'collective transfer of their close groups'. Overall, MMRDA's non-compliance to the project norms and SPARC's coercive techniques and pathways of mediation, manipulated the PAPs to offer their 'progressive compliance' (according to a community worker) to the imposed conditions of resettlement. These embodied subjectivities establish that SPARC's strategies remain embedded in the politics of coercion and '[politics of] compensation' (Roy, 2009) unlike its institutional narratives of 'non-confrontational negotiation' (Patel, d'Cruz, and Burra, 2002) and 'politics of patience' (Appadurai, 2001, p. 28), which translate into diverse pathways of negotiation in the post-resettlement phase.

Politics of negotiation: Claims, entitlements and marginalities

Examining housing-based politics of citizenship, Appadurai (2001, p. 28) notes that, 'Housing – and its lack – is the stage for the most public drama of disenfranchisement in Mumbai, in fact, it can be argued that housing is the single most critical site of this city's politics of citizenship'. Uncertain transformations in the post-resettlement phase problematizes Appadurai's (2001) linear conceptualization and establishes that access to legal housing and conditional security of tenure, through resettlement, could neither guarantee empowerment nor facilitate 'substantive [urban] citizenship' (McFarlane, 2004) for the resettled urban poor. While, Vashi Naka – being MUTP's biggest R&R township – epitomizes MUTP's policy of 'successful resettlement' for the PAPs (Mishra and Srinivas, 2012), that are accommodated in

apartments (of 20.9 square metres each) in over 90 of its 143 buildings, MMRDA's exigency to resettle and SPARC's coercive techniques seeking progressive compliance yielded unsystematic resettlement and rehabilitation in Vashi Naka.

It brought in segregation and othering, advanced random mixing of households from different projects and resulted in the loss of erstwhile community ties. The mixed housing of PAPs from slums and pavements together induced an overt sense of othering. In an FGD, a resettled slum dweller argued, 'We are from slums, but they have allotted pavement dwellers to the flats next door. They do not have any culture. How can you expect a community here?' while a resettled pavement dweller responded, 'How can anybody question who stays where and what one does? It is neither their *jhopadpatti* (slum) nor our *phutapaath* (pavement). A family should restrict itself to the allotted flat.' Such experiences of difference and forced co-habitation translate the sociological dichotomy between 'community-based' living in slum settlements and 'street culture' of pavements dwellers (Speak and Tipple, 2006) into everyday encounters and conflicts. Differences in everyday routines, utilization of common areas, privacy-seeking attitudes and cultural practices intensifies the notion of othering and engenders disputes at inter-household and intra-community levels, which is further exacerbated along interstices of caste and religion.

Diverse community restoration experiences influence the CHSs' operations. According to a community worker, 'CHSs are mini-governments' that conceptualize the liberal art of government. Comprising of progressively 'empowered' (Rose, 1996) PAPs, they are expected to, through self-operation and self-regulation, manage increased regulatory and financial burdens like prioritization of needs, payment for commodified basic services, collection of property tax, coordination with state institutions for services and supervision of community resources. In this context, CHSs of groups that were better off economically and that relocated together 'experience solidarity and collective decision-making, thus establishing better leadership and functioning', a CHS leader mentioned. In contrast, a majority of the CHSs that were formed by random allocation of flats demonstrate antagonism and conflicts. Another CHS leader stated, 'Lower floor households are concerned about garbage disposal and cleanliness; upper floor households need elevators. How can we prioritize and balance everyone's needs?' Presently, CHSs symbolizes an immature and inefficient civic space, unable to make society representatives accountable for negotiation and services and unable to claim services from the state, while struggling with inflating burdens of maintenance, divergent needs and limited financial resources.

PAPs' struggles for basic amenities and negotiation for promised entitlements continued during the post-resettlement years. After relocation (2003-06) to Vashi Naka, the PAPs continued to be dependent on nearby slums, water intermediaries and water tankers for their everyday water needs. Discontent built up in the summer of 2008 when the tankers were withdrawn for three consecutive weeks and the state authorities and SPARC remained unresponsive to the escalating crisis. A PAP activist described the unrest, 'At least, we should have the right to water [like, we had in the slum]! We had no other option than to organize a hunger strike until death. A few days later, influential political leaders intervened and local organizations [NGOs] approached us in support. Feeling the pressure, MMRDA and MCGM authorities had to negotiate'. Following the collective resistance of 2008 and subsequent protests of 2009 and 2010, Vashi Naka continued to receive water tankers, albeit irregularly, for the next few years, until a piped connection and regular water supply was established recently.

Presently, the water supply remains intermittently limited and the distribution to buildings traverse complicated terrains of local politics. While, the local political parties ensure supply of water to nearby slums, from the supply infrastructure designated for resettlement colonies, in exchange for votes and populist support from the slum residents; they also receive reverse patronage from the resettled urban poor for their mediation in the water crisis earlier. Seemingly a process of 'legal claim making', the hunger strike reflects a 'theatre of highly organized collective protests' (Hansen, 2001, p. 230) enshrined in the 'politics of the governed' (Chatterjee, 2004) that alerts the state of its moral negligence towards the urban poor's humanistic needs. Moreover, occasional support from local NGOs and non-state actors expand the urban poor's civic spaces of negotiation and claim-making strategies, which in juxtaposition with the power play of patronage from political parties and reverse patronage from the urban poor, complicate the transforming state-subaltern relations.

Beyond complex negotiations for access to water, interventions for livelihood restoration have also yielded intricate subjectivities. While resettlement in peripheral locations distanced the PAPs from their economic activities, the post-resettlement years mark institutional denial, grievance-based tokenism, gendered livelihood interventions and bourgeoning informality. After three years of disenfranchisement from their initial livelihood avenues and persistent lack of livelihood restoration, the PAPs protested in 2008 and MMRDA representatives shirked their responsibility stating, 'There is no question of livelihood compensation!' (Yuvamedia, 2012, 6:00). Instead of intensive institutional engagements, MMRDA's tokenism translated

into few job-fairs and entrepreneurial interventions for over 40,000 families in Vashi Naka (Yuvamedia, 2012).

MUTP's rampant demolition drives and resettlement-linked livelihoods losses resulted in the PAPs approaching the World Bank with their grievances (World Bank, 2005). Responding to the grievances, an industrial women's cooperative, Sankalp, was commissioned in Vashi Naka under the World Bank's recommendations and MMRDA's intervention, which undertakes training, market linkage and livelihoods generation activities (Mishra and Srinivas, 2012). Sankalp members described their attempts at livelihoods diversification and its associated drudgery, 'We wake up very early, travel long distances to buy vegetables and fish and then sell them in the evening. During the daytime, we work at Sankalp. We also manage our household work and hardly sleep for 4 hours a day. What else can we do to survive?' The utilization of women's agency to restore livelihoods through gendered initiatives exacerbates the 'time poverty' (Gummage, 2010, p. 83) amongst Sankalp members who struggle to balance reproductive roles with productive roles. Further, limited in its approach and majorly co-opted by Mahila Milan leaders and active members, Sankalp remains essentially inconsequential amidst rampant unemployment.

While MMRDA's interventions remain gendered and infinitesimal in approach, SPARC's pre-resettlement assessment of slum-based entrepreneurial livelihoods could translate into the allotment of only fifteen shops for the PAPs, thus overlooking men's livelihood restoration needs. Such systemic negligence has engendered mass unemployment on account of suspension from earlier forms of livelihoods, owing to significant transportation costs, long commutes and loss of market-linkages, and bourgeoning informal entrepreneurship in the form of street vending, pavement shops and small unlicensed kiosks. Further, due to the lack of designated hawking zones and market spaces, the informal entrepreneurs have to face new kinds of governmentalities through the enforcement of various municipal, police, traffic and civic laws that categorize unauthorized pavement-based livelihoods activities as 'illegal' encroachment of public spaces and punish them with demolition, confiscation of wares and penalty.

Enforcement of such laws, however, creates ambiguous effects at the local levels whereby the urban poor tend either to negotiate with the institutions or to devise mechanisms to escape disciplining. A pavement entrepreneur, among many others, narrated, 'I had a tin-shed shop. As I could not offer regular *hafta* (weekly-bribe), the MCGM officials raided and demolished my shop. Then, I replaced the tin-shed with a tarpaulin sheet. Whenever I saw them, I collected my wares and ran away'. Also, 'now our *neta* (political leader) has managed [to deal with]

them and stop the demolitions'. Such experiences reflect the urban poor's makeshift and para-legal arrangements and contextual mediations to counter the state's imposed binaries of legality and illegality and anti-poor policies. Beyond individualist negotiations for sustenance, groups that successfully negotiated for central locations within Vashi Naka exhibit socio-spatial distinctions regarding livelihoods innovation as well. They have manoeuvred political patronage to ensure that the state turns a blind eye towards their quasi-legal documentary evidence and non-statutory utilization of allotted space. Converting CHSs' office space, flats on the ground floor and *Balwadi* (kindergarten) into entrepreneurial spaces have created vibrant, but apparently illegal, marketplaces.

Insufficient social and physical infrastructure further supplements urban poor's disenfranchisement in Vashi Naka. Against this backdrop, political entrepreneurship runs deep and tactfully fills the voids created by the state's negligence by catering to the need for schools, gymnasium, community halls, religious sites and hawking zones, in exchange for votes and populist support. Although the resettlement policy curtailed local political interferences, as Harriss (2007) also notes, its half-hearted implementation led to the successful comeback of networks of political parties that utilize socio-cultural and ethnic distinctions to create *karyakartas* (party workers), and political communities who seek redressal by associating with them. However, large groups of urban poor that relocated together utilize populist politics and exchange their political solidarity for various material benefits, while, dispersed groups and individual households find it difficult to mobilize substantive political patronage.

The lack of clarity about the duties of the state institutions, viz. MMRDA and MCGM, and the shifting of responsibilities between these authorities have proved to be problematic for the PAPs, CHSs and the new community. At the household level, high maintenance charges and spatial exclusion from livelihoods have made sustenance strenuous for many. While, the most vulnerable families, majorly from the railways component of MUTP, have shifted to other locations by renting out or selling their flats, creating a shadow rental or property market for the middle class (Bhide and Dabir, 2008), several other households find it difficult to cope with increased financial burdens. At the CHSs' level, leaders, vacillating between the governing authorities to cope with the worsened physical and environmental conditions arising from poor quality construction, poor maintenance, persistent leakage and seepage, accumulated garbage and broken and overflowing sewage channels, find it difficult to manage increased maintenance costs and to hold authorities responsible for promised entitlements and support (Bhide, 2017).

Meanwhile, Resettlement Action Plan directed the CHSs to register as cooperatives and receive corpus funds (Community Management Fund and Building Maintenance Fund of INR

1,000 and 20,000 per household respectively), collective land titles and conveyance deeds for the formation of management committees and federations to meet the exit criteria for MMRDA. The apprehension of withdrawal, amidst half-hearted rehabilitation measures, has unfolded yet another trajectory of collectivization, whereby housing societies have hastily joined hands to form local CHS-federations to engage with the withdrawing institutions. While these federations encompass immense potential for political and civic negotiation, they currently remain ineffective amidst divergent priorities, multifocal challenges and diverse political affiliations.

Recent trends suggest that resettlement colonies in Vashi Naka are not free from the redevelopment discourse of the city. The nexus of the dominant political parties, private builders and CHS-federation leaders have inspired the PAPs to plan for the redevelopment of allotted buildings. Interestingly, the PAPs highlight crammed living, little inter-building space, non-existent open space, poor ventilation, inefficient sewerage system and non-fire compliance, caused by compromised structural and environmental standards of the resettlement policy, in their argument for increased housing space and better infrastructure through future redevelopment. The private builders envision to tactfully utilize the resettlement scheme to introduce the resettlement colonies to further redevelopment. Arguably, while, resettlement absolved the state from its responsibilities towards the displaced urban poor, the pressures of neoliberal urbanism aim to capitalize the resettlement colonies, without making any substantial contribution to their lives.

Concluding remarks

This article has explored the SPARC-mediated inclusion of, claim-making by, and citizenship outcomes for the PAPs of MUTP and has analysed transforming informality-state relations and subaltern urban politics. It establishes that the governmentalization of the state through SPARC's mediation and the latter's asymmetrical and transforming relationship with the PAPs across the phases of resettlement yields differential subjectivities through co-option, coercion, confrontation and compensation, unlike SPARC's institutional narratives that promise community development and 'substantive urban citizenship'. Subsequently, PAPs' negotiations occur within the urban reform milieu whereby the hegemonic redevelopment regime, its apparatuses of mediation and the limited 'spaces of political engagement' conduct the subaltern collectives to make them increasingly 'wilful', reposition their demands and reframe their negotiation trajectories to increasingly fit into the state's offered alternatives.

The modalities of conditional inclusion, visibility and entitlements while conferring the PAPs with limited legal rights, ensure that they remain subject to governance as 'population'. Such limited traversal from being 'urban subaltern' in informal settlements to 'citizen' in resettlement colonies establishes incomplete civilizing of the political society, which in turn defies the antagonistic articulations of the state-urban subaltern relations, viz. 'political society' or 'deep democracy'. Within this milieu – of bifold governance – the urban poor as 'the disciplined subjects and the wilful subjects, the empowered subjects and the obedient subjects' (Roy, 2009, p. 168), are simultaneously rights-bearing citizens and subjects of governance, who vacillate between legality and illegality, formality and informality, legal rights and moral rights, and civil society and political society. Consistent with the modern political rationality, which exhibits a doubling of rules, they are 'simultaneously juridically and biopolitically constituted, i.e. as citizens with rights, but also as subjects of pastoral supervision and biopolitical intervention' (Ashenden, 2015, p. 40).

Beyond contested models of institutional inclusion, community practice and political subjectivities of the urban poor, the paradoxical unfolding of the resettlement process highlights how the state structures the roles of the mediating NGO in urban renewal and restricts institutionalization of the strategies of 'deep democracy'. The creation of modern governmental bodies like MMRDA, and its institutional assemblage with international institutions like World Bank institutionalizes SPARC for resettlement and reconfigures the state's techniques of governing the urban poor. Hence, the methods of 'production of knowledge' (Roy, 2009, p. 165) and 'dimensions of democratic politics: its vision, its vocabularies and its practices … as well as the style, strategies and functional characteristics' (Appadurai, 2001, p. 28) demonstrate ideological, organizational and operational divergences across SPARC's differential modalities of engagement with the PAPs, restricting the deepening of democracy.

Within these institutional and operational complexities, SPARC's apprehensions that 'the state, appreciating the usefulness of such groups [SPARC and Mahila Milan] can easily co-opt them to do much more of their work' (SPARC, n.d.) is actualized. Its shifts from rights-based to need-based, activist to reformist, grassroots to top-down, insurgent to subservient reinforces the state's hegemonic redevelopment regime. An attempt to challenge the state's hegemony in the (re)development discourse through the realignment of the roles of the mediating institutions, the repositioning of the displaced within the spaces of political engagement, and the (re)politicization of the (re)development discourse, however, might translate the envisioned 'deepening of democracy' into reality and enable sustainable community development.

Acknowledgements

Author Note

Rishi Jha (rishitiss12@gmail.com) is a doctoral researcher at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, India and a visiting doctoral researcher at the Lund University, Sweden.

References

Appadurai, A. (2001) Deep democracy: Urban governmentality and the horizon of politics, *Environment and Urbanization*, **13** (2), 23-43.

Ashenden, S. (2015) Foucault, Ferguson, and civil society, *Foucault Studies*, **20**, 36-51.

Benjamin, S. (2008) Occupancy urbanism: Radicalizing politics and economy beyond policy and programs, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, **32** (3), 719-729.

Bhide, A. (2017) Colonising the slum: Changing trajectories of state-market violence in Mumbai, *Economic and Political Weekly*, **52** (7), 75-82.

Bhide, A. and Dabir, N. (2008) *Staking Claims: Housing rights of the poor in Mumbai*, Tata Institute of Social Sciences Research Report.

Chatterjee, P. (1998) Beyond the nation? Or within?, *Social Text*, **16** (39), 57-69.

Chatterjee, P. (2004) *Politics of the governed: Reflections on popular politics in most of the world*, Columbia University Press, New York.

Chatterjee, R. (2005) Plans, habitation and slum redevelopment: The production of community in Dharavi, Mumbai, *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, **39** (2), 197-218.

Cruikshank, B. (1994) The will to empower: Technologies of citizenship and the war on poverty, *Socialist Review*, **23** (4), 29-55.

Davis, M. (2006) *Planet of slums*, Verso Publications, London.

Dean, M. (2010) *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*, Sage Publications, London.

Doshi, S. (2012) The politics of the evicted: Redevelopment, subjectivity, and difference in Mumbai's slum frontier, *Antipode*, **00** (0), 1-22.

Foucault, M. (1993) About the beginning of the hermeneutics of the self: Two lectures at Dartmouth, *Political Theory*, **21** (2), 198-227.

Foucault, M. (2008) *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979* (G. Burchell, Trans.), Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Gummage, S. (2010) Time pressed and time poor: Unpaid household work in Guatemala, *Feminist Economics*, **16** (3), 79-112.

Hansen, T. B. (2001) *Wages of violence: Naming and identity in postcolonial Mumbai*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Harriss, J. (2007) Antinomies of Empowerment: Observations on civil society, politics and urban governance in India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, **42** (26), 2716-2724.

Holston, J. (2008) *Insurgent citizenship: Disjunctions of democracy and modernity in Brazil*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Legg, S. (2007) *Spaces of colonialism: Delhi's urban governmentalities*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

McFarlane, C. (2004) Geographical imaginations and spaces of political engagement: Examples from the Indian alliance, *Antipode,* **36** (5), 890-916.

MCGM. (2010) *Mumbai human development report 2009*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.

Milton, D. and Patel, S. (2005) Re-interpreting the rights-based approach: A grassroots perspective on rights and development. Global Poverty Research Group, Working Paper No. 22, Oxford, accessed at: http://www.gprg.org/pubs/workingpapers/pdfs/gprg-wps-022.pdf (20 January 2018).

Mishra, S. N. and Srinivas, S. V. R. (2012) *Mumbai urban transport project: Urban resettlement (English)*, India innovations in development, **7,** World Bank: Washington DC, India, accessed at: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/438861468260119746/Mumbai-Urban-Transport-Project-urban-resettlement (15 January 2018).

Nainan, N. (2008) Building boomers and fragmentation of space in Mumbai, *Economic and Political Weekly*, **43** (21), 29-34.

Patel, S. and Bartlett, S. (2009) Reflections on innovation, assessment, and social change: a SPARC case study, *Development in Practice*, **19** (1), 3-15.

Patel, S. and Milton, D. (2001) *The work of SPARC, the National Slum Dwellers Federation, and Mahila Milan*, Human Settlements Programme IIED, Working Paper 5, London, accessed at: http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9074IIED.pdf (15 January 2018).

Patel, S., d'Cruz, C. and Burra, S. (2002) Beyond evictions in a global city: People-managed resettlement in Mumbai, *Environment and Urbanization*, **14** (1), 159-172.

Rose, N. (1996) Governing "advanced" liberal democracies, in A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose, eds, *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, pp. 37-64.

Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of freedom*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Roy, A. (2009) Civic governmentality: The politics of inclusion in Beirut and Mumbai, *Antipode*, **41** (1), 159-179.

SPARC (n.d.) *Enumeration as a tool of mobilisation*, accessed at: http://www.sparcindia.org/pdf/articles/ennumerations.pdf (15 January 2018).

Speak, S. and Tipple, G. (2006) Perceptions, persecution and pity: The limitations of interventions for homelessness in developing countries, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, **30** (1), 172-188.

World Bank. (2005) *India - Mumbai urban transport project: Inspection panel investigation report (English)*, World Bank: Washington DC, accessed at: http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/645491468283447968/India-Mumbai-Urban-Transport-Project-Inspection-Panel-Investigation-Report (15 January 2018).

Yuvamedia. (2012, June 14) Vashi Naka hunger strike, accessed at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lbiGyeWgD08&t=50s (3 February 2018).