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MODULE I

RURAL AND URBAN DIFFERENTIATION

1.1. Rural and urban sociology: Subject matter, Rationale of classification.

Rural Sociology, as indicated by its name, studies rural society, rural social structures and institutions. The rural society is primarily dependent on agriculture and hence rural sociology also concerns itself on the peasant society. Rural sociology is centered on the rural community life. There is a stark difference between the social structure, processes, social dynamics and social control in rural society. Hence, there is a difference between studying urban society and rural society, rural sociology studies the latter. Thus, rural sociology has been specially designed to study the rural phenomena and it is a systematic study of the varied aspects of the rural society. It is the study of the rural social networks and how they operate for the smooth functioning of the society. The rural society is generally rooted in the villages, and rural sociology studies the facets of the villages, the way it functions, the various problems it faces and the how it tackles to face the imminent challenges. Rural sociology offers viable solutions and ways of mitigating the problems that hound over the villages.

Definition of Rural Sociology:

1. According to Sanderson, “Rural sociology is the sociology of rural life in the rural environment”.
2. Bertand says, “Rural sociology is that study of human relationships in rural environment”.

3. T.L. Smith, “Such sociological facts and principles as are derived from the study of rural social relationships may be referred to as rural sociology”.

4. F.S Chapin, “The sociology of rural life is a study of rural population, rural social organization, and the rural social processes operative in rural society”.

5. A.R Desai defines rural sociology as, “the science of rural society….It is the science of laws of the development of rural society”.

The above definitions clearly justify that rural sociology studies the social interactions, institutions and activities and social changes that take place in the rural society. It studies the rural social organizations, structure and set up. In other words, it can be said that rural sociology acts as a reflection of the rural social life and provides the norms and values that govern the rural society. It provides a clear picture of the rural population and the difference they possess from the urban population. Emergence of Rural Sociology in India The commencement of rural sociology as a discipline in India dates back to Sir Henry S Maine who published two books i.e. Ancient Law (1861) and Ancient Society (1877). However, a systematic study of rural sociology in India commenced after the promulgation of the Constitution of India and the implementation of the Community Development Programmes. During the British era in India, sociologists tried to trace for the patterns of land tenure, customary laws and the functioning of the peasants and the artisans. There were also researches and enquiries made on the day to day affairs of the rural life. The recurrent famines in India provoked numerous
studies. It was the effort of the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR)—an apex body of the social scientists who conducted research based surveys for nearly a decade. In its very first volume entitled A Survey of Research in Sociology and Social Anthropology (Vol.I), the sub-discipline of rural sociology is discussed under the chapter ‘Rural Studies’. A.R. Desai, a noted sociologist, has done a pioneering work in the field of Rural Sociology by editing Rural Sociology in India. He has raised few queries before defining rural sociology. Is rural sociology a distinct science or is it merely an application of the general principles of sociology? Should rural sociology restrict its scope merely to the life processes of rural society or should it also include as an integral part a study of rural and urban social life, comparative as well as in the mutual interconnection and interaction. He also interrogates: Should rural sociology only provide scientific knowledge about rural societies and laws governing its development or should it serve as a guide and suggest practical programmes of reform or reconstruction of that society in the socio-economic and cultural fields? Postindependent India saw an upheaval in the community based life due to extensive participation of the rural masses in the freedom struggle. There have been many instances of deep divide on the basis of language, caste, regional biasness etc. Rural sociology eventually gained prominence and emerged in the India soil due to aforementioned reasons and also due to its agrarian nature. India resides in villages and majority of its denizens are dependent on agriculture, these twin statements paved way for the origin and growth of rural sociology in India. It aimed at studying the grave issues, understanding the observable phenomena and proving viable and practicable solutions to mitigate the challenges.
Scope of Rural Sociology:

In comparison to other social sciences, Rural Sociology is a novel branch of Sociology and is a separate science that possesses its own subject matter and method of study. By scope of the discipline, it is meant that what Rural Sociology refers to what it studies. Rural Sociology is widely understood as the sociology of Rural Society. Apart from studying the rural society, Rural Sociology also studies its nature and primary components from the structural and functional stances. The most crucial objective of rural sociology is to study rural social life. Rural social life encompasses the behaviour patterns, web of relationship, social interactions, standard of living and socio-economic conditions of the rural people. Therefore, the scope of Rural Sociology expands where the boundary of Rural Society is expanded.

To draw attention on the scope, N.L. Sims says, “The field of Rural Sociology is the study of association among people living by or immediately dependent upon agriculture. Open country and village groupings and groups behaviour are its concern.” According to Lowry Nelson, “The scope of Rural Sociology is the description and analysis of progress of various groups as they exist in the rural environment. In the words of Bertrand and his associates: “In its broadest definition Rural Sociology is the study of human relationship in rural environment.” On account of the opinions given by Sims, Nelson and Bertrand, it is observed that the scope of Rural Sociology revolves around rural people, their livelihood and social relationship in rural environment. Though it studies society from the rural perspective, its main aim is concentrated on rural lives. The subjects that are included within the scope are very comprehensive in nature and we can blindly say that its boundary is varying large. The scope of Rural Sociology may be clear from the analysis of the following subjects.
a) Rural Society: Rural Sociology is widely understood as the sociology of Rural Society. Apart from studying the rural society, Rural Sociology also studies its nature and primary components from the structural and functional stances. The most crucial objective of rural sociology is to study rural social life. Rural social life encompasses the behaviour patterns, web of relationship, social interactions, standard of living and socio-economic conditions of the rural people. Therefore, the scope of Rural Sociology expands where the boundary of Rural Society is expanded.

b) Rural Population: The population residing in the geographical rural area is the basic essence of Rural Sociology. The discipline studies the nature, characteristics, size, density and distribution of rural population from various angles. Rural Sociology aims at the study of the factors of growth of population, its evil effects of Rural Society, rural –urban migration for the greater interest of the country at large. It also tries to understand the behavioural patterns, prevailing customs and folklores that dominate the day to day lives of the rural population.

c) Rural Community: Rural community is considered as one of the primordial organizations of mankind. Hence, Rural Sociology is chiefly concerned with the origin, nature, characteristics, social attributes and human ecology of rural community. It also studies the homogenous trajectory of the rigid and conservative nature of hither to existing customs, traditions, folkways, mores, norms, values and so on in rural community.

d) Rural Social Organization: Social organization plays the backbone of every society as well as social life. The most imperative function of Rural Sociology, therefore, is to offer fundamental knowledge about rural social organization. Rural Social organization envelops the spiritual lives, religious
activities, sacred relationship and divine notion of rebirth, Karmaphala etc. of the rural folk which intensely affects the entire rural social life. Rural sociology, thus, for the betterment of rural life, studies the future prospectus of rural social organization and governing laws for its development.

e) Rural Social Institution: Rural social institutions imply the known figures of processes that prevail among the relations between the rural people. Rural sociology, thus, studies the structure, characteristics and functions of rural social institutions. Rural social institutions comprise family, marriage, kinship, religion, caste. Rural Sociology studies the sociological significance of these institutions in the rural context.

f) Rural Economy: Agriculture is the backbone of rural economy and majority of the rural population are absorbed in it. They directly depend on agriculture for their livelihood and sustenance. Rural Sociology, therefore, studies the causes liable for the failure of agriculture and suggests various measures for the development of agriculture in villages. Besides, the acceptance of new agricultural technology among the farming centers, upgrading of old farming methods, formation of open markets and providing agricultural training to the farmers are the vital areas of the study of rural society.

g) Rural social Process: Rural Sociology also studies the two process of rural social interaction, namely, conjunctive and disjunctive. Rural conjunctive process includes co-operation, accommodation and assimilation. Rural disjunctive process, on the other hand, comprises competition and conflict. Thus, the nature, characteristics and social importance of these processes are to be appropriately considered by the scope of Rural Sociology.
h) Rural Religion: Religion plays a predominant role in the rural society, considered as the soul of rural people and it is regarded as the chief quintessence of rural life. The rural people blindly follow the religious ideas and values; consider worshipping as a prime duty. Rural Sociology, in this context, and studies the concept and social importance of rural religion and its impact on rural society.

i) Rural Culture: Culture refers to that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, moral law, art, custom and any other capabilities acquired by man as a member of society. Rural culture is firmly rooted in rigid and conservative dogmas and it is generally very stagnant in nature. It includes old customs, tradition, folkways, mores, norms, values and so on. Rural Sociology studies the complexities of rural culture, its different structural organizations, cultural patterns, cultural traits and cultural lag in the rural contexts.

j) Rural Social Problems: One of the important contents of rural sociology includes the study of problem engulfed in the rural life. These problems are centred on socio-economic conditions, political, cultural ethos and value based. The problems generally are poverty, unemployment, population growth, illiteracy, casteism, untouchability etc. Rural Sociology, therefore, studies the causes and evil effects of these problems and also suggests measures for their eradication for the greater interests of the country at large. As these problems are rooted in the rural societies that are also diverse from place to place, their causes, nature and remedies vary from on one another. Rural sociology tries draw in the similarities as well as the differences between the problems that stem from various existing issues and also the discipline tries to provide viable remedies to it.
k) Rural Social Control: Social control is the control of society over an individual. In Rural Society, social control is in formal and rigid in nature. Rural Sociology considerably studies the informal means and agencies such as religions, customs, folkways, mores, norms etc, of social control. In rural society, the imperative primary groups like family and neighbourhood play a vital role in social control.

l) Rural Social Change: Social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organization, that is, structure and functions of society. Of late, the rural society is on the path of social change. Due to the impact of money modernizing forces, Rural Society is undergoing incredible transformations in the twentieth century. In order to pace up social change in the rural areas and also keep the momentum going, Rural Sociology undertakes necessary steps. Rural Sociology also studies the diverse factors responsible for social changes in a systematic way. It also tries to provide possible solutions for any change ignited derailment in rural social life.

m) Rural Urban Contrast: The study of rural society remains incomplete unless the study of rural urban contrast is done in a proper and scientific manner. Both the village and city, hypothetically, are the two contrasting modes of community life. Rural Sociology studies the rural-urban contrast on the basis of social, economic, religious and cultural point of view. Besides, rural sociology also draws attention on the comparative study of these two societies. As a result, the concept of rural society and social institutions can be clear by this contrasting analysis.

n) Rural Planning and Reconstruction: Rural planning and reconstruction are very much necessary for under developed societies. In this context, the poor and backward condition of Indian rural society requires planning and reconstruction in a
systematic and planned manner. Rural Society is engulfed in plenty of issues and social problems.

Therefore, for the eradication of these problems and for the betterment of rural life, proper planning and reconstruction should be made by the state as well the central government. A.R. Desai says, Rural Sociology studies all these subjects and provides proper guidelines in this direction. It is obvious from the above analysis that the scope or subject matter or Rural Sociology, no doubt is very immense. Though, it is the youngest and progressive science, yet it studies the various aspects of rural society as well as rural life to a great extent

**Rural and Urban Differentiation: Rationale of classification.**

Many families and individuals find themselves, at least at some point, questioning the advantages of rural versus urban life. Quality of life is one of the central issues to consider in any comparison between rural versus urban living. While a case can be made for either location as being the best place to live, it is worthwhile to consider how these two options, rural versus urban, are similar and different. Important factors such as the capacity to make general choices, diversity, health, and employment concerns all influence both sides of the comparison and although each both rural and urban living offer great benefits, they both have a seemingly equal number of drawbacks. Rural and urban areas are generally similar in terms of terms of human interaction but differ most widely when diversity and choice are issues.

There are a number of positive as well as negative factors that contribute the overall quality of life in urban centres and if there is any general statement to be made about urban living, it is that there is a great deal of diversity and choice. In urban areas, there are many more choices people can make about a number of aspects of their daily lives. For instance, in urban areas, one is
more likely to be able to find many different types of food and this could lead to overall greater health since there could be a greater diversity in diet. In addition, those in urban areas enjoy the opportunity to take in any number of cultural or social events as they have a large list to choose from. As a result they have the opportunity to be more cultured and are more likely to encounter those from other class, cultural, and ethnic groups. Pollution (noise and atmospheric) is an issue that could impact the overall quality of life. In addition to this, overpopulation concerns can also contribute to a decrease in the standard of living. Parents have a number of choices available for the education of their children and can often select from a long list of both public and private school districts, which leads to the potential for better education. It is also worth noting that urban areas offer residents the possibility to choose from a range of employment options at any number of companies or organizations. Aside from this, urbanites have better access to choices in healthcare as well and if they suffer from diseases they have a number of specialists to choose from in their area.

Rural places do not offer the same level of choice and in very isolated areas and one might be forced to commute long distances to find even a remote selection of the diversity found in urban centres. Still, despite this lack of choice, there are a number of positive sides to rural living in terms of quality of life. For instance, living in a rural area allows residents to enjoy the natural world more easily instead of having to go to parks. In addition, people do not have to fight with the daily stresses of urban life such as being stuck in traffic, dealing with higher rates of crime, and in many cases, paying higher taxes. These absences of stressors can have a great effect on the overall quality of life and as one researcher notes, “People living in rural and sparsely populated areas are less likely to have mental health problems than those living in urban areas and may also be less likely to
relapse into depression or mental illness once they have recovered from these in more densely populated areas”. The lack of daily stress found in cities from external factors (traffic, long lines, feeling caged, etc) has much to do with this. While there may not be a large number of stores and restaurants to choose from, those in rural areas have the benefit of land upon which to grow their own food, which is much healthier.

Although urban populations have large numbers of social networks and networking opportunities, rural communities offer residents the ability to have long-lasting and more personal relationships since they encounter the same people more frequently. While there are not as many schools to choose from and sometimes rural schools are not funded as well as some others, children can grow up knowing their classmates and experience the benefits of smaller classrooms One of the drawbacks to living in a rural area, however, is that unlike urban areas, residents do not have the best opportunity to choose from a range of employment options. While they can commute to larger towns, this gets expensive and is not as convenient as working close to their residence. In general, if there is any statement to be made about the quality of life of rural living, it is that there is a greater ability to connect with people and the landscape. The quality of life in urban areas is similar to that in rural areas in that both involve a high degree of socialization, even if on a cursory level. Where they differ most noticeably is in the availability of choices and diversity, especially when vital factors (healthcare, education, and employment options) are concerned.

The term ‘rural society’ is used almost interchangeably with terms like ‘village’, ‘countryside’, or ‘folk society’. Of these, the term most commonly used in sociological literature on rural society is the village. The term ‘countryside’ is chiefly popular in the western world. It primarily denotes a quiet place, away from
the hustle and bustle of the city, where one is in close proximity to nature. One chooses to retire to the countryside. It is not a place bereft of facilities, as villages are in the developing world. There are ‘pubs’ and recreational centres in the countryside. What it lacks is the ‘fast life of the city’. Let us now look at the term ‘folk’, which attained popularity through the works of Robert Redfield. It implies a person or persons belonging to a small traditional and homogeneous community. By implication, a folk society is traditional and homogeneous. This category is best understood in terms of culture and stands in contrast with the fast-changing and heterogeneous urban society. As we spoke of the rural-urban continuum earlier, in the same way, Redfield has written about the folk-urban continuum. A folk society is ‘past-oriented’, so said Redfield, in the sense that its members are content with their lot, with what they have, and they proudly hold their tradition high. By tradition, sociologists mean the ‘conventionalized modes of social behaviour and thought’, i.e. the behaviour and thought that were established long time back are considered valuable and applicable at all times, present and future. In comparison with a rural society, we find that an urban society is ‘future-oriented’. Here, people are not satisfied with what they have, and they unceasingly want to change virtually everything they have. If urban dwellers are ‘forward-looking’, the folks are ‘backward-looking’. If change is the catchphrase of urban living, stability is that of the folk society.

Let us now turn to the term, ‘rural society.’ From sociological point of view, the term ‘rural society’ implies the following: · In comparison with the urban society, it is a small society, meaning thereby that it has a small population and extends over a shorter physical area. Various institutions (such as police stations, hospitals, schools, post-offices, clubs, etc.) may or may not be there, and if existent, they are not available in plenty. · Density of the rural population is also low, and it may be clustered according
to the criteria of social status. In other words, people occupying the same status may share the same neighbourhood, and may observe considerable social, and sometimes physical, distance from others, especially those lower in hierarchy. · A sizable number of rural people are engaged in agriculture, which is the mainstay of their lives. In addition, a rural society has several other groups, engaged in various other occupations of arts and crafts, usually known as artisans and craftsmen, who regularly supply their services to agriculturalists in exchange for grains and cereals. · Rural society has some full-time and a large number of part-time specialists. Craftsmen and artisans also indulge in agricultural pursuits, especially during the monsoon and the agricultural produce of such specialists and small agriculturalists is mainly for domestic consumption. · Rural society is regarded as the repository of traditional mores and folkways. It preserves the traditional culture, and many of its values and virtues are carried forward to urban areas, of which they become a part after their refinement. When scholars say that ‘India lives in villages’, they mean not only that villages constitute the abode of three-quarters of Indians, but also that the fundamental values of Indian society and civilization are preserved in villages, wherefrom they are transmitted to towns and cities. One cannot have an idea about the spirit of India unless her villages are understood.

Classification of Villages

The village, town and city are categories of human settlements. These categories Village, Town and City are dependent on each other for economic, social and political purposes. Very often people from village migrate to towns and cities in search of new livelihoods and occupations. The villagers sell their agricultural products in nearby towns and cities and buy essential commodities which they cannot grow or produce themselves. They are dependant on towns and cities for many goods and
services. The townsmen are also dependent on villages for food products like vegetables, food grains, milk, human labour etc. The point to mention here is that the categories of human settlement are inter dependent on each other for raw materials on villages, towns and cities produce other furnished goods which need higher technology and more organisation. Therefore, they are all dependent on each other but there are some distinctive features which separate them from each other. In this unit we will discuss about the features of these three categories of human settlements: village, town and city. This will enable students to have a clear understanding of these categories.

You know that villages have been classified on the basis of size. According to the Census of India – 1991, 94.7 per cent of villages had less than five thousand people.

According to the size of population, the villages were divided into three categories: · 26.5 per cent villages were inhabited by less than five hundred people; · 48.8 per cent villages had a population falling between 500 and 2000; and · 19.4 per cent villages had a population falling between 2000 and 5000. It is clear that villages of the medium-size were almost fifty per cent of the villages in India. Another classification of India villages divides them into nucleated and dispersed villages. It is well known that villages comprise homestead land (âbâdî) and cultivable land. In nucleated villages, all the households are clustered together in a compact unit surrounded on all sides by cultivable land. When households are distributed over a large area, and each cluster of a few houses is separated by cultivable land, it is known as a dispersed village. Most of the villages in India are of compact nucleated type. Dispersed villages are found in the coastal areas of Kerala in south India, in Bhil settlements to the east and north of Gujarat, and in Coorg and western Mysore.
M.N. Srinivas proposes that detailed studies of these two types of village need to be carried out to see differences in their respective organizational patterns. For example, he notes that in nucleated villages the responsibility of defending the village from robbers and wild animals falls on all the inhabitants. In dispersed villages, each farm has to protect itself against the enemies. The kin group owning the farm must have enough people to defend itself when the need arises. It is quite likely that houses in dispersed villages are built with an eye to defence. One may hypothesize that dispersed villages are associated with large kinship groups and martial traditions.

The word ‘Urban’ has been defined in the Oxford Dictionary as pertaining to city or town life. The term urban is derived from the Latin word ‘urbs’ meaning a ‘city’. The concept of urban is almost universally understood to mean a large and densely settled population engaged primarily in non-agricultural economic pursuits. In actual practices, the designation of localities by various countries as urban or rural varies widely and it is often dependent upon administrative, political, cultural and historical, as well as upon demographic or economic considerations. The Indian Census definition of urban areas basically hinges on two different aspects- (a) Existence of a local self – government (b) Fulfillment of the criteria of size, density and occupational diversification.

1.2. Rural and urban divide - Census perspective and socio political perspective: Amsom, Desom and Taluk divisions

Census of India has adopted the following five criteria to define any place as a city.

(1) Size of population – 5,000 or above
(2) Density – 1,000/ sq. mile and above

(3) Occupation – more than 75% of the inhabitants must be occupied in non-agricultural activities. (4) Political administration – The urban area to be so classified must be governed by municipality.

(5) Pronounced urban characteristics – like market, water supply, road, electricity, transport and communication with standardized housing, banks, hospitals, courts and educational institutions.

(6) Louis Wirth has given a sociological definition of city “as a relatively large, dense and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals.” This points to certain characteristics of city i.e. relatively larger and dense population which again gives rise to another feature i.e. heterogeneity among the dwellers.

Sombart defined city “as a place which becomes so large that people do not know each other.” Bergel defined a city “as a settlement where the majority of the occupants are engaged in other than agricultural activities”. He has pointed that market as a system of exchange is one of the basic feature of non-agricultural activity without which city dwellers would have nothing to eat. Sorokin and Zimmerman and others hold that a proper definition of the city includes a number of qualities or characteristics combined together. They further add that the characteristics of urban areas are different from the characteristics of rural areas. These differences are in the following spheres –

(a) Occupation

(b) Environment

(c) Size of community
(d) Density of population

(e) Heterogeneity or homogeneity of population.

(f) Social differentiation and stratification

(g) Mobility

(h) System of interaction (i.e. number and type of contacts).

We shall call a city any settlement where the occupants are engaged in other than agricultural activity. We shall call a community urban if the activities are centered around a market, for a market is essential for non-agricultural activities as without exchange of goods, the urban dweller will not be able to survive.

According to Prof R.N. Morris, two aspects of city are important.

1) Size

2) Density of population

1) Size: Size of the city is an important aspect of city. City’s growth and development depends upon its size. If the city is small, its works, structure, social relations differ compared to a larger city. In the bigger city like Mumbai the relations are impersonal, superficial. Persons do not know each other as they play some roles. Family affinity is missing in their behaviour. The city dwellers treat social relations as instruments to serve his purposes. Louis Wirth calls it as ‘a rational sophisticated manner’. The city man becomes more calculative, less social and spontaneous, less participative and more frustrated. In most of the modern cities, division of labour is sharp edged. Occupations define urbanization. Urbanization becomes more selfish and artificial with various occupations where people are alienated and doing not for others but for their own ends. People become goal
oriented. So Wirth says that the ‘corporation has no soul’. Urbanization is showing different type of social control compared to rural and tribal community. Police, court, government and many other originations control behavior and manners of people. Peoples’ religion, ethics worshipping are regularized with festivals and the amount of donation they pay. Urbanization shows us that there is a specialization of marketing and its products. Cities serve and fulfil various demands like consumer goods, clothes, medicines, and educational facilities, national and international requirements. City is imbalanced and does not get stability and equilibrium due to extreme specialization and interdependence. Modern cities do not regulate systematic urbanization because houses, markets, slums, roads and transport grow abnormally. Governments fail to regularize urban way of life.

2) Density of population: City is a place of specialization. There is a high concentration of population in a particular place. There are many reasons for the growth of city. It may be industrial development, marketing, public administration etc. Density of population is related to heterogeneity. The quality of life and behaviour of people is diverse and always changing.

**Desom, Amsom and Village Communities**

Desoms are the most basic geographical unit in a village (Amsom) which are distinguished on the basis of the political control of the local chieftains. That is, the local chieftains who had possession of the most number of desoms were treated as the most superior landlords in a specific territory. In Valluwanad region in Kerala, it was found that most of these desoms which belonged to a local chieftain had its own deity in a temple and there was a common temple under the rule of the chieftain to which all these small temples were connected.
According to Rajan Gurukkal, “The temple became a landed magnet of the time and acquired the central place in the realm of the agrarian economy and socio-religious life towards the end of the first millennium AD. It enjoyed a lot of revenue from the land owned and controlled by it… the endowments of the temple included crown land held by the ruling aristocracy (Cherikkal), land owned by the Brahmanas (Brahmaswam), the land occupied by merchants, and the leases (Karanmai) held by the temple functionaries” (Gurukkal, 2010). The practice of showing obligation to a specific deity and to the chieftain who held control over the various desoms belonging to his territory is still reflected in the ritual practices of annual festivals in various temples. It clearly shows that the obligation of the local people towards the chieftains was not confined to land relations, but was also extended to the socio-cultural realm. It also shows that besides the religious dimensions, the control over the temples was instrumental in determining political power.

The territorial classifications of desoms are significant to determine the geopolitics of a particular territory. Unlike desoms, amsoms have nothing to do with religious affairs; rather it was a political categorisation that emerged during the British Rule. Each desom comes under the control of specific officials like Amsadhikari, Menon, Kolkkan, etc. All these Amsoms were affiliated to a Tehsil which was headed by the Tahsildar. Even before the Colonial rule such a system prevailed in India. The terms like ‘Panchayath’ (the term Panchayath is etymologically linked to the Persian term ‘sarpanch’, head of a local community), Tahsils, Munsiffs, Kasaba, etc. are Persian terms which depict its historic connection with the Mughal regime. The colonial rulers did not disrupt this multi-layer administrative system as it facilitated systematic tax appropriation and effective political administration.
Present classification

India is a large country comprising of 28 states and 7 union territories. These states and the union territories are divided into districts. At the time of Census 2001 there were in all 593 districts against 467 districts at the time of 1991 Census. Each district is further divided into sub-districts, which are known differently in different parts of the country (e.g., tahsil, taluka, community development (CD) block, Police station, Mandal, revenue circle, etc.).

The lowest primary administrative units of administration are the villages in rural areas and towns in urban areas. At the time of Census 2001, there were about 6.39 lakh villages in the country, out of which about 44,856 have been uninhabited villages. The villages are of different sizes in terms of population depending upon the geography of the area, availability of land and water, etc. The population living in the villages comprises the rural population of the country.

The number of towns in the country at the time of Census 2001 was 5,161. The towns include statutory towns (as notified by government) and census towns as identified by the census organization on the basis of well defined criteria. When towns grow in area and population, the areas adjoining the notified core town(s) also may acquire urban characteristics. Therefore, for proper representation, the Census also provides data on the Urban Agglomerations (UAs), which comprise core town(s) and its outgrowths meeting the urban characteristics. Delhi, Kolkata, Chennai, Mumbai are examples of such Urban Agglomerations. There are 384 Urban Agglomerations in the country. The number of UAs and towns at the Census 2001 was 4,378. The population living in the urban areas comprises the urban population of the country.
All the villages and towns usually form part of a sub-district. There are however towns which extend beyond the limits of a district (e.g., Delhi, Srinagar, etc.). There are a few districts that are fully urban (Mumbai, Kolkata, Chennai, Hyderabad, etc.) and a few districts that are fully rural.

Census data are made available for the country as a whole and by state, union territory, district, sun-district, UA and town. For a few important characteristics, these are also made available down to village level in rural areas and ward level in towns.

1.3. Distinguishing features of rural and urban society - Religion, Caste, Family, Occupation, Economy, Labour, Leisure and technology

Religion: Religion plays a supreme role in the life of the village. Religious influence is visible in every significant action of village life like sowing, harvesting of crops, birth, marriage, illness, death etc. On all such occasions, the villagers observe religious ceremonies in the form of ‘Puja’, ‘Mela’ or ‘kirtan’. In this way, faith in religion is very robust in rural area. Alongside the personal dimensions of worship and reverence, rural festivals and rituals can have a more basic social function in expressing, fixing and reinforcing the shared values and beliefs of a society. Rituals can aid in creating a firm sense of group identity. This function can be exploited for political ends. Humans have used rituals to create social bonds and even to nourish interpersonal relationships. Researchers and sociologists think that urban revolution is another factor that led to the change of people's way of thinking. In 19th and 20th century, as a result of industrial revolution, many people migrated and urbanization along with social changes in which happened after industrial and political revolutions had a deep impact on religious beliefs. The levels of belief and ritual dimensions of religiosity are higher in rural
residents in comparison with urban residents. In addition, among sub-dimensions of ritual religiosity, only intellectual religiosity has no significant difference between rural and urban residents. Moreover, the level of religiosity of total urban residents and rural residents has a significant difference and the level of religiosity in rural residents is higher than urban residents.

**Caste:** Caste has for long been viewed as distinctive features of the Indian society. It is not merely an institution that characterises the structure of social stratification in India. Caste has often been seen to represent the core of India. It has been viewed both as an institution as well as an ideology. Institutionally, caste provided a framework for arranging and organizing social groups in terms of their statuses and positions in the social and economic system. It fixes individuals into the structure of social hierarchy on the basis of their birth. The significance of Caste system in the rural social structure lies in the fact that it provides a social status to the people and as mentioned above, this status brings either privileges or disabilities. It determines social relationships in the village. The nature of interaction one is supposed to have with others is also determined by the Caste system. With the spread of education, the institutional arrangements of the urban centres also changed. The educated people joined the bureaucracy, and also took up jobs as teachers, journalists, lawyers and so on. They brought about a new worldview. The urban centres gradually grew up to be the centres of new social and political ideas, diverse economic activities and of heterogeneous populations. The new process of urbanisation presented various economic opportunities and scope for occupational and social mobility, it was only the upper caste and class people who were able to make use of these opportunities.

**Family:** The much celebrated ‘joint family system’ of rural areas, is argued to have gone through tremendous changes under urban
influences. It has been a general belief that with the changes in cropping pattern and occupational diversification there will be a breakup of joint family system into nuclear ones. Marriage and family are two important aspects of social life. In the urban areas caste norms have been flexible with regard to the selection of mates. There have been increasing opportunities for the free mixing of young men and women. Again the voluntary associations have encouraged inter-caste marriages. As a result there have been more inter-caste and inter-religious marriage in the urban areas than earlier. Though it has been pointed out that joint families are breaking down in the urban areas, studies conducted in several parts of the country also suggest that joint families do exist in the cities among certain castes like Khatris of Delhi and Chettiar of Madras. It can be said that due to the rapid socioeconomic changes in urban areas, rural societies have also changed tremendously. When people migrate from rural to urban areas there is a change in the rural joint family structure. The family size shrinks and so also the nature of relationship. Further caste as a social institution has also undergone massive change in rural societies with growing migration and dissociation from caste based occupation.

**Occupation:** The degree of urban-industrialisation and planned development through the Five-Year Plans could not bring about a significant shift in occupational structure in India till 1990. The percentage of Indian labour force in agriculture remained static between 1901 and 1971. In the period 69.4 percent and 69.7 percent of the total labour force was in agriculture respectively. Though the percentage of urban population increased substantially during this period there has not been corresponding increase in the percentage of the labour force in the urban manufacturing, construction and service sector. Things have started improving slightly by 2001. In 1991 around 67 percent of the total workers were in the agricultural sector. In 2001 only 58
percent of the total workers have been recorded to be in the agricultural sector. The results from 2001 census clearly suggest a shift in the composition of labour force from a predominantly agricultural to moderately non-agricultural sector. (Census Report 2001) The percentage of urban workers engaged in primary (comprising cultivation, household industry, mining quarrying, fishing), secondary (comprising manufacturing and processing) and tertiary (comprising commerce and service) sectors during 1993-94 is 16.8, 31 and 52.1 percent, respectively (see table 4.2). Whereas the total workforce engaged in these three sectors during the same period is 67.5, 12.0 and 20.5, respectively

**Economy:** Urbanisation is a natural and inevitable consequence of economic development. Urbanisation accompanies economic development because economic development entails a massive shift of labour and other inputs from predominantly rural sectors to those predominantly urban (Mill and Becker 1986: 17). The National Commission on Urbanisation of India recognises the economic importance of the Indian cities and towns. It considers “urbanisation as a catalyst for economic development and that the towns and cities despite their problems are for the millions and millions of our people the road to a better future”. When we examine the various cities in India, we find that some cities have come up during twentieth century in places where there were nothing but forests earlier. One of the first steel cities in India, like Jamshedpur in Bihar, has provided employment to a large number of people including the Santals who are the local tribal inhabitants of this area. These tribals who were relatively isolated earlier have come into contact with a wide section of Indian population, coming from different regions, speaking different languages, and so on. Besides Jamshedpur, three more steel towns have emerged after Independence. These are Bhilai in Madhya Pradesh, Rourkela in Orissa and Durgapur in West Bengal.
Emergence of these steel factories has brought about not only prosperity but has led to the modification of the whole social scenario of this area. Areas that were socio-economically backward have now become prosperous and cosmopolitan.

**Labour:** We all know that in India especially its rural societies are predominantly agrarian in nature. But with industrialisation and urbanisation, there has been a tendency among the rural youth to search for livelihood mechanisms outside agriculture. Agriculture, as we know is dependent of the weather conditions and therefore agricultural output is uncertain. Either in times of flood or drought, agricultural production dwindles which poses challenges to those vast majority of people whose livelihood is dependent on agriculture. Hence there is growing tendency especially among the rural youths to work in non-agricultural sectors in order to have a secured source of livelihood. Along with this the growth of Secondary and Tertiary Sector have resulted in absorption of majority of people into these segments. Thus in the contemporary Indian Society, Secondary and Tertiary Sectors have emerged as major players in the country's economic growth.

**Leisure:** The urban culture of India is influenced by the size, density, demographic and ethnic compositions and spatial organizations of urban settlements. Tremendous transformation have taken place in urban culture in terms of relation between rural and urban, local, regional and global, private and public spaces, elite and popular etc. Leisure time activities such as working in parks or beaches, participation in religious and cultural festivals, celebrations and sports like wrestling, playing guilli-danda attending plays and films have defined urban culture for both the elite and the mass. Earlier film going was a mass activity. But now with the growing multiplexes it has been restricted to a certain class. The cultural activities in cites have also become class – specific and even for communities and
gender. For example practices such as going to theatre, discos and pubs have been identified to the elite. These practices are related to food, clothing and style of living inside and outside home. Moreover our body has now been treated as an object of production through fashion and beauty industry and cultural activities like playing cards or celebrating religious activities. Commercial recreation is a modern form of recreation found in modern urban societies, especially in the highly industrialized countries. It is a profit-making business for entertaining masses of people. Although it is a modern phenomenon, it has existed even in earlier times. People in pre-industrial era sought recreation by paying to dancing girls, bards and “tamasha” groups entertaining people from one village to another. In the major townships there were opera houses, theatres and orchestra groups to entertain the elite and upper middle class who could pay higher price for recreation. There were circus and drama companies which travelled from place to place offering entertainment to large segments of people.

**Technology:** Rapid development in technology of communication provided unprecedented boost to commercial recreation as a competitive, profitmaking activity. In today’s societies, commercial recreation has become a lucrative (easily income earning) business that engages the talented, creative minds who are business minded and only interested in money-making and they do not think of the harmful impact of it on the masses, particularly the young. Each commercial or business organization tries to seek a slot on T.V when people watch the programme. To popularize a programme, the producers seek the patronage of well known film stars or celebrities. Multistoried shopping complexes and malls have become the other major sources of commercial recreation in the booming towers and cities.
While field studies of villages have proved valuable, there is a tendency to treat them as the bases of generalisations of the Indian society as a whole. Hence, it is necessary to promote urban studies which would supplement the rural view and thus provide a balanced picture of the Indian social institutions. However, some circles of sociologists lament that the distinction between rural sociology and urban sociology is not meaningful in the Indian context because about 80% of the people live in villages, and hence there is hardly any justification for the requirement of urban studies. On the other hand, it has also been argued that, although religion, caste and kinship are the bases of social organisation in both villages and towns, there are significant differences in the working of these in the two contexts. For example, the rules of the caste system regarding occupation are to a great extent strictly observed in the villages but in cities the same rules tend to become flexible. In the urban context, the institutional framework and the constraints in which religion, caste and kinship operate are not the same as those in the villages. Therefore, in order to study rural and urban societies in their entirety, rural and urban sociologies have been developed as specialised fields of sociology in India. The development of these specialised fields help our further understanding of the social structure, system of stratification as well as the social processes which vary in rural and urban societies.
MODULE II

CONCEPTS AND PERSPECTIVES

2.1. Basic Concepts- Urbanisation, Urbanism, Urbanity, Rural- Urban continuum

Concept of Urban

The word 'urban' was hardly used in the English language before the nineteenth century. It is briefly defined by the Shorter Oxford Dictionary as 'pertaining to town or city life'. It is derived from the Latin 'urbs' a term applied by the Romans to a city-more especially the city of Rome. Urban refers to a city or town, which is directly opposite to village or country. Resident of a village is known as Folk and the city is known as urban. It is not possible to have a study of urbanisation unless adequate note is taken of the definition of an "urban area" or "urban centre" or city or town, which varies from country to country and from one census year to another.

Urbanisation

Urbanization is commonly understood as a process by which an area and its population assume “urban” character or features. The Population Census in India accords “urban” status to a settlement when at least 70 per cent of its male workers are engaged in the non-agricultural sector and when it satisfies some other standards regarding size and density of population. When an area grows in size, density, and heterogeneity and assumes urban social, cultural, economic, ecological, physical and political features and declared as “urban” by the State administration it is called urban. Some ideal-type features, which are generally taken as urban...
include non-agricultural occupations, a big size population in a given area, high density of population, social and cultural heterogeneity of population, large-scale division of labour, an economy based primarily on industry, commerce, tourism, concentration of facilities like modern communication and transportation, banking, education, health, sports, courts, administration, concentration of urban civic amenities like power and water supply, sanitation, garbage clearance, parking, market complexes, parks, play grounds, community halls, theatre halls and similar other facilities for public use, urban association based on contractual relations rather than kinship or primordial relations, erosion or breakdown of traditional values and norms and rise of new set of values, morality and norms (which are rationalistic in nature), and a municipal or corporation administration, with provisions of democratic decentralism and urban citizenship. Such general features of the “urban” are called ideal typical because there is no fixity or concreteness of the levels to these features to be called urban and even in the absence of some of these features a particular area could be accorded urban status. Urbanization is actually a process where a non-urban area becomes urban and a less urban area becomes more urban by assuming more and more of these features. In the process of urbanization the urban people or the urbanites, and the new entrants to the urban centre get attuned to urbanism, or the urban way of life. It is however debatable if there is only one particular way to urban life. The nonEuropean sociologists and anthropologists have argued that the characterization of urban, as has been done above, is primarily Western and suffers from Western ethnocentrism. Empirical studies of the African and Asian urban situations have confirmed that there could be non-Western modes and levels of urbanization as well, where each country would have their historical and contextual specificities, and some degree of continuation of their cultural, social and
political traditions, and the level of economic and technological developments could also be different. The traditional social and cultural forms are expected to continue in the urban areas. The level of civic amenities, the physical looks of the cities, the structural arrangements, and the level of consumerism would also be different from those in the Western cities, although the influence of Western modernity or post modernity in the cities of the less developed countries could also be felt.

**Levels of Urbanization:** The level of urbanization is often defined in terms of proportion of urban population to total population. This measure of urbanization attaches great value to the human and social dimensions of urbanization as well. There are, however, two more important measures of urbanization. The first one is that the towns serve the rural people in terms of socio-economic change and the larger the rural people served by each town, on an average, the lower the level of urbanization. Alternatively, when no rural people are left to be served by town urbanization is taken to have reached its zenith. The second measure of urbanization concerns the distance that the rural people have to cover to reach the nearest urban centre. The greater the distance, lower the level of urbanisation. Because such a situation would mean urban centres are fewer in number and the distance between the urban centres is quite high. In a state with well-developed urban network people cover smaller distances to reach the urban centres.

Classification of towns by size and differential trends of urbanization

On the basis of population size the Census of India has placed towns into six categories:

Class I town – 1,00,000 or more
Class II towns – From 50,000 to 99,999

Class III towns – From 20,000 to 49,999

Class IV towns – From 10,000 to 19,999

Class V – From 5,000 to 9,999

Class VI – Below 5,000

Urban studies are commonly divided into two subject areas: urbanism (the study of urban life, or the impact of cities upon human behaviour) and urbanization (the study of the growth of cities). Urbanization further includes the process of population concentration within human settlements (the city), as well as the expansion of cities into surrounding communities (suburbanization) and regions. The study of urbanization has employed several types of empirical approaches, including the “rank size rule” (when cities were thought to be distributed in orderly fashion according to a Pareto distribution), the typological classification of cities assigned to levels within a hierarchy of places, and functional correlates according to city size. These classifications reflect developments in social science disciplines more generally; for example, in the 1960s there were efforts to explain urbanization following general systems theory, while from the 1980s forward it has become more common to refer to cities within a network of global cities. This entry presents a brief overview of the origins of cities and urban life, with a focus on urbanization of the past 200 years, and then discusses the emergence of the megacity as a current emphasis in the study of urbanization.
Urbanism

Urbanism refers to the characteristics of, and quality of life in, cities and, for urban studies, the question of how human interaction and social organization has been altered by urban life. Early urban theorists, observing the overwhelming social changes brought about by industrialization and the rapid pace of urbanization, thought that the city would lead to personal disorganization (persons living in cities would not be able to cope with the rapid pace and stimuli of the urban environment) and social disorganization (families and social norms would break down). Debate surrounding these questions continues to inform the urban disciplines, and urban studies more generally, as new urban formations and growing megacities in the developing world further stress urban populations.

The classic statement on urban life is that of Louis Wirth, an American sociologist who studied under Robert Park and Ernest Burgess at the University of Chicago and who would later become an important member of the faculty. Wirth’s Urbanism as a Way of Life, published in 1938, is considered a summary of the perspectives of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology. Wirth set out to establish a theory of urbanism and began by suggesting that urban life is characterized by three variables: size, density, and heterogeneity. Compared to nonurban communities, the city had a larger and more heterogeneous population concentrated within urban space, and these variables interacted with one another to produce a distinctive urban way of life found only in the city. Increased population size resulted in a division of labour and specialisation, while increased density would speed social interaction and competition among urban populations. Larger population size was in part the result of immigration, and cities would bring together persons of different cultures (just as the division of labour would mean the concentration of persons
would increase urban heterogeneity by bring together persons with different skills and backgrounds within urban space). Urbanism would create greater opportunities for the individual for self-fulfillment with others who shared common interests, but the overall effect was negative: Urban life was characterized by social disorganization, as personal interactions within the primary group were replaced by voluntary associations among secondary groups. The impersonal nature of social relations in the city would result in anomie (a sense of isolation) despite the number of persons one encountered in daily life. The social disorganization of urban life was a pervasive trope in the early Chicago School studies, with studies of homeless men, street gangs, and slums. There has emerged an important critique of European tradition, represented by Tönnies, Simmel, and others, based upon the observation that what they (Simmel, in particular) were describing was not the effect of urbanization on urban life per se, but instead the powerful forces of modernity. The changes in daily life described in these studies are not the result of urbanization but instead are the consequence of societal change brought about by industrial capitalism: It was industrial employment that brought persons from rural communities to the large cities and into competitive and alienating relationships with one another, which resulted in the breakdown of the family, decline in other primary group relationships, alienation, and the like.

**Urbanity**

As Louis Wirth wrote in his essay “Urbanism as a way of life”, the contemporary world is urban to a much greater extent than indicated by the number of population that is living in cities and therefore their influence cannot be brought down to the urbanisation ratio. The quality of urbanity is constituted by secondary rather than by primary contacts. Although urbanity is
currently more often understood as Tönnie’s society (Gesellschaft) rather than community (Gemeinschaft), it does not imply that its sole components are population density and heterogeneity. A universal agreement does not exist in this matter. The appearance of this concept in urban narratives and discourses draws our attention towards the city residents and their journeys in time and space, the experience of urban everyday life, changing impressions and “intensification of nervous stimulation” as Georg Simmel would put it. Spaces and landscapes, the spirit of the city and tangible and symbolic values of identity characteristics, cumulated and selected over time, are commonly recognised as constitutive of concept of urbanity. But apart from these, its new varieties appear outside the official discourse. The category of urbanity still remains valid, in the experience and inter-subjective mental structures of residents, tourists and other users. This is phenomenon is being accelerated by the mediatisation of modern societies.

**Rural- Urban continuum**

Rural Urban continuum is the merging of town and village. The concept is a term used in recognition of the fact that there is rarely, either physically or socially, a sharp division, a clearly marked boundary between the two, with one part of the population wholly urban, the other wholly rural. The term was given by Robert Redfield (1930). He made an important contribution to develop the concept of folk, rural and urban continuum. He has constructed a continuum from small rural villages to large cities. More urban means that population is more secular, more individualistic and with a greater division of labour.

The characteristics of these two modes of living are represented by two concepts namely ‘ruralism’ and ‘urbanism.’ Ruralism signifies the rural mode of living in which there is predominance of traditions, customs, and folk culture and joint family. On the
other hand, urbanism signifies the urban mode of living in which there is predominance of impersonal relations, individualism and secondary associations. Urban way of life is becoming more predominant day by day. There is also a danger of increasing slums with increasing urbanization as big cities are expanding fast. There is a danger of urban realm turning in slum according to trends.

The rural social world is different from the urban social world. There is a valid distinction between village and city in terms of two different ways of life, cultural patterns, socio-cultural groupings and modes of earning and livelihood. The village is considered a basic unit of settlement. It doesn’t mean that urban systems are not basic.

The rural-urban differences developed in a unilinear fashion which led to a breakdown of rural urban differences. Thus one can delineate three inter-related aspects of urbanization. One is the sequential sectoral development of the economy. Second is the growing concentration of population in areas where secondary and tertiary activities are located. Third is the diffusion of the development process leading to the disappearance of rural urban differences. Thus, the rural-urban continuum may be defined as a dynamic equilibrium wherein the development process involves the people in both rural and urban areas and the returns of development are also distributed to the people whose settlement pattern is distributed spatially.

2.2. Related concepts – Urban Agglomeration, City, Suburbs, Rurban, Peri Urbanisation

Urban Agglomeration (UA):

An urban agglomeration is a continuous urban spread constituting a town and its adjoining outgrowths (OGs), or two or
more physically contiguous towns together with or without outgrowths of such towns. An Urban Agglomeration must consist of at least a statutory town and its total population (i.e. all the constituents put together) should not be less than 20,000 as per the 2001 Census. In varying local conditions, there were similar other combinations which have been treated as urban agglomerations satisfying the basic condition of contiguity. Examples: Greater Mumbai UA, Delhi UA, etc.

**Population of UAs/Towns:**

1. The total urban population in the country as per Census 2011 is more than 377 million constituting 31.16% of the total population.

2. Class I UAs/Towns: The UAs/Towns are grouped on the basis their population in Census. The UAs/Towns which have at least 1,00,000 persons as population are categorised as Class I UA/Town. At the Census 2011, there are 468 such UAs/Towns. The corresponding number in Census 2001 was 394.

3. 264.9 million persons, constituting 70% of the total urban population, live in these Class I UAs/Towns. The proportion has increased considerable over the last Census. In the remaining classes of towns the growth has been nominal.

4. Million Plus UAs/Towns: Out of 468 UAs/Towns belonging to Class I category, 53 UAs/Towns each has a population of one million or above each. Known as Million Plus UAs/Cities, these are the major urban centres in the country. 160.7 million persons (or 42.6% of the urban population) live in these Million Plus UAs/Cities. 18 new UAs/Towns have been added to this list since the last Census.
5. **Mega Cities**: Among the Million Plus UAs/Cities, there are three very large UAs with more than 10 million persons in the country, known as Mega Cities. These are Greater Mumbai UA (18.4 million), Delhi UA (16.3 million) and Kolkata UA (14.1 million). The largest UA in the country is Greater Mumbai UA followed by Delhi UA. Kolkata UA which held the second rank in Census 2001 has been replaced by Delhi UA. The growth in population in the Mega Cities has slowed down considerably during the last decade. Greater Mumbai UA, which had witnessed 30.47% growth in population during 1991-2001 has recorded 12.05% during 2001-2011. Similarly Delhi UA (from 52.24% to 26.69% in 2001-2011) and Kolkata UA (from 19.60% to 6.87% in 2001-2011) have also slowed down considerably.

**City**

The notion that the contemporary industrial city, and thus urban life, should be regarded as definitive of the contemporary moment had a certain visceral logic. Cities often seem to represent the crystallization of a particular society’s defining attributes. And, indeed, many neo-Marxist and neo-Marxist theorists influenced by the writing of the French urbanist Henri Lefebvre still cleave tightly to this argument. Other theorists, however, see little analytic value in emphasizing the connection between urban life and a particular notion of the modern or the contemporary. Writers such as Ray Pahl, David Pocock, and Peter Saunders argued that to focus on the urban as somehow the engine of social change is to misplace the arrow of causality. It may be true that many of the characteristics that define modern life predominate in cities. But this is not the result of urban life per se. It is the consequence of living in a highly specialized, technologically advanced, capitalist society.
**Town**

Towns: For the Census of India 2011, the definition of urban area is as follows;

1. All places with a municipality, corporation, cantonment board or notified town area committee, etc.

2. All other places which satisfied the following criteria: i) A minimum population of 5,000; ii) At least 75 per cent of the male main working population engaged in non-agricultural pursuits; and iii) A density of population of at least 400 persons per sq. km.

The first category of urban units is known as Statutory Towns. These towns are notified under law by the concerned State/UT Government and have local bodies like municipal corporations, municipalities, municipal committees, etc., irrespective of their demographic characteristics as reckoned on 31st December 2009. Examples: Vadodara (M Corp.), Shimla (M Corp.) etc. The second category of Towns (as in item 2 above) is known as Census Town. These were identified on the basis of Census 2001 data.

**Metropolis**

The notion of metropolitan region refers to a collection of territories considered interdependent, some located in the central areas and others on the urban fringe. It is also identified with a plan to constitute a coherent territorial structure operating across several spatial scales. Yet, metropolitan territorial coherence is contradicted by the emergence of peripheral spaces, including “edge” and “edgeless” cities, which deny the predominant role of the centre. However, the metropolitan region, a territory experienced as a functional construct by some but an abstraction by others, suffers from a lack of political recognition in most countries.
A number of scholars of democracy, from Socrates to the political scientist Robert Dahl, have considered what the ideal size of the polity (in the democratic sense of the term) should be, however, the overwhelming growth of urbanization in the course of the twentieth century has shifted the debate from the size of the polity to that of the city. Discussion now focuses on the minimal population threshold for new urban forms, whether the city in the strict sense, the metropolitan region, or the megalopolis.

The theory of ecological expansion that was developed in the wake of the Chicago School’s first publications is drawn on to understand the meaning of the idea of metropolitan community. This refers to a territory composed of a centre along with socially differentiated social areas and suburbs that depend on the centre. These intrametropolitan territories are connected, notably by daily commuter journeys, but also through residential trajectories following the invasion–succession model. This theory of metropolitan expansion supposes that the urban area grows to the extent that costs and commuting time decrease, on one hand, and households gain increased capacity for residential choice, on the other. It seeks to determine the limits of the metropolis and its structure, defined as the principal axes ensuring interrelations between the center and the periphery. In this way, the metropolitan region is defined as a space of flows, specifically in terms of the level of commuting between residential areas and central places. The pattern of these flows is a function of the distance to be covered, accessibility to places, and the structure of economic locations. Residential choices are due to personal preferences as much as to cost rationality and travel times. This space of flows might also be structured by social forces that condition relationships between different parts of metropolises. In regional science, the attraction of different activity centres are considered as masses that differentially generate flows, their direction, and their spatial range. Spatial interactions arise from
the structure of economic locations and the effect of the attraction of one sector for another as a function of size and distance. These interactions define the region’s edge by indicating where the flows sharply dissipate.

Emerging metropolitan forms have been influenced by the decentralization of commercial activities, manufacturers, and, more recently, high technology. The debate is therefore about the general tendency of the phenomenon of decentralization and concentration of activities and employment in suburban centres.

**Megalopolis**

Many academics have coined terms for their phenomenon of study, but few have been successful. But Jean Gottmann’s proposal for megalopolis to refer to a string of closely interconnected metropolises was logical and inspired and has become part of the language. The term is derived from Greek and means simply “very large city.” A group of ancient Greeks planned to construct a large city of this name on the Peloponnese Peninsula; only a small city of Megalopolis still exists. The best contemporary treatment of Megalopolis is a 1998 report by Birdsall and Florin, The Megalopolitan Region, which was prepared for the U.S. State Department and is available online. Gottmann (1915–1994) was a French geographer who for 20 years studied the north eastern United States and published his seminal work in 1961.

The ingenuity of the term and the obvious functional reality and importance of interconnected sets of large cities inevitably led to the proclaiming of similar urban systems around the world. There is a degree of subjectivity in the definition and delineation of other megalopolises, depending on whether the conception is
closer to a rather continuous conurbation of urban settlement or to a more loosely related set of metropolitan areas.

Outside the United States, the earliest recognized and the world’s largest megalopolis is surely the Tokyo-Nagoya-Osaka corridor, with up to 80 million people. Other reasonable contenders are the urban regions centered on London, São Paulo–Rio de Janeiro, Beijing-Tianjin-Tangshan, the Pearl River Delta (Hong Kong–Guangzhou), and the Tangtze Metropolis River delta (greater Shanghai). Note that this excludes many of the world’s largest cities, which are not part of a system of cities, for example, Mexico City, Mumbai, Kolkata, Jakarta, Bangkok, Delhi, Seoul, and Buenos Aires. Similarly functionally related city regions, but of smaller size, are, for example, Randstad (Netherlands-Belgium) and Rhine-Ruhr, Toronto, and Taipei. But if they see themselves as megalopolises, why not? Neil Pierce, in his 2008 opinion piece “The Megalopolis Century,” clearly prefers a looser conception; he says that “more than 200 million people, two-thirds of the U.S. population already live in 10 megalopolitan regions.

Suburbanisation and Periurbanisation

The walled cities of ancient and medieval India stood apart from the surrounding rural areas. The limits of the physical city were then clearly defined by the walls, the moats, and other protective structures around the city. The gates, few in number, provided the only regulated points of entry to and exit from the city. Inside the walled city lived an urban class of people engaged in non-agricultural occupations, and in the villages outside the city, there lived rural people who were primarily engaged in agriculture and animal husbandry. The city and countryside were clearly divided by a discernible and conspicuous boundary the city wall. Even where walls were absent, the boundary between the traditional
Indian city and the rural villages was abrupt and clearly defined. Even today, the boundaries of all towns, large and small, and one lakh cities as well, are clearly demarcated. Even a casual observer in these places would notice the point where the urban area abruptly gives way to areas of rural land use. The situation is very different in the case of metropolitan cities and some of the over one lakh cities. Around these major urban centres, the physical expansion of built-up areas beyond their municipal boundaries has been very conspicuous. Much of this development has occurred in a spontaneous, haphazard and unplanned manner. What were essentially rural villages beyond the municipal limit have now been unmistakably transformed by the location of urban residential, commercial and industrial complexes. The city has penetrated, in some cases deeply, into rural areas. The term rural-urban fringe has been used to designate such areas where we have a mixture of rural and urban land uses.

2.3. Views on urban social life

a) Emile Durkheim- Division of labour, The moral basis of the community

Emile Durkheim indicated urbanization in his book of division of labor in which he attempted to describe organic solidarity or urban society’s characteristics. Durkheim stated urbanization created a new form of social cohesion based on mutual interdependence that signifies liberating. According to Durkheim such interdependence is typical feature of organic solidarity or cooperative society. Durkheim was more positive than Tönnies about the nature of cities and urbanized societies. He is optimistic about futurity of city. He certainly appreciated the social bonds and community feeling, which he called mechanical solidarity, characteristic of small, rural societies. However, he also thought that these societies stifled individual freedom and that social ties
still exist in larger, urban societies. He called these latter ties organic solidarity, which he said stems from the division of labor.

Durkheim argued that the type of group solidarity produced in complex urbanized societies could also form the basis for the emergence of new forms of communal life. A key question in this regard was how a sense of collective morality could be maintained amid the increasing differentiation and complexity of modern society. The answer proposed by Durkheim initially seems contradictory. On the one hand, an increase in occupational specialization and the development of complex social arrangements has meant that traditional ways of life have declined, thereby creating pervasive feelings of social and moral disintegration. Durkheim referred to this condition of social discord as “anomie.” Conditions of anomie arise when sudden and disruptive changes occur in social structure. Rather than lament this state of affairs, however, Durkheim suggested that new forms of solidarity and community could grow from the institutional bases of modern society. Although Durkheim remains vague as to what precise shape these communal forms may take, his emphasis upon the nature of collective morality, social cohesion, and the differentiation of modern life was to exercise a significant influence upon subsequent theories of community.

b) Marx and Engles- The town, the country and the capitalist mode of production

Like other sociologists, Marx was so critical of urbanization process. He, with his colleague Engels, condemned the process of urbanization under capitalism under the issue of the political economy and urbanization. According to them rise of city was transition from barbarism to civilization. Marx and Engels believe people realize political and economic freedom, productive and
specialization in city. They assert Social evolution of humans not complete through urbanization until capitalism was transformed into socialism. Marx and Engels emphasizes on economics and problems of inequality and conflict in urban area. They believed the consequence of urbanization is harmful for society. For them, pauperization and material degradation were aspects of urbanization. But they considered critically the most pervasive impact of urbanization which was the destruction of the social nexus of the traditional community and its replacement by the utilitarian world of the city.

c) Max Weber- The city and the growth of rationality

Max Weber Considered social structure of city. Weber defined urban community as an ideal type that required:

- Trade or commercial relations, e.g. market center (economic perspective)
- Court and law of its own (legal perspectives)
- Partial political autonomy (political perspectives)
- Militarily self-sufficient for self-defense (Administrative perspectives)
- Forms of associations or social participation whereby individuals engage in social relationships and organizations(sociological perspectives)

Weber suggested that cities are linked to larger processes, e.g. economic or political orientations and urbanism determined by cultural and historical conditions. Weber agree with Marx & Engels who argued that human condition of cities was result of economic structure. Thus, cities are treated in terms of their
relations to other cities, to other parts of their society, as integral parts of the social and political order. To Weber, like his predecessors Marx, Tönnies and Simmel, metropolis is the paradigm of an inhuman, debasing social environment. He believes mass urbanization nullified opportunities for political participation, which was one of the crucial characteristics of the city. His ideal city is the medieval guild city, which combined economic enterprise and religious activity as well as private and public life.

d) Tönnies - The dichotomy model - Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft

Somewhat similar to the concept of primary and secondary groups are the concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, developed by Ferdinand Tönnies (1887). These two terms translate roughly as ‘Community’ and ‘Society’. The Gemeinschaft is a social system in which most relationships are personal or traditional and often both. A good example is the feudal manor, a small community held together by a combination of personal relationships and status obligation. Although great inequality existed, the lord of the manor was personally known to his subjects, while their duties to him were balanced by his obligation for their welfare. In the Gesellschaft, the society of tradition is replaced with the society of contract. In this society neither personal attachment nor traditional rights and duties are important. The relationships between people are determined by bargaining and defined in written agreements. Relatives are often separated because people move about and live among strangers. Commonly accepted codes of behavior are largely replaced by rational or ‘cold-blooded’ calculation of profit and loss. Thus in the Gemeinschaft, primary-group relationships were dominant, while in the Gesellschaft, secondary-group relationships gained in importance.
e) Simmel- The Metropolis and Mental Life

George Simmel is pessimistic about urban growth and considered importance of urban experience, i.e. chose to focus on urbanism (life within the city) rather than urbanization (development of urban areas). "The Metropolis and Mental Life" is an essay detailing his views on life in the city, focusing more on social psychological aspects. Individual develops a blase attitude that is a social reserve, a detachment, respond with head rather than heart, don’t care and don’t get involved.

**Philosophy of Money:** Money promotes rational calculation in human affairs, furthering rationalization characteristic of modern societies. Money replaces personal ties by impersonal relations that limited to a specific purpose. Above economic functions, it symbolizes and embodies modern spirit of rationalism, calculability and impersonality. Simmel indicated that monetary interaction has negative impact on social relationship that manifested in prostitution. Prostitution is another form of interaction that entertains monetary values as central element in the sociation. The deepest problems of modern life derive from the claim of the individual to preserve the autonomy and individuality of his existence in the face of overwhelming social forces, of historical heritage, of external culture, and of the technique of life. He talked about the detached and capricious urban cosmopolitan. The urban modernist is now embedded in the iron cage of a world of work and bureaucracy as well as the consumer’s dilemma of a search for identity in a soulless mass society.
MODULE III

URBAN SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN INDIA

3.1 Colonialism and the emergence of urban centres, Industrialisation and emergence of towns

Sociologists define urbanisation as the movement of people from villages to town/city where economic activities are centred around non-agricultural occupations such as trade, manufacturing industry and management. Broadly speaking, in order to explain the process of urbanisation we can discuss the following three aspects:

i) The demographic and spatial aspects

ii) Economic aspects and

iii) Socio-cultural aspects

While considering the early growth of cities and the development of urban areas in undivided India, one can trace their beginnings to about 5,500 years backwards. Around 2500 B.C. the cities of Mohenjodaro and Harappa (since 1947 in Pakistan) were established in the valley of Indus river. Archaeologists and historians have pointed out that around 2000 B.C. urbanisation in the Harappan culture exhibited signs of high development in brick technology, geometry, agriculture and irrigation practices. Another important phase of urbanisation is said to have begun somewhere around 600 B.C. in India culminating in the formation of early historical cities.
During the ancient and medieval periods of Indian history, the kings established various capital regions which developed into towns. For example, Pataliputra (now Patna) and Vaishali developed as towns during the Magadh rule around B.C. 300. Kanauj was the capital town of Harshavardhana in Uttar Pradesh in A.D. 700. Mohammad Tughlaq is noted for shifting his capital from Delhi to Daulatabad (Devagiri) in the southern region in A.D. 1300.

The establishment of the East India Company and the onset of British colonial control of India from the seventeenth century led to the growth of urban centres of Delhi, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. These cities (except Delhi) developed along the seacoast in the respective regions where the British had established administrative system in terms of provinces.

With the coming of European colonial traders in India, the process of urbanisation entered into a new phase. Cities grew up in the coastal areas as ports-cum-trading centres. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries European trading posts were established initially for trading purposes. As the British power grew in the nineteenth century, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras became the political centres too. Indeed, in this period with the introduction and development of advanced technological knowledge, we find the emergence of new economic and political institutions, new modes of communication such as telegraph, railways, advanced system of roads and waterways.

The British were responsible for changes in the organisation and development of cities and towns on the basis of the needs of a European colonial power. Thus, the colonial port cities like Bombay, Madras and Calcutta supplanted Surat, Calicut and Dacca. While many old centres of industrial production declined, new market towns and towns fulfilling new needs emerged during
the colonial period. To this, scholars such as Atiya Habeeb gave the term „dependent urbanisation“. Christopher Bayly has argued that there were new towns like Mirzapur and old ones like Benares which flourished because of the demand for Indian commodities created by the East India Company in the early 19th century before the formal incorporation of these territories.

The British were responsible by the late 19th century for the decline of artisanal production and of many urban centres. Some new centres, such as Moradabad which produced brassware, emerged in the twentieth century due to railway transport at reasonable cost and an increase in consumer preference for brass utensils. There was also the movement of some dispersed or rural traditional industries to bigger centres or towns as in the case of leather goods. The traditional textiles in rural areas employing unskilled workers declined. In such towns the textile producers improved their chances of getting better terms for credit, a better price for their products and they could also draw on the resources of skilled dyers.

The process of urbanisation became smooth and widened the structure of economic opportunity and widened the social horizons of people. In the nineteenth century, though the process of urbanisation grew in a modest way, the countryside suffered from the gradual process of the destruction of the cottage and small industries in the rural areas. In this situation, the new economic opportunity structure pulled a significant section of population to the urban areas. Many of the artisans became unemployed. Hence, the displaced rural artisans and labourers were also pushed to urban areas for employment.

The late nineteenth century, however, witnessed a large-scale migration of the rural labour force especially from Bihar and eastern United Provinces towards the jute mills of Calcutta and
other industrial destinations. To avail the new economic opportunities many people migrated either temporarily or permanently to the urban areas. With the spread of education, the institutional arrangements of the urban centres also changed. The educated people joined the bureaucracy, and also took up jobs as teachers, journalists, lawyers and so on. They brought about a new worldview.

The urban centres gradually grew up to be the centres of new social and political ideas, diverse economic activities and of heterogeneous populations. The new process of urbanisation presented various economic opportunities and scope for occupational and social mobility, it was only the upper caste and class people who were able to make use of these opportunities. The new process of urbanisation, which began, with the advent of the British received a momentum at the beginning of twentieth century. The process of this urbanisation has some distinctive features.

**Cantonments:** The British need to recruit and maintain a substantial army led to the creation of cantonments and urban centres close to such military stations. In Madras, the British had a fortified area of European settlement called the White Town that was separated from the Black Town where the Indians lived. The idea of racial segregation developed in India because of the need to maintain European superiority as well as to ensure regulation of inter-racial contacts for reasons of health and avoidance of diseases. The cantonment inhabitants in the early years of the 19th century were often victims of cholera, an illness which principally devastated the lives of the poor in rural areas. As David Arnold observes, „Troops were particularly susceptible to a disease that flourished in the unsanitary and crowded conditions of barracks and encampments; and they, in turn, were among the principal agencies by which the disease was disseminated throughout India.
The cantonments were meant to protect the European soldiers from contact with Indian society but that proved difficult. This was partly because of the proximity to markets which played an important role in meeting the needs of the soldiers.

**Irrigation and canal colonies:** In many areas the British improved or remodelled the existing canals as in the case of the Ganges and Yamuna canals in the United Provinces. In Bengal the Eden canal was not very successful partly because the demand for water was not as acute as in the dry regions of India and peasants did not want to pay for water unless it was absolutely necessary. The areas which were most suitable for irrigation were those where there was both the demand for water and the possibility of providing water by irrigation schemes. The towns in these areas were important centres for merchants and moneylenders who moved the agricultural output to the market and the centres of consumption. Nevertheless, the power of the merchants and moneylenders in the Punjab, and in the canal towns in particular, was less pervasive than in the Bombay Deccan or Bengal, since they were unable to exercise the kind of influence over the rural population through debt and loan advances that they did in other parts of India.

**Railways and Railway Towns:** During Colonial rule, the British developed the railways in India to facilitate the movement of British manufactured goods into the country and the export of raw materials from India. The import of railway equipment and skilled manpower to run the railways was a consequence. The railways were built on a substantial scale and imported a large number of locomotives and wagons until 1947, although the Tata Iron & Steel Company began providing the railways with wagons after protective tariffs were introduced by the Government of India during the 1920s. It has been estimated that only 700 locomotives were built in India between 1865 and 1941 while
12,000 were imported. Therefore the railways did not lead to the development of an indigenous manufacturing sector in steel and engineering that could have led to modernisation and urbanisation, although, AsIan Kerr has argued, even the production of 700 locomotives in India revealed its immense technological possibilities. Rajat Ray has argued that if India had been an independent country, railway development could have promoted rapid industrialisation by the early twentieth century.

**Hill stations:** The first British hill station was built in 1819 and by the 1860s, many of them served as the summer capitals of the British government in India. In 1864 Simla became the official summer capital of the Viceroy and in 1870 Ootacamund (Ooty) that of the Madras presidency. Nainital served as the summer capital of the United Provinces for five months in a year and Darjeeling as that of the Bengal government for three months. As a result of protests from Indian petitioners against this practice, (which reached a peak in Madras in 1884 when thirty thousand petitioners wrote to Parliament) the duration of the official „flight” to the hills was curtailed. These hill stations were shaped by the need to make suitable spaces for European officials and their families. English medium private schools, sanatoriums and churches dotted the landscape of the hills, which had a lower population density than the plains, so the British were free to re-create an English atmosphere and promote an architecture that was closer to what they were familiar with back home. They could also „overlook” the Indian elites and ordinary people in these mountain retreats. Although there were differences in their size and importance, the British created about eighty hill stations in different parts of the subcontinent.

The urbanisation during the colonial period has sometimes been called parasitic or dependent because it was based on the exploitation of the peasants by urban and commercial interests.
The new urban centres were principally the port towns, the military cantonments, the railway towns and the commercial centres or market towns.

3.2 Changes in Land tenure Systems and agrarian societies and its impact on urbanisation

The spread of industrialisation in the Western countries during the 19th century and in rest of the world during 20th century has brought about significant changes in the agrarian sector of the economy as well. We can identify two important changes in the agrarian economy that came with industrialisation and development. First, agriculture lost its earlier significance and became only a marginal sector of the economy. For example, in most countries of the West today, it employs only a small proportion of the total working population (between two to five or six per cent) and its contribution to the total national income of these countries is also not very high. In the countries of the Third World also, the significance of agriculture has been declining over the years. In India, for example, though a large proportion of population is still employed in agricultural sector, its contribution to the total national income has come down substantially (from nearly sixty per cent at the time of independence to less than thirty per cent during early 1990s). The second important change that has been experienced in the agrarian sector is in its internal social organisation.

The social framework of agricultural production has experienced a sea change in different parts of the world during the last century or so. The earlier modes of social organisations, such as, "feudalism" and "peasant societies" (as discussed above) have disintegrated giving way more differentiated social structures. This has largely happened due to the influences of the processes of industrialisation and modernisation. The modern industry has
provided a large variety of machines and equipment for carrying out farm operations, such as, ploughing and threshing. This mechanisation of agricultural production has made it possible for the landowners to cultivate much larger areas of land in lesser time. Certain other technological breakthroughs also gave the cultivators chemical fertilisers and the new high yielding varieties of seeds. The net result of these changes has been an enormous increase in the productivity of land.

The agrarian policies of the British colonial rulers are regarded as among the most important factors responsible for introducing changes in the agrarian structure of the subcontinent. In order to maximise their incomes from land (which was collected from the cultivators in the form of land revenue), they introduced some basic changes in the property relations in the Indian countryside. These agrarian policies of the colonial rulers had far reaching consequences. In Bengal and Bihar, in parts of Chennai and United Province they conferred full ownership rights over the erstwhile zamindars that were only tax collecting intermediaries during the earlier regimes. The vast majority of peasants who had been actually cultivating land became tenants of the new landlords. Similarly, they demanded revenues in the form of a fixed amount of cash rather than as a share from what was produced on the land. Thus, even when bad weather destroyed the crop; the peasants were forced to pay the land revenue.

Permanent Settlement System for assessing land revenue was first introduced by the British in Banaras in 1773. Later, the Bengal Permanent Settlement Regulation of 1793 was passed by Lord Cornwallis. It was applicable to Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh. The traditional revenue collectors, who wielded considerable political, social and economic authority at the local level, were recognised as proprietors of the land and also agents for the collection of revenue on behalf of the government. The
original owners of the land (who had the usufruct rights) were reduced to the status of tenants who could be expropriated at the proprietors’ will.

Post Independence scenario and Land reforms

The term ‘land reforms’ specifically refers to land tenure reforms. The word tenure, derived from the Latin word “teneo”, means ‘to hold’. Therefore, land tenure is used to refer to the conditions under which land is held. Or, we may look at it as an arrangement by which farmers hold or control land and the conditions that must be observed for its use and occupancy. Land is expropriated or confiscated and redistributed in order to maintain this system. Land reforms are visualised as an instrument of social justice as they seek to do away with exploitative relationships characterised by sharp class division between rich landowning classes and impoverished peasants with no security of tenure. It is a step against the concentration of land holdings in the hands of a few absentee/non-cultivating owners, through imposition of ceilings on the size of holdings, which can be owned by a family.

Legislative measures for the abolition of intermediary tenure started with Uttar Pradesh with the Zamindari Abolition and Land Reform Act of 1950 of U.P. followed by legislations in other states. The pattern of land ownership is a key element for ushering in change. While the Act ushered in a new era, it was not without any weaknesses. First, an unduly high price was paid by way of compensation to the erstwhile intermediaries, in addition to a number of other benefits like debt settlement and interim compensation. Further, in the name of khudkasht of land under self-cultivation, many of the old landlords were able to retain extensive areas under their control leading to dispossession and eviction of a large number of tenants. Thus, while the tenurial
patterns changed, they did not lead to any effective improvement in the position of the poorer (evicted) tenants, the sharecroppers and the agricultural labourers.

The Act had not clearly envisaged any radical redistribution of land. Many of the old relationships between the owners of the land and those with tenancy rights were retained. By 1954 almost every state had passed Land Reform legislation on priority basis for the abolition of intermediary tenures on payment of compensation, as a result of which 20 million tenants were brought into direct contact with the state. Moreover, it is important to note that what is supposed to have been abolished is only the topmost layer of a hierarchy of intermediaries and not intermediaries as a class.

Urbanization in India has developed through the five year plans. The first two plans focused on institution and organization building and same was instructed to the states to do. The third plan emphasized on importance of towns and cities in balanced regional development. So, it advised urban planning to adopt regional approach. It also emphasized the need for urban land regulation, checking of urban land prices, preparation of master plan, etc. The fourth plan continued with the theme of third plan and development plans for 72 urban areas were undertaken. Regional studies in respect of metropolitan regions around Delhi, Mumbai and Calcutta were initiated.

During fifth plan, urban land ceiling act was passed in 1976. It also advised the state governments to create metropolitan planning regions to take care of the growing areas outside administrative city limits. It also emphasized the urban and industrial decentralization. The sixth five year plan stressed the need to develop small and medium sized towns and a scheme of Integrated development of Small and Medium towns (IDSMT)
was launched in 1979 by central government. During the seventh plan, some important institutional developments were done, which shaped the urban development policy and planning.

After independence, Indian Government supported all state governments to go for industrial developments. Especially, in the second five years plan, more funds was allocated and spent on industrialization, which has boosted for the rapid urbanization. Almost all industrial activities were concentrated in the major cities like Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Nagpur and Bangalore. The outskirts of these cities were crowded with shanty houses as slums, tin houses and sheds for human residence, then mushroom growth of required shops and establishments were born in a short time. The municipal and local administration allowed growing number of slums. Slum dwellers were provided with ration card, electricity and tap water connection. Goodaism and hooliganism prevailed in such places to capture government empty land for residential use, sell and resell it to others encouraged growth of slums.

3.3 Urban migration - Push and pull factors influencing urbanization – Issues of mobility and social status, Reverse migration

It is only in recent decades that natural increase has played an increasing role in accounting for urban population growth. Traditionally cities grew by migration which is a geographical process, since death rates match birth rates or were greater than birth rates in the past. In the past, it was migration that contributed to urban growth. Migration is the movement of population from one geographical region to another. Migration is a multi-faceted concept which includes both in migration and immigration. Immigration is in-migration, which means a population enters a region from another area.
Emigration is out-migration, which means a population leaves an area. Net migration is the difference between immigration and emigration. Internal migration is movement within a nation’s boundaries. In India, migration from abroad has been most reliable, except in recent years when there has been a significant increase in the Muslim population due to migration from Pakistan, Bangladesh & Afghanistan. It is in fact the internal migration which has led to population distribution from east to west and north to south today even through the death rate has fallen substantially, the birth rates has not fallen that much. Hence growth does not depend on birth or death rates alone but on migration which is determined by a number of socio-economic factors. Migration constitutes the very foundation of urban process in India. According to the Indian census, a migrant is one who is enumerated at a place other than his place of birth.

Mechanization of agriculture has led to surplus labour and this labour migrates from rural to urban areas and as opportunities decline in one region, and new opportunities arise in another region due to industrialization then the physical mobility of a population increases. As a society increases in scale, a major factor contributing to mobility is the restructuring of productive activities and the readjustments taking place between and within cities. This massive movement of people suggests that the labour force is closely tuned to the ebb and flow of the national economy.

The rural-urban migration is primarily a manifestation of population explosion, poverty and stagnation of rural life which prompts people to move to the cities the inability of the manufacturing sector to absorb the surplus labour suggests that even migrants are usually compelled to move because of the push factor. They are usually poor and such migration is less selective as survival depends on it. And in India distress migration is often due to famine and droughts. Migration by the ‘pull’ factor is
largely selective. Such migrants are normally younger with a higher level of education and training than the general population they are drawn to the cities for better job opportunities and may actually shop around for jobs. Those who are welloff are attracted by the glamour and life of the city. In India, the landowning and business groups who are better off and more educated than the population of the rural areas where they belong move to the city.

Internal migration in India, in terms of origin, volume distance and direction presents a picture which shows considerable mobility and this migration has been increasing because of education, employment and better transport facilities. It is possible to identify 3 types of migration which all roughly indicative of the relation between distance and migration. Short Distance - gone outside the place of enumeration but in the district i.e. known as inter-district.

Medium Distance – i.e. people gone outside the district but within the state of enumeration intra-state migration. Long Distance – persons born in any state of India but outside the state of enumeration inter-state. As far as migration is concerned, a little over ½ of male migration and about 3/4th of female migration is short distance migration. Most of the female migration is confined to the marriage field and the male migration is in terms of the employment field. The other ½ of the males travel over medium and long distances due to the urban pull. The number of such migrants has been increasing steadily, but it is mainly to the class 1 cities. Migration can also be classified in terms of the rural-urban breakdown.

Rural - Rural

Rural - Urban

Urban - Urban
Urban – Rural

The predominant form of migration in India is rural to rural especially 90% of the females and 50% males belong to this category and they are influenced by socio-economic factors characterized by marriage migration, village exogamy and associational migration in the case of males, migration may be seasonal and floating (harvest time) especially if it is first time migration. Women at such times are usually left behind. The artisan classes in the villages, due to a lack of demand for their goods, are often forced to leave and work as agricultural labourers over short and medium distances. However there is also a reverse return or outmigration i.e. from urban to rural areas. This is particularly true of the older group. From an economic point of view it is the rural-urban migration which is relatively long distance i.e. important. However it is less stable than the one induced by traditional social forces.

The short duration category of such male migration is indicative of the vagaries of the employment market and belongs to ‘by your luck’ category, since it is induced by the supposed benefits of the city. On the other hand female migration induced by the traditional forces has a built-in stability. The larger city especially the industrial towns have a larger proportion of longdistant migrants who are attracted to the facilities offered by the city and are willing to take up any job as they become part of the street economy. At the same time, there is a large turnover migration as population move from one area to another without really being able to settle down. This geographical mobility need not be voluntary as often persons are pushed to urban areas because of the poor rural economic conditions.

Urban – Urban migration is short distance but generally it is the push-back factor which operates everywhere as a consequence of
population increases and associated with a rapid increase in the labour force. Because of this unemployment and underemployment it is the migrants who are marginal who remain in the city in the hope than when job opportunities are created, they will be absorbed. According to Dandekar & Rath, rural poverty has remained the same but urban poverty has deepened because there has been an overflow of the rural poor in urban areas this explains the mushrooming of squatter settlements and ruralization of urban areas. The positive of this picture is that as a result of the development plans in the rural based agricultural sector and the extension of irrigation facilities and the bleak economic prospects in urban areas, the potential migrants are discouraged from moving to urban areas.

It has been postulated that rural urban inequality in terms of economic and social wellbeing would accelerate rural urban migration. The pull factors operating through the highly productive sectors in urban centres would attract labour force from rural areas. Many among rural poor would move to urban areas in any case as a part of their survival strategy and supplement their family income in their villages. Rural economy often plays an important role in ensuring balance between demand and supply of labour through circulation of population in different seasons of the year. Broadly, three different kinds of rural urban migration could be identified.

i) First, there are villages in which a significant proportion of populations have sought employment in far off urban areas. In this situation they leave their families in villages of their birth. This situation is prevalent not only within the country but also in overseas cities. In either of the situation, such emigrants visit their village either during festivals or on family occasions. Most significantly majority of them send money regularly. In villages, because of constant flow of money to such families, the economic
status is raised. In some cases, even the urban employment itself becomes the symbol of higher social status. In tangible terms, families of such emigrants have been found to build fashionable houses in their villages. They have also invested money on land and industry. Then it can be safely be inferred that whether the emigrants reside in Indian or overseas cities, the feedback effect of urbanization remains significant for such villages. In this situation, the urban impact is felt by villages despite the fact that physically they are neither situated within the cities nor are near them.

ii) Second kind of impact is felt by villages which are situated near an industrial town. These villages are exposed to several kinds of influences. The reasons for this could be a) with the coming up of an industrial town some villages might be totally up-rooted, b) lands are partially acquired, c) influx of immigrant workers, d) demand of all kinds of amenities for - new residents and e) finally ordering of relationship between immigrants and native residents.

In real terms this could mean that because Industrial Township is coming up, so there would be employment opportunities for villagers at their door step. In other words, this means that there would be a shift in the occupational structure among the villagers. Hence villagers instead of depending only upon agriculture, would send their adult members of the family to work in the factories as well. A considerable number of workers would commute from the city to the factories and eventually may shift their residence. However, it is important to remember that urbanization due to industrialization has general as well as specific influences on the villages. The specific influence has more to do with the nature of industry. Hence, agro based industries will encourage farmers of surrounding villages to devote more agricultural lands for that particular crop. The best
example in this case could be that of sugar mills. It has been observed that farmers in villages around sugar mills tend to cultivate sugarcane on larger portion of their land.

iii) Finally, the third type of urban impact is felt by phenomenon of ever increasing size of metropolitan cities which many times convert into megalopolis. In the above situations, normally either village is sucked in to the city as it expands or land excluding the inhabited area is used for urban development. Such situations give rise to 'rural pockets' in the city area. In such villages the landless peasants get cash compensation, which they either invest in far-off places or in commerce or squander money. The villagers in general seek urban employment. In villages where land is partially acquired, there cultivation is still possible, but then farmers take up the emerging demand in consideration while deciding for the type of crop which they cultivate. Another effect of a metropolitan city on the surrounding villages is the outflow of urban residents who wish to move out of the congested areas in the city into the open countryside.

Rural areas in the immediate periphery of large cities often act as dormitories for poor migrants who commute on daily basis, as they are unable to find a foothold in the cities. The rural periphery, which absorbs these migrants has to deal with various socio economic problems, due to deficiency of basic amenities and social fragmentation. These often lead to outbreak of epidemics, social tensions as also group conflicts, as the local residents struggle and fight with the migrant groups to access or share the limited employment opportunities and basic amenities. Furthermore, the environmental lobby gaining strength in these cities often launches measures to push out the pollutant and obnoxious industries to these areas, thereby creating a process of degenerated Peripheralisation. Understandably, this process helps
the cities in reducing their infrastructural costs and pass on the responsibility and costs of social transition to peripheral villages.

**Issues of mobility and social status**

The urban influence on rural areas has also been a factor in bringing about changes in traditional status based differentiation. In rural areas, traditionally status has been based on ownership of land, however under new set this has lost much of its edge. Now status markers are income, occupation and education. Modern occupation based in urban areas brings with it prestige and even there some are more prestigious than others. That is, white collar workers are on higher pedestal than blue collar workers. Hence the caste identity which earlier defined the level of interaction between villagers seems to have realigned itself. Rather now the new status markers are bringing out new rules of interaction.

In a sense this has created a sort of egalitarian grounds for the people to interact, but at the same time created new types of social differentiation. In this context, it must also be noted that though there has been changes in the occupation, association and at broader level changes in the life style of people but certain basic principles of caste differentiation still remains intact. Those premises are endogamy, rules of inter-dining i.e. commensality and ritual hierarchy at local level. The recent developments in rural-urban relationships however have highlighted the fact that same villagers who have settled in urban areas are not very sensitive to rules of inter-dining and ritual hierarchy. Moreover, the endogamy is still very much prevalent and in some communities where it was relaxed slightly earlier is trying to reinforce with higher zeal. All these changes in some institutions and continuing with traditional values in other institutions bring out the point that people in rural areas differentiate among several spheres of social system. That is, in some respects they accept
changes easily whereas in some others there is quite a big resistance. But the fact of the matter is that as soon as changes are accepted in one domain it has its rippling effect in other domains as well, only the pace varies.

Urban influences also result in a household in village adopting different combinations of occupations and occupational mobility. Under the impact of modernization and globalization, many of the villagers tend to combine both traditional and modern occupations. In a household a husband may be working in urban area as clerk, peon or as call centre worker on casual or regular basis while his wife may be working as farm labour. The other trend has been that many a times a villager begins with traditional occupation and midway changes to modern occupation but is forced back to traditional occupation due to uncertain global or national market. One of the reasons offered by scholars are that traditional occupations becomes a life support system in case of job loss in urban areas. Final type of urban influence on occupational structure can be seen is situations in which traditional occupations are pursued with low earnings in modern settings of an urban area. Caste based occupations such as barber, sweepers and others, are often pursued even in towns and cities. But the only difference is that it is not governed by traditional social and economic constraints.

**Reverse Migration**

Reverse migration is situation in which migrant person wants move back to his own city or village from where he belong. Despite the absence of effective public policy for encouraging resettlement of rural areas, we appear to be experiencing a dramatic reversal of the rural to urban population flow. This reversal documented for the 1970-73 period is the result of innumerable personal decisions, both private and commercial in
nature [Beale, 1975]. Demographers and other social scientists are suggesting a number of explanations for the decision of individuals to relocate in rural communities. Among more generally offered explanations are:

1) the development of rural recreational and retirement communities,

2) the exploitation of energy resources,

3) the growth of state and community colleges,

4) the decentralization of manufacturing activity, and

5) the search for alternative life-styles resulting from an apparent shift in values and in attitudes regarding the place where people want to live.

Although these generalities appear to afford some plausible gross explanations, we still lack understanding of the decision-making process and factors entering into that process which lead people to choose to live in rural America. Regardless of the reason, newcomers and old timers are confronting the need to adapt to each other and to a changing rural community situation. This means that new relationships must be worked out in how community needs and priorities are determined and in how action is taken to meet them.
MODULE IV

URBAN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

4.1 The economics of urban life, Urban family, urban religion, education

The economics of urban life

In India wide range of economic reforms were carried out with the aim of liberalizing and globalizing the economy. Amongst all the other changes, the changes in employment and wages are the major potential channels through which the social impact of increased openness and globalization are felt. Any discussion of new occupational structure in new economy is incomplete at least in India if there is no discussion of occupations emerging because of rise of the knowledge sector.

By Knowledge sector is mainly meant ‘information technology’ (IT) and ‘Information technology enabled services’ (ITES). By any rough estimate this sector contributes around 20% (approx. 28 billion USD) of India’s total export (around 150 billion USD) and employs around 2 million people. It is estimated that by 2010 this figure will reach 70 billion USD out of 300 billion USD for IT & ITES contribution and total export of India respectively. Further, by any conservative estimate annually 75000 professionals go to US. 90% out of the 75000 professional are IT professionals. Not much information is available about the number of professionals going to other countries. However, what we have information about is that annual remittance is around 22 billion USD in India. Even if out of 22 billion USD only 50% is contributed by the professionals of this sector, the figures become
very impressive. As far as occupations emerging out of this sector is concerned, most of the jobs are related to either IT or ITES. This has also changed the hierarchy of disciplines in science, arts or in engineering. Moreover, this has also opened the new opportunity for the people not taking science or engineering stream in the graduation stage. Rather it has in a way reduced the dependency of the people on the govt. jobs.

Above scenario of employment in terms of Non-Farm Employment (NFE) can be viewed both as cause or effect of some other causes. Nonetheless NFE has certain features which are very significant for understanding the causal relationship. First one to be noted is ‘sectoral diversification’. NSS data suggest a process of sectoral diversification in rural areas. There has been an increase in the non-farm sector’s share in employment (principal and subsidiary status) during 1973-99. This has been maintained during 1993-99 as well. However, the process of sectoral diversification seems to have occurred only among the male workers during entire period. This shift has not taken place in case of female workers during the same period. Further much of the increase in the share of NFE for males has been contributed to the tertiary sector, while manufacturing sector has almost stagnated during the same period. As far as NFE for females are concerned, there has not been any major shift across sectors over the past decades.

**Urban family**

It is clear that urbanization process is an important force of social change. In India this process besides reflecting economic growth, political change, change in values and attitudes, has also revealed elements of continuity between rural and urban social structures. Pocock (1960) categorically maintains that villages and cities in India are part of the same civilization and as such cannot be
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separately understood. Therefore any discussion of urban social structure in India is in terms of its basic social institutions, such as the family, marriage, kinship and caste. All these four aspects are closely related with each other in both rural, as well as, urban social structure. It is often assumed by sociologists studying the urban society in India that the process of urbanization leads to the break down of the joint family, increase of nuclear family, slackens the caste and kinship ties and role of religion. These assumptions have been critiqued by several sociologists who tried to understand the urban social structure in India.

Family in India has been generally of two kinds, joint or extended family comprising more than two generations of members such as a married couple, their children, married or unmarried and one or both parents. The other type of family is the nuclear family consisting of husband, wife and unmarried children. It was initially assumed that the process of urbanization leads to a decline in family size, weakening of family ties and break up of joint family system into nuclear families. This assumption was a result of application of Western notions of evolution. F. Tonnies, E. Durkheim, Louis Wirth etc., advanced theories which explained these developments in society as it moved from simple to complex.

Industrialization and urbanization brought about these types of social changes in society and nuclear families came to be associated with the modern industrial urban societies. In India, too, this assumption presupposes that joint family is an institution of the rural social structure and as society gets urbanized the joint families, associated with rural agrarian economy will give way to nuclear family with the increase of non-agrarian occupations. But as evidence gathered by sociologists studying family in urban India reveals, this hypothesis does not hold much credence since as a matter of fact joint families are found in urban areas as well.
The correlation of “joint” family with rural areas and “nuclear family with urban is not tenable. In fact, sociologists like A.M, Shah (1970) Kapadia (1956) Gore (1968) and others observe a cyclical change from nuclear to joint to nuclear family within a period of time. This is the household dimension of family in India which indicates that there is no correlation between urbanization and ‘separate’ nuclear households.

A. M. Shah (1970: 100-101) dispels the myth of the breakdown of the joint family in urban India. He studied the social history of Gujarat and on the basis of his findings, he claims that in the past the sanskritized castes (i.e. those castes which have adopted the values, customs and behaviour of the upper castes) formed a much higher proportion of the population in towns (or cities) than in villages. This implies that the principle of the residential unity of partikin and their wives was practiced to a much greater extent is towns than in villages. This shows that towns included a considerable number of households composed of two or more married brothers living together after their parent’s death. It may also have included a few large households where married cousins lived together in the same household even after the death of their father and grandfather; the households composed of parents and two or more married sons formed a greater proportion of household in the town. Shah believes that these findings are very important because they debunk the two notions that are widely prevalent amongst urban sociologists in India. These notions are:

1) that the people who migrate from villages are governed by strong emphasis on the principle of the residential unity of patrikins and their wives; and

2) that the urban area into which they come to live is necessarily an area having a weak emphasis on the principle of the residential unity of patrikin and their wives.’
Ram Krishna Mukherjee (1964:87) studied the rural-urban differences in the familial organization of West Bengal society. He too, while examining the co-resident and commensal relationships amongst kin groups as the locally functioning family units found the presence of extended or non-nuclear family types amongst the cities, towns and villages equally. But as he mentions, paradoxically, the nuclear type of family is found most frequently in villages, then in the towns, and the least frequently in cities.

In a different study, Mukherjee (1965) reports that unlike the common assumption, his data does not support the belief that joint family organization is not linked with the urban way of life. His study indicates clearly that joint family organization increases progressively as one shifts from villages to small towns to large cities or from non-industrial through partly industrial to highly industrial towns. He discovered that the upper castes, who also generally belong to the upper economic classes gave more importance to the joint family organization than the lower castes and lower economic classes. Mukherjee’s findings support Shah’s (1974: 246) correlation between household, caste and rural-urban community.

Urban religion

India has always been a laboratory for cultural diversity and pluralism, which has been responsible for India’s pride in the world map. Festivals in India have an important place in society. Of all the cities in India, it is arguably Mumbai that is most saturated with media networks. Religious events in the city continue to be entangled in the city’s public culture. They show the direct influence of media-The adoption of film music, advertisements and the actual use of film and video during festival events and displays. Newspaper and cable, satellite and terrestrial
television provide day-to-day coverage of these events. It is notable that festive moments such as Ganpati Utsav and other collective gatherings have facilitated the process of carving out a public realm of debate, action and empowerment, since colonial times. Under the influence of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the festival was mobilized for nationalist agenda in the 1890s. Due to the impact of western culture, the religious occasions in India became another forum for public debate. Thus there was secularization of the law, administration of justice, education and politics.

Today commercialization has spread its wings everywhere. It has not spared festivals, be it Diwali, Id or Dussera. Each day is a day of different celebration like father’s day, valentine’s day etc. It is because of globalization. In the modern days all these festivals whether religious or secular are viewed as the business of religion. During festivals, shops and streets are decorated with colourful lights. Shops and malls attract people with heavy discount on products like furniture, clothes, kitchen products, jewelleries. Thus shops and markets are heavily crowded as people do mad shopping, especially the sweet and gift shops. Cinema houses also run houseful when a new film releases. Flat booking in cities also peak during festivals, as it is very auspicious time for new ventures and better prospects.

**Education**

Within intangible cultural influences of urban areas upon rural populace also comes in the domain of education. The apparent sign of this is the proliferation or mushrooming of 'English medium schools' in the villages. Some people believe that this is exploitation of the aspirations of poor villagers. In this context, it should be recognized that villagers, in course of their contact with urban areas as emigrant workers, or for business or as resident of fringe villages, have witnessed the role of English education in
getting jobs. Hence they aspire to send their children to English medium schools. However, given the availability of resources in villages both in terms of infrastructure and human resources, only some of the elite of the villages are able to send their children to schools. In this regard important thing to remember is that there seems to be developing a synergy of needs of urban areas and aspirations of the villagers.

4.2 Urban poverty, Housing and slums, Transport, Crime, Juvenile delinquency, Urban pollution and environmental problems.

Urban poverty

Poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon and caused by a variety of factors. Its manifestation also differs from context to context. There is no linear chain of cause and effect. It is an inter-related wave of economic, social, psychological, cultural and political factor which influence the occurrence and persistence of poverty. Real poverty may not be apparent and apparent poverty may not be real. Thus there cannot be a single strategy to eradicate it in different societal context.

At the conceptual level, poverty includes market based consumption (or income) as well as public provision of goods and services, access to common property resources and the intangible dimensions of good life. Such as clean air, dignity, autonomy and low levels of disease and crime. The proponents of the conventional approach argue that the income and consumption measure is still the best single proxy for poverty since it can incorporate non market goods and services and wide range of other utility (clean air, democracy) and disutility (noise pollution) through “shadow prices” into a monitory equivalent that is easy to compare over time and across context.
Poverty studies in India have been preserve of the economists rather than sociologists (Bardhan and Srinivasan. 1974, Dantwala. 1973, Krisnaswami). They have been driven by the preoccupation with development planning in which economists have played leading part. The Planning Commission, set up soon after independence, played a leading part in initiating, stimulating and organizing the research on poverty. The cause, nature and eradication of poverty in India have been subjects of long debate. In the colonial period, the main pre-occupation of Indian writers on the topic was with the poverty of India. This was traced to exploitation by and unequal exchange with the imperial power. After de-colonization, the instruments of policy became national and the debate shifted inward to address poverty within India. This process of enquiry into conditions of poverty has been influenced by the government policies for the mitigation of poverty and inequality.

Poverty reduction is a prominent objective of social and economic development in the Indian constitution, finding expressions in plans, policy statements and programmes. Poverty has long been recognized as an interlocking condition of assetlessness, underemployment, low-wages and incomes, proneness to diseases, illiteracy, gender, and economic vulnerability social disadvantage and political powerlessness. The condition itself is not sharply defined and enquiry into it has had certain distinctive preoccupations. These have varied from one phase to another.

The early corpus of research in India has addressed the measurement of poverty, expressed in terms of a poverty line related to income or more commonly to estimates of consumption expenditure based on successive rounds of the National Sample Survey (NSS). The poverty line began life defined as a per capita monthly consumption of Rs.15 for the rural population or Rs.20 for the urban in 1960-61 prices (Planning Commission
More recently this norm has been modified to the expenditure necessary to acquire a daily consumption of 2400 kilo calories in rural areas and 2100 in urban one (Planning Commission 1981).

The poverty line is thus a concept closely related to subsistence survival. Research tended to focus on insights to be got from numbers, proportions, regional distribution and trends over time an influential argument related to the concept of the poverty line was also made for govt. action in the form of public works and employment generation programmes. The analysis of trends in the incidence of both rural and urban poverty showed that it was characterized by fluctuations largely stemming from variation in agricultural output, which were the results of seasonal conditions. The proportion of people below the poverty line varied roughly between 40 and 50%, while absolute numbers of the rural poverty increased relentlessly.

The emergence during broadly the same historical period of industrial capitalism on the one hand and democratic institutions on the other set in motion important changes in poverty. The demographic and social dislocations of the early phase of the industrial revolution probably increased the magnitude, the severity and the intensity of poverty. They certainly made poverty more visible, particularly in the industrial towns and cities where large numbers of labouring poor were to be found, in and out of ill-paid and insecure employment. The new economic order created not only great poverty but also great wealth. Industrial capitalism changed the spatial distribution of population. In rural societies based agricultural and handicraft, poverty tend to be dispersed. It tends to be concentrated in industrial societies, particularly in the early stages of industrialisation. There is nothing really comparable to the industrial slums spawned by
early capitalism in even relatively poor and stagnant agricultural societies

**Housing and slums**

The urban housing characteristics for entire India and the four leading Metros of Mumbai, Kolkata Delhi and Chennai reveal the following facts. In Mumbai, 34 percent of the households lived in semi-pucca and 3 percent in Kutcha houses followed by 33 percent and 9 percent respectively in Chennai. However, in Delhi, 11 percent households resided in semi-pucca 21 and less than 1 percent in kutcha houses. It is a good sign for Kolkata that there were only 5 percent semi-pucca houses and almost negligible kutcha houses. This shows that in Mumbai and Chennai housing situation is poorer than Kolkata and Delhi.

On the other hand, the houses in these metros are very much over crowded. More than 3 persons residing in a single room, is the condition of 56 percent of the population of Mumbai followed by 43 percent population of Kolkata, 30 percent population of Chennai and 1/4th of the population of Delhi. Further, 5 and more persons residing in a room, such miserable conditions was faced by 28 percent population of Mumbai, followed by 17 percent of the population of Kolkata and about 10 percent population of Delhi and Chennai both.

The urban malaise of shelterlessness and man’s efforts to solve it in the most adverse circumstances of poverty and illiteracy are seen in its most concrete form in slums, shanty towns, shacks-towns and squatters colonies. A slum is nothing but an area of substandard housing. The slum problem is, therefore, essentially the problem of shelter for the poor. Slums develop due to social standards and behaviour. The slum is a complex product of many factors. Poverty is one of the causes. Poor can’t afford a decent or
good housing. They have to have a shelter to live and are satisfied with whatever they have. They tolerate since the situation was even worst in their native rural areas. Mostly migrants especially poor people erect such houses on any vacant plot and start living there. But lack of adequate income is not the only cause, it is the culture or habit of people who do not mind dirt or shabby ways of living. They also can live with a pile of garbage, rubbish or debris with full of bad smell, dirty water around. Almost any area can turn into a slum, if it’s residents do not take proper care of their dwelling.

Once people accept the socially unacceptable standard of living, the condition will remain the same – even though they raise their income. They do not like to improve, unless the desire comes from within, the substandard housing conditions cannot be changed. Slums in India do not possess decent living conditions. Most of the houses are not even permanent structures, they are made up of temporary materials like tin sheet, rags, anything which is readily available, used or afforded by people.

Normally, lower income groups only can live in such houses which are without any facility. In many slums, there are no lavatories nor water taps. Many slums in Mumbai are on the road, obstructing traffic and free movement of people, having temporary and shaking structure often going off during rainy seasons. The horrible condition of living in the “katras” of Delhi, “bustees” of Kolkata, the “zopadpattis” of Mumbai and the “cheris” of Chennai are well known to the serious students of urban problems. Slums are generally areas of poor sanitation, excessive overcrowding is not merely a question of low per capita living space; it portends health hazards of a severe nature.

Slum areas show a higher rate of disease, illness and infant mortality than nonslum areas. Slum dwellers generally live under
fear and suspicion – fear of flood, storm, fire and eviction. An outsider is always viewed with suspicion. Slum are generally areas of poor education. The slum area is usually associated with some degree of deviation. Alcoholism, criminality, juvenile delinquency and such other elements of urban pathology have been brought to light by studies of slums conducted at different periods and at different places.

The Government of India Slum Area (Improvement and Clearance) Act of 1954 defines a slum as “any predominantly residential area, in which light or sanitary facilities or any combination of these factors are detrimental to the safety, health or morals”. According to NSS (National Sample Survey), “a slum is a compact settlement with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together, in unhygienic conditions, usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities. Such an area is considered as a Non-Notified Slum if at least 20 households live in that area. Notified Slums are those areas notified as Slums by Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) or development authorities. The vast majority of the city ward migrants belongs to the working class and finds it difficult to secure accommodation within their means. Therefore they squat on every open space available, nearby their work places and construct huts with cheap temporary building materials. In this way, slums grow in number and population.

Total and slum population in India according to size/class of towns during 1991 showed that 41 percent of the total slum population was residing in million plus cities where 27 percent of the total population of India resided. However, cities with population between 0.5 – 1 million have only 9 percent of total slum population, where 20 percent of the total population was residing. Further, cities with population between 0.3 to 0.5 million had only 6 percent of total slum population; where 19
percent of total population was residing. This shows that cities with population between 0.5 to 1 million and city with population between 0.3 to 0.5 million have very less percentage of slum population whereas million plus cities have more percentage of slum population. It reveals that the opportunity in the medium cities is less than that offered by the million cities.

**Juvenile delinquency**

Due to the increasing disparities in the urban areas of India, particularly the million plus cities, urban crime has been on the rampant in most of the areas. The common types are theft of property, crime against women, crime against children, crime against the aged and cyber crimes. A total of 297679 cognizable crimes under the IPC (Indian Penal Code) were reported from the 35 million plus cities in 2002, (National Crime Records Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs, 2002), as compared to 289775 crimes during 2001, thereby reporting an increase of 2.7 percent compared to the national scenario on a marginal increase of 0.6 percent. The Indian metropolises witnessed an increase of Murder (5.9 percent), attempt to commit murder (6.2 percent), dacoity (37.1), riots (1.3) and dowry deaths (10.1). In addition, the metropolitan centers, had also contributed to 45.9 percent of the total Auto thefts cases in the country, 31.5 percent cheating cases and 28.6 percent of counterfeiting cases of the nation’s total crime.

Today the social environment of the cities is also under threat. On account of peculiar problems like unchecked migration, illegal settlements, diverse socio-cultural disparities, uneven distribution of incomes, the phenomenon of urban poverty etc, the metropolitan cities are facing increased criminal activities. Organized groups, gangsters, professional criminals and even youth and juveniles find crime as a short cut for a lavish life in
these cities. Moreover unabated population increase has also led to a pressure on the existing physical and social infrastructure of the cities like power supply, supply of potable water, urban transport, educational and health institutions.

In recent years Cyber Crimes have also increased in the Indian Cities. The Information technology (IT) Act of 2000, specifies, the criminal acts under the broad head of Cyber Crimes. Of the total 70 cases registered under IT Act 2000, around 47 percent cases pertain to obscene publication and transmission in electronic form. 38 persons were taken in custody for such offences during 2002. Other such cases include hacking, signature fraud, breach of confidentiality etc. The urban centres of Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka, and Delhi reported the maximum number of these cases.

**Urban pollution and environmental problems**

India is the second largest population giant in the world with current population of 1.03 billion (Census of India 2001). Of this, about 285 million people or 27.8 percent of the total population reside in the urban areas of the country. India in 2001 had 10.02 percent of the world’s urban population and 21.10 percent of Asia’s urban population. Infact, India’s urban population is larger than the total population of small countries like France and Germany and larger than the total population of the big countries like Brazil and USA. Again it is larger than the total population of parts of continents like Eastern Africa, Western Asia and Western Europe; and larger than the total population of the whole continent of Australia.

The level of urbanization in terms of the proportion of urban population to total population is low in India, but the urban population in absolute terms is very high. Moreover, most of the urban population is concentrated in the Class I cities accounting for 65 percent of the total urban population and these cities are
expanding at a faster rate than average population growth. A more disaggregated level of analysis revels that the million plus cities or the metropolitan cities of India are growing very rapidly and their numbers have constantly increased from 12 in 1981 to 23 in 1991 and 35 in 2001.

The total population of these metros accounts for nearly one-third of the total population and 10.5 percent of India’s total population in 2001. Again, over 50 percent of the population of these metros live in the five giant conglomerates; Mumbai (16.3 million), Kolkata (13.2 million), Delhi (12.7 million), Chennai (6.4 million), and Bangalore (5.7 million). The population in these cities grew by 52 percent higher than the growth of urban population in India, but compared to the last decade, the pace of metropotalisation has slowed down; and the 12 new cities grew at a faster rate than the existing cities, Surat recording the highest growth of 85 percent.

Due to increased human activities in the urban centers arising out of industrialisation and commercialization, there is a copious usage of water, energy and other raw materials, transforming them into goods and services and returning the wastes into the environment in the form of emissions and not usable solid wastes. Therefore the cities are becoming the major contributors to local, regional and global environmental problems.

4.3 Need of an urban planning in developing countries especially in India, Problems of urban planning, Relevance of sociology in town planning.

Urban Planning in India

at the Central level, the Ministry of Urban Development and The Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation form the apex authority of the GOI at the National level to formulate
policies, sponsor and support programmes, coordinate the activities of various central ministries, state governments and of the nodal authorities and monitor the programmes concerning all issues of urban development and housing. The key interventions of the GOI are:

- National Urban Transport Policy;
- Guidelines for sector reform and public-private partnership in the urban water and sanitation sector;
- Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS), such as integrated development of small and medium towns;
- Mega city schemes;
- Special development plan for National Capital Region;
- Accelerated urban water supply programme;
- Low cost sanitation etc.
- Administering fiscal concessions such as tax holidays for integrated urban infrastructure development projects;
- Urban environmental infrastructure schemes such as for solid waste management and urban water supply, tax free status for municipal bonds, etc
- Training and information: by funding a variety of training programmes,
- Creating and disseminating manuals such as the Municipal Solid Waste Planning Manuel.

The present form of urban local government owes its genesis to the British rule. The first such body called Municipal Corporation was set up in Madras in 1688, and was followed by the
establishment of similar corporations in Bombay and Calcutta in 1762.

Since then, the structure of municipal bodies has remained by and large the same even though the number of urban areas had increased and their problems had become more and more complex. Recent years have witnessed an increasing interest in and growing consciousness of the need and importance of local self-government as a provider of services to the community as well as an instrument of democratic self-government. The 74th CAA, 1992, proposed to form a uniform structure of Municipal Corporations, Municipal Councils and Nagar Panchayats in transitional areas. Urban local bodies are democratic institutions based on the principle of self-government and should represent peoples desires and strengths. ULBs offer

- Enhanced opportunities for people’s participation; local government is closest to the citizens and in the best position both to involve them in the decision making process of improving their living conditions and to make use of their knowledge and capabilities in the promotion of all round development;

- Bottom-up planning; and

- Effective implementation by enhancing coordination and responsiveness to users

Under the 74th Amendment Act, the urban local institutions have to administer 18 subjects listed in the twelfth Schedule to the constitution these include urban planning, including town planning; regulation of land use and construction of buildings; planning for economic and social development; roads and bridges; water supply for domestic, industrial and commercial purposes; public health; sanitation; conservancy and solid waste management; fire services; urban forestry; protection of the
environment; safeguarding the interests of the weaker sections of
the society, slum improvement and upgradation, provision of
urban civic amenities such as parks, gardens, playgrounds,
promotion of cultural and educational aspects, burial and burial
grounds; cremation grounds, public amenities including street
lighting, parking lots, bus stops and public conveniences. These
subjects are of great importance to provide need-based services to
the city dwellers. But it is a matter of grave concern that in most
cases local self-governing institutions could not provide goods
and services of best quality due to inherited weaknesses.

The GOI has also begun to respond to the magnitude of
challenges facing urban service provision in India. For the cities
of India to realize their full potential and become true engines of
growth, it is necessary that focused attention be given to the
improvement of infrastructure therein. For achieving this
objective a mission mode approach is essential. Accordingly, the
Prime Minister of India has launched a mission Jawaharlal Nehru
National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) on 3rd December
2005. The mission comprises two submissions – 1) For Basic
Services to the Urban Poor (BSUP) and the other for
2) Infrastructure and Governance. The JNNURM will be
implemented in select 63 cities the duration of the mission is for
seven years beginning with the year 2005-06. For other
cities/towns two schemes, viz, Integrated Housing and Slum
Development (IHSDP) and Urban Infrastructure Development
for Small and Medium Towns have also been launched along with

The existing Valmiki Ambedkar Awas Yojana (VAMBAY) and
the discontinued National Slum Development Programme
(NSDP) are subsumed in the IHSDP. The IHSDP implemented
by the Ministry of UEPA has been launched with the objective to
strive for holistic slum development with the healthily and
enabling urban environment by providing adequate shelter and basic infrastructure facilities to the slum dwellers of identified urban areas.

**Problems in Urban Planning**

India has a very large number of municipalities most of which are considered weak and which are having increasingly greater problems in meeting the infrastructural needs of the rapidly growing populations. In the past what has been making things even worse generally was that urban development has been low on the development agenda and has often been approached as a negative phenomenon. The crucial point is how best the financial, managerial and technical resources can be mobilized to effectively cope up with the situation. State level as well as local government will realize that there is no alternative to work in partnership with the private sector, the NGO’s and the community to generate the required resources. Existing legislation will also require review and reform in order to stimulate the housing construction and development and full expansion of the urban finance sector. Moreover Indian cities have yet to find and develop their tools for a sustainable development and the implementation of the ecologically conscious urban development as indicated in the United Nations Agenda 21 has yet to be initiated at the local level. Environmental degradation and encroachments may require a new set of rules and penalties to check their impact on urban development, land use and urban densities.

**Relevance of sociology in town planning**

Since urban spaces are predominantly a built environment, planning plays a vital role in determining the societal conditions in urban areas. Here, planning is assumed as a needed strategic
intervention to bring about development in a particular territory. The task of planning is to design strategic interventions for economic and social development.

Each country, based on its history, socio-political institutions, development priorities, resource endowments and institutional structure, undertakes development planning. Here the political authorities who initiate such plans cannot be assumed always as serving the interests of the down trodden, but are alarmingly becoming a feel-good mechanism to materialise the capitalist interests. Even the decentralised political pattern, which gives an opportunity to the local communities to draft their development plans, is not free from such parochial interests. Therefore it is more realistic to assume planning and development as an endeavour for 'strategic intervention' of the centres of power for exploiting and extracting the human spaces as well as natural resources.

The drastic consequences of fragmented development initiatives in urban spaces are so apparent that they lead to many social problems like Social and Spatial exclusion, Displacement, Gentrification and Urban Sprawl. It is commonly seen that the practice of urban planning is predominantly carried out by the trio- Economists, Engineers and Politicians. In many cases the process of planning has just become an endeavour to resolve certain immediate problems, rather than understanding the socio-cultural conditions of the beneficiaries facilitating their sustainable development. It is quite obvious that plenary bodies are engaged more on budgeting at the implementation level since the fund allocation precedes planning. Social Scientists should be capable of addressing such down to earth issues by taking a subaltern approach challenging the mainstream development paradigm.