

Unit 15

Level, Trends and Patterns

Contents

- 15.1 Introduction
- 15.2 Urbanization and Levels of Urbanization: Concepts
- 15.3 Urban Growth in India: Trends
- 15.4 Classification of towns by size and differential trends of Urbanization
- 15.5 Inter-state Variation in Urbanization
- 15.6 West Bengal Model
- 15.7 Changing Urban Employment Market and its Impact on Urbanization
- 15.8 Conclusion
- 15.9 Further Reading

Learning Objectives

After studying this unit, you will be able to:

- explain the concept of urbanization and levels of urbanization
- describe the urban growth and its trends in India
- Classify towns by size and differential trends of urbanization
- discuss the inter-state variation in urbanization
- describe a model of West Bengal in this context and, finally
- discuss the changing urban employment market and its impact on urbanization

15.1 Introduction

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 center 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 non-European 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, 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.

15.2 Urbanization and Levels of Urbanization: Concepts

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 center. The greater the distance, lower the level of urbanization. Because such a situation would mean urban centers are fewer in number and the distance between the urban centers is quite high. In a state with well-developed urban network people cover smaller distances to reach the urban centers (Ramachandran, 1989: 121-122).

15.3 Urban Growth in India: Trends

Put against the level of urbanization in the world India's urbanization level is still low, although urbanization has gained some speed in the post-independence period. From the 1990 data we can see that 42.7 per cent of world population was living in urban areas. There was wide gap in the level of urbanization between the more developed regions, which had 72.7 per cent of the population as urban population, and the less developed regions, with only 33.9 per cent of urban population. Among the continents Europe, Oceania and Latin America had a very high level of urbanization with 73.1, 70.9 and 72.3 per cent of their population as urban population respectively. In contrast, Africa with 34.5 per cent of its population as urban population and Asia with only 29.9 per cent of its population as urban population were the least urbanized among the continents. Again, among the Asian regions Western Asia is more urbanized (with 58.2 per cent of its population living in urban areas) than Eastern Asia (29.4 per cent), Southeastern Asia (29 per cent) and South Asia (27.8 per cent) (for details see Mitra, 1994: 48). Thus South Asia, of which India is a part, is one of the least urbanized regions of the world. According to 1991 census only 25.72 per cent of India's population was living in urban areas, which again is less than the South Asian standard.

The annual growth rate of urban population in India has declined from 3.1 per cent during 1981-91 to 2.7 per cent during 1991-2001. The decade 1971-81 had recorded the highest annual growth rate of 3.8 per cent but the last two decades have recorded decelerating growth rates in India. The percentage of urban population has gone up from 23.73 in 1981 to 25.72 in 1991 and finally to 27.78 in 2001. The slow growth of urban population in India goes against popular notions of “urban explosion” and against the most expert predictions. The Planning Commission (1983), the Expert Committee for Population Projections for the Eighth Plan, and the UN Study of World Urbanization Prospects (1995, 2001) had predicted 3 – 4.4 per cent annual growth of urban population in the 1980s and 1990s. The UN projection of 3.2 per cent growth during 2000-10 and 2.8 per cent during 2020-25 also seem to be unrealistic. Keeping in view that the growth rate of total population is expected to be less than 1 per cent according to UN projection it would require a very high rate of rural-urban migration to meet the projected level of urbanization.

By way of explanation to the sluggish growth of urban population the scholars argue that not only the natural growth rate of urban population has declined but also the city bound migration of both male and female population has decelerated over the years. A study in 1983 suggests that contribution of rural-urban migration to urbanization declined over the decades and stood at 22.6 percent in the 1980s. During 1971-81 the percentage of intercensal migrants in urban areas declined from 18.5 to 16.9 and that of lifetime migrants (male) from 33.6 to 32.4. The share of lifetime interstate migrants came down from 11.2 per cent to 10.0 per cent. The 1991 Census also recorded further decline in urban-bound migration rate. In the 1981-91 decade the decadal, lifetime and interstate migration rates were 11.7, 26.0 and 8.0 respectively. The female migration to the urban areas, which takes place primarily due to social and cultural factors, also slowed down during the decade.

Table 1: Number of towns and growth of urban population over census years

Census year	Number of towns	% of urban to total population	Annual growth
1901	1827	10.84	-
1911	1915	10.29	0.03
1921	1949	11.18	0.79
1931	2072	11.99	1.75
1941	2250	13.86	2.77
1951	2843	17.29	3.47
1961	2365	17.97	2.34
1971	2590	19.91	3.21
1981	3378	23.34	3.83
1991	3768	25.72	3.09
2001	4368	27.78	2.73

Source: Census of respective years

Amitabh Kundu has identified four major reasons for the growth of urban population in India: (a) natural increase, (b) growth of new towns outside agglomerations, (c) merging of towns and jurisdictional changes in agglomerations, and (d) rural-urban migration. Available data suggest that natural increase accounted for 61.3 per cent and 59.4 per cent of the total increase in urban population in 1971-81 and 1981-91 decades respectively. The 1991-2001 decade too experienced a decline in natural growth rate of urban population. The share of component (b) in the total addition to urban population has declined from 9.4 per cent in the 1980s to 6.2 percent in the 1990s. This indicates that the rate of urban growth outside the existing agglomerations and urbanized regions has slowed down over the decades. The third component, i.e., extension of municipal boundaries, merging of old towns or inclusion of new towns in the existing urban agglomerations, was considered a minor contributor to the growth of urban population in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. The number of towns merged with existing neighbouring towns was only 221 in 2001 and in 1991 the number was half of this. However, the share of this factor to the growth of urban population went up from 7.6 per cent in 1991 to 13.0 percent in 2001. The contribution of the fourth factor has been estimated to be 21 per cent in 1990s, which was marginally less than the figure for the previous decade. (Kundu, 2005: 105).

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

Table 2: Distribution of towns by category and census year

Year	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI
1901	24	43	130	391	744	479
1911	23	40	135	364	707	485
1921	29	45	145	370	734	571
1931	35	56	183	434	800	509
1941	49	74	242	498	920	407
1951	76	91	327	608	1124	569
1961	102	129	437	719	711	172
1971	148	173	558	827	623	147
1981	218	270	743	1059	758	253
1991	300	345	947	1167	740	197
2001	393	401	1151	1344	888	191

Source: Census of India for respective years

Table 2 suggests that the number of large cities and medium towns (Class I to Class IV) has grown significantly over the decades while the number of smaller towns in Class V and Class VI has remained either stagnant or declined. The other trend is that growth in number of cities before independence was rather slow and the number started increasing at a faster rate in the post-independence period; the increase is particularly remarkable from 1951 census. Intensification of developmental activities in and around the large towns, investment in industrial production, increase of commerce, the increase in agricultural productivity and evolution of smaller towns into bigger ones explain the relatively faster urbanization in the post-independence period. This also explains the reason behind the faster growth of larger cities and towns. Apart from rural-urban migration from smaller towns to bigger ones has contributed to the faster growth of larger towns. Migration of people from East and West Pakistan and from other neighbouring countries has also contributed to the faster urban growth in the post-independence period.

India being relatively advanced economy it has drawn migrants from poverty infested Bangladesh and Nepal. The explosive demographic pressure in Bangladesh is continually ejecting a significant part of its labour force to India even in recent years.

Table 3: Urban population in towns of different categories

Year	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V	Class VI
1901	26.00	11.29	15.64	20.83	20.14	6.10
1911	27.48	10.51	16.4	19.73	19.31	6.57
1921	29.70	10.39	15.92	18.29	18.67	7.03
1931	31.20	11.65	16.8	18.00	17.14	5.21
1941	38.23	11.42	16.35	15.78	15.08	3.14
1951	44.63	9.96	15.72	13.63	12.97	3.09
1961	51.42	11.23	16.94	12.77	6.87	0.77
1971	57.24	10.92	16.01	10.94	4.45	0.44
1981	60.37	11.63	14.33	9.54	3.58	0.50
1991	65.20	10.95	13.19	7.77	2.60	0.29
2001	68.67	9.67	12.23	6.84	2.36	0.23

Source: Census of India for respective years

Data presented in Table 3 further substantiate the top-heavy trend of urbanization. While the percentage share of total urban population Class I cities has grown substantially from 26 in 1901 to 68.67 in 2001 the population share of towns of all other categories has declined. The worst sufferers in the process are Class IV, V, and VI towns.

The higher growth rate of Class I cities is due to expansion of area and immigration. The emergence of large satellite towns in close proximity and their subsequent integration into the city agglomeration has helped faster growth of Class I cities. Most importantly, the concentration of production and commercial activities, and development of infrastructure-base have attracted migrants of different economic classes from the far-flung places (Kundu, 2005: 107).

During 1981-1991, the metropolitan cities (cities with more than one million population) grew by 3.25 per cent per annum against 2.83 per cent growth rate of other towns. During 1991-2001, however, the growth rate of the metropolitan towns has slowed down to 2.88 and for the common towns the rate has been 2.6 per cent. The share of population of the million plus cities was 26.4 per cent in 1981, which has gone up to 32.5 per cent in 1991

and to 37.8 per cent in 2001. The metropolitan cities have grown at a faster rate than class I cities as well as towns of other categories.

The growth rate of capital cities (state as well as national) is also high. During 1981-91 the growth rate of capital cities was at par with that of the million plus cities, the growth being 33.6 per cent in the decade. However, the percentage share of population of the capital cities to total urban population increased marginally from 25.7 in 1991 to 25.9 in 2001.

Thus despite the higher growth rate of the class I cities, metropolitan cities and capital cities it is not difficult to notice the slight decline in the growth rate of these cities in the last decade in particular. Fall in the government investment in the urban infrastructure, decline in the public sector, fall in the natural growth of population and dwindling migration could be some of the reasons that can explain the relative slump in the growth in the bigger cities in recent years.

15.5 Inter-State Variation in Urbanization

Since the forces of urbanization are unequally distributed the level and pattern of urbanization in the States and Union Territories of Indian federation vary widely. Following the 2001 Census it is observed that the States that are economically developed experience higher rate of urbanization and account for a larger share of urban population. Thus six relatively developed states, namely, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Punjab, and West Bengal together account for more than half the total urban population of the country. The percentage share of urban population of all these states is higher than the national average of 27.78, according to 2001 census. The share of urban population of less developed States with less per capita income is much less than the national average.

Following the findings of 2001 Census we can classify the Indian States and Union Territories into three groups depending upon the levels of urbanization: Group A consisting of States and UTs with higher level of urbanization (with an urban population higher than the national average of 27.72 per cent), Group B consisting of States and UTs with moderate level of urbanization (more than 20 per cent but less than the national

average), and Group C consisting of States and UTs with low level urbanization (with less than 20 per cent urban population to total population of the State or UT).

Group A

Delhi (93.01), Goa (49.77), Gujarat (37.35), Haryana (29.00), Karnataka (33.98), Maharashtra (42.4), Mizoram (49.5), Punjab (33.95), Tamil Nadu (43.86), West Bengal (28.03), Andaman and Nicobre Islands (32.67), Chandigarh (89.78) Daman & Diu (36.26) Lakshadweep (44.47) and Pondicherry (66.57). The figures within the parenthesis indicate percentage share as urban population in the respective State or UT.

Group B

Arunachal Pradesh (20.41), Chattisgarh (20.08), Jammu & Kashmir (24.88), Jharkhand (22.25), Kerala (25.97), Madhya Pradesh (26.67), Manipur (23.88), Rajasthan (23.38), Uttar Pradesh (20.78), Uttaranchal (25.59), and Dadra & Nagar Haveli (22.89).

Group C

Assam (12.72), Bihar (10.47), Himachal Pradesh (9.97), Meghalaya (19.63), Nagaland (17.74), Orissa (14.97), Sikkim (11.1) and Tripura (17.02).

With four of the seven North-East Indian States figuring in Group C, it may be said that this part of India is least urbanized. Two of the relatively economically backward East zone States namely Bihar and Orissa too are among the States with low level of urbanization. Earlier, following the trend up to 1981, Ramachandran had observed that urbanization is at a lower level in states of North-East and in the Ganga plains of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, and in Orissa. In general terms, he observed, 'western and southern India are relatively highly urbanized while eastern and northern India are least urbanized' (Ramachandran, 1989: 123). In recent years while some of the earlier trends continue it is not difficult to see that the north Indian states and even some of North-East states are experiencing urbanization at a faster rate.

Reflection and Action 15.1

If you live in a city or town, find out which category A, B or C it belongs to in terms of the level of urbanization it has. If you live in a village, find out whether it is developing the features of urban area or not in terms of its social, economic, occupational structure.

Write a note on “The Level of Urbanization in My town/City/Village” based on your finding in about two pages. Share your note with other students at your study centre.

During the 1991-2001 decade the urban population in India has grown by 2.27 per cent annually. Among the states which have recorded a high growth rate (i.e, more than 3 per cent annually) in the last decade are Arunachal Pradesh (7.00 per cent), Assam (3.09 per cent), Chattisgarh (3.09), Delhi (4.14), Goa (3.32), Haryana (4.11), Jammu & Kashmir (3.44), Meghalaya (3.16), Mizoram (3.27), Nagaland (5.27), Punjab (3.19), Sikkim (4.83), Tamil Nadu (3.56), Andaman & Nicobar Islands (4.40), Chandigarh (3.40), and Dadra & Nagar Haveli (14.59). There is none among the States that has recorded a negative growth. Among the UTs, however, Lakshadweep has recorded a negative growth of -0.77 per cent. It is noteworthy that some of the States with low level of urbanization figure among the States which have been experiencing higher rate of urbanization in recent years, while many of the States with higher level of urbanization (i.e, many of the Group A States) are experiencing urban deceleration. Among the major States that have experienced very low rate of annual growth in the last decade are Andhra Pradesh (1.37), Kerala (0.74), Manipur (1.21) and West Bengal (1.84).

The trend however was different until 1991 of the post-independence period. The states like Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Punjab already had high concentration of urban centers and urban population but the rate of urban growth was either medium or low. On the other hand, the relatively backward States like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa registered higher growth rate despite the fact that these States had lower share of urban population. As an exception to this trend, economically advanced states like Haryana and Maharashtra had both higher rate of growth and higher share of urban population. Overall, the trend until 1991 negates the positive correlation between economic development and urban growth. We have to look for other factors to explain this puzzle. Possibly, higher incidence of rural poverty, regular occurrence of natural disasters like drought and flood can also cause higher incidence of rural-urban migration and hence higher rate of urban growth. The post-independence dualism in the urbanization pattern, according to Kundu (2005: 108), be partially be attributed to ‘ ...

government investment in the district and *taluka* headquarters, programmes of urban industrial dispersal, and transfer of funds from the states to local bodies through a need based or what is popularly known as “a gap filling” approach’. The “lack of diversification in agrarian economy” in these backward States also, as Kundu suggests, has contributed to higher urban growth.

In the 1990s, with the economic liberalization gaining momentum, there has been significant investment of foreign and corporate capital and expansion of commercial activities in the economically advanced States. This precisely explains why the rate of urbanization is high in Tamil Nadu, Punjab, Haryana, Maharashtra and Gujarat. In Karnataka and West Bengal the rate of urbanization is relatively low among these highly urban states because these states, and particularly West Bengal, has been following a policy of urban dispersal. The introduction of land reforms, infrastructure development of small and medium sized towns, dispersal of production activities, introduction of panchayats have probably put a check on the rate of urbanization and city-bound movement of population. We have therefore considered the West Bengal case separately in the following section.

15.6 West Bengal Model

India is a vast country and its economic and social development is marked by huge regional disparities. The concentration of resources (both natural and human), the historicity of the region, the geographical location of the state and proximity to international borders, cross-border migration, the level of agricultural and industrial development, the initiatives of the state government are some of the major factors that influence the level of urbanization of that region. The end result is that there are different patterns and levels of urbanization in different parts of the country.

West Bengal is one of the States, which has higher urban growth. In the last decade the growth rate for India was 25.71 per cent, but for West Bengal it was 27.40 per cent. In contrast to the rest of the country, where urban growth is large city-centric in West

Bengal the trend of migration to metropolis has been arrested. In 1970s 70 per cent of State's urban population lived in Calcutta but in 1991 the share of metropolitan population has declined to 59 per cent; the cities and towns other than Calcutta together have a share of 41 per cent of the urban population in the State. Between 1971 and 1991 the number of class –I cities (with more than one lakh population) has doubled from 148 to 296 but in West Bengal the number of class-1 cities has grown five times and large cities can now be seen in the distant districts from Calcutta. During the same period the number of municipalities has grown by 43 per cent. As an impact of the spread of urbanization all over the State there has been a significant achievement in terms of control of natural growth rate of urban population. According to 1991 figures, West Bengal had a decadal natural growth of 8.2 per cent against the national rate of 14.4 per cent. Between 1981 and 1991 the natural growth rate in Maharashtra was 14.7 per cent and in Tamil Nadu it was 11.2 per cent.

The balanced urban growth and urban spread have been possible primarily of two factors: first, land reforms, rural development through *panchayats* and the resultant rise in agricultural production, and (2) decentralized urbanization through the development of small and medium-sized towns. Between 1980-81 and 1990-91 food-crop production in West Bengal grew by 5.9 per cent against the national average of 2.8 per cent. Agricultural growth has helped expansion of rural markets and increase of earning opportunities. The calorie intake of average villager in West Bengal was less than the national average in 1972-73 but in 1993-93 the average calorie intake of rural people in West Bengal has exceeded the national average by 209 kilo calorie. As a result of a distinct rise in the quality of life in rural areas the rate of rural-urban movement has been largely controlled over the years.

With a view to achieve balanced urbanization the Government of West Bengal is now focusing on (a) decentralized urban growth, (b) participation of people, especially the people of economically backward classes and women in urban planning and in execution of development programmes, (c) democratic decentralization, and transparent and responsible urban administration, (d) development of small and medium towns and rural

development, (e) reduction of the gap between Kolkata (Calcutta) and other towns in terms of per capita allocation of development fund, and (f) slum development and development of quality of life of the urban poor, reduction of infant mortality and population growth rate (For details see Bhattacharya, 2005: 82).

15.7 Changing Urban Employment Market and its Impact on Urbanization

The concentration of industrial, commercial and development activities in the urban areas create employment and earning opportunities which in turn not only sustain the urban work force but also draws additional workforce from outside the urban areas, specially from the poverty infested rural areas and economically stagnant small towns. After economic liberalization the general economic trend is that while the corporate sector of industry is growing the public sector and small-scale industries are either facing stagnation or gradual decline. The fast growing high-tech corporate sector is capital intensive and therefore the employment generation capacity of this sector is limited. The public sector units have registered a negative growth of workforce in the 1990s and thereafter. The National Sample Survey (NSSO 2001) has reported a steady decline in the share of regular and salaried workers during this period. Since the large industries are now resorting to subcontracting there has been a steady growth of casual and self-employed workers and feminization of workforce. The large masses of urban workforce in these casual and contractual jobs in the tertiary sector are highly exploited and lack security of job and income. The Fourth Economic Census and Various Enterprise Surveys by NSS (see Kundu 2001) have reported the waning capacity of the urban informal sector, which was earlier termed as the “survival sector for the urban poor”, to absorb the new entrants to the urban job market. The recent changes in the urban job market have been reflected in the decline in the urban growth, particularly the falling rate of growth of large cities.

Reflection and Action 15.2

Identify a business district or area in your neighbourhood. Select an industry or business organization which employed more than 100 people. Find out which background these

employees are coming from; what is their level of education and skill and what are their promotion chances.

Write a report on “Profile of Urban Workers” based on your findings. Share it with your Academic Counsellor and peers at your study centre

Another recent trend is that the large-scale industries in the private sector (national as well as multinational) are coming up mostly outside the geographical limits of the large cities because it is very difficult to find the required land within the cities. The supporters of green movement are also contributing to this process. The investors do not mind this because they get cheap land in the bargain. Thus new settlements develop around these industries without immediately adding to total urban population.

Yet another factor that has contributed to the deceleration of urban growth in the recent decades in the application of land ceiling, and control on location of industrial and commercial units, rigid land use regime imposed through Master Plans. Such restrictions have restricted the absorptive capacity of the cities.

In the post-independence India rural poverty has been more intense and widespread than the urban poverty. With the growth of population the pressure of man on land has also increased over the years. Although the ratio of non-agricultural occupation has increased the non-agricultural sector in rural economy has failed to arrest the city-bound migration of rural poor. In the recent years, however, the intensity of rural poverty is falling and the gap between urban and rural poverty is also narrowing down. Also, when the unemployment in urban areas is on the rise the rate of rural-urban migration is declining.

15.8 Conclusion

Urbanization does not mean the growth of urban population and concentration of production and commercial activities alone; it would also mean a balanced development of infrastructure, civic amenities and opportunities for all sections of the urbanites. It would mean access to healthy environment, egalitarian development, democratic empowerment, and decentralization of power and cultural uplift of the people. What

would ultimately matter is the quality of life that the urban centers ensure to their citizens.

Judging the current trend it is projected that by 2015 around 40 per cent of India's population would be living in urban areas and a large majority of this population would inhabit the large cities. At present nearly 38 per cent of total urban population is considered poor and about 35 per cent live in slums. About 44 per cent of urban families manage with one room, between 70 and 80 lakh urban population are homeless; 52 per cent of urban population do not have access to healthy sanitation; only about 24 per cent own sanitary latrines; a large section of urban population does not have access to safe drinking water; every year environmental pollution hands over untimely death to about 40,000 urbanites. When there is an estimated need of twenty thousand crore rupees to provide the minimum urban amenities to its people the Indian Government is down sizing the budgetary allocation for urban development. In 1951 the budgetary allocation for urban development was 8 per cent but in 2005 it has been reduced to 2.6 per cent (Bhattacharya, 2005: 56-83)

Asish Bose has observed that the post-independence urban legislations, particularly the Urban Land Ceiling and Regulation Act of 1976, have the negative impact in the urban land and housing market because these have affected the urban poor and have not helped promote equity in the urban sector (Bose, 1995: 37). The National Commission on Urbanization submitted its report in 1988 and in the report there suggested scrapping of Urban Land Ceiling Act. The report was prepared as groundwork for the impending economic liberalization. There was a general consensus, in line with World Bank policies, that nothing should be subsidized and people must be made to pay for urban services and public utilities.

With globalization process gaining speed in India one could see its impact on the future trend of urbanization in India. The Indian cities would see a significant improvement in the infrastructure as the cities would be showcased to attract FDI, the looks of the cities would change fast and more speed would be injected in city life. The metropolitan administration and the state governments are already moving in this direction. Since the

corporate capital will not be available for development of infrastructure the State governments shall have to borrow money from the international monetary agencies for the purpose. As a part of structural adjustment the government would always want to cut expenditure on the welfare sector and public services. We have already seen how the health, transport, education, power, housing, telecommunication, television and entertainment sectors are thrown open to the private capital. The urban land would be sold to the corporate houses and as a result the urban poor and middle classes would lose their control over precious urban land. We would see demolition of slums and squatter settlements, extinction of water bodies and fallow land in and around the cities. The job market that would be created in the corporate sector would be meant for the skilled workers alone and this would not attract the rural unskilled labour force. With more and more government services going private the urban poor would find it difficult to maintain the minimum quality of life. In the era of globalization many of the public sector production units are finding it difficult to compete with the corporate capital and as a result many units are being closed down and thousands of industrial workers are being rendered jobless. The impact of these changes has already been felt in terms of slowing down of rural-urban migration and the rate of overall urban growth in the country. The falling rate of natural growth of urban population would also have its bearing on the urban growth rate in the years to come. With the urban areas already reaching the saturation point in terms of accommodation of more people, and little land being available for investment, there is a clear possibility that the cities would grow horizontally and more and more new and planned townships would come up with support of the private capital.

15.9 Further Reading

Kundu, Amitabh, 2005. 'Urbanization and Urban Governance: Search for a Perspective beyond Neo-Liberalism', in *Pachimbange Nagar Unnyoner Abhigyata*, Proceedings of the Seminar held at NBU on 5-6 February 2005: 101-124.

Ramachandran, R., 1989. *Urbanization and Urban System in India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

References

- Bhattacharya, Asok, 2005. 'Khamatar Bikendrikaran O Pachimbanger Paurasabha: Ekobinsha Satabdite Unnyonsil Dese Nagarayaner Bikalpa Dristibhangi' in *Pachimbange Nagar Unnyoner Abhigyata*, Proceedings of the Seminar held at NBU on 5-6 February 2005: 56-83.
- Bose, Ashish, 1995. 'Urbanization and Slums' in Prodipto Roy and S Das Gupta (eds.) *Urbanization and Slums*, New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications: 19-43.
- Kundu, Amitabh, 2005. 'Urbanization and Urban Governance: Search for a Perspective beyond Neo-Liberalism', in *Pachimbange Nagar Unnyoner Abhigyata*, Proceedings of the Seminar held at NBU on 5-6 February 2005: 101-124.
- Mitra, Arup, 1994. *Urbanisation, Slums, Informal Sector Employment and Poverty: An Exploratory Study*, Delhi: B. R. Publishing Corporation.
- Planning Commission, 1983. *Task Forces on Housing and Urban Development, Vol. I*, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Ramachandran, R., 1989. *Urbanization and Urban System in India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- United Nations, 1995. *World Urbanization Prospects*, New York: Population Division.
- United Nations, 2001. *World Urbanization Prospects (The 1999 revision)*, New York: Population Division.