

GLOBALISATION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRIVATISED NEW TOWNSHIPS IN PUNE: PROCESSES OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND EXCLUSION

Anchal Kumari¹

The development of new townships inside cities is not simply the creation of new towns on hitherto agricultural land. With the emergence of these townships new forms of socio-spatial exclusion emerge and at the same time strengthen the existing inequalities inside city space. The objective of this article is to present some of the aspects of spatial exclusion with the creation of private townships or private urban spaces inside the city of Pune. The analysis is based on observations and in-depth interviews from the new/old local residents of the townships and their surroundings. The narratives of local people tell an interconnected story of capital and power in the new townships. This article attempts to contribute to the existing debate on the changing nature of urban spaces.

Introduction

As a result of its colonial history India has four dominant mega cities, namely Mumbai (Bombay), Delhi, Kolkata (Calcutta) and Chennai (Madras). The liberalisation of the Indian economy has strengthened the mega cities along with other large cities to emerge as the nerve centre of India's economy. The process of economic reforms is changing the urban structure of the country, the city size distribution as well as the internal structure of the cities. Since the liberalisation process began in the 1990s, various actors have involved themselves in the process of urban development. To make cities' investment friendly, state governments provide various incentives, in the form of "geobribes" as defined by Smith (2002), to emerging industries like Information Technology (IT). The changes in the structure of cities are mainly due to growing international competition. In the process of urban development the uneven nature of urbanisation is clearly visible; such uneven development of urban spaces, as argued by Harvey (2007), can be seen as a process of "creative destruction" for further economic progress.

The process of economic reforms is changing the urban structure of India. The power of globalising processes can be seen on the city spaces and lives of people. The development of privatised new townships in India is the contemporary example of changing

¹ PhD Scholar, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai 400 088, Mobile: 08879386857. Email address: anchalk18@gmail.com

urban forms. Many of the new townships are exclusionary and made for upper classes or global players. “Their quality of life demands have triumphed over the logic of social reproduction that constituted the urban space in the Ford-ist era, leading to the gentrification of cities and the exclusion of disadvantaged urban populations and the traditional working class” (Bhattacharya & Sanyal, 2011, p. 41). This process of restructuring represents the inequalities of power and wealth inside the cities. Many such changes are happening in the metropolitans in order to make them investment friendly for global capital. The major features of these developments are gentrification of urban spaces and large scale displacement and dispossession of the poor.

In the next section the literature on discourses surrounding social spatial exclusion, the development of new townships in India, and the widening gap and exclusion in Indian cities is reviewed. Following this, a case study is given that presents narratives from fieldwork in Magarpatta and Amanora Townships of Pune. The analysis centres on aspects of exclusion of the urban poor and socio-spatial inequalities due to the creation of private urban spaces.

Review of Literature

Discourses on social and spatial exclusion

In the social science literature “[s]ocial exclusion is defined as social process which involves denial of fair and equal opportunities to certain social groups in multiple spheres in society, resulting in the inability of individuals from excluded groups to participate in the basic political, economic and social functioning of the society” (Thorat & Sabharwal, 2010, p. 3). Walker and Walker (1997, p. 8) define social exclusion as the denial or non realisation of the civil, political and social rights of citizenship.

In contemporary global academic and policy debates the expression social exclusion has become prominent in policy design and implementation. The relationship between social exclusion and high deprivation and poverty among social groups that have been facing discrimination through the ages is now firmly recognised (Thorat & Sabharwal, 2010). The use of the term ‘social exclusion’ was initially reserved to discuss deprivation and poverty. It was also used to indicate the processes of marginalisation of disadvantaged individuals and groups. However “[t]he study of “social exclusion induced human poverty” of excluded groups (due to their identity associated with social origin like caste, ethnicity, religion, colour,

indigenous region, nationality, gender and other), is something which has been neglected in the mainstream social science discourse” (Thorat and Sabharwal, 2010, pp. 1-2). Thus studies began to make an attempt to differentiate social exclusion from the simpler notion of poverty.

Amartya Sen’s work challenged the mainstream economic theories which mainly focused on material inequality. He contributed to the debate of social exclusion by categorising inequality in the broader sense of lack of opportunities, freedom and choices. He emphasised this idea by asking a prominent question of “equality of what?” (Zheng & Walsham, 2008, p. 223). The concept of freedom in Sen’s book *Development as Freedom* (1999) in a broad sense talks about the importance of having effective opportunities to lead the kind of lives we want to live or have reasons to value. Sen argues that poverty is not solely the lowness of income, but it is the stage of living “impoverished lives”; it is the deprivation of the freedom to undertake important activities that a person might wish to choose. Amartya Sen earlier focussed on capabilities. “Critical to the capability approach is the recognition of human diversity which gives rise to an explicit differentiation between “spaces of equality”. Equality in one space to lead a valuable life, e.g. income, does not necessarily mean equality in life opportunities to achieve it, e.g. access to quality healthcare. Therefore, individual variations as well as structural differences in society, must be brought in to considerations of individual opportunities to take a full part in society” (Zheng & Walsham, 2008, p. 224). The development in the literature on social exclusion is very helpful for the researchers of social sciences to understand the application of the concept of social exclusion for the study of caste based exclusion and the exclusion that results from the practice of untouchability in India.

Another group of literature talks about social exclusion in the information technological enabled society or in the more advanced form of society in the era of globalisation. These studies mainly revolve around the debate on globalisation and Information Technology. Castells (1999) discusses the effects of informational capitalism. According to Zheng and Walsham (2008, p. 222), the “focus on the provision and distribution of technological resources has expanded to the integration of a wider range of social resources in the process of social exclusion and inclusion”.

Another important perspective comes from Madanipour (2016, p. 203), who states that “exclusion of groups of city residents from access to all that the city has to offer on the basis of race, class,

religion, income, gender, national origin, sexual orientation, or some other characteristics has been or continues to be a pressing problem in cities throughout the world". Globalisation allows the movement of labour and capital from one country to another, but this deepens the existing forms of exclusion. It is therefore important to understand how social exclusion restricts certain individuals from participating in urban processes or from receiving a part of the benefits cities offer in the form of several amenities.

In order to define the spatiality of exclusion, Madanipour has defined exclusion in terms of lack of access to employment, lack of political representation and marginalisation from cultural symbols, meanings, discourses and rituals. In the era of globalisation, on the one hand people throughout the world have come closer to one another, yet on the other hand new avenues of exclusion have been opened. Madanipour raises some important questions in this regard, such as how an individual or group of people can be excluded from taking part in the development of the city in which they reside, or from everything that city life offers.

Madanipour reminds us that the worst kind of exclusion combines all three forms: economic, political and cultural. These forms of exclusion, he argues, tend to be spatially concentrated in places like the inner-city or peripheral areas. In his analysis Madanipour presents several examples which show how socio-spatial processes take place at the local level in cities. For example, the housing structure in cities can produce social exclusion as it divides neighbourhood spaces, which creates the ground for social, political and cultural exclusion. We can experience this disparity in today's cities in the form of ghetto formations, development of gated townships and processes of gentrification. Also, the real estate market and land use pattern in the cities considers space a commodity and further creates segregation and leads to differential access to these resources. Thus social exclusion is the lack/denial of access to resources or decision making. "The multidimensional phenomenon of social exclusion finds spatial manifestations, in its acute forms, in deprived inner or peripheral urban areas. This spatiality of social exclusion is constructed through the physical organization of space as well as through the social control of space, as ensured by informal codes and signs and formal rules and regulations" (Madanipour, 2016, p. 211).

The spatial concentration of the poor and disadvantaged in the periphery of cities often results in their isolation from mainstream social and economic activities (McGregor & McConnachie, 1995). Gentrification in urban areas, which leads to displacement and

dispossession, results in the exclusion of a population from reaping the benefits that cities provide. Besides this, the restructuring and privatisation of urban spaces can lead to the exclusion of the poor from different aspects of cities. Neil Smith argues that gentrification had “evolved by the 1990s into a crucial urban strategy for city governments in consort with private capital in cities around the world” (Smith, 2002, p. 440). The process of gentrification first identified in a few major advanced capitalist cities such as London, New York, Paris and Sydney, has by now become a global phenomenon. Over the past decade we have seen the rapid emergence of state-led gentrification in the Global South (Lees, 2012); processes of gentrification are changing the centres of cities in third world cities, including those of China and India.

The gentrification process plays a crucial role in neoliberal urbanism. According to Harris (2008, p. 2409), “In the creation of new privatised cultural landscapes and the generation of new circuits of capital accumulation, gentrification has become a key urban arena in the development of neo-liberal policies”. The real estate sector plays an important role in the process of capital accumulation, and is involved in urban restructuring processes and beautification of cities in order to make individual cities friendly for international investors. We can see the intense integration of the real estate industry into the definitional core of neoliberal urbanism in cities such as Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, Rio de Janeiro, and Mumbai, where real-estate prices in the 1990s have multiplied manifold (Smith, 2002). The whole process of gentrification represents the social and economic interest of the elite class over the interests of marginalised sections.

Lees (2012, p. 164) presents the example of findings from The Asian Coalition for Housing Rights who have monitored evictions in seven Asian countries (Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia and the Philippines), showing that evictions have increased dramatically: between January to June 2004, 334,593 people were evicted in the urban areas of these countries; from January to June 2005, 2,084,388 people were evicted. The major reason for these evictions was ‘the beautification of the city’. In the majority of cases, people did not receive any compensation for the losses they incurred and where resettlement did take place it was 25-60 kilometres from the city centre (Lees, 2012). Gentrification in the Global South is leading to the relocation (either formally or informally) of evicted inner-city populations to peri-urban areas far away from their places of work, educational possibilities, social networks and better health facilities (Lees, 2012, p. 164).

Fernandes (2004) presents the pattern of urban restructuring in Mumbai. Exorbitant real estate prices in south Mumbai, the heart of the city, have increasingly pushed middle-class individuals into suburban areas. The result has been the production of new and distinctive forms of suburban cultural and social communities. “In what are now considered upmarket suburbs, neighbourhoods in areas such as Bandra and other western suburbs have witnessed the growth of upmarket restaurants, shopping enterprises and movie theatres. New trendy movie theatres in the suburbs, for instance, depart from the traditional fee structure of regular theatres. While regular theatres provide different scales from expensive ‘balcony’ seats to cheaper seats at the bottom level of the theatre, such theatres offer only a flat higher price for all seating. The pricing system effectively keeps out poorer working class or even lower-middle-class individuals from such theatres” (Fernandes, 2004, p. 2419).

The development of new townships in India

The history of the development of private townships in India can be divided into two phases. In the first, new industrial townships like Durgapur, Rourkela, Salem, Bhilai etc, were developed. Here, we may include the first private steel plant of India, located in the city of Jamshedpur (also known as Tatanagar), situated in south-eastern Jharkhand. Before the period of reforms these industrial townships mainly revolved around manufacturing-related industries, while also generating employment for local people in their surroundings. The second phase of development of new townships is for the most part either public-private partnerships or totally private initiatives. The contemporary new towns are very different from the industrial townships of the past set up during the planning regime. As Bhattacharya and Sanyal (2011, p. 42) state, “These new towns are aligned with the global economy rather than the national economy and in this sense are very different from those set up during the planning regime, either as new administrative capitals (Chandigarh, Gandhinagar, Bhubaneswar) or industrial towns (Durgapur, Rourkela, Bhilai)”. Many of the contemporary new towns are exclusionary and made for upper classes or global players. Thus the development of private townships in the cities of India can be seen as a contemporary example of how the upper classes are fulfilling their demands for *aestheticised* urban spaces.

In recent decades with the aspiration to make “global cities”, India’s state governments are promoting the development of new townships around the dominant megacities. “A national policy has been announced to promote the growth of 100 new towns of one

million target population by the year 2020” (Wang, Kundu, & Chen, 2010, p. 321). The three largest metropolises Mumbai, Delhi and Kolkata started their large scale new town programmes in the early 1990s. Such townships are accelerating suburbanisation by promoting urban development in the suburban areas. The new townships are formed as new residential enclaves with job opportunities to create an economic growth pole of the IT industry, to ease the increasing pressure of urbanisation in megacities, or as large scale gated communities with global standard housing and amenities to attract high income upwardly mobile populations (ibid., p. 323). For example Rajarhat New Town outside Kolkata is the largest state regulated planned township project of West Bengal, providing world class amenities and high-end commercial housing to globally connected professionals working in the IT sector (ibid.).

These new towns are aligned with the global economy rather than the national economy; hence they are very different from the towns that were set up earlier such as administrative or industrial townships. For example in Gujarat, where an integrated township policy was adopted in 2007, integrated towns are classified by use as technology parks, education based townships, medical/healthcare townships, tourism related infrastructure, logistics parks and residential townships. The township policy explicitly considers that knowledge based activities and businesses are driven by global capital, and that locations should be chosen by comparing the advantages of cities across the world (Bhattacharya & Sanyal, 2011), allowing the new townships to provide world class amenities and services for global investment. Inside the global and globalising cities of the Third World a new geography of centrality and marginality (Banerjee-Guha, 2002) can be observed.

Widening gap and exclusion in the cities of India

Built environment is defined by Banerjee-Guha (2002, p. 121) as a phenomenon in the urban development process that “is fixed in space whose individual elements may be produced, maintained, managed and owned by diverse class and economic interests”. In a later article, Banerjee-Guha states that “Indian cities of various sizes are being remodelled in recent times as “world class cities” to function as nodes of circulation of global finance and hi-tech activities of a diverse nature. Apparently the essential objective is to make these cities sufficiently investment friendly, acceptable to the credit rating agencies and help them emerge as geostrategic points to further neoliberalism in the Global South” (2009, p. 96).

In the Indian context, Roy (2009) discusses urban planning using the case of an airport in Bangalore, which is presented as a case of planning failure in the city. The airport was located far away from the town and the connecting road between the city and airport was not wide enough to accommodate the traffic. The city water supply did not reach the airport area and so the shops, office towers, and other developments that were supposed to surround the airport remained unbuilt. Roy (2009) argues that Bangalore is being increasingly planned, if not by private developers then by international finance institutions such as the World Bank and Asian Development Bank. This is because the globally competitive high-tech firms make demands for world-class services (water, power, fast transport, a responsive and accountable state bureaucracy, fully accessorized housing complexes, etc.). The situation has divided the city of Bangalore because on the one hand, Infosys, the second largest Indian IT firm, has backup diesel generators that can run for days at a time, while on the other hand most of the population only receives water for a few hours every third day from the public distribution system, has minimal access to sanitation/sewerage service, and irregular provision of electricity (Roy, 2009).

Ghertner (2008) notes that almost all of Delhi's constructions violate some planning or building law, such that much of the construction in the city can be viewed as 'unauthorized'. He poses the vital question of why some of these areas are now being designated as illegal and worthy of demolition while others are protected and formalized. He observed that in recent years the law has come to designate slums as a 'nuisance' and the residents of slums as a 'secondary category of citizens', as distinguished from 'normal', private property owning citizens. Ghertner (2008, p. 66) cites the example of Akshardham temple, which has a "world class" look despite violating zoning of building byelaws. The temple has been granted amnesty and heralded as a monument of modernity! Such differentiation creates a fundamental axis of inequality in today's urban India.

Such economic liberalisation policies and practices have been accompanied by discourses on the rise of the new middle class in India. The newness of this Indian middle class is marked by changing consumption practices and lifestyles (Fernandes, 2004). Metropolises of the Global South are showing signs of intense conflict because of the imposition of a neoliberal framework of urban development, reflecting the contestation between the local and global (Banerjee-Guha, 2002). On the one hand the new Indian middle class are benefitting from globalisation, while on the other hand the "political

dynamics of the new Indian middle class rest on a political project of “forgetting” the urban poor and working classes” (Fernandes, 2004, p. 2438). The conception of the “politics of forgetting” cannot be viewed merely as a process wherein particular localities are excluded from globalisation, but as an active political process that involves processes of exclusion (Fernandes, 2004). The political process is present in the entire series of spatial practices and planning at the local level in cities. Within this the exercise of state power is an important political force. The state actively participates via urban planning in an attempt to produce a middle class-based vision of a beautified, globalising city in which signs of poverty can be forgotten in both spatial and political terms (Fernandes, 2004).

Urban planning supports a “world class city” vision through the remapping of cities by the intense gentrification of urban space and the recasting of the urban form and governance. The major aspects of this new urban form are large scale displacement and dispossession of the poor, and various other processes of marginalisation such as “closure of small-scale manufacturing and retail units, anti-poor legal order, regulations against informal workers, hawkers, waste pickers, privatisation of basic services like water, sanitation, housing, health and education, and, last but not the least, restricting access to open spaces for making available more arenas for elitist consumption. Ideology, armed with power, is found to bring about patterns of domination and repression in many Indian cities in current times” (Banerjee-Guha, 2009, p. 97).

Methodology

Research area

Magarpatta and Amanora townships are situated in the Hadapsar ward of Pune city. Both were earlier agricultural land and have now been restructured as townships. In both townships reside a predominantly highly paid IT workforce, and both are designed for upper classes, e.g. full of luxurious amenities.

A farmers’ collective were behind the formation of Magarpatta mixed-use township: almost 120 Magar farmer families, who together owned more than 400 acres of land, decided to pool their land together and develop it themselves as a township instead of selling it to an outside developer. They formed Magarpatta Township Development and Construction Company Limited and developed Magarpatta as an integrated mixed-use planned township with multiple commercial zones, residential neighbourhoods, school, hospital, shopping malls,

hotels, restaurants, and recreation areas. The township also has IT Park called Cyber-city that provides international facilities to leading global IT giants. The most influential person of this project is Mr. Satish Magar, who has strong political and social connections, which aided the Magar community's gaining of government support and formation of the collective. The Maratha caste status of the Magar farmers played a big role, as they had a stronghold over the economy (sugarcane factories), politics and society. All the landholding farmers got a share in the Magarpatta company based on the acres of land contributed, and all of them have bungalows and flats inside the township, and are very happy with the project.

By contrast the fully residential Amanora township, which like Magarpatta is located in the Hadapsar administrative ward of Pune, was developed by an independent builder. Amanora was also agricultural land prior to the town's development. Farmers had sold their land to the private developer and the township was developed under a private township scheme. Yet landless labourers, many from Scheduled Caste (SC) communities, had no land to sell and therefore had no stake in the project. As stated by Thorat (2009, p. 54), "[l]andlessness among SCs is the common feature in the Indian rural economy". Thus scheduled castes cannot participate in or benefit from the process of transformation of agrarian to urban economy; and of urban restructuring.

Research design

The study is qualitative in nature. Observation and in-depth interviews were used for data collection between the months of February 2015 to June 2015. The respondents were the old and new residents of Magarpatta and Amanora townships. The interviews and observations were later analysed such to allow themes to emerge.

Findings and Analysis

Narratives of socio-spatial segregation of the informal workforce and urban poor in Pune

The affluent upper classes have always resided in the best areas of Pune; either in the city centre or in the periphery. In the last few years, they are distancing themselves from the problems of city of which they are part of, for example, by moving away from the noise, crowd, waste contamination or traffic. In this section I present narratives which express the views of the townships' new residents, and also the narratives of the lived experiences of local people within the new urban space.

In the contemporary urban form we can see two segments of the city. On one side there are wealthy neighbourhoods with all kinds of services, exclusive schools, many recreational sports services like golf courses, multiplexes and even private police patrolling. On the other side of the city, however, there is a scarcity of even the basic amenities. One of the residents of these new townships describes the importance of living in new towns as:

“It is wonderful to live peacefully in a totally safe, clean and green part of Pune city. It is a good area, calm area and purely residential. Other places of Pune are not peaceful; this township is connected to nature. A good class of educated people lives here. It is closely connected to the airport. The best part of this township is there is no slum nearby. So this township is very clean and safe.”

The poor, the underprivileged and the marginalised – the section of population who do not have political power – suffer first and foremost in the process of neoliberalised urban development. In recent decades this process has dispossessed the urban masses of any right to the city whatsoever. Indeed, the right to the city has come to be firmly in the hands of private interests. Politically, socially and economically elite individuals and groups have taken possession of the right to the city and are reshaping it according to their needs and desires.

Through the development of new townships privatised urban spaces are bracketing themselves from the rest of the city. In this process, the price component plays a major role. The urban poor obviously cannot afford to stay in these big apartments with all their associated smart features. Indeed they cannot even afford to stay in the surroundings of these new townships because of increases in rent and land prices in the area. As described by a local resident of Pune:

“Housing rent has increased so much in Hadapsar because of all these constructions of new townships and IT park. Price of land has also increased. People like us can't even think to buy house or even pay rent to live nearby or in the other areas of Hadapsar.”

The people who cannot afford to stay in the surroundings of the new townships because of increased rents and land prices have no other option but to move to a more peripheral part of the city, or to live in a congested slum area. This results in the further

marginalisation of the poorer segment of the population. The increasing spatial concentration of the disadvantaged has resulted in the isolation of these individuals and households from mainstream social and economic activities. This results in a situation whereby the urban poor cannot fully access the services, facilities and networks a metropolis has to offer.

The above-mentioned crisis of urban space in new cities or townships relates to these cities' placement in the world city system and the limitations of related global-local networks (Banerjee-Guha, 2010). The holders of international capital compare the luxurious amenities any city is going to offer before investing in any particular city. Many multinational corporations (MNCs) have offices in Magarpatta township's IT Park. However, most of these have their headquarters elsewhere – in other countries, and thus the employees of the MNCs work in a different time zone to their managers. Thus such cities are more connected globally than locally, with implications for the local residents – as is visible in Hadapsar.

The Hadapsar ward of Pune, in which Amanora and Magarpatta townships are situated, is located at Pune's periphery. In recent years Hadapsar has witnessed major changes in its land use pattern, from that of agricultural land to the emergence of new townships and IT parks. Over these years, and associated with these development, the local people of Hadapsar have seen changes to their lives and livelihoods. The local people of Hadapsar understand the concept of IT parks and companies through the term "call centres". The employees of these IT companies mainly hail from outside of Pune and Maharashtra. The locals of Hadapsar view them as the most educated and elite classes of India's population. The privatised townships in Pune are being developed with all the luxurious amenities and services to serve the lifestyle demanded by these rising upper middle classes.

In private townships such as Magarpatta, work and residential spaces are connected by private roads, have their own private shopping malls, and closed circuit television (CCTV). All of this paves the way for the "fragmentation of the social and material fabric of the city" (Graham & Marvin, 2001, p. 33). The concept of "splintering urbanism" (ibid.) is useful to understand this process. As stated by Atkinson and Flint (2004, p. 876), "Gated communities provide a force for exclusion in new and different ways to earlier forms of residential patterning". This viewpoint helps us understand that both old and new forms of exclusion and segregation exist in the townships.

The narratives indicate that the urban upper classes are moving to the city periphery with the formation of new townships. The motivations behind moving to new townships are mainly self-centred ones: clean and green environment, safety, maintaining distance from the crowd of the central city, and avoidance of contact with certain social groups, namely the urban poor in the city. Also, there is little or no social contact between the new incoming residents of the townships and the city's earlier population, i.e. local people.

The landless agricultural labourers, who mainly belong to the category of Scheduled Caste, lost their livelihoods in the process of development of the new townships, and after the emergence of the new urban form the jobs they are getting are very difficult and highly temporary in nature. As stated by a 54 years old woman whose job is to collect garbage from the buildings of Amanora township:

“Earlier it was good for me when this place was agricultural land and not the township. We used to get vegetables and other things from the field. I was working on the agricultural land here. I have been doing agricultural work my entire life. Now my job is to collect garbage from 18th floor to ground floor, and for this I get rupees 80-100 per day.”

Every development process has a diverse impact on the masses based on their social and economic positions. A woman (49 years) who works as a maid in the township states:

“People like me, who earlier used to work in the farming land of Magarpatta, are mostly working as domestic workers. This has only benefited the rich people, while there is nothing for the poor. They want us just to work here even if they are paying very less. But we work as we have no other option, we have to take care of our children and we need money to fulfil our basic needs of food and home.”

The narratives of the people who are directly or indirectly related to these townships helps understand how the production of private urban spaces contributes towards the socio-spatial transformations and socio-spatial inequalities within the cities. The subjective experience of locals helps critically to examine the relevance of “right to the city” in such new townships.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The privatisation of urban spaces in the process of restructuring to the contemporary urban form is an emerging phenomenon since the time of India's reforms. The private nature of new townships in Pune creates new avenues for exclusion; it also strengthens pre-existing socio-spatial inequalities. The idea of new townships moves beyond the concept of private urban forms and also becomes the story of labouring forces at work. The contemporary townships are developed to be the location of the new economy as well as the new residential spaces for the workforce of this economy. This new economic space is markedly different from that of the displaced population's previous space which included their traditional activities. Indeed, the nature of work for the traditional working classes (e.g. agricultural labourers), which include Scheduled Castes and other weaker sections, has become more repressive in these privatised urban spaces.

In these townships the work available for the urban poor is highly temporary in nature. This raises the questions of who can call these townships their own, and of who belongs to these townships? Even the residents of the townships, those who are a part of the IT workforce, stay in the township for a maximum of four to five years because of transfers and quick job shifting. The negligence of attention to the aspects of social exclusion in the process of policy formation and implementation is very much visible in new townships in particular, and in cities in general. This research may contribute to a better understanding of social exclusion as it highlights the impact on the urban poor. Such considerations need to be kept in mind in light of the broader framework of "smart cities" formation.

References

- Atkinson, R., & Flint, J. (2004). Fortress UK? Gated communities, the spatial revolt of the elites and time-space trajectories of segregation. *Housing Studies*, 19(6), 875-892.
- Banerjee-Guha, S. (2002). Shifting cities: Urban restructuring in Mumbai. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(2), 121-128.
- Banerjee-Guha, S. (2009). Neoliberalising the urban: New geographies of power and injustice in Indian cities. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLIV(22), 95-107.
- Banerjee-Guha, S. (2010). Introduction: Transformative cities in the new global order. In S. Banerjee-Guha (Ed.), *Accumulation by dispossession: Transformative cities in the new global order* (pp. 1-16). New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bhattacharya, R., & Sanyal, K. (2011). Bypassing the squalor: New towns, immaterial labour and exclusion in post colonial urbanisation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVI(31), 41-48.

- Castells, M. (1999). *Information technology, globalization and social development* (UNRISD Discussion Paper No. 114). Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development. Retrieved from [http://www.unrisd.org/unrisd/website/document.nsf/70870613ae33162380256b5a004d932e/f270e0c066f3de7780256b67005b728c/\\$FILE/dp114.pdf](http://www.unrisd.org/unrisd/website/document.nsf/70870613ae33162380256b5a004d932e/f270e0c066f3de7780256b67005b728c/$FILE/dp114.pdf)
- Dey, I., Samaddar, R., & Sen, S. K. (2013). *Beyond Kolkata: Rajarhat and dystopia of urban imagination*. Delhi: Routledge.
- Fernandes, L. (2004). The politics of forgetting: Class politics, state power and restructuring of urban space in India. *Urban Studies*, 41(12), 2415-2438.
- Ghertner, A. (2008). Analysis of new legal discourse behind Delhi's slum demolitions. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(20), 59-66.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Graham, S., & Marvin, S. (2001). *Splintering urbanism: Networked infrastructure, technological mobilities and the urban condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, A. (2008). From London to Mumbai and back again: Gentrification and public policy in comparative perspective. *Urban Studies*, 45(12), 2407-28.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lees, L. (2012). The geography of gentrification: Thinking through comparative urbanism. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(2), 155-171.
- Madanipour, A. (2016). Social exclusion and space. In R. LeGates, & F. Stout (Eds.), *The city reader* (8th ed.) (pp. 203-211). Oxon: Routledge.
- McGregor, A., & McConnachie, M. (1995). Social exclusion, urban regeneration and economic integration. *Urban Studies*, 32(10), 1587-1600.
- Powell, F. (1995). Citizenship and social exclusion. *Administration*, 43(3), 23-25.
- Roy, A. (2009). Why India cannot plan its cities: Informality, insurgence and the idiom of urbanisation. *Planning Theory*, 8(1), 76-87.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Smith, N. (2002). New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as global urban strategy. *Antipode*, 34(3), 427-450.
- Thorat, S. (2009). *Dalits in India: Search for a common destiny*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Thorat, S., & Sabharwal, N. S. (2010). *Caste and social exclusion: Issues related to concept, indicators and measurement* (Children, Social Exclusion and Development Working Paper Series, Volume 02, Number 01). New Delhi: Indian Institute of Dalit Studies & UNICEF. Retrieved from http://www.dalitstudies.org.in/images/stories/Unicef_IIDS_Working_Paper_Volume_2_No1.pdf
- Walker, A., & Walker, C. (1997). *Britain divided: The growth of social exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s*. London: CPAG.
- Wang, L., Kundu, R., & Chen, X. (2010). Building for what and whom? New town development as planned suburbanisation in China and India. *Research in Urban Sociology*, 10, 319-345.
- Zheng, Y., & Walsham, G. (2008). Inequality of what? Social exclusion in the e-society as capability deprivation. *Information Technology & People*, 21(3), 222-243.