Illustrate Lessons for India on Urban Development Approach through Case Studies of Changing Global Approaches in USA, Brazil and South Africa

[1]Kandarp Saparia, [2]Dr. Nanak Pamnani
[1]PhD Research Scholar, [2]Professor
[1]Dept. of Civil Engineering
[1]Madhav University, Pindwara (Sirohi), Rajasthan, India

Abstract: Urban areas around the world are playing critical role in making wealth, attractive social development and, drawing investment. Cities play a serious role in driving the transition to sustainable development and promise better access to improved social infrastructure such as health, education, culture and entertainment among others and a range of physical infrastructure namely water, power, sewerage, sanitation, roads and transportation to upgrade the quality of life of its inhabitants. As countries develop, cities and urban settlements account for a larger share of the national income. Thus the concern of the study was to illustrate lessons for India on Urban Development approach with the help of studding changing global scenario in not only to developed countries but as well as developing countries. The study concluded with very useful reflection on our own policies and work towards redesigning Urban Development approach.

Index term: Urban Development, Urban Development Policy, Urbanization, Industrialization, Decentralization, Infrastructure.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1995, the world passed through a critical phase. For the first time ever, the percentage of urban population in the globe crossed the mark of 50%. We now animate in an urban world. However, the significance of urban is very diverse in the developed and the developing world. The developing world is challenging urban development as a phenomenon among widespread poverty. It looks towards urbanization as a path to economic growth and development. Further, there are wide variations in the urban development paths among the developing countries too. There is a lot that one can absorb from a study of these different approaches to urban development. It enables one to imitate upon the development adoptions of our own country. China, Brazil and South Africa in particular, are countries that are seen as newly developing economies in the world along with India. These are all countries that had tremendously low levels of urbanization at the turn of the twentieth century. At least two of these, South Africa and Brazil have had a lengthy involvement of colonization. Thus they have a lot in common and hence the differences in growing choices are even more motivating to study.

2. CHANGING GLOBAL APPROACHES ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Till the mid half of the twentieth century, urbanization was considered an attendant of the development process and in particular, the state of industrialization of society. The urbanization of the Western or the developed world was seen as the norm and by those standards; the urbanization, which was happening in the developing countries was seen as 'over urbanization'. Urbanization was seen to be uneven to the state of industrialization. The high demographic growth of these cities which was non commensurate with the development of infrastructure was seen as a problem. The solutions presented were more balanced, even growth and rural industrialization.

This perspective changed towards the end of the twentieth century. Urbanization began to be recognized not as a problem but as a positive strength that was capable of driving economic growth. This transformed perspective is clearly reflected in the World Development Report of 2009. The report titled 'Shaping New Economic Geography' discusses that unevenness of development is a natural process. Given the attention of innovation, knowledge in the urban areas, these areas are bound to develop and attract further investment thereby becoming growth centres. It sees migration as a positive force which evens out the impacts of growth over a period of time. This changed perspective on urbanization is currently influencing many developing countries across the world to pursue aggressive strategies of urbanization, seeking to make their cities more competitive and able to attract investment that has now become passing across national borders.

It is interesting to note that the affiliation of urbanization which was in the West in the nineteenth and twentieth century has now lifted towards the East and the Global South. The initial problems of poverty, underdevelopment, still persist but some of these countries have charted impressive growths in the last few decades. Developments in the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) in certain have attracted global attention. Almost all of these countries have focused consideration on urbanization as a key strategy of development. All these countries are part of the developing countries and though there are some clear differences in their regimes, governance systems, starting points on urbanization; there are numerous lessons that they offer for us. This is the background of the sections of urbanization in Brazil and South Africa that surveyed.

3. CASE STUDIES

3.1 Urban Development Policy Approach in USA

USA does not have a definite urban policy, however, it has strategically addressed the urban development problems. The main insertions are poverty reduction, social justice, ensuring employment, infrastructure networks and housing. The USA urban policy can be broadly categorized into five phases (Harvey, 2008):

i) Carter Urban Development Policy (1977-1981): The decline of urban life in the United States is one of the most difficult and deeply rooted problems of this age. The Federal Government has a vibrant responsibility to lead the effort to reverse that deterioration, these efforts are: (i) the leadership will deal with difficult and deeply rooted problems; (ii) federal efforts alone will never be enough, everyone has a protagonist; and (iii) if one has to preserve the special values of urban, suburban, and rural life, one must recognize that these values are mutually dependent. To a greater extent, than ever before, the future of cities and the destiny of the Nation are joined. This link is now accepted by almost every American. Yet, throughout most of its history, America has been indecisive about its cities.

ii) Reagan Urban Development Policy (1981-1989): Some of the Potential of Regan Urban Development Policy are: (i) considered by many to be a retreat from proactive inner city revitalization (ii) built on the premise of efficient national economic growth and allowing private enterprise to facilities revitalization in distressed areas with minimal public sector participation (iii) mix and quality of public services should be made by knowledgeable administrations at the state and local level (iv) economic investment was key, not social investment, and (v) retreated from a city unambiguous policy basis.

iii) George H. W. Bush Urban Development Policy (1989-1993): The concentration was on housing policy, affordability and tax relief rather than holistic urban development policy.

iv) Clinton National Urban Policy Report 1995: Some of the important structures of Clinton Urban Development Policy are: (i) maintaining fiscal integrity (ii) middle class tax relief (iii) expanding opportunities to all (iv) expanding access to metropolitan opportunities (through leveraging private investment and jobs, not infrastructure) (v) ensuring access to financial capital (vi) expanding homeownership opportunity (vii) freedom from fear; and (viii) empowerment zones and enterprise communities.

v) Current Urban Development Policy: Some of the important urban policy approach of current government are:

    A) Strengthening Federal Commitment to cities:
        a) Create a Whitehouse office on urban policy.
        b) Fully fund the community development block grant.

    B) Stimulate Economic Prosperity in Metropolitan Regions:
        a) Support job creation and access to jobs;
        b) Enhance workforce training;
        c) Increase access to capital for underserved businesses;
        d) Create nation network of public-private business incubators;
        e) Convert manufacturing to clean technology;
        f) Strengthen core infrastructure;
        g) Invest in skilled clean tech workforce;
        h) Housing;
        i) Tax reform, access to affordable credit; and
        j) Increase supply of affordable housing through trust funds.

3.2 Urban Development Policy Approach in Brazil

Brazil is South America's largest country, occupying almost half the continent; and with a population of 187 million, it is the fifth most populous country (and the fourth most populous democracy) in the world. Brazil has urbanized rapidly over the past few decades. According to a 2000 census, over 80 percent of the population lives in urban areas. However, much of this urbanization has been unequal; population has grown around state capitals and neighboring municipalities of greater metropolitan areas, while other regions have experienced adverse growth rates. The result has been pockets of poverty with increased social exclusion and environmental threats. Brazil instigated as a federated republic in 1889. Throughout the twentieth century, the country practiced periods of development where the government required to manipulate urban space to shape society. Post-Brasilia, from 1964 to 1985, the country was under the rule of military leaders, and until 1990 there were no general elections for President. However, beginning in the late 1970s, Brazil slowly returned to democratic rule, and in 1982, direct elections were apprehended for state governorships. This process of re-democratization has actively shaped the countryside of urban development policies in Brazil.

The process of re-democratization extended the political arena to include diverse sections of society who demanded urban reform through dynamic struggles. This struggle for urban reform began in the 1960s, when progressive sectors of Brazilian society demanded structural reforms to the legal regulation and use of public land. The key issue was agrarian reform in the countryside. However the military coup of 1964 gave increase to an authoritarian political system (lasting until 1984) which did not allow these reforms to be carried out. Urban reform issues reappeared in the 1970s and 1980s during a period of slow and steady political openness in which social movements slowly gained greater visibility and political weight, and were able to construct an independent discourse and social practice. The movement's demands were presented as privileges in an effort to inverse social inequalities on the basis of a new social ethic. At the time, Brazil's urban landscape had experienced significant changes. Marked by a high rate of rural-urban migration between 1940 and 1991 during which time the urban population increased from 31.2% to 75% of the country's entire population. Brazilian cities cultivated without basic infrastructure. Major moments resulted, especially the spatial exclusion of neighborhoods which were largely neglected, lacked the basic circumstances for adequacy and developed with the complicity of the public authorities.

In 1988, the struggle for urban improvement was taken up again. In the beginning, the movement's fight was focused on local issues, such as demands for housing. However, by the end of the military regime, it had begun to incorporate thoughts of the right to a more social life: the idea of the town, the town of all people, a home beyond one's house, a home accessed by paved roads, public services, schools, and transportation. In 1986, the National Urban Reform Movement defined the theory of urban improvement as a new social ethic which rejects the use of the city as a cause of profit for a few while conversely subjecting many to poverty. Thus, this new social ethic politicizes the debate about the city and generates a discourse and political platform for urban social arrangements, in which access to the city is the right of all its residents and not restricted to a few, or rather, the wealthiest. The struggle carried together several organizations, movements,

professional organizations .The church too came out powerfully in defense of the social role of property which was a major contribution in a deeply religious society like Brazil.

The conclusion of these struggles and fights was the establishment of an internal regulation in the Constituent Assembly which indorsed the use of popular initiatives to present amendments to the Brazilian Constitution of 1988. More than 12 million signatures were gathered for popular alterations which contained the earlier discussed reforms. Conservative forces discussed that the principles of social justice were being used as an excuse to prevent the country's development (development was a term long used to disguise the issue of the inequality of urban space) and that prevailing in urban policy would give the state too large of a role. While all the proposals for improvement were not incorporated in the constitution, some important ones were. With the popular modification, Brazilian public rights began to guarantee not only private property and individual interest, but also the security of collective interest above the several uses of individual property. Other accomplishments at that time were the affirmation and establishment of effective municipal autonomy and the expansion of popular participation in city management, both through direct institutional contrivances like plebiscites, referendums, popular initiatives and public consultation, as well as other forms of direct contribution such as councils, conferences, forums and public hearings.

This ensured the community's input in the development of Master Plans, the main urban planning instrument for municipalities. Further they paved the way for many other improvements such as the recognition of the right to housing as a fundamental right in the Brazilian Constitution in 2000 and the approval of the City Statute in 2001.

The City Statute (Federal Law No. 10.257/01) is the Brazilian development law that regulates the section on urban policy in the 1988 Brazilian Constitution. It sets the complete guidelines to promote urban policy that must be observed by the Union (federal government), the states (state governments) and municipalities. The City Statute precisely addresses:

- Instruments designed to ensure the accomplishment of the social function of property, progressive taxation over time on urban property and expropriation for urban improvement purposes;
- Criteria for municipalities to develop, manage and implement Development Plans;
- Regulatory tools for the use of and access to urban lands occupied by low-income people; democratic city management tools; public hearings; councils; and city
- Meetings and discussions on national, state and municipal plans.

These improvements have set the stage for several policy innovations in cities of Brazil which incorporate the features of inclusivity and sustainability. In the case of Curitiba, the principle of planning for the poor first was incorporated to create a model of a clean and green city. In the case of Porto Allegre, where participatory budgeting enabled the city to set its priorities for the poor first. In the case of Rio where a massive up gradation programme of slums is undertaken are all examples of these innovations that have been made possible due to a high degree of decentralization, popular participation and political guarantee to goals of inclusivity and sustainability. Brazil's urbanization story is thus one of possibilities of how problems such as uncleanliness, poverty and inequity can be dealt with through determined action by both people as well as policy makers. It is not without difficulties. In these way, high proportions of outside and public debt are concomitants o the urbanization in the country. However, Brazil still has the potential to become one of the largest and fastest growing economies of the world.

3.3 Urban Development Policy Perspectives in South Africa

South Africa is another nation that is urbanizing very promptly. Over 55% of its population is urban and approximations indicate that the current rate of urbanization is about 4.9%.The largest proportion of this urban population (about 67%) is situated in the four metropolitan areas of Pretoria / Johannesburg, Durban, Cape Town and Port Elizabeth. The country also has a number of intermediate sized towns in the South and the East but the four metropolitan areas are the real instruments of its economy, generating over 80% of the GDP of South Africa. The system of apartheid which characterized the country is articulated in almost every aspect of South African cities, in particular the larger ones. The system of apartheid with its accompanying town planning, transport policies and arrangements of governance perpetuated by economic services resulted in cities with extremely high proportion of inequity and exclusion Thus, there is low- density, well serviced white neighborhoods and there are overcrowded, poorly serviced black neighborhoods which are spatially ghettoized. Black townships and housing is generally the worst in these cities and is either in the form of matchbox housing or shacks. Towns like Durban and Elizabeth have about half their population in such shack housing which is not formal. Most of the economic opportunities are located in the well services portions of towns. The neighborhoods were governed by distinct authorities. Spatial segregation thus was a marker of differential prospects.

In 1990, when the system of apartheid completed and the country embarked on a truly democratic path, the fundamental challenge that it faced in terms of urban development was to continue its high progress trajectory while tackling the challenge of systemic exclusion. Several legislations were passed to materialize this visualization. The South African constitution thus preserves an access to adequate housing as a Constitutional right. The Local government Transition Act,1996 attempted to connect the distinct local governance systems while the Development Facilitation Act,1995 provides for fast tracking of land development for urban development while also providing for integrated planning of cities.

Local governments in South Africa are seen to be primarily responsible for service delivery as well as local economic growth while the tasks of redistribution, etc. are entrusted to the provincial governments. This has intended that most city governments are engaged in fascinating new investment opportunities and in improving service delivery. The country has very effectively used the organization of events such as World Cup football (which took place in 2010) to enhance its infrastructure and economic competitiveness.

The downside of the South African urbanization section remains that apartheid no longer continues in its original form but is expressed substantially sufficient in the access to housing, services, and economic and other opportunities. However, the system of 'Soweto' where towns were considered the preserves of the annoying and blacks whose access to city was otherwise restricted were brought in mainly to serve as labor has been broken. Migration is now unrestricted and cost free. This has brought some of the contradictions to the forefront as witnessed by the increasing occupation of public lands by humble black population and thus an increase in informal housing. These are the new challenges being generated in South African cities.

4. ILLUSTRATE LESSONS FOR INDIA ON URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

India is a large country considered diversify and it's democratic structure which has developed strong roots. The country also is characterized by inequalities and in specific, institutionalized systems of inequity like those based on caste, religion and ethnicity. Policy making in India has few counterparts with the systems in the countries described earlier and yet there are several lessons that we can learn from these countries.

The first is the perspective and approach towards urbanization. The experience of all these countries indicates that urbanization as a conscious strategy of development yields positive results. At a stage where agricultural employment becomes motionless, it helps to relieve the stress of employment on the farming sector and brings in new modes of enhancing productivity. It thus also channelizes the vitalities and the creativity of the youth, thereby cashing on the demographic bonus available to these countries. India has urbanized at a sensible speed, our perspective towards urbanization is unclear. The spatial dimension to policies is by and large ignored; our cities not develop in planned manner. The experience of other countries in particular, offers immense lessons for a combined approach to economic and spatially focused development.

The second major area for learning is in terms of the difference that active local governments make to the growth potential and quality in cities' life. In South Africa, the stakes of local governments in economic growth have enabled these governments to develop ways in which to attract investments and growth opportunities. In Brazil, decentralization has allowed the inclusivity and sustainability to become political programs, allowing local governments to pursue pro- poor and inclusive policies through revolutions. In India, the decentralization program began to be developed through the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Act but the task remains unaccomplished. Most of the ULBs (Urban Local Bodies) in the country have very little autonomy to either chart their economic futures or innovate for inclusivity. The strength of effective decentralization is thus, a tremendous lesson offered by these countries.

One more area for learning is the controlling of migration. China discouraged migration directly through the Hukou; it has been forced to engage in a gradual improvement of the system to inspire urban development. South Africa created divided cities by compelling labor to move to cities in selected areas. It is still handling with the impacts of the systematized apartheid on its cities. Brazil encountered migration and inequity through some innovative process which then transformed the principles and standards of urban governance totally. In India, towns are theoretically open to migrants but we have not rectified the concerns of identity, inclusion in city fabric and services in a systematic way, instead imposing them to find their own solutions by way of slums and informal livelihoods. The experiences of the three countries should illustrate to us that dealing with urban poverty and migration is a crucial encounter, especially if it is to be channeled to improving the prospects of a urban area or city or town.

5. CONCLUSION

As the world becomes urban and the affiliation of urbanization shifts to the Global South, challenges of urbanization that did not exist before and for which little knowledge is available are developing. So, there is a lot of value in such countries learning from each other than following the recommendations of the West which never experienced such challenges. Brazil and South Africa characterize countries which have followed largely the same developmental trajectory as India and thus their urbanization experience offers several important lessons for us. However, the urban policy perspectives of the USA have also been discussed and argued in this study. The experiences in the way of case studies of these three countries offer a lot of lessons, particularly in the areas of perspective on urbanization, decentralization and management of migration.

The current phase of urbanization is one which the world has never experienced earlier. Urbanization amidst poverty, the experience of large scale cities urbanization while the climatic changes create new hazards and vulnerable for living environments are discouraging aspects of this urban experience, for which little knowledge exists. Learning from each other is perhaps the best way of learning at this stage. Lessons from Brazil and South Africa with broadly similar change trajectories are thus very useful for India to reflect on policies and work towards redesigning Urban Development Approach.

REFERENCES

[1] Piper Laurence and Deacon, R (2008): Partisan Ward Committees, Elite Accountability and Community Participation in Transformation, Vol66-67, pg 61-82.

[2] Gianpaolo Baiocchi, "Decentralisation of Government in Brazil—Perils and Prospects" (paper presented at the International Conference on Democratic Decentralisation, Thiruvananthapuram, 23-27 May 2000).

[3] Mukhopadhyaya Partha (2010): Beginning a Conversation on Chinese Urbanization in Growing Cities in a shrinking world: The Challenges of Urbanism in India and China (Ed) Gurung et al, India China Institute, Mac. Millan, New York, pg 118-142.

[4] Beall,J;Crankshaw,O and Parnell,S (2002),Uniting a Divided City, Earthscan, London.

[5] Rebecca Abers, "From Ideas to Practice: The Partido dos Trabalhadores and Participatory Governance in Brazil," Latin American Perspectives 23, no. 4 (1996): 39.

[6] Harvey, Vanessa (2008) National Urban Policy in the United States, SGS Economic and Planning.

[7] Kevin R. Cox (with David Hemson and Alison Todes), "Urbanisation in South Africa and the Changing Character of Migrant Labor," Department of Geography, the Ohio State University, August 9, 2005

[8] Heller Patrick: Moving the State: Democratic Decentralisation in Kerala, Porto Alegre and South Africa in Politics & Society, Vol. 29 No. 1, March 2001 131-163© 2001 Sage Publications.

[9] Goldman Sachs (2006): Dreaming with BRICS: The pathway to 2050, Global Economics paper no 99.