

DELHI'S CAPITAL CENTURY (1911-2011):

UNDERSTANDING THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE CITY

(4th March 2011 - Colloquium Program for Agrarian Studies, Yale University)

Nayanjot Lahiri

In the centenary year of Delhi's designation as India's capital, this paper intends to tell the history of some aspects of the city across that 'capital century'. I hope that readers will focus on similarities then and now - the amazement of Delhi's residents at their city being designated the capital of India in 1911 and their surprise on the eve of 2011 at being told that their city's role as India's political capital stems from an announcement made by the king of England a mere hundred years ago; the planning and building of a 'new Delhi' in the aftermath of the 1911 announcement, and the character of planning for Delhi after independence; the definitive role of India's rulers in the evolution of modern Delhi; and the ways in which such political masters neglected to either enhance the heritage character of the city or address a range of problems within it. Through this paper, I have also tried to show that the peripheries of the city - if understood as being marginal to the grand schemes of the planners and the political class - are spatially located within the heart of Delhi, in the form of the old city and its urban villages. These adjuncts, unplanned though they are, continue to mark the character of Delhi since they represent the oldest continuously inhabited areas of the city. A large number of medieval monuments are also located there which define perceptions of the city's historic identity. In human terms as well, Delhi's peripheral spaces function as a safety valve for the residential and the small-scale industrial needs of the capital.

DELHI'S CAPITAL CENTURY (1911-2011):

UNDERSTANDING THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE CITY

Nayanjot Lahiri

"We are pleased to announce to Our People that on the advice of Our Ministers tendered after consultation with Our Governor-General in Council, We have decided upon the transfer of the seat of the Government of India from Calcutta to the ancient Capital Delhi...."¹

WITH THESE WORDS, King George V delivered a sensational surprise to his subjects in Delhi on 12 December 1911. The significance of the announcement was barely concealed by the pompous royalese in which it was phrased: from that moment, as the new political capital of India, Delhi would gradually displace Calcutta, which had been the nerve centre of the British empire since the eighteenth century.

Over the course of this year, there will be many commemorations of the centenary of Delhi's designation as India's capital - and the monumental

process it put into motion. But the significance of the initial decision is today largely taken for granted: many Dilliwallas are surprised to learn that the city has not always been the centre of political power in India.

When I asked friends and acquaintances last year when they thought Delhi had become India's capital, one common reaction was that it had been so "from ancient times." For many - as it had been for George V - the notion of Delhi as the perennial political capital of this region of the subcontinent is an abiding one: several people cited the myth in the *Mahabharata*, India's oldest epic, about the capital of the Pandavas, Indraprastha, having been located at Purana Qila.² Others pointed to the extraordinary monuments which have survived in Delhi - testimony to a long litany of medieval kings and emperors who made Delhi the capital of their empires - from the 11th century Lal Kot in Mehrauli to the still splendid 17th century Lal Qila and Jama Masjid of the time of Emperor Shah Jahan.³ Another common response was that Delhi had become the capital of India on 15 August 1947, at the moment of India's independence; many believe that the city assumed its political role from that date.

As we have seen from the heated debate over the Babri Masjid, perceptions of the past are often at variance with historical fact - and no less strongly held as a result. The danger in such thinking arises when a notion or an idea about the past becomes so prominent that the real history fades from consciousness. My admittedly casual survey of knowledge about Delhi's history suggests a similar

dynamic is at work today: the idea of the city as the capital - a place that embodies the nation or represents nationhood - rather than as a cultural centre or a living urban habitation with specific and distinguishing characteristics, is very strongly and perhaps detrimentally embedded in people's minds. Narayani Gupta, a historian of Delhi, refers to this when she argues that "the national is crushing the city" of Delhi. "Tilak Nagars and Nehru Roads proliferate," she laments, while hardly anyone knows about Delhi's historic culture as enshrined in the poetry of Mir and the witticisms of Mirza Ghalib.⁴

When I met her to talk about Delhi where she has lived much of her life, she posed her own question to me: could I point to any roads named after Taqi Mir or Ghalib? There are none, of course - but there are two Vivekanand Margs.⁵

Historians like Gupta - who has written about the saga of Delhi's reconstruction as India's capital after 1911 - must experience a certain sense of *deja vu* when contemplating the fact that many today are surprised that their city's role as India's capital emerged not from antiquity or from leaders of independent India, but from the King of England. That decision, after all, was an astonishing surprise to the Dilliwallas at the time.⁶

In the months prior to King George V's astonishing announcement in December 1911, there were few clues that history was about to be made. A grand gathering of India's British rulers, Indian princes, nobles, troops, and related

panoplies of the powerful had been organized in Delhi to celebrate the coronation of King George V, and to participate in an imperial assemblage proclaiming him the King-Emperor of India. Memorably described in Ahmed Ali's classic novel *Twilight in Delhi*, preparations for this durbar had been personally choreographed by the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge.⁷ Some 233 camps were set up, covering 40 square kilometres of canvas.⁸ From the spring of 1911 onwards, around 20,000 people had been at work on these camps. Alongside, 64 kilometres of new roads were constructed; 80 kilometres of water mains and 48 kilometres of water pipes for the distribution of water in the camps were laid; farms with herds of cows and dairies as also markets for meat and vegetables were set up. Clearly, the guests who gathered in Delhi were adequately housed, fed and watered.

Delhi was used to such gatherings. In 1877 a similar durbar had been witness to a proclamation that Queen Victoria was Empress of India. Again, in 1903 a durbar in Delhi celebrated the coronation of Edward VII as Emperor of India. Unique, though, was the presence in the third British Imperial Assemblage of 1911, of the subject of the proclamation: George V showed up in person with his Queen Mary dutifully in tow. Their appearance added a new and altogether different aura to this Coronation durbar.⁹

The royal couple arrived in Delhi on 7th December on an imperial train from Bombay, making their state entry in a procession that lasted for some five hours. By then, the citizens of Delhi, some 233,000 in number, had been

overwhelmed by the arrival of three-quarters of a million more.¹⁰ Moreover, just as nowadays 'undesirable elements' - the terminology adopted by the government bureaucracy for the poor and the unkempt - are removed from sight before sensitive events like the Commonwealth Games, some 300 'dangerous characters' were arrested and remained in prison until the king left Delhi.¹¹ Large contingents of police were posted at 'vulnerable' spots along the processional path. At Chandni Chowk, where their highnesses and their retinue passed almost under the windows of houses of a curious and perhaps bemused citizenry, a police officer was posted at every window and nobody was allowed entry into or egress from their houses after 6 a.m.¹²

The durbar itself was held five days later in a purpose-built amphitheatre in northwest Delhi, with some 100,000 spectators. Some 12,000 persons were seated beneath the canopy while 70,000 less privileged persons watched this human circus from a huge semi-circular mound. Suresh Kalmadi could have been drawing inspiration from this durbar, for the last few nails were being driven into the red carpet only a couple of minutes before the Viceroy's escort rode up.¹³ Not that anyone noticed in the flourish of trumpets and drums that followed. The durbar proceedings involved much kneeling as well as the customary bowing and scraping before the king, including the kissing of 'His Majesty's' hand - by Hardinge and members of his Council, by the Indian chiefs and princes, and by many others.

At the last stage of the durbar, the king sprang a surprise on his audience. As Hardinge finished announcing the boons conferred in commemoration of the accession of George V, he handed over a document to the king. Standing before his principal durbaris, the king read aloud a carefully prepared statement announcing the transfer of the capital from Calcutta to Delhi, the reunion of Eastern and Western Bengal and other administrative changes.

The announcement was greeted by "a deep silence of profound surprise" among the unsuspecting listeners, Hardinge writes, followed by wild cheering a few seconds later¹⁴. Such surprise was natural. Notwithstanding its hoary past, at the time that this unsought-for elevation was thrust upon Delhi, it was a provincial city of modest dimensions. Unlike the discontented Bengalis - who began resisting the partition of Bengal from 1903 (when it was announced by the Viceroy, Lord Curzon) and had been fighting ever since for its revocation - Dilliwallas had neither asked nor agitated for any such status. Above all, George V's announcement astonished everyone because it had remained a closely guarded secret.

The decision that the transfer announcement would be an important gift for the King to carry with him to India had been mooted in June that year. It was known only to a dozen people in India and about the same number in England. Even the gazettes and news-sheets carrying the proclamation, and distributed simultaneously with the king's announcement, had been printed in the utmost secrecy. Much like India's annual budget exercise nowadays, a press camp

had been organized in Delhi where living accommodation, along with printing machines, was provided for secretaries, printers, and their servants. Officials were placed in this camp three days before the durbar, with a cordon of troops and police ensuring that nothing could go in or out until the actual moment of the durbar. So Hardinge was justified in describing the announcement of the transfer of the capital to Delhi as one of the best-kept secrets in history.¹⁵

* *

CONVERTING DELHI INTO INDIA'S new imperial capital was far more challenging, and retrospectively, far less successful. That has a great deal to do with the fact that the priority of the colonial political class was to provide an urban form to their imperial vision rather than create a capital around the historic identity of Delhi and its requirements. Similarly, as will be soon be evident to the reader, some epochal moments in the transformation of post-independence Delhi, would also be shaped by the motives of India's political class - in the guise of national needs and, as with the Commonwealth Games, international aspirations - rather than the character and the problems of the city.

To begin with, building the new city took some twenty years, and this was in spite of the fact that the decision to build a 'new Delhi' was taken simultaneously with the decision to transfer the capital. The royal couple had laid the foundation stones of that new capital with great ceremony within the

precincts of the durbar camp. Hardinge had also moved quickly. By the end of March 1912 he had departed from Calcutta with all the paraphernalia of the viceregal court. Soon, temporary quarters for the government offices were being built in Delhi and Hardinge was choosing the site where the city would be located.

Several locations were considered, and rejected. The durbar area was declared uninteresting and unhealthy as also liable to flooding. Sabzi Mandi was better, but acquisition of the factory areas would annoy mill owners. Civil Lines, similarly, would antagonize the European population, which would have to be evicted. For reasons of health, for its undulating land, for the space it provided, and for its relationship with many historic sites, the Raisina village area and hill were what appealed to the Viceroy: "From the top of the hill there was a magnificent view embracing old Delhi and all of the principal monuments situated outside the town, with the River at a little distance. I said at once....'This is the site for Government House.'"¹⁶ With the construction of Government House, though, large segments of the magnificent Raisina hill would have to be blasted away.

By 1912 the architects who designed New Delhi too had been commissioned. Edwin Landseer Lutyens (1869-1944) with his old friend Herbert Baker (1862-1946) as his collaborator, had been given the job. The choice of Lutyens in 1912 for designing India's new capital could not have been based on his track record. Public buildings and city architecture, far from being his forte, were on

the contrary the sorts of edifice with which he had nearly no connection. His chief claim to fame came from designing unusual and sometimes eccentric English country homes for businessmen, politicians and 'lords'. These fancy farmhouses of the British aristocracy had names like 'Folly Farm' (in Sulhampstead) and 'The Pleasaunce' (in Norfolk).¹⁷ What Lutyens lacked in terms of experience, he made up for with his connections. For one, it is unlikely to have been a disadvantage for him to have been married to Emily Lytton, the only daughter of the viceroy, Lord Lytton, who had presided over Queen Victoria's 1877 durbar in Delhi. For another, Lutyens' great friend and collaborator was the well-connected and gifted garden designer Gertrude Jekyll.

We will never know whether it was Lutyens' networking or the quality of his cottage-making which landed him the monumental Delhi job, one where, unlike his familiar country homes, would now involve him in building on a scale that was Mughal. What we do know is that Hardinge wanted him to finish everything quickly which Lutyens maintained was not possible if he was to design the buildings and supervise their construction single-handed. So he pushed for Herbert Baker to be made his collaborator.¹⁸ Baker had made his name and fame in South Africa. Before joining Lutyens in designing Delhi, he had worked on the Union Buildings in Pretoria when that city was designated in 1910 as the administrative capital of South Africa. Lutyens and Baker had been friends since they first met in the 1880s as apprentices to Ernest George,

a London architect. In the process of designing the magnificent new capital, however, their friendship was overtaken by endless tensions and squabbles. But that was later. When they began work in 1912, their agreement ensured that Lutyens would be the architect of the overall design of New Delhi and of Government House (later Viceregal house and now Rashtrapati Bhawan) while Baker would take charge of the Secretariats (North and South Blocks) and Council (now Parliament) House.

In this imperial project, a high wall separated the British designers of New Delhi from Indian master-builders and craftsmen. These craftsmen were inheritors of an unbroken subcontinental building tradition of a couple of thousand years, but the Delhi designers did not think it was necessary to integrate their skills into the capital project.¹⁹ This appalled many influential Britishers and Indians.²⁰ Several of them actually petitioned the Secretary of State for India in 1913 to the effect that 'native' architecture would suffer if it was to take its inspiration from abroad:²¹

"...the question to be discussed is, not in what style, but by what method the new city should be built; whether that of the modern architect in an office with his assistants, detached from materials, craftsmen, and site, carrying his buildings to completion upon paper, with pencil-trained mind and hands....or, the method that has given us Westminster Abbey, Saint Sofia, Saint Peter's (Rome), and in India the Taj, the Palaces of Akbar and Shah Jahan, and the great public works of former times, that

of the master-builder with his craftsmen, working in accustomed materials upon the site from simple instructions as to accommodation and arrangement such as would have been given to a master-mason or a master-carpenter by a medieval King who required a palace or a castle, or by a Bishop who desired to found a cathedral."

Indian elements and motifs came to be used by Lutyens and Baker, drawing inspiration from Buddhist religious complexes on the one hand, and Mughal buildings on the other. But, the overwhelming aesthetic within which these elements were deployed was that of imperial architecture, capturing the spirit of British imperialism. Irving's description of Viceregal House sums this up:²²

"Lutyen's august, supremely ordered Viceregal palace at New Delhi not only expressed 'the ideal and fact of British rule in India,' but achieved that fusion of traditions which both politics and climate dictated. Just as his early houses in Surrey joined paradoxical elements of the picturesque and the classical, so at Delhi the hues and shadows of Mughal facades were married to the sculptural massing and subtle proportions of European architecture."

And it was not done by the methods by which earlier such Indian buildings had been made. The Indians who built Delhi, in fact, were not the traditional master-builders but modern contractors.²³ Some of them had come to Delhi in the time of the 1911 durbar. Sujjan Singh and his elder son, Sobha Singh were

one such family from Sargodha: they had won the contract to level the land for the 1911 Delhi durbar. There was no looking back thereafter and Sobha Singh went on to construct some of the most prominent buildings in Lutyens' Delhi, including South Block, the All-India Memorial (India Gate), and the forecourt of the Viceregal House (Rashtrapati Bhawan). The bulk of the construction of Viceregal House was entrusted to Seth Haroun-al-Rashid from Sindh.

But coming back to the plan of New Delhi, the architect-town planner A.K. Jain emphasizes that it was conceived by Lutyens as a combination of two separate geometric systems.²⁴ One of these was a hexagonal pattern which linked governmental, commercial and recreational activities with the residential areas. The other grid was a monumental one along Central Vista, now Rajpath, which in turn, linked the capital complex marked by Viceregal House on Raisina hill with the War Memorial (now India Gate) serving as a kind of symbolic entry from the riverside. The conceptual plans are distinguished for the visual reference that they make to aspects of historic Delhi. One avenue, now Parliament Street, is linked to Jama Masjid, while the Central Vista unified, visually speaking, the Viceregal House with Purana Qila. As I hope to demonstrate later, such integration remained confined to mere visual references.

Lutyens, on his part, designed Viceregal House not within the framework of domestic architecture but in terms of imperial ideals. In fact, if building New Delhi was the most ambitious architectural labour undertaken by the British

Empire, the Viceregal House was truly the "temple of its imperial power." ²⁵ Larger than the Palace of Versailles, its 340 rooms, 227 columns and 2.4 kilometres of corridors stood in an estate of 330 acres. The big problem, however, was that the view of the magnificent Viceregal palace was blocked by Baker's Secretariat buildings. Lutyens had originally intended to build it on the brow of Raisina hill, dominating the plain to the distant Yamuna river. But the government preferred the Secretariats to stand on the same level and, apparently to please Baker, Lutyens agreed to place the Viceroy's house at the western end of the hill. The condition, though, was that the road leading to it between the twin government offices should be so gently sloped that Government House would be visible from the 'Great Place' (now Vijay Chowk) from where the road ascended. However, the gradient ensured as one commentator put it, that the secretariats appeared as a pair of round kiosks and between them, Government House was only a pale distant button of a dome and half an obelisk. It is not as if Baker always got his way. The Council House, for instance, had been designed by him in the first plan as an equilateral triangle whose three sides were linked to a dome that would filter light. Lutyens felt it jarred as an important part of the larger architectural scheme and argued for a circular colosseum design. And that is why Delhi has a circular Parliament house.

But these battles, fought by foul-tempered men with massive egos, were confined to the New Delhi that was being built. Other kinds of battles were

being fought elsewhere, as some Indians struggled to provide the city with institutions that behoved a political capital. Creating a university in Delhi became one such battleground. While around the time that the declaration which made Delhi India's imperial capital was made, the idea to form a university was mooted, the British were not keen to give it life. Even after a decade of that declaration, the British members of the Viceroy's Council threw cold water on the proposal. The Finance Member, Sir Malcolm Hailey, actually remarked that India had too many universities which are unable to finance themselves or get financed.²⁶ It was an Indian member of the Council, Muhammad Shafi, who pointed out that whereas England's eighteen universities serviced fifty million people, for the education needs of the thirty million population of Punjab, Northwest Frontier and Delhi there was only the Lahore-based Punjab University. As he put it, it would be a standing reproach against a Central Government that in the one province which was still under their direct charge and where they had their own winter home, they had not yet established the university which was an integral part of the original scheme of transfer of India's capital to Delhi. Eventually, the Viceroy went along with Shafi and other Indian members. This resulted, finally, in the creation of the University of Delhi in 1922. The penny pinchers, though, succeeded in ensuring that it began its existence with a pauper's purse of Rs. 40,000. This was surprisingly stingy since, around the same time, the government was

spending large sums of money on building ostentatious structures for itself in Delhi.

The structures that Lutyens and Baker were building barely mattered to those who lived in that part of Delhi through which George V had passed on his way to the durbar camp. And this raises the other major problem with the way our British rulers conceived of their new capital. Those who had designed it could not have done a better job of treating the rest of Delhi as if it was an irrelevance. For one, the villagers of Raisina were banished across Barapullah Nullah to Bhogal, now a thriving service area. Unlike the broad avenues and big bungalows being built in New Delhi, the resettlement colony of Bhogal was laid out along traditional caste lines. For another, what came to be known as Old Delhi was ignored. The 130-odd million rupees that were spent on making the capital city, apart from the visual gesture that linked the Council House and Jama Masjid, did not involve a scheme for integrating Old Delhi with New Delhi, and despite a mass of suggestions for improving conditions in the older city, no definite policy emerged.²⁷

Shahjahanabad where Bahadur Shah II had accepted the nominal leadership of the 1857 revolt, and whose devaluation had begun in right earnest in the aftermath of its suppression - when one third of Delhi's urban landscape was destroyed - was now relegated to being treated like a large dirty slum of overcrowded buildings. Stephen Legg's representation of the difference between New and Old Delhi strikingly sums this up. The difference, he says in his work

on imperial Delhi, was "an iconic representation of the difference between health and disease, order and disorder, boulevards and galis, white and brown".²⁸ The old city, of course, continued to provide for New Delhi in various ways which is evident, for instance, from the fact that more than half of the clerks who worked for the government, lived there.²⁹ Thus, it relieved the pressure from the new capital which obviously had failed to house all its workers. One of the only facilities which the citizens of Old Delhi seem to have enjoyed cheaper than their counterparts in the new city was electricity.³⁰ This was due to the high urban density there, which meant that the number of connections served by a couple of kilometres of distributing main lines in Old Delhi was very high and, in turn, this ensured cost saving in distribution. On the other hand, in New Delhi, the circumstances were precisely the reverse. Also, for aesthetic reasons, an underground system of distribution mains was adopted there which was far more expensive, and this expense was passed on to the consumers! Clearly, no thought had been given to treating Delhi's citizens in a uniform manner.

Many within official circles thought of their own government's priorities as absurd, where building the new capital was being pursued at the cost of everything else in Delhi. One of these was John Marshall, Director General of the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) and a member of the larger team overseeing the project. He was convinced that the "monstrously pretentious structures" being planned for imperial Delhi were ones that no one in India

wanted or cared for, while, as he pointed out, even though the "ancient mosques and palaces of Delhi may seem a slight thing compared with the vast structures that are being reared at their side", they had a message and a meaning for Indians which "our own creations, costly and pretentious as they are, will never have and the government would be wise to pay more not less regard to the sentiment attaching to them."³¹

Marshall's rhetorical shrewdness in holding a mirror to his own government which had turned a Nelson's eye to the living core of historic Delhi is no doubt related to the frequent financial cutbacks that the ASI faced, which in turn adversely impacted the conservation of Delhi's monuments and historic gardens. But the call to pay heed to Indian sentiment was also founded on the large - scale disorders in India in the wake of the all-India movement launched by the Indian National Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. In fact, as the countdown to the inauguration of the new capital's buildings began, what was described as 'civil disobedience' against the British government spiralled as did the surveillance of and crackdowns on Congress workers and local leaders. As the *Report on the Administration of the Delhi Province for 1930-31* noted, this was a most arduous time for the administration, with almost daily arrests being made throughout the year.³²

The irony of the timing of the inauguration of New Delhi's big buildings, when the continuance of the British Raj was being fiercely resisted by nationalists, could not have been lost on the government. Take the case of the Council

House, which was opened in 1927. Within a couple of years, a most sensational protest took place inside it. On 8th April 1929, two militant nationalists, Bhagat Singh and B.K. Dutt, sneaked in unnoticed and hurled bombs from the public gallery of the Legislative Assembly (where the Lok Sabha now sits). This dramatically highlighted Indian resistance to two bills - the Public Safety bill which would empower the government to detain anyone without trial, and the Trade Disputes bill meant to deter labour unions from organizing strikes - which were scheduled for discussion on that day. While the bombs themselves were of low intensity and did not seriously injure people, the incongruity of the spectacle must have struck many in the overflowing visitors' gallery that day. Here, in the newly created heart of England's Indian empire, one that was built on a scale which sought to showcase political permanence, the treasury benches of the great imperial Legislative Assembly had been attacked and showered with leaflets bearing the immortal line of the French anarchist Vaillant, 'it takes a loud voice to make the deaf hear'!³³

SOME 18 YEARS LATER the same Legislative Assembly, saw the end of British rule. 'Independence Day' dawned on 15th August 1947 but the celebrations started on 14th August. These began in the Assembly hall, when the Constituent Assembly of India, made up of Indians who were drafting a constitution for the new nation, held a special session that started at 11 p.m. The star speaker that night was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru whose words imparted a strong sense of occasion. "At the stroke of the midnight hour when

the world sleeps," Nehru announced, "India will awake to life and freedom". As members of the Assembly listened to the chimes which announced the midnight hour, one of them blew a conch shell to announce the great event. Thousands crowded around the entrance to the Council building that night while shopping centres, public buildings, temples and homes all over Delhi were decorated with lights and with the national flag.³⁴

Independence, tragically, also saw an unprecedented bloodbath. As a united India was partitioned, Delhi became the site of a particularly vicious campaign in which Muslims were butchered in thousands.³⁵ Many others moved to camps for safety and, eventually to Pakistan, even as an estimated half a million Hindu and Sikh refugees from Pakistan, especially Punjab, poured into the city, literally transforming Delhi into a 'refugeeistan'. Initially, it was Muslims seeking a safe haven who occupied such places as the Jama Masjid area, Nizamuddin and Okhla, graveyards and abandoned Muslim monuments, the houses of cabinet ministers, the Pakistani High Commission, and the huge refugee camps that were set up in the Purana Qila and Humayun's tomb. Later, tens of thousands of Hindu and Sikh refugees took shelter in such camps, which continued to exist for several years after Partition.

How did resettlement of refugees proceed? On the one hand, several thousand refugees 'resettled' themselves in the sense that abandoned Muslim homes were forcibly occupied by Hindus and one estimate mentions that nearly 44,000 Muslims houses were occupied in old Delhi alone.³⁶ The government,

initially, protected the rights of the "evacuee" by treating these as illegal occupations and it was hoped that Muslims would come back. At the same time, no (non-Muslim) refugee would be evicted for illegal occupation, according to government policy, without being provided with alternative occupation. This meant, as Zamindar comments, that "Muslims who had taken shelter in camps could not return to their homes if they had been occupied, even after the riots and murders stopped."³⁷ On the other hand, the government sought to rehabilitate Muslims from 'mixed localities' into 'Muslim areas' or what were called 'Muslim zones'. Muslim localities (including Sadr Bazar, Pahari Imli and Pul Bangash) were cordoned off and 'abandoned' houses there were kept empty so that Muslims could return to them or other Muslims could be moved there from 'mixed areas'.

A large number, as many as thirty six, rehabilitation colonies for refugees were also created as emergency projects. Rajendra Nagar, Patel Nagar, Tilak Nagar and Lajpat Nagar are among the largest of those colonies, and as the historian Ramachandra Guha pointed out to me, "they are named after Congress Hindus who were not as pro-Muslim as Gandhi and Nehru were thought to be!" Meher Chand Khanna, then Minister for Rehabilitation, apparently named several government colonies on the basis of who the occupants were. Sewa Nagar was so named because it was where peons, daftaris etc. lived while the joint secretaries and directors were housed in Maan Nagar and Shan Nagar. Apparently, it was after Nehru made his annoyance clear that the names of

Shan Nagar and Maan Nagar were changed to Bharati Nagar and Rabindra Nagar.³⁸

The self reliance and pride that refugees brought with them also changed the character of Delhi. Ashok Mitra, an Indian Civil Service officer, who visited Delhi in the winter of 1947 commented at length on the new spirit that was evident even as the distraught city groaned under the strain of refugees:

"It came all in a flash when, sauntering that selfsame December under the arcades of Connaught Circus stripped through changing hands and still meagerly stocked, one was surprised by a little boy with a topknot on his head hawking newspapers a day old. Not wanting the paper I offered a two-anna piece. Pat came the disdainful rebuke from the four feet lump of pride. He did not want my coin unless I wanted his paper."³⁹

Occupationally, since most refugees in Delhi came from the urban areas of West Pakistan, they moved towards trade and commerce. In many parts of Delhi, shops and businesses were taken over by such refugees. About 90% of the shops in Chandni Chowk's Cloth Market, for example, originally belonged to the old residents of Delhi but over time Punjabi refugees took over the bulk of the business, with a mere 10% eventually remaining in the control of the old merchants.⁴⁰ The retail and general merchandise shops under the incredibly hardworking and pushy Punjabi refugees, in fact, became the primary reason why Delhi, post-independence, became a big retail market city.

While the dynamism and drive with which refugees rebuilt their lives and the alacrity with which the government rehabilitated them, make for a deeply moving story, it also hastened haphazard urban growth. By the 1950s, this alarmed many in the city - among them Prime Minister Nehru. Unlike recent Prime Ministers, Nehru took a keen interest in Delhi. His *Selected Works* contain all kinds of nuggets that highlight this - from deciding that government offices and official buildings should be placed on both sides of the Vista (now Rajpath)⁴¹ to the way in which the National Museum jutted out of line with the other buildings ("I hope no other building would be constructed which encroaches on the open space of the Vista").⁴² That a security blanket ought to be created around prized heritage buildings can also be traced back to the ideas of Nehru who in 1955 complained to the Union Minister of Education that India's old and historical places were getting spoilt by new buildings being put around them. In order to protect them from such intrusion, Nehru suggested that the government can "lay down that within a certain area no building should be put up without permission".⁴³ An example of Nehru's proactive approach on this protective barrier is the enclosure encircling the tomb of Abdur Rahim Kahn-i-Khana in Delhi. This was done after Nehru had visited it and had suggested that the adjacent grounds be converted into a small garden or park because, as he put it, he "did not want what was called by the uncouth name of 'Nizamuddin Extension East' " to extend into the area around the tomb.⁴⁴

There are extensive comments on the ways in which Delhi's 'fair' face was being blemished by unplanned growth as well. As Nehru put it, "Delhi will be spoilt completely if there is no overall planning of the city and we do not stop odd structures going up without paying attention to larger considerations of planning, health, sanitation, keeping of open places and the future growth of the city."⁴⁵ Profiteering and speculation around land in Delhi during the 1950s was rife, involving all kinds of people, including senior government officials. Nehru's concern about such speculation is captured in this letter which he wrote on 26th July 1956 to Swaran Singh, then Minister of Works, Housing and Supply:⁴⁶

"I am informed that all the land on Ring Road from Vinay Nagar to Medical Enclave on both sides of the road has been bought up by the Chairman of the Delhi Improvement Trust, Dr. Gopi Chand Bhargava, K.P.S. Menon, Datar Singh, Sanwal, Shankar Prasad and a number of other senior officers of the Central Government as well as some businessmen. The land was originally bought about a year or two ago, it is stated, for four annas to a rupee per square yard. It is now being sold in small lots at eight rupees per square yard. This does seem to me rather extravagant profit.

What is specially to be noted is that senior officers of government are involved in this business. Of all the persons, surely the Chairman of the Delhi Improvement Trust should not make money in this way."

So, much as in 1911 the Viceroy had taken the initiative to change the face of Delhi, it was the Prime Minister of India who in the 1950s became the moving force behind the idea that the city should be managed and planned through a government propelled Master Plan.

By 1956, Nehru had decided that there would be a central authority to control and regulate the expansion of Delhi and that this authority would draw up a detailed plan for this purpose.⁴⁷ In 1957, institutions which Dilliwallas today associate with the planning, upkeep and problems of their city were created. The Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD) and the Delhi Development Authority (DDA) were set up that year, with the DDA's objective being "to promote and secure the development of Delhi according to Plan." Work on the Master Plan for Delhi began even before this and was prepared by a team of Indian planners, most of whom were educated in the U.S., and assisted by consultants of the Ford Foundation.⁴⁸

The senior architect and town planner, Kuldip Singh, remembers interning in the summer of 1955 with the Town Planning Organization, the institutional umbrella under which the Indian planners who prepared the plan, worked. I sought out Kuldip Singh, now 76 years old, to speak about his perspective on the Master Plan, whose methodology and space standards later became benchmarks for planning cities all over India. Having spent more than half a century studying and designing buildings in India, his description of the post-independence political leaders who have sought to protect the character of

Delhi is straightforward and blunt. Three Prime Ministers of India took a keen interest in the planning of Delhi. Nehru would always be remembered, he says, for initiating the Master Plan of Delhi; Indira Gandhi for the establishment of key institutions that went on to play an important role in servicing and regulating the city - Housing Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO) in 1970 for dealing with problems of housing for the economically weaker sections as also the Delhi Urban Art Commission (DUAC) in 1974 for regulating the aesthetic and architectural aspects of the city ⁴⁹ - and for intervening to replan the Connaught Place extension of New Delhi in 1972; and Rajiv Gandhi for ensuring that the Delhi Metropolitan Rail Corporation's (DMRC) rails remained underground across Lutyens' Delhi. Kuldeep Singh remembers a meeting of architects and urban planners chaired by Rajiv Gandhi where the DUAC's Perspective Plan 2000 for Delhi was being discussed, in which he shot down in no uncertain terms a DDA- inspired plan for an elevated rail track across Lutyens' Delhi.

The Nehru-driven Master Plan aimed at balanced and integrated development to take care of the growth of Delhi till 1981 - thus, it was also a long range plan. It functionally zoned land uses, with the city being divided into a number of planning divisions, each of these being visualized as self-contained in the matter of employment, residential places, recreational areas, shopping and other requirements.⁵⁰ Commercial activity was decentralized, and consequently, various district shopping centres were proposed so as to be

within easy reach of each residential pocket. These were to be composite centres with shopping, business, commercial and professional offices, local government offices, cinemas, restaurants and other places of entertainment. Space came to be provided for the expanding population of the University of Delhi with sites for twenty new colleges being earmarked in the plan and another 2,900 acres for research institutions.⁵¹

For the first time, thanks to the Master Plan, large open areas came to be demarcated around monuments so that they could be better preserved. This was done by developing huge 'greens' around historical monuments including 250 acres around Hauz Khas, 325 hectares in Tughlakabad, 175 hectares in Jahanpanah, 75 hectares in Chirag Delhi and 100 hectares Siri Fort.⁵² Again, it was this Master Plan which ensured that the Ram Lila grounds which stretched from Delhi Gate to Ajmere Gate would not be built up and would remain a major lung for the Old City.⁵³ In fact, Delhi's urbanisable land itself, as visualized till 1981, was to be surrounded by a green belt of agricultural land to limit the city's physical growth and to prevent it merging with the cities nearby.

The government, along with the plan, also set in place what was arguably the largest land nationalization in Indian urban history, where the DDA was empowered to acquire a projected area of 35,000 acres for housing through the Land Acquisition Act. This land would be sold by the DDA after comprehensive planning, and the surplus ploughed into public infrastructure. As the plan

underlined, the "ownership of land by Government makes planning and the implementation of plans easier and is imperative if slum clearance, redevelopment and subsidised housing and provision of community facilities according to accepted standards have to be undertaken, as, indeed, they must be in Delhi, in a determined way."⁵⁴ The image of the state as the sovereign owner of Delhi's land, which it had acquired for public purpose, is based on this single initiative. Above all, as the Master Plan assumed statutory shape in 1962, it facilitated the preparation of Master Plans for all the major cities of India. Therefore, as Kuldip Singh put it, the present state of our cities, for better or worse, bears the unmistakable stamp of this single, far-reaching decision.

Singh is also quick to point out the deficiencies of that plan. A large part of Delhi continued to grow unplanned, notwithstanding all the safeguards, with lakhs of urban working poor living in illegal squatter colonies in the city. In the 'Emergency' years, from 1975 to 1977, it was such groups who were forcibly moved out into resettlement colonies. This was part of the programme of Sanjay Gandhi, the powerful son of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, and following his focus on removing slums, Delhi's poor were removed by the administration to the peripheries of the city. Each family was entitled to some 25 square yards, with about 60,000 such plots being demarcated. Ironically, the administrative machinery, then as now, failed to demolish the illegal colonies of the rich. Sainik farms which was set up as a defence services

cooperative in the 1960s, is an example of this. Rather than farms, the land was bought by Delhi's rich - business people and politicians - and converted into residences.

The planning process continues in much the same way, in the sense that subsequent Master Plans too have failed to provide adequate authorized housing for millions of Delhi's citizens, even as rich illegal colonies like Sainik farms are on the brink of being granted a legal status. A senior official of the Urban Development Ministry of the Government of India informed me that today in Delhi, three to four million people live lived in unauthorized colonies, about the same number in slums, some one million in recently created 'resettlement' colonies where no planning regulations seem to have been followed, and 2 million or so in rural and urban villages which, by law, are exempt from the planning process.

There are 106 urban villages scattered within the urban limits of Delhi - some of which have been continuously occupied for five hundred years or so - where, until very recently, municipal regulations did not apply, with no control even over basic light and ventilation requirements in buildings there. Such villages provide cheap accomodation and have also absorbed a lot of the small scale industry across the city. The 1961 Master Plan had provision for flatted factories in several places but these were actually never built and thus, small scale industries came to be located in urban villages. The architect Ranjit Sabikhi evocatively captures their character when he says that while they have

"no proper provision of water, electricity and sewage services", they have key role in Delhi in the sense that they "have provided a safety valve to the city, from the intense pressures of population growth for which no proper provisions have been made."⁵⁵ The most recent house listing survey done for Census 2011 also provides a clue to the number of buildings in Delhi's unplanned areas. These areas house at least 16 lakh buildings.⁵⁶

Shahjahanabad, as before, has remained ignored in the planning process and no worthwhile improvement has occurred here after the enforcement of the Master Plan. On the contrary, in the 1960s, congestion only increased with the average gross residential density per acre increasing from 443 in 1961 to 487 in 1971.⁵⁷ Similar was the condition of its industrial units. The average space occupied by an industrial worker in Shahjahanabad was only 140 sq ft as against the corresponding figure of 348 sq ft in Okhla and 285 sq ft in the Najafgarh Road Industrial Area. The problems of old Delhi are writ large across the 1961 Master Plan when it notes "almost an absence of community facilities and only sub-standard services there" or when it speaks about the necessity of decongesting the Old City.⁵⁸ However, the modes through which there would be a thinning of the population in the Old City through the redevelopment of other areas were not pursued as, for instance, the scheme to house the population from the proposed redevelopment of the Old City, in the Mata Sundari area which is today dotted with institutional complexes, not residential pockets.⁵⁹ Several schemes since the 1970s have been suggested for rebuilding

the walled city such as proposals for relocating part of its bloated commercial component, pedestrianizing Chandni Chowk and construction of a road linking Jama Masjid with Parliament Street (thus, translating, the visual gesture that in Lutyens' plan, linked the Council House and Jama Masjid).⁶⁰ None of these schemes have been operationalized.

Equally imperfect was the plan's approach to transport. What the First Master Plan had visualized, Singh says, was essentially private-vehicle-ownership based: be it a cycle, a two-wheeler or a car. No specific scheme was formulated for mass transit facilities. The subsequent growth in population of the city "from the forecast of 5.4 million in 1981 to 8.25 million in the year 2001 and now 22.0 to 23.0 million in the year 2021 has led to jam packed roads, overflowing car parks, painfully high accident rate, all pervasive noise pollution, and numerous incidents of murderous road rage."⁶¹ It was with the idea of overcoming this deficiency that the Delhi Metro Rail Corporation (DMRC) was formed under a statute in 1995. The first stretch of the rail system was completed in 2002, well ahead of schedule, and, because of the advantages to the travelling public, it has since been hailed in Singh's description "as the torch bearer of a resurgent India determined to shed its image of project bunglers!"

What the Metro also did was to deface the surrounding cityscape in a way that would have made Nehru furious. For one, this 400-billion-rupee undertaking with some 415 km length of rail track all over Delhi is by far the longest

elevated rail track system in any city in the world. Its elevated character has ensured that the central medians in arterial roads of Nehru's Master Plan now have huge monsters of concrete. For another, the project is detached from the Master Plan. Since 2006, some 500 registered architects as also 60 town planners have been tenaciously highlighting this. Their petition to the Prime Minister on 29th March 2007 noted that "the logic of urban planning has been turned on its head. Instead of fitting a transport system into a well organized land use framework, land-uses are now arbitrarily altered to chase a transport system." The petition resonates with my own experience as a member of the DUAC, a body which frequently examines DMRC projects that are required by Parliament to be conceptually approved by it. Making a mockery of the DUAC Act, most stations that come for approval are already more than half-built when sent for 'sanction'. Delhi Metro projects, unlike similar schemes in other parts of the world, are also exempt from environmental evaluation.

But India's rulers have grown insensitive to the aesthetics and other needs of the city. Nothing appears to have come out of the petition to the Prime Minister Manmohan Singh which, as some cynics would say, is only to be expected from a government that is more concerned about enhancing India's international image and its growth rate than with the absence of city planning or the degradation of Delhi's historic environment. A little over a year ago, the Delhi High Court had dramatically highlighted this when it pointed out the manner in which protected monuments in Delhi were being compromised - with the

Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) having proactively broken the very law by which it is supposed to protect monuments and archaeological sites.⁶² The judgment concerned a dispute around a residential property in the vicinity of Humayun's tomb. The genesis of the dispute lies in a 1992 notification of the Central government, where areas up to 100 metres and areas upto 200 metres near or adjoining protected monuments, as is the case with Humayun's tomb, were declared to be prohibited and regulated areas. The idea of designating these zones was to ensure better preservation and access to monuments, with the 100 metre line being an inviolable one. Naturally, the High Court asked the ASI to follow its own rules in dealing with the abovementioned property which falls within the prohibited zone surrounding Humayun's tomb. At the same time, in the course of hearing this matter, it unearthed an ingenious mechanism through which that organization had repeatedly broken the law that was supposed to govern its functioning.

Apparently, in 2006, the Director-General of the ASI prepared a note at the behest of the Minister of Tourism and Culture, for constituting a committee to advise him for giving permission for renovations and constructions in the prohibited areas of protected monuments. From 2006 till 2009 this Advisory Committee in Delhi alone allowed constructions within the prohibited zone of some 70 odd protected historical monuments ranging from Safdarjung's Tomb and Humayun's Tomb to the Asokan rock edict in Srinivaspuri and Jantar Mantar near Connaught Place. Among the most glaring such permissions was

that granted for the construction of the elevated road on Barapullah Nullah which connects the Commonwealth Games Village with the Jawaharlal Nehru Stadium. This runs just five metres from the early seventeenth century Bara Pulah bridge and within 105 metres from Abdul Rahim Khan-i-Khana's tomb (also built in the seventeenth century). K.T. Ravindran, a senior urban planner and presently Chairman of DUAC, had pointed out to the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI) that it was too close to the Bara Pulah bridge, and would endanger it and had advised the government to consider another route. The ASI not only ignored the suggestion, it gave the green signal to an elevated road which, for the two-week Commonwealth jamboree, permanently compromised a nearly 400-year-old bridge.⁶³

And so, as 2011 begins, will Dilliwallas continue to experience the open spaces around the city's monuments and the planned development that has famously enhanced the visual appeal of large parts of their city? Or will they primarily experience their city in the form of elevated roads and railway tracks outside their homes? Without political will intervening to restore sanity to planning in India's political capital, Kuldip Singh's words, may well turn out to be true: "Known as a 'City of Monuments', Delhi in future could well be called the city of 'Serpentine Concrete.' "

ENDNOTES

¹ The announcement has been extensively reprinted, most recently in Malvika Singh and Rudrangshu Mukherjee, *New Delhi Making of a Capital* (Lustre Press, Roli Books: New Delhi, 2009), p.28.

² For ancient Delhi, Upinder Singh, *Ancient Delhi* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999).

³ For medieval Delhi, Maulvi Zafar Hasan, *Monuments of Delhi*, three volumes (New Delhi:Aryan Books International, first published in 1916, 1997 reprint).

⁴ Narayani Gupta, *Delhi Between Two Empires 1803-1931* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1981), preface. Bal Gangadhar Tilak was an important nationalist leader from Maharashtra, Jawaharlal Nehru was India's first prime minister, Mirza Ghalib and Mir Taqi Mir, both Dilliwallas, were among the most famous Urdu poets of modern India.

⁵ Vivekananda was a celebrated 19th century Indian social reformer and leader, with roots in Bengal.

⁶ For the reasons for transferring the capital to Delhi - the undesirability of having the seat of the Government of India in the same city as one of the provincial governments, the necessity of a more central and accessible location than that of Calcutta, the advantages in terms of climate and communications that Delhi enjoyed and the city's historical associations - Rudragshu Mukherjee in *New Delhi Making of a Capital*, pp. 20-22.

⁷ Ahmed Ali, *Twilight in Delhi*, (New Delhi: Rupa & Co., first published in 1940, 2010 reprint).

⁸ For this and other details here of durbar arrangements, see Lord Hardinge of Penhurst, *My Indian Years 1910-1916* (London: John Murray, 1948), pp 23, 29 and 48.

⁹ Robert Grant Irving's work remains the most outstanding account of the Coronation Darbar and the creation of the new capital. See Robert Grant Irving, *Indian Summer - Lutyens, Baker and Imperial Delhi* (New Haven: Yale University Press and Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1981). Also see Robert Grant Irving, "Architecture for Empire's Sake: Lutyen's Palace for Delhi," *Perspecta*, 18 (1982), pp. 7-23.

¹⁰ The number mentioned in the 1912 Gazetteer is 232,837. See H.C. Beadon, *Gazetteer of the Delhi District (1912)* (Gurgaon: Vintage Books, 1992 reprint, first published in 1913), p. 49; Irving, *Indian Summer*, p. 10.

¹¹ For the removal of beggars before the Commonwealth Games, Gaurav Vivek Bhatnagar, 'Beggars Making a Silent Exit' (*The Hindu*, September 1, 2010).

¹² Hardinge, *My Indian Years*, p. 48.

¹³ Kalmadi was Chairman of the Organizing Committee for the 2010 Commonwealth Games held in Delhi where many venues were completed just days before the games began. For the durbar red carpet, Hardinge, *My Indian Years*, p. 50.

¹⁴ Hardinge, *My Indian Years*, p. 52.

¹⁵ Hardinge, *My Indian Years*, p. 49.

¹⁶ Hardinge, *My Indian Years*, p. 72.

¹⁷ Christopher Hussey, *The Life of Sir Edwin Lutyens* (London: Country Life Limited, 1953) is the official biography of Lutyens. Also see Roderick Gradige, *Edwin Lutyens Architect Laureate* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981).

¹⁸ Thomas R. Metcalf, 'Architecture and Empire Sire Herbert Baker and the Building of New Delhi' in R.E. Frykenberg (edited) *Delhi Through The Ages - Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 390-400.

¹⁹ Interestingly enough, no Indian architect or architectural firm was contracted for the designing of stadia and other facilities in Delhi for the Commonwealth Games. It seems that the qualifying criteria were framed in a way that prevented them from bidding.

²⁰ For an excellent account of this controversy, Irving, *Indian Summer*, pp. 101-09.

²¹ See E.B. Havell, *Indian Architecture, its psychology, structure, and history from the first Muhammadan invasion to the present day* (London: John Murray, 1913), p. 252.

²² Irving, *Indian Summer*, p. 170.

²³ Oddly enough, Christopher Hussey who wrote the official biography of Lutyens does not mention any of the Indian names!

²⁴ For a visual representation of the monumental grid of the plan of New Delhi, A.K. Jain, *The Making of a Metropolis Planning and Growth of Delhi* (New Delhi: National Book Organisation, 1990), p. 58.

²⁵ Hussey, *The Life*, p. 520.

²⁶ For a history of the founding of the University of Delhi, Aparna Basu, *University of Delhi Platinum Jubilee 1922-1997* (Delhi: University of Delhi, 1998), Chapter 1. Also see *The University of Delhi Calendar 1922-23* (Calcutta: Lal Chand & Sons, 1924), pp. 27-35.

²⁷ This is ironic because for both the British and Indians, Shahjahanabad has been an abiding symbol of power. George V and his Queen, for instance, had appeared on Shah jahan's balcony in the Red Fort to a crowd of a few lakhs below. Again, the flag of free India was first hoisted in Shahjahanabad, on the Red Fort, by Pandit Nehru on 15 August 1947. This continues to be done by India's Prime Minister on every Independence day. For schemes floated to improve Old Delhi prior to 1947, see Stephen Legg, *Spaces of Colonialism - Delhi's Urban Governmentalities* (Chennai: Blackwell Publishing, 2007 Indian reprint), pp. 152-53.

²⁸ Legg, *Spaces*, p. 209.

²⁹ Legg, *Spaces*, pp.65-66.

³⁰ *Delhi Electric Supply Enquiry Committee 1936 Report* (New Delhi: Government of India Press, 1937), pp. 8-11.

³¹ For details and references, see Nayanjot Lahiri, *Finding Forgotten Cities - How the Indus Civilization was Discovered* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2005), p. 183.

³² *Report on the Administration of the Delhi Province for 1930-31* (Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch, 1932), p. 21.

³³ Kuldeep Nayar, *The Martyr Bhagat Singh - Experiments in Revolution* (New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications, 2000), p.71.

³⁴ Ramachandra Guha, *India after Gandhi The History of the World's Largest Democracy* (New Delhi: Picador,2007), pp. 5- 7.

³⁵ For the aftermath of Independence and partition, especially with reference to Delhi, see Vazir Fazila-Yacoobali Zamindar, *The Long Partition and the Making of Modern South Asia Refugees, Boundaries, Histories* (New Delhi: Viking, 2008) Gyanendra Pandey, *Remembering Partition* (England: Cambridge University Press, 1994) and Tai Yong Tan and Gyanesh Kudaisya, *The Aftermath of Partition in South Asia* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

³⁶ See Tan and Kudaisya, *The Aftermath*, p. 199, and Zamindar, *The Long Partition*, pp. 88-91,134-49. There are numerous references to this in Gandhi's speeches. See Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, *Delhi Diary (Prayer Speeches from 10-9-47 to 30-1-48)* (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House), especially p. 202 and pp. 206-7, p. 262 and p. 313.

³⁷ Zamindar, *The Long Partition*, p. 29.

³⁸ 'Delhi a city of refugee enterprise' in *Times of India* (24th January 2010).

³⁹ A. Mitra, *Delhi Capital City* (New Delhi: Thomson Press, 1970), p. 3.

⁴⁰ V.N. Datta, 'Punjabi Refugees and the Urban Development of Greater Delhi' in Frykenberg (edited), *Delhi Through the Ages*, p. 454.

⁴¹ Letter to Swaran Singh dated 18 June 1952 in *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Second Series, Volume 18 (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1996), p. 122.

⁴² Letter to K.C. Reddy dated 4 June 1957 in *Selected Works*, Volume 38 (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund), p. 241.

⁴³ Note to Union Minister of Education dated 14th January 1955, *Selected Works* Volume 27 (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 2006), p. 414.

⁴⁴ Note to Minister of Education dated 8 May 1954, *Selected Works*, Volume 25 (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1999), p. 144.

⁴⁵ Note dated 31 January 1953 to Ministries of Home, Health and Rehabilitation and the Chief Minister of Delhi in *Selected Works*, Volume 21 (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1997), p. 295.

⁴⁶ *Selected Works*, Volume 34, p. 147. K.P.S. Menon was India's ambassador to the U.S.S.R., Datar Singh was Development Advisor of the Government of India for Kashmir, K.D. Sanwal was a member of the Planning Commission and Shankar Prasad was Chairman of Indian Airlines and Air India International.

⁴⁷ Nehru's letter to Dr. Sampurnand dated 17 September 1956, *Selected Works*, Volume 35(New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund, 1997), p. 227.

⁴⁸ Sayed S. Shafi and B.G. Kambo studied architecture at M.I.T., B.G. Fernandes passed out of U.C.L.A., B.N. Rahalkar was an architect from Harvard University and Manohar was from the University of North Carolina. Shafi, in an interview with HINDU (Metroplus Weekend, January 15, 2011), mentioned that they were all around 30 years old or younger. For a recent controversial analysis of the Master Plan, Ravi Sundaram, *Pirate Modernity Delhi's Media Urbanism* (London, London and New Delhi: Routledge, 2010), chapter 1.

⁴⁹ This body was set up to preserve, develop and maintain the aesthetic quality of urban and environmental design within Delhi.

⁵⁰ *Master Plan for Delhi* (Delhi: Delhi Development Authority, 1961).

⁵¹ *Master Plan for Delhi*, pp. 35-36.

⁵² Jagmohan, *Shaping India's New Destiny*, Allied Publishers Private Limited, Delhi, 2008, p. 147.

⁵³ *Master Plan for Delhi*, p. 12.

⁵⁴ *Master Plan for Delhi*, p. 7.

⁵⁵ Ranjit Sabiki, *The Urban Villages of Delhi* (Manuscript, 24th August 2010).

⁵⁶ Dipak Kumar Dash, '16L buildings in unplanned areas ' *Times of India* (Delhi edition), 22nd January 2011, p. 8.

⁵⁷ Jagmohan, *Rebuilding Shahjahanabad The Walled City of Delhi*, 1975, Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, p. 31.

⁵⁸ *Master Plan for Delhi*, pp. 5 - 7.

⁵⁹ *Master Plan for Delhi*, p.6.

⁶⁰ Jagmohan, *Rebuilding Shahjahanabad*, Chapter VI.

⁶¹ Presentation made by Kuldip Singh on 17th April 2010 at Maharashtra Chambers of Commerce Industries and Agriculture.

⁶² This was delivered on October 30, 2009 by Chief Justice A.P. Shah and Justice S. Muralidhar of the Delhi High Court. Protected monuments, incidentally, are those which, by law, have to be mandatorily preserved by the ASI.

⁶³ As a fall out of the judgment, a new amendment seeking to make the 100m prohibited zone part of the monuments protection act, was passed by parliament in March 2010.