

Delhi's Journey Part 4

Sangeeta Mittal

Associate Professor

Department of English

Maharaja Agrasen College (University of Delhi), Vasundhara Enclave, Delhi -110096

Abstract : *Journey of any city is a very fascinating one to scholars of urban studies as well as dwellers, visitors, policy makers and managers of cities. Delhi has an extremely rich past dating back to pre-historic times and charting epochs like the Gupta period, Rajput phase, the Sultanate, Lodhis, Mughals, British and finally, capital of Independent India. This paper is third part of a series in which the first part presented a birds' eye view of the urban character of Delhi from the prehistoric times to 1638: the founding of Shahjahanabad and the second continued the story till the Twilight of the Mughals. The next phase of Delhi history has been covered in a previously published paper by the author- 'Delhi during Pax Britannica'. The third part of this series in this paper encapsulates the impact and aftermath of the 1857 uprising on the city of Delhi, including the three darbars and the announcement of shifting of the imperial capital from Calcutta to Delhi in the last one in 1911. The fourth part contains the redrawing of Lutyens Delhi as showcase Imperial capital; demographic and urban upheaval caused by Independence and Partition and expansion and development of Delhi thereafter. The objective of this series is to contextualize many monuments, travel writings, novels, memoirs, films, myths, stories, stereotypes present in/on Delhi to a continuity as well as complexity of urban and cultural tradition. As thinkers and users of cities, it is imperative that we appreciate the ethos we inherit, consume, represent and create. Using a variety of sources from history, sociology, cultural and urban studies, the paper puts together diverse dimensions of this ancient city and imperial capital from the perspective of underscoring that urbanity has always been a matter of intersecting spaces, lives, powers and intentions.*

Index Terms: *Delhi history, Delhi culture, Lutyens' Delhi, Imperial capital, National Capital*

I. INTRODUCTION

The "capital surprise" was such a closely guarded secret that even the Queen did not know about it and Hardinge had a 'mystery camp' in the Darbar area which dealt with all the transfer related papers with utmost confidentiality. However, this move was being toyed with in the upper echelons of Government of India, less for itself, and more as part of the modus operandi of handling the King's desire to repeal the partition of Bengal and bestowing a large enough boon to the people of India on his India visit, the expense and intent of which was being widely debated in Britain and India. The idea originated in a note from 'Member Home', John Lewis Jenkins, who felt that moving the capital would be "a bold stroke of statesmanship" by which could be killed two birds - terminating the stalemate of Bengal by restoring it to its undivided state (minus Bihar, Orrisa and Assam) but at the same time also reducing it to political and commercial insignificance. (Sengupta, 2007, p. 25) By nipping in bud the nascent nationalism of Bengal *Bhadralok*, the imperialist banner could then be raised afresh in a more stolid territory. As R E Frykenberg comments,

Of one thing there can be no doubt. The decision to move the seat of Supreme Government from Calcutta was intimately linked both to the partition of Bengal and its revocation. ... If, in vivid expressions of imperial grandeur, pageantry, and power, some saw it as the ultimate high noon of British arrogance and pomp, there were others who saw it as a more pathetic and petty spectacle, and a harbinger of dire events. ... It signaled, in other words, an eventual ending both of British and Bengali hegemony in India. (Frykenberg, 1986, 2002, p. 226)

He found approval from other imperialist opportunists like Sir Guy Fleetwood Wilson, Member Finance; Lord Crewe, Secretary of State in London and Lord Hardinge himself. This showcase capital was the colonizer's instrument for spatially, architecturally and politically mesmerizing the colony into submission. It also served to legitimize the huge expenditure on the Darbar and gave the King the desired 'Breaking News' headlines. History has judged this manoeuvre as desperate and delusory measures of a floundering empire, not incorrectly perhaps, as just 16 years separated the inauguration of New Delhi in 1931 and the final departure of the British from India in 1947.

Delhi's claim to fame was its pristine history, its special place in the hearts of Rajputs and Muslims, its nearness to Simla and its abundance of space. Delhi might have been an ancient seat of power but New Delhi was to be everything which Delhi was not. New Delhi was to be built like Washington, away from the chaos and malaise of the old city, built and then occupied, not vice versa, like a naturally spawning city. H V Lanchester, an urban planner, also considered for the job of Consultant which eventually went to Lord Lytton's son-in-law, Edwin Lutyens in 1912, favoured extensions to existing settlements but Lutyens' projection of wholesale new development won approval from the Delhi Town Planning Committee (DTPC). (Gupta, 1998, 2002, p. 182) Another town planner, Patrick Geddes, visited India in 1915 and advocated the technique of "Civic Survey" and "Conservative Survey" as indispensable to town planning in cities of ancient and foreign origin whereby minimal physical and cultural displacement produced maximum cross-sectional benefits. (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006: 240) However, Lutyens was "what the British in India wanted". (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006: 240) New Delhi was to image the "Grand Manner" of absolutist capitals; the sweep of western science, art and civilization; the relentless geometry of reason and restraint. (Sengupta, 2007: 28) Edwin Lutyens, J A Brodie and George Swinton were appointed members of a Site Planning Committee. They rejected north-west Delhi and the Cantonment on the Ridge as possible locations for the vision was to build on an elevated and extensive tract and thus, the Raisina Hill turned out to be the ideal location for Acropolis like citadel and further south, land around the village, Naraina, for the new Cantonment. The European plan of concentric circles was adopted in the design where the power hierarchies unfold centrifugally to the margins. At the nucleus of this design lay the Government House at the highest altitude flanked by two Secretariats to form "one high platform expressing the unity of the Viceroy with his Government", as per Baker's suggestion. (Metcalf, 1986, 2002: 251) The symbolism of power, in fact, was the guiding principle from Lutyens who designed the central buildings to Geoffrey de Montmorency, secretary, Imperial Delhi Committee who allocated spaces to the future residents of this capital and Malcolm Hailey, the chairman of the Imperial Delhi Committee. The Commander-in-Chief's house was south of the Secretariats (Teen Murti Bhavan). The

power entropic layout had the senior most gazetted officers and princely states at the core with joint secretaries, deputy secretaries and undersecretaries and then, European P&T officers, NDMC officers following outward in that order. Indian officials were confined to the rims. So were the Indian affluent and businessmen. While the European bungalows were on the Civil Lines pattern, the accommodation for Indian employees, for instance, at Rouse Avenue, was designed in the Indian way with a courtyard enclosed at the centre. Writes Ranjana Sengupta,

Not coincidentally, hierarchies such as these, expressed in spatial terms are found in Hanoi, built by the French, Manila, built by the Americans, and in Lusaka, built by the British. Allocations by minutely specified gradation are a common feature of all colonial cities. New Delhi, however, refines the distinction of race and rank to an unprecedented degree. The address not only conveyed professional status, but also the size of the house and garden, width of the road and whether the official was British or Indian. (Sengupta, 2007, p. 34)

The power principle was entrenched further by the use of heights, angular symmetry, straight streets, broad processional avenues and vistas, triumphal arches, columns and ramps. This organized dignity and solemnity was aimed at concretizing the pride of the western world in disciplining disorder into beauty and productivity.

II. EDWIN LUTYENS, HERBERT BAKER AND OTHER ARCHITECTS OF NEW DELHI

Lutyens, himself a man disposed to European Classicism in architectural style, had to pay heed to a rampant debate to eventually mix a lot of Mughal and Rajput elements with his brand of hardcore European proportions. Though he was influenced by the Sanchi Stupa and the concept of railings, yet he abhorred any servile indigenization through clichéd styles like the Indo-Saracenic. Indo-saracenic denotes the fusion of Victorian features like turrets, spires, arches etc. (Mutiny Memorial is the only pure surviving Victorian monument in Delhi) with Islamic forms like domes and cupolas (old St. Stephens College near Kashmiri Gate by Swinton Jacob the surviving example of this style). He was more a votary for reinventing in the local context the canonical purity of the line of architecture traced from the Greeks and Romans to the Italians, the French and the Wren architecture in England which “meant a return to the ‘essence’ of classical form, and its subsequent reconstitution”. (Metcalf, 1986, 2002, p. 253) His Kingsway (Rajpath), the Great Place (Vijay Chowk), its fountains, pools, screens all flowed out of this thoroughly applied creative creed. The epitome of this style is the Government House. Built in red and cream Dholpur stone, its focal point is the Central Dome. Below is a two storey building with 340 rooms. Immediately below the Dome is the Darbar Hall. Despite budgetary constraints in the War Years, Lutyens designed the adjoining estate with the same trademark creativity. The screen gates of the Government House and the Jaipur Column were other embellishing ideas in this flagship project. Lutyens was a keen exponent of the theory of filling intervening spaces with well landscaped gardens which was endorsed by his co-architects, Herbert Baker and Samuel Swinton Jacob, an expert on Indian art, as it also camouflaged the very many empty spaces in the fledgling capital. Lutyens thus sculpted the Government House garden, or the Mughal Garden of the Rashtrapati Bhavan as it is called today, throwing in pools, fountains, stone pergolas and formal beds and circular gardens. He was also the architect of the 138 ft high War Memorial Arch (India Gate), completed in 1921, behind which stood in the middle of the Princes Park under an umbrella, the statue of George V, which today is in the Coronation Park, a desolate relic of the Raj days. Around the Princes Park, Lutyens designed Hyderabad House (1928), Baroda House (1936), Patiala House (1938), Jaipur House (1936), the National Stadium (1930s), Bikaner House (1939) and Travancore House (1930). He visualized a set of monumental buildings on the Queensway (Janpath) crossing, of which only the National Archives building was built for the rest would have obstructed the vision on the Kingsway.

Lutyens' colleague, Baker, joined the DTPC on his recommendation as the deadline for the completion of New Delhi was an unrealistic four years and Baker had the experience of building in colonial South Africa. Baker was the mind behind the Secretariats (North and South Blocs) and the Parliament House. Baker, like Lutyens, was not open to the idea of using Indian architecture for the sake of it. He appreciated the *chhatra* and the *jaali* but disapproved of too much carving and detailing. He subscribed to a more explicitly political approach than the neo-classicism of Lutyens but the two blocks fit in eminently with Lutyens' look of the Government House. Also articulated in the same red and cream Dholpur, wearing Baker's interpretations of traditional Indian forms, displaying the same assimilation of solidity with delicacy, the buildings add to the body as well as the soul to the *piece de resistance* formed by the Government House. When Lutyens proposed the Government House atop the Raisina Hill, Baker suggested that the Secretariats be also built on the elevation. This meant pushing back the Government House but Lutyens conceded to the suggestion. Though Lutyens had a merciless eye for detail, yet he missed to notice in the architectural drawings, the fact that after a point on the Kingsway only the dome of the Government House is visible while the rest is lost to view in this arrangement. When he realized after two years of construction, it was too late for rectification and he fell out with Baker over what he called his “Bakerloo”. Baker had perfected what is called ‘Imperial Architecture’ under Cecil Rhodes and Alfred Milner in South Africa sculpting the idea of the empire into stone in buildings like Pretoria Station and Union Buildings inspired by Greek temple style architecture. As Metcalfe explains,

Imperial architecture, then, shaped by its colonial setting, must be regarded as a distinct style of building, such an architecture did not involve the simple transplantation of European modes to foreign lands. Nor was it the same as the endeavor to realize which Lutyens or later Le Corbusier, an abstract universal (classical) vision. Much less did it involve the copying of ‘native’ styles. (Metcalf, 1986, 2002, p. 254)

It meant for Baker that “The new capital must be the sculptural monument of the good government and unity which India for the first time in its history, has enjoyed under British rule. British rule in India is not a mere veneer of government and culture. It is a new civilization in growth, a blend of the best elements of the East and the west ... it is to this great fact that the architecture of Delhi should bear testimony”. (Metcalf, 1986, 2002, p. 252) It is this parable of empire which is also echoed in the legends in the Secretariat blocks- “Liberty will not descend to a people. A people must raise themselves to Liberty. It is a blessing that must be earned before it is enjoyed”. The intermixing of European classicism with Indian features brought together the visual grammar in which the European and the Indian traditionally apprehended ‘empire’. The Indian superstructure established the British as legitimate heirs to the Mughal legacy while the base in classical antiquity conveyed cultural pride, national achievements and racial superiority. The Parliament building was commissioned after the 1919 Montague-Chelmsford reforms which enlarged the composition of the Government Council allowing for Indian participation in the Government. Lutyens envisaged a Coliseum-like building and Baker pounded three semi-circular chambers leading to an inner circular chamber together to squeeze into an exterior circle opening on to a verandah. A belated addition of a second storey has now hidden a dwarfed dome on the Central Chamber but the upper part of the incongruous dome is still visible from a distance. Baker believed in according due consideration to the tropical climate. Thus, open verandahs, exposed colonnades, overhead cornices, high skylights were all used to improve air circulation. The Bungalows were by and large left to the Public Works Department. PWD, under its

head Robert Tor Russel, was also responsible for constructing the Gol Dak Khaanaa, the Connaught Place, the Western and Eastern Courts. Walter Sykes George designed the unusual housing type of Sujana Singh Park and Lodi colony and also the St. Stephen's College. Russel's successor, Medd, designed the Sacred Heart's Cathedral, on the Gol Dak Khaanaa roundabout. Another assistant of Lutyens, Arthur Gordon Shoomsmith, designed the St. Martin's Church in the New Delhi Cantonment which embodies an experimental style unique to this period. The ideologically loaded "grand manner" or "imperial style" is responsible for Lutyens and his tribe ignoring the modernist revolution of the post-war years. Masters like Walter Gropius, Frank Lloyd Wright and Le Corbusier ushered in "architecture devoid of ornament, and incorporated new materials such as glass and steel, with an obsessive desire for functionality. Modernist buildings were bare, horizontal structures, and this new wave also came to be known as the machine or factory aesthetic". (Khanna and Parhawk, 2008, p. 9)

III. BUILDING NEW DELHI

Delhi ceased to be a part of Punjab Provinces and became an independent province of 1290 sq. miles consisting of the Delhi district and some adjoining land from United Provinces from 1912 under a Chief Commissioner. Delhi Municipality's jurisdiction was now limited to the area between the Temporary Capital and the New Capital. To the Civil Lines, 500 acres were attached and this 'Notified Area' functioned as the Temporary Capital till the new one was partly complete in 1922. As part of this the Viceregal Lodge (now in Delhi University), Secretary's office (now 5, Shammath Marg), the Commander-in-Chief's office (Indraprastha College since 1932) and Assembly House (now Old Secretariat) were built. The DTPC was faced with a poser in whether and how to integrate the old city with the new. The psychosis of sterilizing the new city from the contagion of the old stood on its own head when it led to 'improvement' efforts in the old areas but all was undertaken in the name of methodical town planning without acknowledging the real objective of purging the insanitary vicinity of New Delhi. As Narayani Gupta states,

By 1931, certain implications of the transfer of the Capital had become clear. Urban government of Delhi area was now more concerned with the maintenance of the capital than with the upkeep of the 'old' city, except where the latter was in close proximity to the former. (Gupta, 1998, 2002, p. 220)

Formally, Delhi got an Improvement Trust in 1937 after exchange of much crossfire between the Municipality and the Imperial Government. The real issue once again was the management of Government (*nazul*) lands, though alleviation of tuberculosis and public outcry over it, were the cited reasons for its constitution. DIT suggested removal of inmates of the congested area but failed to propose a feasible scheme for their rehousing and undertook very selectively the extension of water and sewerage systems as the attitude was not of all-round welfare but only of scavenging the filth of "slum areas of the meanest type ... constituting a menace to the public health of the whole urban area of Delhi" (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006, p. 227). Thus, in overview,

A look at the whole effort of the DIT (1937-50) displays an absence of vision in city development and a marked pro-affluent bias.... At the end of its career the DIT left behind more congestion than when it started. Squatter settlements, the *jhuggi jhonpuri bastis* started coming up at the periphery of the city- Delhi's second type of slums. (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006, p. 227).

New Delhi took a whopping Rs.115 millions in the making. New Delhi Municipality though constituted in 1916 became fully functional from 1925. The land and rent costs shot to the sky as a result of this windfall. V N Datta analyses the demographic data from 1921 to 1941 to conclude that

The striking increase of c. 18% in the decade before 1921 was due to the transfer of the capital from Calcutta to Delhi and to Delhi's growing administrative and commercial importance. The higher rate of increase during the decade from 1931 to 1941 can be attributed to the Second World War which also created much new employment in commerce, industry and transport. (Datta, 1986, 2002, p. 287)

It managed to achieve its ideological purpose to a large extent, yet the year it was inaugurated in 1931, the Roundtable conference to pave way for some form of Indian independence was also held. The basic premise of permanence of British rule in India was already challenged. Another important premise of unfettered construction was impeded by constraints of time, money and even space when older settlements like Paharganj presented themselves in the way. Imperialistic ideals so zealously embraced by DTPC were critiqued by contemporaries like Patrick Geddes and Gerald Breese who thought that irreconcilable incongruities are inevitable:

so long as such architects continue to derive inspiration mainly from the majesty of the state and of its institutions- and too little from and towards the human interest of each neighbourhood, the individuality of its homes. (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006, p. 240)

Lucy Peck summarizes in retrospect:

Now, in the twenty-first century, it can only be said that New Delhi is a city-planner's nightmare, leaving what is now a huge metropolis with an impractically hollow centre. However, despite the obvious problems, in architectural and visual terms parts of New Delhi are sublime and have to be viewed in that light". (Peck, 2005, p. 258)

The growth of the city had to be manipulated westwards by developing the Western Extension Area (WEA, Karol Bagh) to accommodate the construction workers for the new Capital and tanners of Paharganj in Raigharpura and connecting it to the Civil Lines by Jhandewalan Road and Idgah Road. Dev Nagar was built to accommodate those junior level Indian officials who had failed to find space in New Delhi. The planned links of the Old City with the New had to be dropped as the Railway interposed, the River was also not so easily integrated and New Delhi overshot its budget as well as timeframe. The Summer Capital preoccupation gave birth to a style which was not sufficiently weather wise. The space earmarked for the Capital proved to be so huge that its builders ran out of resources to plug the gaps and trees were planted instead, which does a lot for the enchantment and the environment of the city today, but leaves a low density area in the heart of this teeming metropolis in a rather anachronistic way. Similarly, the luxury of colonial housing transplanted in New Delhi, once again makes one wonder about the blithe ignorance of the British that tomorrow could be another day.

IV. PARTITION AND DELHI

Tomorrow indeed was another day when the Imperial Capital built for 65000 persons, certainly an addition to its roughly two and a half lakhs in 1911, as the capital of Independent India, was inundated in 1947 by the exodus of 4,95,391 people from the newly created nation of Pakistan. The rise in Delhi's population was by an explosive 90%. In 1951, Refugees comprised a substantial 28.4% of Delhi's 1,744,072 strong population. Of the 1,437,134 urban residents, 32.7% were refugees. As V N Datta states,

The impact of the refugee population is evident from the density figure of 1951, which is an increase of 106.6 % over that of 1941-51. In terms of spatial growth, the city's urban area expanded from c.42 square kilometers in 1901 to 445 square kilometers in 1971- or by more than ten times. (Datta, 1986, 2002, p. 289)

The Government of India formed a ministry of Rehabilitation in 1947 with K C Neogy as minister to deal with hapless hordes of 'evacuees' who were sweating and starving in every nook and corner of Delhi. Camps in Kingsway, Karol Bagh and Shahdara were organized for immediate relief. Subsequently, rehabilitation was undertaken through provision of housing, employment, education and cooperative facilities. Outbreak of violence against Muslims exacerbated the already grim condition of the city. While massacre, arson, vandalizing and looting had become the order of the day, property belonging to the Muslims was also forcibly wrested by mobs. Muslims sought shelter in Idgah, Nizamuddin, Purana Qila, Red Fort and Jama Masjid. Eventually, approximately one third of the city's Muslim population crossed over to Pakistan. Writes Ranjana Sengupta,

While the aim of the government was certainly crisis management, there was a simultaneous awareness that systems needed to be set up to make refugees self-sufficient and the state was willing to invest money and effort to bring this about. The authorities were seeking long term solutions and this mind set had a profound impact on the paths the refugees' lives took in subsequent decades. (Sengupta, 2007, p. 76)

Apart from the government, organizations like the Hindu Mahasabha, Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh offshoots- All India Refugee Conference and Central Refugee Front, Congress leader Meher Chand Khanna's United Refugee Front were instrumental in safeguarding the interests of the refugees. All in all, it was a community issue and support was provided by all those who could. 3 lakh refugees were housed in dwellings vacated by Muslims as well as in newly constructed units.

By the end of 1951, 529 one-roomed, 3398 two-roomed, 357 single storey and 156 double storey three-roomed houses; 11,159 single-roomed tenements; 1,518 shops and stalls; and 593 shops-cum-residences had been completed. Another 88 two-roomed and 19 three-roomed houses, and 8456 tenements were then under construction. (Datta, 1986, 2002, p. 291)

This large scale expansion spread over Malviya Nagar in the south; the Rajendra Nagars, Patel Nagars, Moti Nagar, Ramesh Nagar, Tilak Nagar in the west; Gandhi Nagar in the east and periphery of the old city along Chandni Chowk, Bara Hindu Rao, Subzi Mandi, Sadar Bazaar, Sarai Rohilla, Jhandewalan, Shakur Basti and Rohtak Road. Jag Pravesh Chandra, Sucheta Kriplani and Dharam Vira were members of the advisory committee of the Ministry of Rehabilitation which surveyed land beyond Lodi Road, Willingdon Crescent and Tihar, hitherto agricultural land yielding vegetables, to develop refugee colonies. This land was bought at throwaway prices by the government as well as private developers like DLF. The land was purchased against *khasras* and plots were irregular in shape but the town planning impetus of those days still developed the plots as self contained "colonies", mostly U shaped, with main road on the fourth side and at least two parks and a local market in between. Bigger plots lay on the edge of the mainroad while smaller plots were cut out in the grid of the inner colony radial roads. This became the standard prototype for later government and private colonies like Vasant Vihar, Kamala Nagar, Nizamuddin etc. There was a demographic shift not only in the quantity but also quality of the population. The non-Muslim, predominantly Punjabi urban population displaced from Pakistan was engaged in money-lending, trading, retailing or professions like medicine, law or academics while the outbound Muslims were artisans, craftsmen, traders or labourers. Thus, the inbound set had to be content with whatever livelihood came its way like hawking, vending, skilled labour or government or private service. The hereditary nature of family profession was broken down among the Khattris, Aroras and other Punjabis owing to this cataclysmic relocation. They pursued their new callings with trademark "drive, patience and competitive spirit" bartering their pre-partition white collared jobs for more laborious ones with a desperation and risk-taking of those who had nothing more to lose. (Dutta, 1986, 2002, p. 298) These literate and enterprising Punjabis soon found their bearings in trade once they had weathered the initial uprooting by securing accommodation, workspace and capital. Retail and manufacture were other two sectors which boomed with the availability of this human capital aided by Government loans and schemes. While retail got concentrated in City-Sadar-Paharganj, Karol Bagh and Connaught Place, 8160 registered factories sprung up in places like Malviya Nagar, Kalkaji, Okhla and satellite towns of Faridabad, Sonapat, Ballabgarh and Ghaziabad. The fortunes of the 'residents' were adversely affected as the 'refugee' outdid them in trade and commerce and shops, businesses, factories and houses changed hands under the rising affluence of the 'refugees'. Not only did the refugee cluster wield economic and political influence, 70s onwards its aspirations and achievements fuelled the juggernaut of liberalization, globalization, consumerism and luxury lifestyles. Paraphrasing Delhi's tryst with destiny, Ranjana Sengupta concludes, "Delhi, without the refugee influx, would have been an entirely different city- not better, not worse, just very different. The refugees have shaped and formed the dynamic, complex and prosperous city we see today". (Sengupta, 2007, p. 91)

V. GOVERNMENT DELHI

While the refugee experience has stamped the face of the city in a defining and indelible way, another equally potent factor at play has been the 'government machinery' of the world's largest democracy sinking roots in Delhi. The imperial regalia and signage seamlessly came to symbolize the sovereignty and philosophy of the new republic. Similarly, the new holders of power swiftly fitted into the power vacuum created by the departure of the British. Thus, Delhi continued its age old romance with power and Nehruvian ideals of progress and modernity forged a space for themselves in the variegated past and the volatile present. Nehru's co-relation of orderly spaces to orderly minds resulted in formulation of a Master Plan for Delhi and in formal espousal to the 'modernist' school of architecture. An enquiry committee under the Chairmanship of G D Birla was empowered to review the working of DIT and to advise on housing policy on Delhi. Delhi Development Authority (Provisional) was set up in 1955 and Town Planning Organization (TPO) was established at the same time to prepare the Master Plan. A Ford Foundation team arrived in 1956 to assist in its preparation. In December 1956, DDA was constituted through an act of Parliament. Delhi Development Act was promulgated in 1957 commencing the "planned" development of the city. In anticipation of DDA led planned development as ordained in the Master Plan and also to contain escalating land prices and adhocism of land use, all vacant urban land was acquired by government under the Land Acquisition Act of 1959. Master Plan of Delhi (MPD-62), submitted by DDA, was adopted in Parliament in 1962 in which "the process of planned development was envisaged as a public sector led process with very little private participation in terms of development of both shelter and infrastructure services". (*Delhi Master Plan 2021*, p. 3) The pre-liberalization rubric of public sector driven growth in Master Plans of 1962 as well as 2001 placed emphasis on large scale acquisition and development of land and on land use as per the hierarchical Master Plan, Zonal Plans and Zone Layout Plans. Quintessentially, a land management plan, it segregated commercial, residential, industrial and educational areas. Theoretically, the Plan contained detailed prototypes for "renewal" of different type of areas. Plans were also made for squatter settlements and urban villages. Town and Country Planning Organisation (TCPO), later version of TPO, noted in 1972 that only higher income housing and beautification

parts of the Plan were receiving attention while the rest were grievously neglected, thereby increasing the number of *jhuggi jhonpuri* clusters. DDA came up with a typical draconian solution to this problem by ruthlessly uprooting the clusters, especially under Jag Mohan, the vice-chairman of DDA during Emergency in 1975-6, to 'relocate' 1.2 lakh squatters in 27 'resettlement' colonies on Delhi's periphery allocating 25 sq. yards to one family. The 'resettlement', however, proved to be an empty promise as inhuman conditions of 25 sq. yards of space in city's dump yards away from employment opportunities coupled with high building costs and non-existent civic amenities demonstrated the same British bias of planners and implementers against the urban poor who were once again treated as 'eye sores' and 'health hazards' to be subordinated by administrative decision to the aesthetic, environmental and spatial needs of the privileged and civilized owners of the city. The rest of the Master Plan also suffered the same fate from application of pressure from land mafia and politicians and non-application of provisions and mechanisms of the Plan by DDA. Still there are 1600 unauthorized colonies, home to some 30 lakh people, a sizeable chunk in which is of rural migrants. Still the vicious circle of regulations, violations and corruption continues to deface the city. A more fundamental reason for the Master Plan fiasco, however, lies in its very model, the shortcomings of which a town planning analyst catalogues as under:

- i. The tendency to apply 'universal' methods to deal similarly with diverse situations
- ii. An uncritical fascination with modern western models
- iii. The destruction of traditional indigenous systems causing great disturbance, displacement and degradation to the existing environment
- iv. Settling for 'poor cousin' versions of expensive developed country models owing to limited resources (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006, p. 238)

Jag Mohan, in his *Island Of Truth*, concedes that Shahjahanabad had its own advantages like high density, social and spatial compactness, economy in terms of municipal services and transportation facilities and organic relationship with people's traditional epistemologies (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006, p. 238) and yet the Geddesian ideal of an "integrated world-view with the human element receiving attention" suggesting reversion and renewal on indigenous lines only finds token cognizance in the Master Plan. (Ritu Priya, 1993, 2006, p. 239) Rather, it repeats the British bias of visualizing cities as well groomed middle class conclaves against indigenous history, customs and preferences. Though VKRV Rao and Desai carried out Greater Delhi Survey (1956-8) and many studies were conducted by TPO to get a fair idea of the given in the city's situation and economies and ecologies of its people, yet the specificities of the zonal and zone layout plans were either neglected, distorted or discredited by selective application, especially in favour of the rich. MPD-2021 sets before itself "some issues for consideration" which include:

- i. Review of the scheme of large scale development and acquisition and its relevance in the present context
- ii. Alternative options for development of areas identified for urbanization in MPD-2021
- iii. Evolving a system under which planning for, and provision for basic infrastructure could take place simultaneously with reference to i. and ii.
- iv. Involving the private sector in the assembly and development of land and provision of infrastructure services. (*Delhi Master Plan 2021*: 3)

The review of past experience throws up certain other factors also which have thrown the planning haywire like population explosion, ill-matched growth of water and power facilities and boom in automobiles in Delhi. As per the concerns stated above which are based on past experience, the Master Plan now aims to incorporate "several innovations for the development of the National Capital. A critical reform has been envisaged in the prevailing land policy and facilitating public-private partnerships. Together with planned development of new areas, a major focus has been on incentivizing the recycling of old dilapidated areas for their rejuvenation. The plan contemplates a mechanism for the restructuring of the city based on mass transport". (*Delhi Master Plan 2021*, p. 5) Mixed land use is now being allowed in acknowledgement of this age old urban reality which years of Master plan regime could not obliterate. Though *Delhi Master Plan 2021* is a step forward but the critique remains that one normative plan cannot settle conflicting interests and requirements in the city and the implementing agency of the Master Plan has focused all through these years on constructing dwelling units and little else.

VI. MODERNIST ARCHITECTURE IN POST-INDEPENDENCE DELHI

Modernist architecture had swept Europe post World War I. Lutyens, however, ignored it for the more political agenda of imperialism. Modernism arrived in India through the first breed of architects who returned from Europe and America to etch its forms in concrete. Achyut Kanvinde, Balkrishna Doshi, Mansingh Rana, Cyrus SH Jhabvala, Habib Rehman all reinterpreted modernism for the Indian context, encouraged by Nehru but criticized by the revivalist elements in his government. Shiv Nath Prasad, Rajinder Kumar and Jugal Kishore Chowdhary were fascinated by Le Corbusier, on the other hand, and used his techniques intelligently in their designs. Joseph Allen Stein, an American architect, further improvised on the objective of modernity and practicality. In the 70s and 80s, architects like Charles Correa, Kuldip Singh, Raj Rewal and Romi Khosla made Delhi a drawing board of experimental designs moving now beyond the modernist apparatus (Khanna and Parhawk). From then on, new styles and materials have erupted on Delhi's skyline though by and large, the bottom line has been to evade the heat, use local materials and apply labour intensive methods. Walter Sykes George's St. Stephen's College and CSH Jhabvala designed Kirorimal College take a significant step towards modernism adopting Oxbridge style layout in exposed brick finish characterized by quadrangles and simplicity in façade doing away with most of Lutyensque embellishments though G B Deolalikar (the first Indian head of CPWD) designed Supreme Court and National Museum continued to remain in the Lutyens mould even in the 50s. Nehru's modernism was not devoid of an Indian soul which got reflected in buildings like India's first five star hotel, The Ashok, designed by E B Doctor, which juxtaposed the modernist with Rajasthani architecture in such a studied manner that it became the very metaphor for the quest for appropriate modern Indian architectural identity in newly independent India. Ideals of secularism are embodied in the design of Vigyan Bhavan, designed by R I Geholote, merging the Buddhist *chaitya* with a *jaali* and a *chhajja*. The debate, of course, was how Indian the modern should be and vice versa. Kanvinde's Council of Scientific and Industrial Research building gives a more purist turn to modernism to represent the work ethics of industrial India. Joseph Allen Stein's Triveni Kala Sangam adapts the California Modern (1950s residential modernist architecture in American suburbs) to the conditions of developing nations while India International Center is his great tribute to Romanticist Modern (less blunt and more contextual harmonious interlinked spaces).

The two pioneering iconic buildings inaugurating the cultural and institutional architecture in post-independence Delhi were complemented by embassy architecture. Edward Durell Stone's American Embassy fuses European classicism with Mughal style *jaali* facade with an understated virtuosity. Habib Rehman's Rabindra Bhavan in Romanticist Modern once again shows the endorsement by this generation of a less severe and more ornate style than the German Bauhaus. Jugal Kishor Chowdhary dabbled in 'Chandigarh architecture' bringing Corbusian lingo of reinforced concrete to Delhi, building the IIT Delhi campus with inspiration as well as abandon. Shiv Nath Prasad carried further the Corbusian legacy by using exposed reinforced concrete and basing his Akbar Bhavan on a group housing style developed by Corbusier for Europe called *Unite d'habitation*. Prasad articulated geometrical starkness in his Sri Ram Centre design on Safdar Hashmi Marg, continuing the use of reinforced concrete, but creating a more original visual experience. A landmark concept structure came in the shape of Kuldip Singh designed Palika Kendra on Sansad Marg opposite the Jantar Mantar observatory. Built in finished form concrete, it replicates the pyramid like base of Jantar Mantar to stretch out elongated for eighteen storeys in an inverted Y structure. His NCDC building in Hauz Khas has the same contoured sinews. Mansingh Rana's Teen Murti Library and Nehru Planetarium constitute the modern counterpart of Lutyensque Flagstaff House or Teen Murti House as it was later called. Employing muted colour, gentle curves and ribbon windows, the buildings signify the movement of Indian aesthetic beyond colonialism. Rajender Kumar's ISBT showcases the Corbusian *brise soleil* treatment on a massive horizontal structure. While Corbusier's influence is writ large on Delhi's post-independence edifice, another master, Louis Kahn, who was the man behind IIM Ahmedabad campus, is visible on Modern School Vasant Vihar building designed by Jasbir Sachdev and Mary Eggleston. A defining moment in Delhi architecture is Raj Rewal's octahedral pillarless The Hall of Nations in Pragati Maidan. A space frame of pour-in-place reinforced concrete standing on pile foundations with futuristic lattice and glass exterior was a concept as well as engineering innovation in a league altogether different from all Kahn and Corbusian takeoffs. Reputed for unconventional solutions like Asian Games Village and State Trading Corporation building on Tolstoy Marg, he introduced post-modernist trends like metabolist architecture from Japan. His contemporary treatment of Fatehpur Sikri cluster of buildings on the Indian Institute of Immunology in Vasant Kunj and *Mandala* patterned Parliament Library make for masterpieces of public architecture. The 80s belonged to the expressionist credo of the likes of Satish Gujral (Belgian Embassy), Vasant and Revathi Kamath (Mobile Creches), Romi Khosla (School for Spastic Children, Hauz Khas), Upal Ghosh (Sanskriti Kendra) and Charles Correa (Jeevan Bharti and British Council).

VII. DELHI COLONIES, FLATS AND SOCIETIES

As discussed in 'Delhi's Journey Part 3' the 'Bungalow' came up not just as the ubiquitous form of official accommodation but also as the predominant paradigm for all the furious building activity in post-independence Delhi (Mittal, 2018). Its associations with power, progress and privacy drove all private housing also to become similarly cut-off from the street islands with neatly manicured, segregated and furnished recesses. Earlier it was the 'streamline modern' or the 'Delhi style' which dominated the façades but 80s onwards, the eclectic mix of styles produced a baffling variety which is variously seen as philistinism of the *nouveau riche* or the typical pluralism of the global urban populace. (Sengupta, 2007, p. 62) Delhi saw the emergence of Group Housing in the late '70s owing to the cost and space demands of plotted housing and also to avoid the seclusion it produced. Raj Rewal designed Asiad Village, Charles Correa designed Tara Apartments and M N Ashish Ganju designed Press Enclave were all path-breaking in attempting to create a new canvas of closer to nature and neighbor living. Government Delhi was officially engendered in 1931 itself but post independence it reached its pinnacle and enjoyed four decades of unbroken glory till the liberalizing and globalizing forces displaced Delhi's predominantly political function by steamrolling the industrial, commercial and service sector giants into its economy. Post-independence, colonies like Bapa Nagar, Rabindra Nagar, Bharati Nagar, Pandara Road, Pandara Park, R K Puram and Shahjahan Road were constructed to house the gargantuan state machinery. Official residential quarters, 65,000 in all, came to fall in eight 'Types' from Type 1 to Type 8. Type 8 comprises of Bungalows in the Imperial zone reserved for the topmost echelons while the rest are post-independence constructions by CPWD dubbed 'monotonous' by some and 'modern' by others but still in great demand by the Parliamentarians and Bureaucracy for subsidized costs, sumptuous facilities and status symbol quality. Junior level housing is spread over Sarojini Nagar, Laxmibai Nagar, Naoroji Nagar, Andrews Ganj, Moti Bagh, Nanakpura, R K Puram, Munirka etc. The 'government' colonies have a recognizable look and are complemented by three other types of 'colony' in Delhi life today- the private colony, the DDA colony and the group housing society. While earlier community life consisted of living in extended family or caste groups, with the building of New Delhi, it increasingly got fractured by affluent families moving to areas like Barakhamba Road, Sikandra Road, Bhagwan Das Road, Prithviraj Road, Ferozshah Road and Curzon Road. Post-independence, the earliest 'colonies' or "plotted residentially demarcated neighbourhoods" sprang up in Jorbagh, Sundarnagar and Golf Links. (Sengupta, 2007, p. 111) These 'colonies', developed on auctioned plots to meet the spiraling demand for private homes, had the same aspirational premise of achieving the lustrous lifestyle of American suburbia or British garden cities or nearer home, New Delhi bungalows, the blueprint for which was already available in Lahore's Model Town. Developed by Sir Ganga Ram and Diwan Khem Chand, it was the first settlement to have adapted Ebenezer Howard's concept of garden cities to Indian conditions. Model Town easily became the precursor of 'colony settlements' in Delhi. (Reeta Grewal, 1991, p. 180) Hauz Khas, Green Park, South Extension, the Kailashes were the colonies developed by private developers and in keeping with the market and the times, all fitted firmly into this new urban ethos. Next came the cooperative group housing of Vasant Vihar, Westend, Santiniketan, Panchsheel Park, Pamposh, Chittranjan Park etc. in which people from same professions or regions constructed a gated community. '70s onwards the thrust shifted to outer regions like East Delhi, Dwarka, Rohini etc. when cooperative group housing became apartment oriented instead of 'kothi' oriented. DDA joined the bandwagon with Saket and went on to build LIG, MIG and Self Financing Flats. These were the dominant forms of middle class living which were a far cry from old city patterns but the difference became subsumed in the overarching discourse of development and in the developing nation, the developing city reflected the developing nexus between urban living and human choices. The dominant forms all remain today in the post liberalization scenario but the inhabitants have changed. The self important government official of the Nehruvian era evaporated with the Emergency. Instead of his progeny which started seeking more global professions, in due course migrants from small towns replaced them in the Civil Services. While the post-independence swish set have become ministers, refugees have become industrialists living in farmhouses, government officers have become retired owners of kothis and flats, migrants have become government officers, bureaucrats, and practitioners of virtually all trades on the global firmament inhabiting the bourgeois universe of flats and apartments. Post-Independence Delhi developed on the lines of Canberra being the seat of Government and little else, to go on to become Washington with installation of showpiece Indian Culture. It has not stopped there. Post-liberalization it transformed itself to New York resonating with mobility and plurality of a teeming commercial and cultural megapolis.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Delhi's tryst with postmodernity commenced post-liberalisation in the 1980s. The visual and demographic character of the city underwent a rapid change. The geographical unit of the city transformed the conurbation called National Capital Territory of Delhi (NCTD) covering 1483 sq. kilometres. The urban spilled into the peripheral towns (e.g NOIDA and Ghaziabad in Uttar Pradesh and Faridabad, Gurgaon, Bhiwani, Rewari, Bahadurgarh in Haryana) necessitating the establishment of the National Capital Region (NCR) Planning Board in 1996. In 1991, the Union Territory of Delhi attained the status of a quasi-state. In 1996, NCTD further expanded to National Capital Region (NCR). In 2018, NCR's population has crossed the 27 million mark. The postmodern, the neo-liberal and the global are responsible for the pluralism and hybrid of the post-metropolis Delhi today.

REFERENCES

- [1] Datta, V N. (2002). Panjabi Refugees and the Urban Development of Greater Delhi. In R.E Frykenberg (Ed.), *Delhi through the Ages- Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society* as reprinted in N. Gupta (Ed.) *The Delhi Omnibus*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. (first published in 1986).
- [2] *Delhi Master Plan 2021*. (2007). New Delhi: Rupa & Co.
- [3] Frykenberg, R E. (2002). The Coronation Darbar of 1911: Some Implications. In R.E Frykenberg (Ed.), *Delhi through the Ages- Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society* as reprinted in Narayani Gupta (Ed.) *The Delhi Omnibus*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. (first published in 1986).
- [4] Gupta, N. (2002). *Delhi Between Two Empires, 1803-1931: Society, Government and Urban Growth* as reprinted in Narayani Gupta (Ed.) *The Delhi Omnibus*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. (first published in 1998).
- [5] Khanna, R. and Parhawk, M. (2007). *The Modern Architecture of New Delhi:1928-2007*. NOIDA: Random House.
- [6] Metcalf, T. R. (2002). Architecture and Empire: Sir Herbert Baker and the Building of New Delhi. In R.E Frykenberg (Ed.), *Delhi through the Ages- Essays in Urban History, Culture and Society* as reprinted in N. Gupta (Ed.) *The Delhi Omnibus*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press (first published in 1986).
- [7] Mittal, S. (2015). Delhi During Pax Britannica. In *The Discussant*, Vo. 1 (3) . New Delhi: CRDJ, pp. 50-70
- [8] Peck, Lucy. (2005). *Delhi: A Thousand Years of Building*. New Delhi: Roli Books.
- [9] Grewal, Reeta. (1991). Urban Morphology under Colonial Rule. In J S Grewal (Ed.), *The City in Indian History*. New Delhi: Manohar Publisher and Distributor.
- [10] Ritu Priya (2006). Town Planning, Public Health and Delhi's Urban Poor: A Historical View. In Sujata Patel and Kushal Deb (Eds), *Urban Studies*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 223-245 (first published in 1993).
- [11] Sengupta, R. (2007). *Delhi Metropolitan: The Making of an Unlikely City*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.

