Introduction—Exploring Urban ‘Southernness’: Praxes and Theory(s)

Anjali Karol Mohan

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The Global South is an acknowledged enigma—a site that simultaneously evokes anxiety and excitement. The realization that soon, a majority of the world’s population will reside in cities of the developing world has led to a call for a corresponding shift in urban theory—away from the current dominant theorization and practice anchored within the geopolitical realities of the Global North. Epistemologically, this shift engages with the Global South as a project, perspective and provocation (Bhan et al., 2018). While there is no unified conceptualization of what constitutes the Global South, there is an emerging consensus on what it isn’t and a recognition of (if not consensus on) the fragments that constitute it.

The original version of this chapter was revised: The author’s last name is corrected from ‘X. M. Abad’ to ‘X. Méndez Abad’. The correction to this chapter is available at https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82475-4_12

A. K. Mohan (✉)
Institute of Public Policy, National Law School University of India,
Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
e-mail: anjalinmohan@nls.ac.in

© The Author(s) 2021, corrected publication 2021
A. K. Mohan et al. (eds.), *Theorising Urban Development From the Global South*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82475-4_1

Scholars distance themselves from the notion of the Southern city as a discrete, static and bounded geography. Instead, they highlight its relational nature in terms of overlapping territories and intertwined histories (Miraftab & Kudva, 2015, p. 4) and its processual nature in terms of transmutable forms of movement, encounter and exchange (Roy, 2009a, p. 821). Thus, while some view it as ‘post-colonial contexts where local and provincial governments are rather belated constructions with limited fiscal and human capacity and with incomplete administrative systems at their disposal’ (Parnell & Pieterse, 2010, p. 150) others see it as ‘modes of production of space marked by a specific temporality and agency that engages transversally with official logics of law, property, and labour’ (Caldeira, 2017, p. 3). Largely, however, the ‘Southern city’ refers to geographies in which assumptions of techno-managerial determinism and the modernistic ideals of entrenched planning models borrowed from the North are both inappropriate and inadequate for conceptualizing and intervening in its urban realities. The Southern city represents ‘new’ materialities of socio-spatial forms, modes of space production and state–society relations (McFarlane, 2008; Roy, 2012), and therefore demands a retelling—in theory and in praxis.

Arguments that position the Southern city as a ‘new geography of theory’ (Roy, 2009a, p. 819) demand a simultaneous grounding in and ‘worlding’ of the South (Roy, 2009a, p. 828). Framing the rapid urbanization processes and attendant dynamics of inequality, informality and spatial fragmentation of Southern urbanism as agendas for action and sites of knowledge production (Watson, 2009a) can potentially allow for a pragmatic and ambitious reimagination of the Southern city. Pragmatically, such framing should respond to the socio-environmental challenges in grounded, feasible and meaningful ways. Ambitiously, it should bring together the specificities and similarities of these myriad sites of knowledge production in order to establish the specific materialities and modalities of Southern urbanism as the ‘ordinary’ (Robinson, 2006, p. 1), in relation not just to urban realities but also to the global urban question (Mabin, 2014).

Embarking from such a standpoint, this volume acknowledges and embraces the contrariness of the South—not as matter of concern but as a ‘new geography of theory’ (Roy, 2009a, p. 819). Its chapters—spanning cities in India, Colombia, Ecuador, China, Israel, Namibia and Nigeria—critique existing and entrenched planning models and explore the urban reality created because of, and around, these institutionalized

models in order to discuss context-specific forms of practice, intervention and engagement. While leveraging the contradictions, complexity and hybridity of empirical specificities as entry points for understanding and theorizing the Southern city, the volume maintains a simultaneous view for generalizability towards mutual learning within and across contexts (Roy, 2009a, p. 820).

Overall, this volume focuses on two issues: (a) how, and to what extent, these geographies can learn from each other given their commonalities as well as their sociocultural specificities, and (b) how this mutual-learning process can inform a planning approach and theory seen ‘from the South’. In doing so, it seeks to contribute to what Galland and Elinbaum (2018, following the concept coined by Bourdieu, 2002) refer to as the ‘field’ [of urban planning] under construction. It offers ‘fragments’ of the urban that provide clues to the larger, oft-repeated ontological question that continues to hold: Why and what does theory from the South mean? (Mohan et al., 2020, p. 6). The objective it sets for itself is not the production of neat theories or models but an assemblage of anchored conduits that can be contextually adapted to respond to the ephemeral, complex and dynamic nature of Southern urban realities.

In setting the tone, this introductory chapter seeks to distil and discusses the call for new geographies of theory. Drawing on the thematic conceptualization of the South as a simultaneously homogeneous and heterogeneous space (Mohan et al., 2020), the volume embraces the Global South as a relational and a ‘process geography’ having emerged as a product of the interaction between two planes of space production: the homogeneous and the heterogenous. The homogeneous is the space of institutionalized practices—deriving from shared colonial history and postcolonial development narrative—that seeks to control, codify and categorize the urban. That these homogenizing practices occurred over varying timelines, intersecting with distinct and specific precolonial histories, brings in a degree of heterogeneity, which manifests itself in emerging urban forms—slums, sprawls, the peri-urban, suburban settlements—marked by temporal, incremental and flexible dynamics. The heterogeneous is thus the empirical space that has emerged as a result of the overlaying of homogeneous codifications—‘boundaries drawn onto’—on context-specific everyday practices, knowledge and imperatives—‘boundaries drawn by’.

Speaking to the South as being simultaneously homogeneous and heterogenous, the volume is divided into two parts. Part I, 'The Homogeneous South: Emerging Planning Territories', draws on four chapters that conceptualize homogeneity along two dimensions: (a) the transnational historical processes that have generated similarities in the urban experiences of diverse contexts, and (b) the homogenizing practices embedded through these processes and their operation in the contemporary context. Part II, 'The Heterogeneous South: Conflicting Rationalities', has a further five chapters, which draw upon the heterogeneous nature of urban reality and the logics that often subvert homogenizing practices. These latter chapters conceptualize heterogeneity along two dimensions: (a) the recursive processes of 'drawing onto' and 'drawing by' that result in the creation of heterogeneous urban realities, and (b) the intrinsic knowledge systems, modalities and materialities embedded within these heterogeneous realities and their potential in triggering urban innovation.

Notably, the volume conceptualizes the homogeneous and heterogeneous not as binaries—rather, these realms of space production are positioned as recursive (as against being discrete). While being anchored within a particular mode of production of space, chapters in either section direct their enquiries to the other section. In doing so, they tease out the juxtapositions that dislodge the binary conceptualization of the two modes of spatial production while foregrounding spaces of mutual learning between the two. The categorization, rather than connoting operational distance between the two modes of spatial production, is thus representative of the direction of theoretical enquiry. While the four chapters in Part I engage with a dominant theoretical lens that moves from the normative, institutionalized and abstracted space of urban planning to the reality of urban experiences, the five chapters in Part II invert the direction of theoretical enquiry by anchoring themselves within empirical specificities in order to move towards institutionalized practices of spatial production.

Following this introduction, Sect. 1.2 traces the burgeoning body of Southern theory in order to highlight the imperatives upon which it builds itself and the explorative directions that it identifies for itself. Leveraging this understanding, Sect. 1.3 validates the conceptualization of the South as a simultaneously homogeneous and heterogeneous space towards enabling an ethos of mutual learning across and within contexts.

Subsection 1.3.1 draws out the characteristics that define the homogeneous realm of space production—boundaries ‘drawn onto’—in Southern cities by focusing on the recursive processes of boundary-making and unmaking that they engender. Subsection 1.3.2 draws out the characteristics of the heterogeneous realm of space production in Southern cities by focusing on the manner in which boundaries ‘drawn onto’ are subverted into boundaries ‘drawn by’, leveraging embedded knowledge systems and capacities. The insights from these two subsections are brought together in the Discussion (Sect. 1.4), which highlights the acknowledged and unacknowledged interlinkages between the homogeneous and heterogeneous realms of spatial production along three dimensions: power, intention and modality. Subsection 1.4.1 draws out these interlinkages from the standpoint of the homogeneous realm of space production while Subsection 1.4.2 draws them out from the standpoint of the heterogeneous realm of space production. The Conclusion (Sect. 1.5) leverages these interlinkages to argue for mutual learning between the homogeneity and heterogeneity of Southern contexts as pathways towards alternative, radical and grounded theory ‘from the South’.

1.2 THE SOUTHERN TURN: NEW GEOGRAPHIES OF THEORY

While the emerging call for Southern theory is a reaction to the perception of crisis within the global consciousness, it is also triggered by a shift of majority of the urban population to the Southern cities (Bhan et al., 2018; Mabin, 2014, p. 25; Watson 2009a; Roy, 2009a). The unprecedented scale and pace of urbanization in these locations and their manifestation in crises of climate change, resource depletion and rising income inequalities is fast emerging as a stark reality, one that has triggered a postcolonial shift in most social disciplines (Mabin, 2014)—the urban included. This shift, in turn, has marked a self-reflective commitment towards societal and moral objectives that marks a rejection of the domination of theories and models from the North while exploring the South as the new centre for urban-theory generation (Mabin, 2014). The shift advocates foregrounding the complexity and diversity of the South as precedent urban futures in order to build a ‘singular script’ (Mabin, 2014, p. 22). That script, this chapter argues, should derive from and highlight the inability (and, by extension, the inefficacy) of imported urban planning models and theories to acknowledge and account for the urban

reality, and the ability of the latter to confound these borrowed models. Currently, within the dominant discourse on the urban in general and planning in particular, urban reality is reductively problematized while in fact it embodies practical innovations (Mahadevia & Joshi, 2009; Nandy, 1998, p. 2; Watson, 2009a).

The inception of planning and urban governance in most Southern cities arose through the vehicles of colonial occupation and imperialism. Planning in these contexts began with the imperatives of creating acceptable urban environments for foreign settlers, and extending administrative control and sanitary conditions to the growing numbers of Indigenous urban poor. Planning legislation, regulatory mechanisms and urban forms carrying with them visions of the ideal, modernist city were embedded by colonial governments in Southern contexts (Watson, 2009a). This notion of modernity, imported from Euro–American contexts, privileged positivist rationality and instilled techno-managerial determinism into planning praxis. This imposition of the rational order (often equated with the scientific) over all others (which were, by extension, irrational/disorderly) devalued, disrupted and marginalized other knowledge systems and socio-spatial orders even as cities continue to grow, inflected by transnational processes and ideologies (Mohan et al., 2020, p. 6).

Post-independence these models/narratives continued with minimal reform, with the dominant discourse of master plans or land-use plans being applied across most Southern cities. The hierarchical and linear ordering of such urbanisms continues to drive context-blind approaches that pursued urban imaginaries of the ‘First World’ as the ideal and framed urban realities of the ‘Third World’ as the problem (Mabin, 2014, p. 25). Concerns for urban aesthetics, modernization and functional specializations continue to dominate urban planning praxis. In effect, this highly regulatory approach coupled with tendencies to prioritize market interests has rendered the planning praxis in Southern cities culpable in the creation and exacerbation of socio-spatial exclusion. Its stagnancy, therefore, is not accidental—nor is it easy to change (Watson, 2009a). Scholars link the rigidity of these established planning mechanisms to the institutionalization of the politics of accumulation and dispossession directed by entrenched sociopolitical hierarchies and global market restructuring (Mahadevia & Joshi, 2009, p. 3). However, it must be noted that the power behind these models is not totalizing; within multiple spaces of agency, mobilization and resistance can—and do—break out. As has been previously argued within Southern scholarship, and is evidenced by

several scholars in this volume, imposed visions are subverted, adapted and contested—often resulting in socio-spatial forms that operate outside the realm of the formal.

The regulatory and context-blind approaches of the state implicitly, if not explicitly, create the unplanned city (Nandy, 1998, p. 2) and its socio-spatial signifiers—slums, squatter settlements, urban villages and peri-urban communities, among them. Positioned as the ‘other’, these are classified as the ‘informal’, which operate as exceptions to state-instituted mandates of taxation and the supervisory and legalized regime of the state. However, against the binary conceptualization of these informal modes of praxis as either manifestations of economic marginality or heroic entrepreneurialism, arguments that informality is in fact created by, embedded within and extends to the differentiating practices of the state (Appadurai, 2001; Roy, 2009b, 2012) are gaining momentum. Empirical evidence of the embeddedness of and interaction between the formal and the informal reveals how, rather than reflecting any intrinsic distinction, the institutionalized binary categorizations of the formal–informal, modern–provincial and rational–irrational are a reflection of power hierarchies (Roy, 2012). This bolsters the proposition that it is these institutionalized binaries that exacerbate spatial exclusion and inequalities (Watson, 2009b).

With formal mechanisms unable to render cities liveable, a hybrid network of actors, modalities and processes outside the formal develop in order to meet these requirements. Embodying varying degrees of power and exclusion, these informal networks and attendant modalities manoeuvre, negotiate and protect spaces of opportunity through complex processes of alliance-making and deal-breaking (Watson, 2009a). While representing structural constraints perpetuated by sociopolitical institutions, these informal practices are also representative of agency that leverages embedded knowledge systems and practices (Ahlers et al., 2014; Bakker et al., 2008). This realm of knowledge and capacities embedded within the lived space (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 362) of everyday interactions, relations and practices directs the incremental, flexible, pragmatic, transversal and rooted nature of these informal modes of space production (Bhan, 2019). The fact that these informalities constitute the dominant mode of service delivery in southern cities (Watson, 2009a, p. 2263) highlights the need to conceptualize them as ‘multiple modernities’ (Roy, 2009a, p. 828) capable of ‘deepening the pot’ (Watson, 2014, p. 63) of planning ideas and approaches.

The burgeoning body of Southern theory therefore anchors itself within the ‘gap’ between displaced planning models and place-specific urban realities. An acknowledgement of this fact is critical in enabling a Southern retelling of urban trajectories. Towards this end, this scholarship encourages scholars and practitioners alike to think in terms of intersections, interchangeability and in-betweenness in order to focus on the frontiers that defy categorization. This process begins with the definition of where the Global South manifests itself. In answer to this question, scholars emphasize the relational nature of the Global South: rather than comprising of discrete territories coterminous with national or administrative boundaries, it represents overlapping territories and intertwined histories (Miraftab & Kudva, 2015, p. 4). Across shared colonial histories and trajectories of postcolonial development, the relationality of urban experiences generated in diverse contexts constitutes both its validation and its potential as an emerging epistemology. Within these contexts, it emphasizes the existence of ‘process geographies’ that defy the neat categorization of trait geographies—i.e. bounded regions with immutable traits (Roy, 2009a, p. 822). These process geographies can be said to develop at the interface between imposed models and specific histories, ecologies and sociocultural systems.

Within these contexts, the arrival of modernity is not experienced as something that replaces the ‘old’ or pre-existing world. Rather, it juxtaposes different materialities in order to embrace tradition and modernity—in turn, creating hybrid societies (McFarlane, 2008; Roy, 2009a; Watson, 2009a, p. 2271). A ‘conflict of rationalities’ thus arises between the governing rationality, driven by notions of modernization and technocratic control of urban environments, on one hand and the survival rationality of everyday interactions, needs, practices and knowledge on the other (Roy & Ong, 2011; Watson, 2003, p. 395). This conflict of rationalities characterizes the contestations, adaptations, evasions and hybridizations that constitute the process geographies of the Global South.

Southern urban theory finds itself at a critical juncture. Enquiries into the nature of Southern cities carry within them an explicit call for action: ‘it is not enough to understand how we got here but also answer the question of where from here’ (Bhan et al., 2018, p. 1). If the epistemological relocation into the grounded modes of praxis reveals natures of ‘deep differences’ (Watson, 2006, p. 33), ‘conflict[s] of rationalities’ (Watson, 2003, p. 395) and ‘shadow materialities’ (McFarlane, 2008,

p. 341), then the subsequent question we have to ask is: How can the planning discipline respond to these specific natures? This will require an ‘auto-construction’ of the planning field through a delineation of the knowledge that should underlie it, the ethics and politics that should drive it and the professional praxis and institutional mechanisms that should characterize it (Bhan et al., 2018, p. 7). In the interest of generating such profound, exciting and less-sectional approaches, scholars highlight the importance of a carefully constructed comparative method—one that allows for indirect and uncertain learning (McFarlane, 2010; Mabin, 2014, p. 31; Roy, 2009a). This auto-construction will require framing the Global South through a paradoxical combination of generalizability and specificity—i.e. the homogeneous and the heterogeneous South. While generating theory anchored within place, it should allow the appropriation, borrowing and remapping of these theories across places. While producing authoritative knowledge that is fine-grained and nuanced, it should exceed its empiricism by allowing theoretical generalization for and from the South (Bhan, 2019; Roy, 2009a).

It is this ethos of mutual learning that directs the present volume and validates its sectional orientation in discussing the homogeneous and the heterogeneous South.

1.3 THE SIMULTANEOUSLY HOMOGENEOUS AND HETEROGENOUS SOUTHERN CITY

The aim of conceptualizing the South as being simultaneously homogeneous and heterogeneous is twofold. First, it is intended to trigger mutual learning within contexts, with the heterogeneous natures of localized forms of knowledge, praxis and materialities coalescing to generate frameworks, approaches and models that can inform urban planning at scale. Second, it should trigger a mutual learning across contexts, with the homogeneous urban experiences across diverse contexts being gathered to ‘speak’ to each other, even while it is their intrinsic heterogeneity that is acknowledged and positioned as central to theory generation.

1.3.1 *The Homogeneous South: Emerging Planning Territories*

The homogeneous is anchored in the represented, normative and institutional space of urban production. The four chapters in Part One of this book, ‘The Homogeneous South: Emerging Planning Territories’,

draw out the homogeneity along two dimensions: first, the shared colonial history and postcolonial development narratives that have created similar yet distinct layering, evolution and contestations among socio-spatial orders; second, the homogenization processes of boundary-making, categorization and control that were embedded through these historic trajectories and continue to dominate the planning practices of the state. In the contemporary context, these have interacted with processes of neoliberalization and globalization to consolidate existing and generate new modalities of techno-managerialism.

Across Latin America, Asia and Africa, urban trajectories have been marked by the overlaying of colonial forms, systems and processes on existing socio-spatial orders, followed by postcolonial interventions of nation-building. Historically, socio-spatial orders in these places have embodied (and continue to embody) an intimate and evolved understanding of ecological relations: everyday practices, livelihoods and infrastructure were premised on these relations and configured accordingly. The arrival of colonial systems and their ideologies gradually replaced, disrupted and even marginalized these historically evolved traditional practices. The importing, imposition and mimicking of Euro-American urban aesthetics, planning legislation and land-tenure arrangements often veiled insidious aims of repressing the cultural life of the colonized people while creating a social divide between native, affluent and common masses (Tom et al., 2019, p. 8). The decline of colonialism post-World War II, and the rise of sovereign states across Africa and Asia, marked the possibility of creating a home-grown script of urbanism and modernity. Yet, the newly formed governments, tasked with carving out a new identity for their nations while also addressing housing, services and employment requirements, accepted, reinforced and entrenched colonial spatial plans and land-management tools—sometimes in even more rigid form than colonial governments (Njoh, 2003, p. 2). Urban planning and governance became oriented around land-use control based on static master plans developed through bureaucratic, top-down processes and driven by visions of the ‘good city’ where ‘proper citizens’ live in ‘proper communities’ (Watson, 2003, 2009a, p. 2268). The importing and entrenchment of static planning models that continue to marginalize embedded socio-spatial orders and knowledge systems in Southern cities is, therefore, neither unique nor accidental.

It was these historical trajectories that led to homogenizing governance and regulatory mechanisms and exercises of boundary-making,

categorization and control, instituted largely to direct urban growth. The rigidity of these homogenizing practices is linked to the state’s imperative of consolidating, maintaining and negotiating social hierarchies of class, caste, race and ethnicity (Roy, 2012, p. 2). In the last quarter of the twentieth century, the neoliberal turn and the retreat of the welfare state led to the orientation of all spheres, planning and urban governance included, towards economic and market rationality. The politics of accumulation and dispossession underlying these homogenizing practices has led to the development of urban forms, materialities and modalities that embody the contrast between the survivalist rationality of inhabitants and the governing rationality of planning practices. With urban reality rarely conforming to homogeneous categories, scholars underscore that it is the boundary-making of the state that requires explanation rather than the existence of territories that defy such categorization (Roy, 2009b; Yiftachel, 1998). The four chapters constituting Part One of this volume and discussed in the rest of this section speak predominantly to this homogenization while simultaneously foregrounding heterogeneity as a lens of theoretical enquiry. They draw out the two interrelated dimensions explained above—the relationality of urban experiences resulting from transnational processes and the entrenched, homogenizing practices of the state.

The chapters analyse institutionalized urban planning and governance praxis in Indian and Chinese contexts while drawing on similarities across other Southern cities. The first chapter, by Sarani Khatua, ‘Production of Suburban Space through Metropolitan Governance in a Global South City Region’, investigates the suburban peripheries of metropolitan Kolkata as one of the ‘cities within the city’. It evidences how the boundary-making processes of the state integrate and segregate urban space for extractive or welfare agendas, and are often mediated by underlying political motivations. While being only tangentially linked to quality-of-life improvements for inhabitants, this boundary-making exercise results in the disruption, displacement and determination of socio-spatial identities. Responding to the disjunction between socio-spatial outcomes and planning praxis, Khatua argues for the need to imbue a non-hierarchical understanding of cities that takes into account ‘all peripheries’ and reflects the processualism, precariousness and potentiality of urban forms such as the peri-urban.

While Khatua discusses homogenizing processes within the urban, the second chapter, by Banashree Banerjee, ‘Planning for the Urban Mosaic

of a Mega-city: the Case of Urban Villages in Delhi' draws them out at the urban–rural edge. It explores the socio-spatial form of urban villages (in Delhi) as an intricate juxtaposition of diverse urban experiences. The chapter explores ways in which this intricacy can be responded to through formal planning praxis. Banerjee points out how over the years, as Delhi grew, urban planning and governance initiatives tried to resolve the contestations emanating from the city gradually engulfing villages, and embedded practices through alternating reformist and practical agendas. The resulting overlap of regulatory systems allows these spaces to develop a quality of 'suspended animation' and a certain 'immunity from urban governance' which is leveraged in relation to capital and labour flows to develop a heterogenous intermix of livelihoods, lifestyles and spatial forms. The chapter problematizes the inadequacies of planning praxis in hybrid contexts such as these as one of 'language'. Even as the state and its institutions recognize the heterogeneous nature of urban reality, their inability to respond adequately stems from the formally defined organizational and institutional frameworks—the homogenizing categories and tools—that, by design, do not allow for an acknowledgement of the diverse specificities on the ground.

The third chapter, by Aashish Xaxa, 'Reimagining Urban Development in a Tribal Region: Readings on a Fifth Schedule Area of India', expands on the understanding of urban villages in the rapidly urbanizing yet a relatively small city of Ranchi. It evidences how urban governance and planning processes were a result of, and benefited from, the marginalization of the original tribal inhabitants and their habitats—the urban villages—engulfed by the city. Expanding on the homogenizing practices of the state, Xaxa shows how it functions not only through boundary-making but also through the unmaking of protective boundaries. The state-led pursuit of industrial and urban development has systematically subverted protective legal provisions to dispossess the original tribal inhabitants of their land and livelihoods. By foregrounding the question of 'development for whom?', the chapter argues for an emulative planning praxis as an alternative to the current extractive model. To this end, the author foregrounds traditional knowledge systems and everyday practices of tribal populations that balance social needs with ecological imperatives as conduits towards envisioning alternate planning models.

The final chapter in Part One, by Zhi Liu and Peiming Wang, 'Urban-planning Practices in China: Struggling Between Politics and the Market', analyses how planning praxis in Chinese cities is shaped

by tensions between national-government imperatives, market pursuits and local interests. In contrast to Indian, Latin American and African examples—as well as the ‘Southeastern’ perspective from Israel seen in Chapter 7—the Chinese context is atypical in that it carries no direct imprints of colonial planning systems, yet typical in that the country’s indigenously developed planning systems are tangentially informed by Western models. The chapter adds a distinct caveat to the understanding of homogenizing practices by highlighting contestations within formal planning and governance practices in order to foreground the inconsistency within these practices. Functioning within highly centralized governance models, these tensions often render planning subsidiary to economic growth. By drawing on the materialities of missing public spaces, ‘copycat’ towns and urban villages, Liu and Wang argue pragmatically for addressing local requirements and social justice through a planning praxis that mediates between the imposition of state visions and the precedence of market-oriented private interests.

1.3.2 *The Heterogeneous South: Conflicting Rationalities*

The heterogeneous is anchored in the empirical and experiential space of urban production. This volume conceptualizes the heterogeneous South along two dimensions: first, heterogeneity as a result of the interaction between the homogenizing practices of the state and specific configurations of land, infrastructure, economy and cultural systems; second, the distinct knowledge systems, logics and modalities that characterize the emerging urban forms of Southern urbanism.

While shared colonial histories and development narratives contribute a degree of homogeneity to the urban experience of the South, their intersections on different timelines and across distinct histories, ecological conditions and sociocultural systems render them heterogeneous. This heterogeneity manifests itself in the empirical or experiential space, which is marked by hybridity, multiplicity and complexity. The fact that this urban reality doesn’t conform to the homogeneous categories of the state is often positioned as the crux of the urban problem. State-led planning praxis, with its techno-managerial and modernist notions of ideal urban forms and modalities, approaches this non-conforming heterogeneity with a reformist agenda—seeking to either displace it or hide it from sight (Watson, 2009b). The paradox in this reformist agenda relates to the fact that these non-conforming forms and the inadequate materialities

(poverty, inequality, informality) that they embody are, in fact, consequential to the homogenizing processes of the state. For instance, as a city grows to engulf surrounding agrarian settlements with their embedded or 'traditional' systems of land and livelihood configurations, a dense intermixing, hybridization and juxtaposition of urban and rural develops to create the socio-spatial form of urban villages. However, the binary categorizations of urban–rural, traditional–modern and formal–informal that are characteristic of formal planning and governance mechanisms are unable to adequately grasp—and, by extension, intervene within—these heterogeneous urban forms (Kasarda & Crenshaw, 1991). This uncertainty notwithstanding, inhabitants within these locales—driven by survivalist and developmental imperatives—eke out spaces of opportunity and habitation in a temporal, incremental and rooted manner (Bhan, 2019). The multiple boundaries 'drawn onto' empirical space by institutional acts of integration, segregation, neglect and erasure are therefore subverted, reinterpreted and contested through everyday acts of citizen agency, which result in new boundaries that are 'drawn by' inhabitants. While these boundaries 'drawn onto' abstract space by the state are marked by the attachment of binary adjectives, the boundaries 'drawn by' inhabitants in the lived space are marked by the enactment of juxtaposition. Together, the iterative processes concomitantly create the heterogeneous realities of the urban South.

These 'drawn by' boundaries are exemplified in the urban forms of slums, squatter settlements, urban villages, peri-urban edges and suburban settlements that exist embedded within, at the edges of and at the intersections of homogeneous categories of the state. Until recently, they were theorized as exceptional urban forms synonymous with the tensions of over-urbanization, megalopolization and the urban primacy of Southern urbanism. However, scholars highlight the need to look beyond the tropes of exceptionality (stark poverty or heroic survival) and position them as an alternate mode of production of space (Bhan, 2019; Roy, 2012, p. 3; Watson, 2014). This approach requires foregrounding the specific temporality and agency of these settlements, which engages transversally with official logics of law, property and labour (Caldeira, 2017). As opposed to the formal production of space—which operates on evidence-based policymaking, techno-rational reasoning and marketized forms of praxis—this grounded production of space embraces uncertainty; is driven by everyday concerns and pursuits; and anchors itself in

spatial, historical and sociopolitical specificities. Representing the dominant mode of production of space in the Global South, scholars theorizing the urban consider these socio-spatial signifiers as tutelary personages (Watson, 2009a, p. 2263)—as a constellation of affordable, feasible and pragmatic responses that build on the exigencies of the socio-spatial inequalities and shortages of the contemporary Southern city. ‘Seeing from the South’ will therefore require privileging not only the localized knowledge, embedded wisdom and cultural specificities that characterize these heterogeneous modes of production of space but also the dominant forms of urban membership and politics that they engender.

The five chapters in this Part II of the book, exemplifying the heterogeneity encountered in the Southern city, draw out the two interrelated dimensions explained above—the extrinsic creation of heterogeneity through interaction with homogenizing practices and its intrinsic creation leveraging embedded knowledge systems, logics and modalities. Its chapters analyse the empirical specificities of urban experiences, politics and space production across Latin America, Asia and Africa. The first chapter, by Edwar Calderón, ‘Invisible Territories: the Visibility of an Urban Crisis in Medellín’, considers the hypertrophy of settlements emerging in response to ‘forced urbanization’ and the attendant dichotomy of visibility–invisibility that is maintained as an exercise of power. With urban growth increasingly driven by internally displaced migrants, the new marginal territories that develop at the peripheries of cities confound the homogeneous categories of the state, denying them territorial and legal recognition. They are thereby assigned a quality of invisibility that manifests itself as a ‘politics of apparition’. The author evidences the ways in which not just state players but also inhabitants opportunistically wield this visibility–invisibility dynamic towards habitational, political and economic imperatives. He thereby qualifies the demand for visibility not as one of equality but as one of recognition, since ‘equality homogenizes but recognition diversifies’. This recognition, Calderón argues, can be facilitated through the tool of participatory mapping, which can potentially bridge between heterogeneous specificities and homogeneous categorizations.

The second chapter by Oren Yiftachel and Nir Cohen, ‘Defensive Urban Citizenship: AView from Southeastern Tel Aviv’, considers the making of urban identities through ‘defensive urban citizenship’, expanding on the understanding of ‘invisible territories’ elucidated by Calderón. Tracing the neoliberal and xenophobic planning policies

behind property-led urban regeneration, attracting creative residents and establishing flagship cultural institutions, Yiftachel and Cohen highlight the emergence of territories suspended in a 'condition of displaceability'. By analysing one such neighbourhood and its three dominant communities, their chapter highlights how 'defensive urban citizenship' develops as inhabitants perceive, mobilize and react to threats. Diverse communities coalesce under a new identity that practices citizenship through mobilization against hegemonically defined spaces and policies. By evidencing the ways in which this mobilization is not just reactionary but accrues protective and contributive dimensions over time, the authors argue for using this new and persistent form of urban membership as a lens through which to understand the Southern city.

The third chapter, by Xavier Méndez Abad, Hans Leinfelder and Kris Scheerlinck, 'Everyday Practices and Public Space (Re-)appropriation in El Cisne Dos, Guayaquil', draws on upgrading projects in informal or self-developed neighbourhoods in order to contrast, compare and analyse official mechanisms of space production alongside spatial self-production, everyday rhythms and local practical knowledge. Their chapter expands on the understanding of emergent and insurgent urban identities discussed by Yiftachel and Cohen in order to show the distinct forms of spatial production and appropriation that they engender. It shows how the recognition of rights, sociocultural specificities and diverse logics of spatial production in historically neglected areas has led to a new direction in policy, positioning in situ upgrading as an accepted model. By focusing on public-space renovation and provisioning within these projects, it argues that the continued reliance on standard spatial models that engage in a limited manner with everyday local dynamics results in physical determinism and the perpetuation of dominating socio-spatial structures. In contrast, it draws out the 'ordinary' re-appropriation of space through gradual, mundane and particular concern-based actions of inhabitants in pursuit of livelihoods, recreation, socialization and spatial personalization. By showing how this grounded spatial production subverts the institutionalized conception of space, the chapter highlights the need to move beyond approaches that aim at standardized aesthetics and spatial products towards perspectives anchored in everyday appropriations, meanings and practices.

The fourth chapter, by Guillermo Delgado, 'Situated Modernities: Socio-Spatial Co-production in Namibia', analyses the emerging modes

of co-produced spatial production in Namibia to argue that these represent situated modernities. It builds on the other chapters in this section by positioning bottom-up spatial production as an alternative to the homogeneous models of the state. Namibia’s experimentation in the 1990s with a new form of bottom-up spatial production emerged through grassroots mobilization for land and housing. While initially showcasing welfare-based relations, over the years it consolidated into a dominant form of spatial production that presented new forms of stakeholder relations facilitated through financial allocations towards an urban transformation process. By comparing bottom-up and top-down spatial production along engagement modalities, temporality and costs, the chapter positions grounded spatial production as a situated modernity that obtains legitimacy through presence, orients itself on collective demands and leverages knowledge of urban development made accessible and transformable at lower levels. It further emphasizes the importance of acknowledging, integrating and adopting these situated modernities within mainstream planning processes.

The final chapter in this section, by Taibat Lawanson, ‘Planning and Pentecostalism in the Spatial (Re-)configuration of Lagos’, considers spatial production by religious organizations in Lagos and their impact on the morphology and land-use configurations of the city. The author highlights the ways in which this spatial production is often in disregard, subversion and contestation of planning regulations. It expands on the understanding of bottom-up spatial production elucidated in the previous chapters to caution against a romantic conception of the much-touted emancipatory effects of bottom-up practices. The author traces space production through religious activities in Lagos to show how these can transform into a homogenizing force. Amidst state failures, Lawanson highlights religion and religious institutions as propagators of alternate urban visions that wield significant impact on patterns of land appropriation, governance and management. Exploiting yet contradicting the state’s perception of religion as a benign presence, infrastructural and relational transformations such as new towns, religious gentrification and interim spaces enacted by religious institutions pass by undetected. By showing how space production by religious institutions has become as aggressive, dictatorial and benevolent as state-led practices, the chapter highlights the importance of visibilizing the agency and agendas underlying grounded modes of spatial production.

1.4 DISCUSSION

The arguments and provocations across this volume's grounded explorations into the relational socio-spatial geographies of Asia, Africa and Latin American point to the anchoring within empirical specificities of the Global South as a pathway rather than a preclusion towards mutual learning. The implicit question contained within the individual chapters and the volume as a whole is how the diversity of space production within contexts, on the one hand, and the specificities and similarities in urban experiences across contexts, on the other, can be brought together in a mutual learning process that helps progress towards an integrated and grounded field of urban praxis and theorization. It is with this intent that the volume conceptualizes the South as a simultaneously homogeneous and heterogeneous place. This conceptualization allows the drawing out of (1) the uniqueness of the intrinsic imperatives, logics and modalities that mark these geographies; and (2) the similarities, simultaneity and interactions that bind them. The remainder of this discussion disqualifies the binary conceptualization of homogeneous and heterogeneous to unpack the interlinkages within and between these along dimensions of power, intention and modalities.

1.4.1 *The Homogeneous South*

Power: The chapter by Liu and Wang draws on the Chinese experience in order to qualify the power of the state's homogenizing practices. They argue that the homogeneous realm of space production, far from operating as a cohesive force, is rife with contestations within itself. The translation of the boundaries that it draws onto empirical space is marked by multiple adaptations, contestations and subversions. Banerjee's analysis of the urban villages of Delhi evidences this argument: mandated master-planning efforts over the years have resulted in an overlapping of urban regulatory guidelines with traditional systems of land ownership and tenure that creates a state of suspended animation in these socio-spatial forms. Inhabitants in these villages leverage this ambiguous state in order to create a new identity for themselves. They develop mechanisms that tap into market opportunities through tools such as quasi-legal land transfers in order to contribute to spaces that provide cheap rental units, supply labour and support discrepant urban activities. The boundaries drawn onto space by the state are thereby subverted into boundaries

drawn by the agency of the inhabitants in response to their social, political, cultural and economic imperatives. Xaxa correlates this agency to a realm of embedded knowledge systems anchored in the everyday practices of tribal communities. His chapter points to an intimate understanding of ecological orders that tribal communities embody and that can potentially be leveraged to respond to the emerging imperatives of sustainability and equitability.

Modalities: The chapters highlight how the entrenched modalities of homogenizing practices limit their ability to intervene in heterogeneous realities. Often, while the state recognizes the empirical heterogeneity abounding its homogeneous categories, its continued reliance on tools and models embodying technocratic, binary and hierarchical categorizations precludes it from intervening in a meaningful, appropriate and effective manner. Banerjee shows how the Delhi masterplan—while recognizing the temporal, multi-use nature of urban villages—continues to employ instruments of static planning frameworks such as land-use zoning and development codes to implement change. Further, the plan continues to orient itself on a simplistic, reformist agenda with an assumption that the subsuming of these settlements into the formal order will implicitly trigger development. Such an approach negates the contribution of these grounded modes of space production in taking on state responsibilities of housing, services and employment provision arguably in more affordable and sustainable manners. The imperative, therefore, is to move beyond the language of ‘drawing onto’ and adopt and acknowledge the language of ‘drawing by’—i.e. the rationalities, modalities and processes critical to reshape planning praxis and regulatory models should be derived from grounded modes of spatial production.

Intention: The chapters draw out the intention that these institutionalized praxes conceal as opposed to the rationality that they project. The orthodoxy of modernistic and technocratic planning and governance models has led to state action that is largely oriented towards reforming, upgrading and integrating un-tameable forms into controllable models and orders. Be it in the boundary-making processes of suburban towns in Kolkata (as highlighted by Khatua) or of the urban villages in Delhi and Ranchi (as highlighted by Banerjee and Xaxa), the state projects agendas of development or reformation in order to validate the categorization and control that it draws onto space. All three authors highlight the internal contradictions in these agendas. While purportedly framed as ‘developmental’, these agendas often mask the extractive, accumulative

and political objectives of various state–society–market stakeholders. Critically, the binaries of urban–rural, traditional–modern, formal–informal and planned–unplanned underlying state action and agendas are, in effect, difficult to defend against an overwhelming body of evidence of the diverse on-the-ground materialities and modalities that occur as intricately juxtaposed in context.

1.4.2 *The Heterogeneous South*

The subsequent five chapters discuss the occurrence of heterogeneous urban realities despite, and because of, the homogenizing practices of the state as well as the specific logic, modalities and complexities that they embody.

Power: The chapters foreground the power and agency embodied in grounded modes of spatial production, evidenced by their ability to remake not just physical but also social space. While Calderón terms this physical remaking a hypertrophy of settlements that develops in relation to processes of rapid urbanization, migration and neoliberalization, Yiftachel and Cohen link it to transit neighbourhoods marked by conditions of displaceability, with xenophobic and gentrifying tendencies gaining prominence in state agendas. Both the chapters then highlight the remaking of urban relations and identities triggered within these new territories. Calderón points to a subversive modality of urban membership termed as ‘politics of apparition’, with dynamics of visibility and invisibility being opportunistically wielded by state and society alike while negotiating market processes, political visions and survivalist imperatives. Yiftachel and Cohen point to a reactionary modality of urban politics termed ‘defensive urban citizenship’, wherein diverse identities amidst conditions of displaceability mobilize against the perception of larger or common threats to develop new identities that derive from a rejection of hegemonies. While initially occupying a reactionary or contrarian position, the authors point to the flexible nature of these identities that allows them to contribute to processes of space production. Méndez Abad et al. highlight these contributions at the neighbourhood scale, where residents re-appropriate public space through everyday practices. Delgado highlights similar re-appropriation at the city scale while discussing grassroots movements around land and housing. In all five contexts—Medellín; Tel Aviv; El Cisne Dos, Guayaquil; Lagos; and cities across Namibia—the authors trace the subversion of the states’ hegemonic visions, relations and

politics. The remaking of urban territories thus contributes incrementally to an alternative realm of urban visions, relations and politics.

Modalities: The chapters highlight the unique modalities leveraged by these grounded modes of production of space to contrast and meet official mechanisms of standardized, static and control-based space production. For example, in considering public-space upgrading projects in the informal settlements of El Cisne Dos, Méndez Abad et al. draw out the ways in which the state’s aim of neighbourhood improvement reaches only limited fruition as it continues to rely on physically determinist and aestheticized models that engage minimally with local dynamics, practices and perception. In contrast, the authors examine the everyday re-appropriation of public space in order to highlight its alignment with community perceptions, priorities and relational dynamics. This grounded spatial production is the cumulative product of distributed, particular concern-based, incremental actions that flexibly adopt, reject and subvert institutionalized conceptions of space. Delgado scales up this analysis to the city level by contrasting grassroots land and housing movements with state-led planning praxis. He highlights how these grounded modes of spatial production often emanate from state incapacities in provisioning citizen and city needs. While initially located outside of legal domains, such space production gains legitimacy and success by orienting problem framing, attendant resource mobilization and interventions at the community level. Stakeholder relations between inhabitants, civil society, universities, private players and the state are configured such that knowledge of territorial transformation is acknowledged to reside at the level of lived experience and is made accessible and transformable from the ground up through tools like community-led data collection and participatory mapping. These grounded modes of spatial production represent a situated modernity that leverages contexts of unpredictability, complexity and disparity and draws on embedded knowledge and everyday experiences to produce socio-spatial outcomes that contrast with, and often mitigate, inadequacies in state-led planning praxis.

Intention: Finally, the chapters caution against romantic conceptualizations of the intention of grounded spatial production. Emancipatory impacts are not a given in either bottom-up or top-down spatial production. Through an analysis of grounded spatial production by religious organizations in Lagos, Lawson evidences new forms of parochial practice that are just as aggressive, dictatorial and benevolent as state-led

praxis—especially when their incremental acquisition of power goes undetected by techno-rational models of the state. Arguably, bottom-up and top-down spatial production constitute complementary realms, showcasing interlinkages that can be potentially leveraged towards triggering co-production.

To conclude on this discussion, the trajectories of theoretical enquiry from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous and vice versa intersect to create a narrative that draws out the interlinkages between the two. Homogenizing practices of the state position socio-spatial forms such as suburban towns (Khatua), urban villages (Banashree; Xaxa) and informal settlements (Calderón; Méndez Abad et al.) along different degrees of visibility corresponding to its binary and hierarchical categorizations. However, the power hierarchies reflected in this disjunctive positioning result in the development of dynamics of ‘suspended animation’ (Banerjee) or ‘conditions of displaceability’ (Yiftachel and Cohen). These dynamics are wielded by the agency of inhabitants to create new modalities of urban membership and politics. These can be (a) subversive, such as the ‘politics of apparition’ as referred to by Calderón while discussing Medellín; (b) reactionary, such as the ‘defensive urban citizenship’ framed by Yiftachel and Cohen; or (c) contributive, as evidenced by Méndez Abad et. al. through the re-appropriation of public space at the neighbourhood level and by Delgado at the city scale.

On one hand, the progression of this grounded spatial production can morph into hegemonies—as Lawanson cautions through the case of religious organizations in Lagos. On the other, the progression of top-down spatial production can be marked by internal contestations, as Liu and Wang draw out in the case of Chinese planning praxis. Overall, the power of homogeneous modes of spatial production is not totalizing but neither is the power of heterogeneous modes of spatial production marginal. The rationality of homogeneous space production often masks sociopolitical intentions while the emancipatory intention of heterogeneous modes of spatial production is not a given. Complementary modalities underly both modes of production, with homogeneous modes of production embodying control, order and predictability and heterogeneous modes of production embodying incrementality, flexibility and uncertainty. It is within these interlinkages in power, intention and modalities that the volume positions a call for mutual learning towards grounded theorizing. It seeks to leverage this ‘in-betweenness’ of homogeneous and heterogeneous modes of space production for a recursive, aggregated and disaggregated process of mutual learning within and across contexts.

1.5 CONCLUSION

The present volume aligns itself with the need for pragmatism and ambition in Southern urban theory. Its anchoring within the empirical specificities of Southern urbanisms is oriented towards an exercise of theory-building that presents both actions for context-specific implementation and abstractions for context-spanning derivations. It is to this end that the pathway of mutual learning between the similarities and specificities of Southern contexts mediates the long-perpetuated gap between theory and praxis. This mutual learning should operate at two levels: across and within contexts.

Across contexts, the relationality of urban trajectories due to transnational processes of colonial rule, postcolonial development and marginalization of embedded socio-spatial orders should facilitate framing of their urban materialities, experiences and forms both as recurring homogeneities and heterogeneous specificities. The volume attempts such a framing when it draws out the socio-spatial specificities of the diverse geographies of Latin America, Asia and Africa and gathers them to speak amongst themselves. For instance, urban villages of India and China emerge as symptomatic manifestations of the institutionalized binaries between urban–rural and traditional–modern. Similarly, the defensive urban citizenship emerging in the transit neighbourhoods of Israel can be read as an evolution or variation of the politics of apparition emerging in the invisible territories of Medellín, Colombia. The shared histories of the diverse geographies of the Global South that intersect across different timelines and different socio-spatial configurations allow relatable yet varying urban experiences that can be leveraged for fluid comparisons, distilling, displacing and directing perspectives that can potentially trigger urban innovation.

Within contexts, the potential for mutual learning is located at the interlinkage points between homogeneous and heterogeneous modes of space production. While both realms involve distinct logics, modalities and temporalities, it is at the interlinkages between them that the potential for approaching, unpacking and leveraging the complexity, hybridity and multiplicity of Southern urbanisms lie. Finally, the volume positions mutual learning between the homogeneous and heterogeneous modes of space production along three processes.

First, through a process of recognition that foregrounds a non-hierarchical processual understanding of space production (Khatua).

Evidence of multiple peripheries (Khatua) or overlapping mosaics (Banerjee) or hypertrophy of settlements (Calderón) negates the institutionalized conceptualization of the urban as a collection of discrete, static and controllable categories. The homogenizing practices of the state that aim to integrate, segregate, erase or neglect heterogeneous specificities interact with the agency of inhabitants acting in response to survivalist and developmental imperatives and adapting, rejecting or subverting boundaries 'drawn onto' space into boundaries 'drawn by'. Acknowledgement of how urban identities, materialities and relationships are in fact a product of the overlapping, embeddedness and intersections between boundaries 'drawn onto' and boundaries 'drawn by' provides an opportunity to dismantle binaries and the hierarchical positioning of homogeneous and heterogeneous modes of space production.

Second, proceeding from such an acknowledgement requires a process of elicitation of grounded vocabularies. That the homogeneous models that continue to use modalities of 'drawing onto' cannot be relied upon is clear from Banerjee's analysis of Delhi's master-planning approach towards urban villages and Méndez Abad et al.'s analysis of in situ upgrading projects in El Cisne Dos. Instead, territorial transformation embedded in lived experience and everyday practices requires elicitation—as does its directionality towards institutionalized modes of spatial production. To the former situation, both Calderón and Lawanson emphasize the visibilizing rather than the subsuming of the agency, logics and modalities of grounded spatial production. To the latter, assistive tools such as participatory mapping and community-initiated household enumerations emerge as critical, as highlighted by both Calderón and Delgado.

Third, the elicitation of these grounded vocabularies will have to be mobilized towards urban transformation through a recursive process of aggregation and disaggregation. The argument here is that responding to Southern urbanisms cannot be an either-or choice between homogeneous and heterogeneous spatial production. On one hand, there is a need for an aggregation of grounded vocabularies anchored in heterogeneous specificities towards informing institutionalized modes of spatial production. On the other, a disaggregation of institutionalized modes of spatial production in order to support, direct and scale heterogeneous modes of spatial production in alignment with the identified socio-ecological goals of communities is required. The need for such a recursive directionality is highlighted by Lawanson's evidence on how it is the disjunction between the homogeneous and heterogeneous modes of production

rather than their intrinsic qualities that results in negative impacts such as the entrenchment of socio-spatial inequalities.

In responding to the enigma of the Global South as a project, provocation and place, this volume conceptualizes it as a relational and processual geography of simultaneous homogeneity and heterogeneity. This conceptualization is anchored in the volume’s understanding that the ‘singular script’ of the South is one written in contraries and simultaneity. Its answers, therefore, are contained in its ‘in-betweenness’, in the spaces between its similarities and specificities—i.e. its homogeneities and heterogeneities. While the chapters in Part I trace this in-betweenness from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous realms of space production, those in Part II trace it from the latter to former. In doing so, they interpret the call for theory ‘from the South’ as one that, while being placed within the empirical specificities of contexts, can be displaced towards generalizability across contexts. The chapters (Two–Ten), while not presenting totalizing theories or models, articulate clues and fragments that, while being assembled to answer the question of the Global South, are capable of reconstructing the question itself.

In contrast, the conclusion (Chapter 11), as a way forward, puts forth arguments for a transformative urban development process that starts from within. The authors propose a grammarian alternative and an autopoietic communication model of space production that relies on an interaction between natural order and social order. They identify processes of insurgent citizenship, urban dialectics and generative designs, which could be used to shape this autopoietic process. Overall, the volume and its chapters are ‘works in progress’ towards theorizing urban development from the Global South. In doing so, they align, respond to and embody the contrarian, ephemeral and intricate nature of Southern urbanisms themselves.

Acknowledgements The author acknowledges the contribution of Sneha Maria Varghese in sifting through and collating the background literature while also being an eager ‘ear’ in formulating the arguments presented in this chapter.

REFERENCES

- Ahlers, R., Cleaver, F., Rusca, M., & Schwartz, K. (2014). Informal space in the urban waterscape: Disaggregation and co-production of water services. *Water Alternatives*, 7(1), 1–14.
- Appadurai, A. (2001). Deep democracy: Urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(2), 23–43.
- Bakker, K., Kooy, M., Shofiani, N. E., & Martijn, E. (2008). Governance Failure: Rethinking the institutional dimensions of urban water supply to poor households. *World Development*, 36(10), 1891–1915.
- Bhan, G. (2019). Notes on a Southern urban practice. *Environment and Urbanization*, 31(2), 639–654.
- Bhan, G., Srinivas, S., & Watson, V. (2018). *The Routledge companion to planning in the global south*. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Routledge.
- Caldeira, T. P. (2017). Peripheral urbanization: Autoconstruction, transversal logics, and politics in cities of the global south. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 35(1), 3–20.
- Galland, D., & Elinbaum, P. (2018). A ‘Field’ under construction: The state of planning in Latin America and the southern turn in planning. *disP—The Planning Review*, 54(1), 18–24.
- Kasarda, J. D., & Crenshaw, E. M. (1991). Third world urbanization: Dimensions, theories, and determinants. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17(1), 467–501.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Blackwell.
- Mabin, A. (2014). Grounding southern city theory in time and place. In S. Parnell & S. Oldfield (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook on cities of the global south* (pp. 21–36). Routledge.
- Mahadevia, D., & Joshi, R. (2009). *Subversive urban development in India: Implications on planning education*. Working Paper—1, Centre for Urban Equity, CEPT University, Ahmedabad.
- McFarlane, C. (2008). Urban shadows: Materiality, the ‘southern city’ and urban theory. *Geography Compass*, 2(2), 340–358.
- McFarlane, C. (2010). The comparative city: Knowledge, learning, urbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(4), 725–742.
- MirafTAB, F., & Kudva, N. (2015). *Cities of the global south reader*. Routledge.
- Mohan, A. K., Parthasarathy, A., Mahajan, P., & Pellissery, S. (2020). *Plurality of voices: Emerging pathways towards planning southern cities*. Institute of Public Policy, National Law Institute of India University.
- Nandy, A. (1998). *The secret politics of our desires: Innocence*. Zed Books.
- Njoh, A. (2003). *Planning in contemporary Africa: The state, town planning and society in Cameroon*. Ashgate.

- Parnell, S., & Pieterse, E. (2010). The ‘right to the city’: Institutional imperatives of a developmental state. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(1), 146–162.
- Robinson, J. (2006). *Ordinary cities: Between modernity and development*. Routledge.
- Roy, A. (2009a). The 21st-century metropolis: New geographies of theory. *Regional Studies*, 43(6), 819–830.
- Roy, A. (2009b). Why India cannot plan its cities: informality, insurgency and the idiom of urbanization. *Planning Theory*, 8(1), 76–87.
- Roy, A. (2012). Urban informality: The production of space and practice of planning. In R. Crane & R. Weber (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of urban planning* (pp. 691–705). Oxford University Press.
- Roy, A. (2014). Worlding the south: Toward a post-colonial urban theory. In S. Parnell & S. Oldfield (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook on cities of the global south* (pp. 9–20). Routledge.
- Roy, A., & Ong, A. (2011). *Worlding cities: Asian experiments and the art of being global*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tom, M. N., Sumida, H. E., & McCarty, T. L. (2019). Indigenous knowledge as vital contributions to sustainability. *International Review of Education*, 65, 1–18.
- Watson, V. (2003). Conflicting rationalities: Implications for planning theory and ethics. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 4(4), 395–407.
- Watson, V. (2006). Deep difference: Diversity, planning and ethics. *Planning Theory*, 5(1), 31–50.
- Watson, V. (2009a). Seeing from the South: Refocusing urban planning on the globe’s central urban issues. *Urban Studies*, 46(11), 2259–2275.
- Watson, V. (2009b). ‘The planned city sweeps the poor away...’: Urban planning and 21st century urbanisation. *Progress in Planning*, 72(3), 151–193.
- Watson, V. (2014). Co-production and collaboration in planning—The difference. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(1), 62–76.
- Yiftachel, O. (1998). Planning and social control: exploring the dark side. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 12(4), 395–406.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.