Bombay was not an indigenous Indian city. It was built by the British expressly for trade. And, like settlements that are not expected to become large towns, it was not planned. Instead, it came into being with every step of its growth being impulsive and incremental — expressing in its form the idea of the city as a field of human enterprise.

This had some shortcomings, for the lack of a master plan, or clear overall design, resulted in a situation where the city was always ill-prepared for growth. However, this also offered some flexibility, for each addition or intervention was an opportunity, potential option, to compensate for deficiencies or reinforce positive attributes of the existing physical structure. This allowed the city to renew its physical expression in response to contemporary aspirations.

Thus, Bombay was never conceived or built in a singular image. In fact, the city's evolution consistently makes evident a series of dualities, a phenomena where two worlds—two ideas and interests—influenced a particular situation. Obviously, the reference to 'two worlds' is only emblematic of representing multiple dualities that are broader than those of mere economic difference — the rich-poor divide. They include dualities in lifestyles, cultural attitudes, planned interventions versus kinetic or incremental growth, big moves versus small gestures, passive versus active interventions, governmental action versus private initiative, the pukka versus the kutch city, etc. In short,
the opposite forces that mould the same geographic space — Bombay.

To understand the physical development of Bombay, it is crucial to examine patterns of change in terms of these dualities. It is then that one could give logic to the unfolding of historical events beyond mere chronology.

In the larger patterns and rhythms in Bombay’s existence, one focuses first on immediate events — the moment, or a particular time-frame — a short count or small move. These include the removal of the ramparts, the reclamation projects, work of a particular governor or architect, the event of the British departing, the creation of a planning agency or authority, the concept of New Bombay, or more recently, crusades by various citizens’ groups and political parties to remake the city in a particular image.

The other is a far longer count, broader rhythm or big move, that represents the more significant aspects of the city’s realities and evolution. At first, broader rhythms are imperceptible, manifesting themselves through introductions and modifications that establish new structures and bring about gradual but irreversible social change. In Bombay, these included planting the seed of commercialism and the capitalist ethos, establishing the city as factory, drastic population fluctuations, the introduction of the railways or other forms of technological inputs, and recently, an unprecedented scale of rural migration resulting in the institution and erosion of social norms. In short, the creation and transformation of mentalities and sensibilities. In contrast, short rhythms seem unique and
singular in their attempts. However, when the city is viewed in terms of broader rhythms, we perceive repetitions, rhythms that reassert a sense of the irreversibility of the processes unleashed (the further you get from the past, the more plausible it seems) Both these views of the city are true, as also that most significant events are related to the broader rhythms of the city’s evolution — implying that the physical form of the city is an outcome of several events triggered off by wider social, economic and technological changes.

However, what runs through these events is the existence and reinforcing of incomprehensible dualities, the constant interaction of opposing events and their coming together and moving apart: all set in the broader rhythms of change. This is why in Bombay, the processes started at the time of settling the town and creating the dual city structures, setting it up as a market and introducing the capitalist ethos, are being physically manifest today as events leading to the irreversible creation and existence of two worlds on the same space — Bombay.

The Evolution of a Core

In examining events that might have had specific relation to the urban morphology of Bombay, the perceptible ones of significance were the steady consolidation of Bombay’s fortune in the 1830s with its high point being the Cotton Boom of the 1860s. This creation of wealth was facilitated by the rise of the great Indian Peninsula Railway (which reached Thana in 1853). During this period the shares of almost all enterprises rose to astonishing heights, stimulating the proposal and execution of the large number of city projects.

The Rampart Removal Project initiated by Sir Bartle Frere, a dynamic governor, was to be the first major civic improvement project in the city. The rampart removal signified a symbolic and real change of purpose for Bombay. For it no longer needed to serve as a western defence fort, as it was now a prosperous trading settlement. The demolition of the ramparts intensified, clarified and made irreversible this change of function. Simultaneously, due to the influx of both population and wealth, land values rose manifold as speculation became frantic, encouraging land reclamation.

While producing great opportunity for city expansion, the combination of the rampart removal and creation of additional land through reclamation allowed for the restructuring and reinforcing of the Fort area (which is now the image centre for the larger urban area of Bombay). In fact, the magnificent ensemble of Gothic buildings (the High Court, University building, Post and Telegraph, the Old Secretariat, etc.) that were built along the sea edge, represent perhaps the first consciously conceived urban design gestures to be found in colonial India. Similarly, the old Cotton Green in front of the Town Hall was restructured by the creation of Horniman Circle. This was used as an opportunity to set up a formal east-west axis for the city centre. The east-west axis emanated from the vista of the bay to the west. Similarly, a north-south axis was created; this was later anchored at one end with the grand Victoria Terminus, and at the other end by the Gateway of India. The intersection of these two axes was celebrated by the building of Flora Fountain on the site of the old Churchgate in 1887. The cross-axis was further reinforced with the development of Hornby Road (since renamed Dadabhaji Navroji Road) in 1898. The development along Hornby Road was an important component in unifying the renovated Fort areas, connecting the crescent of public buildings south of Flora Fountain (that is, Elphinstone College, Sassoon Library, the University, Watsons Hotel) to the grand Victoria Terminus at the northern end. This brought together disparate elements in the composition of the newly designed city core.

Thus, every opportunity was being used by the government to set up a cohesive urban form by using urban technology (buildings and infrastructure) relevant to the representation of power. This was in complete contrast to the additive, incremental and impulsive growth which had characterized the Fort area since the inception of the settlement of Bombay.

However, besides the creation of a distinct core, the boom decades of the 1860s and 70s also brought fragmentary development all over the island. Mills were set up bringing immigrants from the neighbouring agricultural districts. The area where the mills were located grew to become the heart of the Indian town (Buleshwar, Girgaum, Naggada, Kamathipura, etc.). Here, unlike the city centre, there was a complete lack of control over the sites being developed for housing or industrial use. This part of the town integrated residential, commercial and religious activity patterns in a tightly knit urban fabric like a traditional Indian town. In short, it was the creation of an urban fabric far removed from the western pattern being etched on and around the Fort area — the symbolic centre of power. Now Bombay had two separate towns, European and Indian, and there were several parallel residential, commercial, religious and recreational areas for both — two spaces in which different worlds existed with minimal conflict.
Structuring the City

By 1900, Bombay had established itself as a primate city in India and the larger Asian region. However, on account of the inherent polarity that had been established in the dual city pattern, a singular ‘master plan’ was an impossibility. Therefore, as the population in Bombay grew, improvement in the city depended upon tangible problems (namely, overcrowding, epidemics, etc.). The restless pursuit of self-interest that had created the commercial city ensured its natural momentum, and the rich continued making their city viable via impulsive planning interventions and projects when the need arose. In this situation, therefore, the funds followed the rich. As they fled the inner city to the suburbs (Malabar Hill, Worli, etc.) improvements followed along those lines. Similarly, the development of the suburbs occurred due to the introduction of efficient public transport. This was to fundamentally alter the perception of the potential growth patterns of the city, thus triggering off a new set of events and possibilities to physically structure the city — perhaps the last of the ‘big moves’.

The development of the suburbs (increasing in intensity at the start of the 1900s) created a central business district through divorcing housing from trade. Work and residence had been combined in the old Fort area until the British sections of the population sought relief from congested quarters further afield. This split symbolized the beginning of a distinct polarization and spatial segregation within the Indian population. For the services and shanty towns of the poor followed the rich (primarily the British, and some wealthy Indians that followed suit) into their retreats at the higher altitudes up on Malabar and Cumballa Hills. However, these shanty towns and settlements of the poor were far flung, giving rise to minimal physical visibility and conflict between the two classes. Thus, controls to check the physical growth of the city were never necessary as each world built on its own space according to its needs and beliefs, perpetuating the segregation that had characterized the form of Bombay. However, in the suburban pattern, the segregation was now restructured to orchestrate distance between the kutchta city and pukka city. By 1888 various building rules were codified in development regulations creating the Bombay Municipal Corporation. Simultaneously, the Improvement Trust was set up in 1898 with the responsibility of formulating specific development plans and controls for different parts of the city. Both these agencies were created primarily to check hygiene and sanitation which was becoming increasingly problematic with the growth in population.

The Improvement Trust’s schemes were mostly conceived by laying out broad streets and sites for the construction of chawls for the poorer classes in North Bombay (refer Mayank Shah’s article, Chawls). It also cleared large areas for upper class housing: the Backbay area, Cumballa Hill and Breach Candy. Moreover, it encouraged the ‘urban’ population to move towards the north to Dadar, Matunga and Sion by acquiring land and laying out building sites which were offered generally on leases. The main aim of the Trust, however, was clearance and development of land and not actual construction. The Trust’s policy was to initiate growth — to harness the inherent energy of private enterprises that existed in the city, while providing some checks and balances in terms of the direction and form development took. It ensured balanced development by planning and initiating projects for both worlds — the poor and rich — but ensured that no apparent overlaps existed.

Besides the Trust’s works, the other significant attempt at planning and ‘structuring’ the growth of the city was that made by the government in attempting the first rough land zoning of the city in 1907. However, here, the focus was to designate residential area for upper classes. The western shores of the island were designated for this purpose.

In 1929, a large government loan was floated to back a scheme which reclaimed over a thousand acres of land behind the sea wall. Marine Drive, a sweeping promenade and road was to be laid out, creating a new western foreshore and entirely restructuring the western edge of South Bombay. What this sweeping gesture gave Bombay was an incredible promenade that physically and visually welded the entire bay edge into one.

The Backbay Reclamation project symbolized a major shift in the spirit of the city and rapidly replaced its image from Victorian to cosmopolitan, international, modern (refer Jon Alfi's article, Art Deco). Perhaps at its time, the creation of Marine Drive was seen as a dramatic shift, as being detrimental to the existing views and physical relationships within the city. Today, however, the visual identity of the city outside the ‘Fort’ hangs on this sweeping and definitive gesture. For what this project did for the city was not only extend existing physical context in a legible manner, but also create a new context. A context based on the pulse of the movement — one that opened up new possibilities.

Greater Bombay

In spite of these grand gestures, the housing problem was gaining greater visibility within

Elphinestone Circle (since renamed Horniman Circle) with its combination of a central park enclosed by controlled facades introduced an urban design approach not previously used in India.

Hornby Road (since renamed DN Road), an example of the Improvement Trust structuring urban form through mandated regulation. Here the arcade was a necessary condition for all buildings.

The move to the Hills — a view of Walkeshwar Road on Malabar Hill in the early 1900s.

The dual city diagram, Two spaces for two worlds — map showing Bombay at the turn of the century — the Fort area, Indian town and the low density development on Malabar Hill and the suburbs.
the city itself. No specific area (or zone) was earmarked for the middle classes as it was assumed that they would occupy areas rendered free by the shifting upper classes. The authorities did not see the need to earmark specific zones for the poor (labourers and industrial workers) because they had to live near their employers — the industries.

In the 1940s, the city could be seen making some rather drastic transitions into its present form. The rich began moving from the city core (the renovated Fort area) to the western edges of the island: Marine Drive, Malabar Hill, Breach Candy, Peddar Road and along Worli Sea Face. The middle classes — or at least the ones that could afford the additional commuting cost and initial investments — also began fleeing the inner city. The suburbs (Bandra, Juhu, Andheri, etc.) offered a cheaper and healthier environment by comparison. The demand, however, for housing in the inner city was still growing due to immigration. This led to a staggering rise in the price of land and accommodation.

Simultaneously, the Rent Control Act which had been imposed in 1942, made building unprofitable to the landlord and impossible to maintain. New housing construction, exempt from the control, was inept at meeting the enormous demand, and far beyond the paying capacity of the average migrant worker. This resulted in total ‘de-gentrification’ of the inner city. Landlords and builders, in an attempt to house the lower middle classes, subdivided the residences vacated by the rich, slowly transforming these grand residences into multi-family chawl-like situations. The other fall-out from this influx was the increased use of the existing chawls. Family sizes of the occupants increased with the influx of relatives and dependants coming into the city to make it their home. Rooms were shared on a rotational basis by the mill workers who took advantage of different shift duties to maximize occupation. Lofts were created, corridors used and staircases provided that extra space for spillovers.

The 1930s were years of great change amongst the industrial elite of Bombay. This indigenous business class was instrumental in financing living enclaves for the middle class and poorer members of their communities, as in the Parsi colonies such as Dadar, Andheri and Huges Road. Similarly, the Maharashtrian community built theirs at Shivaji Park and Dadar (west), while the South Indians were located in Matunga. This move to the suburbs, and eventually into the Greater Bombay region, was an outcome of the growing pressure on the island.

Impetus was given to this idea of the ‘greater’ region by the infrastructure. This came in the form of the electric train system and the pipeline from the lakes in the surrounds (Vihar, Tulsi, Tansa) thereby tying up the ‘greater area’ and symbolically creating a region. This was an important event with reference to the urban morphology of Bombay, blurring beyond recognition the apparent physical segregation in the original dual city diagram.

The drawback of this move derived from a visible lack of will (on the part of the authorities) to physically create or encourage architectonic clarity in the emerging city. This resulted in an unchecked sprawl grafted and organized around the major transport spines — a trend that continues today as the city spreads out to Versova, Vasai and Virar in the north. Also, as opposed to the Victorian core, there existed an inability to consciously give expression to any ideological form to the city, or to consistently restructure and reinterpret growth to create an illusion of cohesiveness. What finally manifested itself was the duality between planned interventions and kinetic or incremental development — the later now forming a bulk of the growth. However, in spite of this duality between economic success and physical failure, the single-minded purpose of economic growth propelled the city from its wholly British origins and control to becoming a powerful indigenous myth and centre of commerce for the nation.

Image Centre
By the 1960s as the city sprawled out on the north-west axis, the ‘drama’ of capturing the seafront played itself out in the east-west direction by congregating onto an ‘image centre’ — a hollow nucleus — the bay. This is illustrated in the recent Nariman Point, Cuffe Parade and the new Navy Nagar developments, where skyscrapers now huddle on land won from the sea, perpetuating in the process the physical duality in the city.

Although in a historical continuum, this is the most recent assertion of the city’s relationship to the sea. It has in no way reinforced the architectural or urban design qualities of Bombay. Nor are the directions it put forth ever likely to, for its basis is not the rational use of valuable land, nor any conscious attempt at making a humane environment, but mere commercial arrogance: of the emergence of the politician-builder nexus and of the inability of the government to control the city’s growth in physical terms (refer Alpa Seth’s article, Builder Housing).

In comparison with the development in the renovated Fort or the Backbay development along Marine Drive, the recent development at Nariman Point and the new Cuffe
Parade reclamation have been lost opportunities in terms of physically improving the city. The lack of concern for social issues or those at the urban design scale is astounding. There is no attempt to understand or plan for the social realities of the city in planning for a mix of uses and activity patterns — the crux of contemporary needs. Similarly, the alienation of these new developments with reference to the adjacent city fabric, or for that matter even the water’s edge, is obvious. There seems to be no conscious attempt to structure these precincts as urban compositions, either at the macro or micro level. The failure of these developments as also most recent planning proposals and schemes, is that they are not only devoid of ideology, but also ignore class dynamics, polarities and interdependence that were an integral part of the city's evolution. By the 1970s and 80s, the self-perpetuating mechanism of the capitalist city was becoming harder to comprehend, let alone control. Issues and problems had transcended the question of style and were replaced by the blind (abstract) mechanism of expressing preferred realities in purely economic equations — scenarios that could no longer be easily translated into architecture or physical design. The ambiguity of this relationship, that between diagnosis and prognosis, is finally beginning to play itself out, and as events are showing, the city is slithering down the same ladders that are intended to prop it up.

City of the Poor
In Bombay today, the economic relationship of exploitation and dependency is the single most important factor giving the ‘two worlds’ in the city their distinctive physical shapes and relative locations. One world is static, monumental in its presence and exploitative of the high spots in the city; the other sprawls along the transport lines and into any interstices or crevices it finds. There now exist equivalents for all systems in the ‘urban’ city — places and means of recreation, markets, techniques of construction, sources for supply of material, and different physical manifestations — the kutchi city. These create a situation where the ‘two worlds’ exist in the same ‘space’ but share, understand, use it differently.

As the poor become more visible, the physical manifestation of the kutchi city threatens the raison d'être of the city as a centre of prosperity and self perpetuating wealth. This results in a situation in which the government is faced with the imminent threat of capital pulling out of the city on one hand, and pressure from the ‘citizens’ on the other. It is precisely this dichotomy between what the city is prepared to give in return for what it gets, that divides opinion and perceptions about the poor in Bombay today.

Unfortunately, in examining proposals by city authorities for the built environment, a sense of induced dualism becomes increasingly visible. Solutions aimed at city improvement through the removal of the poor to the peripheries are not only inhuman, but economically not feasible. They release land in the core areas, allowing the government to appropriate land values created by urbanization, while passing on the entire social overheads of the poor (by transporting them to the outskirts of the city) to the community at large. Similarly, the logic underlying the hierarchical patterning and functional specialization of zoning plans create an urban structure resulting in segregation, especially segregation between work place and residence, hindering the establishment of small scale local activities and services which require a close knit and integrated environment.

In the newer developments at the southern end of the city, such as Nariman Point and Cuffe Parade, this sense of segregation and severe single-use patterns is more blatant than ever. Witness Nariman Point, for example, which at street level is a chaotic market place during the day and an eerie ghost town at night. Design induced error? It is a case of an architectural and urban design pattern incapable of accommodating multiple associations or use patterns — of being unable to house more than one world on the same space! Thus the polarity between the two worlds in the city is further heightened by the manner in which the environment is structured today.

Herein lies the sense of ‘towness’ of the city: the ‘city of gold’; the fortune making mechanism that it has come to mean, but as a transformed physical entity far removed from what its creators and patrons had striven for it to be. Today, in fact, the sheer number of poor rural migrants should make city authorities and planners realize that migrants are shaping and making the culture and physical form of the city as much as they are adjusting to it. In other words, it is becoming incredibly hard for the city to consistently remake itself in an apparently singular image, for it is uncertain how these broader rhythms of change in the city will translate into positive physical realities.

One Space, Two Worlds
Historically, in Bombay’s growth, with each shift or broader rhythm in the city’s development, there surfaced opportunities to improve its physical structure. Between 1850 and the 1900s, with unprecedented wealth, urban technology (both infrastructure and buildings)
was employed in an extremely skilful manner to convert the 
\textit{laissez faire} growth into a structured city core — the symbol of a prosperous city. It was an opportunity to get a potential city going with big moves that involved large physical interventions coupled with complex social engineering — the mixing of communities to get the chemistry of the capitalist city acting — of different interest groups establishing new equations!

After the 1900s once the city got going, the railways were used to open up land, tie in the region and disperse the population. Via reclaims, the land itself was created by this compulsive urge to create a city. Simultaneously, almost naturally, smaller moves, events in the growth of the city by creating community enclaves, social physical infrastructure, private buildings, housing, began playing themselves out. The 1930s onwards saw the rise of the indigenous patrons and the increase of smaller scale planning and design interventions — Marine Drive, the various ethnic enclaves, corporate buildings . . . mere events in response to major shifts in the sensibilities of a city becoming increasingly commercial and cosmopolitan. What becomes evident in the city’s evolution after the 1950s is, however, the diminishing scale of these interventions. Perhaps the founding years required big moves. As this momentum built up, the scale of interventions decreased. This is evident today in the lack of will and response in terms of structuring the city — converting the immense opportunities of human enterprise into positive physical attributes.

The question this raises is, that through these various big and small moves, what was the engine that propelled the dynamic growth of Bombay? In the past, most physical development in the city was brought about by private wealth and enterprise — Horniman Circle, the reclaims, Hornby Road, the various housing estates and 
\textit{chaawls}, with the city authorities and agencies acting as facilitators providing the essential core infrastructure — big moves. In this equation, the city patrons (paternal capitalists) provided the checks and balances ensuring that the social (schools, hospitals, etc.,) and physical (housing, etc.,) infrastructure was provided for the poor (at least those of their communities).

The real issue here is, which input preceded the other? Does private enterprise rise to act on opportunities made evident by the facilitators, as in the Government? Or, does private enterprise show the way — actually initiate the big and small moves with a ‘responsible’ government or facilitator responding to check this force for positive transformations in the city? Perhaps it does not matter as long as the system provides checks to ensure that some benefits are utilized for public good — supporting many worlds.

However, given the contemporary situation, where the Government (comprising chiefly rural based politicians with a power base outside Bombay) is seemingly incapable of playing a lead role, and private initiative apparently lacks a moral conscience, how can we harness the inherent energy of private enterprise for public good? Can we control the politician-builder nexus, for example, in order to derive benefit for the poor? Is our present system capable of producing the appropriate checks and balances?

There have recently emerged in Bombay, environmentalists and citizen’s groups who are motivated to reverse the physical deterioration and imbalance in the development of the city (refer Group Efforts). In their most optimistic perception, what these groups really represent is the bringing in of an entirely new relationship; an action oriented relationship, of the city with the government — private initiative for public good. However, the recent past in Bombay has shown that most of these efforts, besides being passive in nature, run the danger of ‘myopic’ and ‘singular’ egocentric thinking resulting in superficial correction in the city. It is the passivity of these groups and organizations that makes them non-effective, thus reducing their impact to merely articulating popular issues and opinions by using the judiciary and press to their advantage in order to raise public opinion. What most of the groups do not possess is an ‘idea’ of what the city should be — a constructive action oriented attitude (as activists) to transform the city in a particular manner — thus inevitably making their well intentioned arguments slip into symbolic ‘battles’ of turf, representing a select minority of a particular ‘world’, and its limited perceptions of city form.

**Bazaars in Victorian Arcades**

Emblematic of this conflict of dualities — of interest groups, of usage, and the passive versus active approaches — is the phenomena of ‘bazaars in Victorian arcades’ in the old Fort area of Bombay, the city centre. Although a thriving business, hawking in the arcades that characterize this area is deemed illegal and is under constant pressure of relocation by the city authorities. Not because it provides an unnecessary service (on the contrary it is patronized by most), but because the Victorian core represents for all, the city centre, with its icons complete! As the city sprawls out to the north, dissipating the clarity of its form, these images, places and icons have acquired greater meaning as crucial symbols of an image centre.

Unfortunately for the city authorities, planners, and various citizen’s groups inter-
ested in reinforcing this image centre, conservation implies 'maintenance without change'. This explains why zones in cities never overlap. A city's prime advantage is precisely a concentration of skills, services and activities, to sustain requires change from within the city in order to accommodate its human resources. This means that existing urban hardware is likely to be shifted — buildings demolished and built, new streets and railways forced through, and so on. Conservation has therefore, to necessarily be looked upon in terms broader than just a clean-up job in order to extend itself into the broader realities of the emerging city.

To effectively conserve a city would mean identifying those components of the urban system that can be transformed to other uses (perhaps for an interim period) without destroying the essential physical structure or the architectural illusion that the city presents. In fact, the essential components of a city would have a greater ability to survive on account of the adaptability of more flexible parts. This is particularly pertinent given the emerging dualism in the city, the varied uses, attitudes and physical manifestations — the existence of two worlds in the same space. In this context, the arcade is a special component that inherently possesses a capacity for reinterpretation. As an architectural or urban design solution it displays an incredible resilience, namely, accomodating a new use while keeping the illusion of its architecture intact. For the existence of two worlds in the same space implies the accommodation and overlap of varying use, perceptions and physical forms.

In addressing issues such as these, the architect/planner can play a decisive role in initiating new solutions — creating new contexts by reinterpreting the existing ones (refer Correa's scheme for hawkers in Housing the People). The solution today lies not only in creating new parts for the city, but in simultaneously understanding, restructuring and shaping perceptions of the existing city form. The challenge in Bombay is to cope with its transforming nature, not by inducing or polarizing its dualism, but by attempting to reconcile it! In seeing opposites as being simultaneously valid. As designers and planners can we contribute towards moulding the physical form of Bombay to respond to the massive shifts in demography? Or translate in design terms the connection between social issues and physical form? How might we weave into the emerging urban forms the aspirations and use patterns of both worlds in the same space? Can we design with disparate attitudes?

We must be clear that our chief concern is about the creation (as activists) and influences of 'space' in both its qualitative and structural aspects on human affairs. It has become fashionable among conservative planners and policy makers to deny the extent and importance of this role — the alarm bells of 'spatial fetishism' are ringing! However, as human activity has to take place, as it were, and so the qualitative and structural aspects of space, the way we ritualize it are potentially of immense importance. Through our explorations and interventions it will be imperative that we base our agenda around initiating spatial transformations that accommodate the needs and aspirations of the many worlds in the city — the gamut of dualities that is Bombay.

The idea of allowing these worlds to grow within the larger fabric of the city is generic to the extent that it is relevant for existing conditions within the city as well as being the basis for inventing a new settlement pattern. If we limit our effort to engineering the existing fabric, it would resemble a process akin to the involution process where the city would take on the function of absorbing more and more people and activities on the same space rather than diversifying to more dynamic modes. It would fail either to stabilize or transform into a new pattern but rather continue to develop by becoming internally more complicated. Thus, the processes of development at a micro and macro level must work simultaneously. In this context, the New Bombay development (refer Peter Engel, Building New Bombay) could potentially be the most significant event and response towards solving the problem of the drastic shift of demography or broader rhythm than has occurred in the city recently. In fact, given the combination of two crucial inputs — an emerging employment base in the new city and an almost complete rail link — New Bombay once again holds the potential to become a big move, altering the entire relationship of the city to its hinterland, an opportunity that the profession must convert into an asset for the future of the city.

Are we as professionals equipped and motivated to address these issues and contribute towards identifying such opportunities? Can we be team players in the wider effort to harness and control private initiative as the engine to pull us out of our chaotic urban state? Could this energy transform the city through positive conflict, or will it re-make it in a singular image? Will we evolve new attitudes that deal with accommodating different worlds in the same space? The choice is ours, for the way we address the questions within the profession and outside it, will determine the physical form of our city — whether we can sustain the ever-transforming urban phenomena of Bombay.
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