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ABSTRACT

Dharavi, one of the largest unplanned settlements in the world, inhabit over 700,000 people. The illegal settlements dating back to the 18th century are now under threat to be torn down in order to develop highly modern office and apartment spaces. The future for the inhabitants is uncertain, only those who qualify will get a replacement home within the new development. The architecture and the urban planning of the new plans show signs of copying cities like Singapore or Shanghai rather than establishing a plan that considers the cultural, historical and contextual aspects of India, Mumbai and Dharavi.

Planners and architects often see themselves as experts and they often rule by the hand of the politicians. Within this top-down planning approach the knowledge of the inhabitants and the sometimes-inexplicable bond to one’s dwelling is forgotten. The essay sets out to find answers to how people and time affect the built environment and the public spaces as well as how important the individual relationship is to the understanding of the workings of the two.

The method used in this essay to find what makes Dharavi unique, observations of the urban spaces were combined with the dreams of the inhabitants of Dharavi. Pictures, sounds and descriptive text have complemented five interviews where the participants were asked to describe their future dreams for themselves and for Dharavi. Through combining the two methods a deeper analysis could be obtained where participation and individual thoughts mixed with how the space could be experienced from an outsider’s point of view. The result became both factual and democratic, an approach Dharavi has seen little of thus far. The essay also contains a large theoretical segment, as one of the purposes for the essay has been to investigate how the human relationship to its built environment has been assessed in the past and how it is in the present and how it can change in the future. Theories of philosophers, anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists, planners and architects have been investigated in order to gain a deeper understanding of how individuals interact with the physical structures around them, and in what way this knowledge can change the future of the urban planning profession.

The main conclusion that can be drawn through this work is that no place exists without a context and that the human presence is essential in the understanding of the quality and uniqueness of a space. The people, their history and their stories, the culture, the different religions, the rest of Mumbai and India all affect the way in that Dharavi is functioning. Changing this dynamic and erasing it completely by building generic multi-story glass and steel buildings might alter this finely tuned unity. Flexibility is also one of the key words for Dharavi as every street serves a multitude of uses throughout the day; a shift from a vertical layout to a horizontal may, as another conclusion, change that flexibility and it might harm the tightly knit social cohesion and the thriving culture that Dharavi shows today. Dharavi is socially intricate and culturally and architecturally multi-layered and it is one of the largest economical benefactors to Mumbai’s fortune as a city. The question is, can Mumbai, and India, afford to meddle with its built structures?
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1 GLOSSARY AND DEFINITIONS

1.1 SPACE
As a consequence of modern society’s tendency to divide and separate entities into smaller fragments in order to label them and differentiate them from each other, the word space has become the source of an endless amount of definitions: geographical, sociological, political, national etc. “We are thus confronted by an indefinite multitude of spaces, each one piled upon or perhaps contained within, the next” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 8).

The word space, as written about in this particular essay, is therefore in need of a definition. Space here used, sometimes referred to as physical space, urban space, open space or public space; represents the physical room that incorporates a place in which people can meet outside of their private spheres, in the words of Heidegger (2001 p. 152): “A space is something that has been made room for, something that is cleared and free, namely within a boundary […]”. Mental space; our thoughts and dreams, on the other hand, represents the abstract space that exists within us, and which do not become real until it is brought out into the public (Arendt, 1998). The two spaces are not each other’s antonyms, neither should they be believed to exist side by side without connection: “in actuality each of these two kinds of space involves, underpins and presupposes the other” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 14).

1.2 SYMBOL
Most of this essay’s discussion on symbols in the urban space is derived from Jung’s work Man and his symbols. A symbol, according to Jung (1968 p. 3) is “a term, a name, or even a picture that may be familiar in daily life, yet that possesses specific connotations in addition to its conventional and obvious meaning. It implies something vague, unknown, or hidden from us”. Or in the words of Anelia Jaffè: “the symbol is an object of the unknown world hinting at something unknown; it is the known expressing the life and sense of the inexpressible” (Jaffè, 1968 p. 310). An object on its own might represent only its real meaning, but put in a context with other objects or brought into a story the same object can become to mean so much more. Thus, an object or a word has symbolic significance only when it implies something other than the meaning it has been fabricated to denote (Jung, 1968).
2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 RESEARCH PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND

There are many words in the English language to describe the kind of settlement that in this essay is researched. Slum, shantytown, informal settlement, squatter camp, occupied settlements etc. the list of synonyms in the English language is almost infinite (Dahlberg, 2010). Informal settlement is a definition most commonly used in western society in order to avoid the word slum, as slum has been thought upon as degrading and too emotionally charged. Informal settlement is though a definition that in itself raises many problems. To describe a place like Dharavi as “informal” is misleading, as the society, the buildings and the people in no way lack in form. Therefore, the definition used in this essay, to describe Dharavi and other places alike, is unplanned settlement. It should though be noted, that for scientific accuracy, all quotes using other synonyms than the advised in this essay are kept in their original state.

Land is to Bombay what politics is to Delhi: the reigning obsession, the fetish, the raison d’être and the topic around which conversations, business, newspapers and dreams revolve.
Suketu Mehta, 1998 [online]

Because of the physical nature of the city of Mumbai’s position on a peninsula in the Indian Ocean, there is basically no land left for the city to expand on. Because of this situation there is a hunt going on to find land within the city that can be changed to fit into the politicians’ visions for Mumbai’s future (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008). There, in the middle of this bustling city lies a district called Dharavi, a huge unplanned settlement in the center of the economic hub that Mumbai has become. For a long time discussions have been going on what to do with Dharavi, and in 2004 a multi-billion dollar strategy, called the Dharavi Redevelopment Program (DRP) was launched (Patel, Arputham, Burra and Savchuk, 2009). This program proposes the whole of Dharavi to be demolished in order to give space for ultra modern office and living spaces. Some of these buildings will accommodate parts of the population of Dharavi. The decision to evacuate the inhabitants of Dharavi to high-rise buildings within, and outside of Mumbai is a highly infected discussion. On the one hand the politicians and the developers claim that the living standard for the inhabitants will increase substantially. On the other hand the Non Governmental Organizations (NGO:s) and the people argue that they will not be able to cope as a society in a structure of high-rise buildings far away from what they consider of as being home. The anthropologist Edward T. Hall wrote in the 1960’s that the choices made by architects and planners all too often come out of the decisions made by the market and that “financial calculations are seldom based on any understanding of human needs or the ultimate costs of ignoring them” (Hall, 1969 p. xi).
Although written over 40 years ago, Hall’s thoughts on the architectural and planning professions are still today evident, especially when the case of Dharavi is discussed. Hall’s work shows the human psychological and philosophical relationship to its built environment and why a shift from a horizontal to a vertical living situation could alter Dharavi’s intricate social network.

2.3 AIM AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS
Dharavi is the central subject matter in the political discussion on how to develop Mumbai’s urban structure further. The medial focus is mostly on the decision making itself and the politicians’ and the developers’ role in the decisions that are being made. This essay aims to relocate the focus to that of the residents and users whom will be most affected by the proposed changes. The topic that is now at the perimeter of the debate is the people of Dharavi and the space that make up their lives. The essay’s researched theories and methods on the relation the human has to the space that it lives within, aspires to expand the understanding on how important Dharavi is for its inhabitants. From this, the study aims to gain an understanding for the factors that make the space and the place of Dharavi unique.

The study also aims to widen the importance of including personal, cultural and contextual factors when urban spaces are being analyzed within the urban planning profession. No space is without character and that is a factor that is often forgotten when new spaces are planned (Paterson, 1995 and Frampton, 2002). It is not only the physical objects that make up the space; a place does not possess character until someone moves through it (Collins, Sitte and Collins, 2006 and Norberg-Schulz, 1975).

2.2 PROBLEM DEFINITION
The topic researched in this essay stems from the theories on the human relationship to the built environment. The human mind and its connections to the surrounding space is a subject that has been thought upon and discussed by many philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, urban planners and architects throughout the years. The question is now how to apply these theories on a 21st century situation and in a country not usually included in the urban architectural discourse. Dharavi with its unique position both physically and socially is a place with immense diversity and differing character, both within its own space but also in correlation to its surroundings. The proposed reconstruction of Dharavi into a Central Business District (CBD) will affect hundreds of thousands of people living and working in the area. Little has though been thought about the relationship between these people and their relationship to the existing built environment. The people and the space work together as one entity where no one can exist without the other.

From researching the quality and character of the public spaces in Dharavi, this essay will show the importance of space context, culture, history and public participation when defining the quality of the space that forms Dharavi. It will also show the human psychological and philosophical relationship to its built environment and why a shift from a horizontal to a vertical living situation could alter Dharavi’s intricate social network.

People fight not only over a piece of turf but about the reality that it constitutes. The struggle over Dharavi is exactly this: a battle for survival of a reality, of an existence.
Camillo Boano, Melissa Garcia Lamarca and William Hunter, 2011 p. 307
Buildings don’t just sit there imposing themselves. They are forever objects of (re)interpretation, narration and representation – and meanings or stories more pliable than the walls and floor they depict. We deconstruct buildings materially and semiotically all the time.

Thomas F. Gieryn, 2002 p. 35

The essay sets out to tell a story on how humans shape their dwellings to fit their individual needs and as attachment is formed and emotions are evoked towards their home the space in turn starts shaping its residents. Through this story it will become evident that no urban space stand without a human relation or attachment and that a city is more than its physical structure.

Through theoretical studies, and through interviews and observations carried out in Dharavi, the essay will concentrate on three main research topics:

1. How does the character of the public spaces in Dharavi reflect the people living there?

2. How important is public participation in the understanding of the public spaces in Dharavi?

3. How can the findings made in Dharavi change the way the human relationship to its built environment is assessed?
3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 HUMANS AND THEIR URBAN SETTING

The methods used in this essay on finding the human relationship to Dharavi are primarily based on the works of the philosophers Hannah Arendt with her book *The human condition* and Henri Lefebvre and his book *The production of space*. Lefebvre states early in his book that “[…] each society offers up its own peculiar space, as it were, as an ‘object’ for analysis and overall theoretical explication” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 31). But, as Lefebvre continues, he also states that: “[…] the very notion of social space resists analysis because […] of the real and formal complexity that it connotes” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 32). Hence, it is a significant point to remember that in finding what sets Dharavi apart, what makes it unique and how this uniqueness impacts the people living there; the concept that no general conclusions, inspired by other cities and spaces, can or should be made. The method of drawing inspiration from others however, often known as neo-liberal planning, is very present in modern architecture and urban planning. As seen in large parts of Asia and all over Europe and North America, this take on post-modernism creates a global and monocultural design aesthetic where little attention is given to the historical and cultural context (Frampton, 2002).

Public spaces are made up of three primary purposes: form, structure and function. These concepts are the functions of every concrete object, every organism consists of a form, a structure and a function and these three all exist in symbiosis with each other (Lefebvre, 1991 pp. 147-148). According to Lefebvre these three purposes are eligible for analysis since they are measurable and, at least as far as words can depict reality, describable (Lefebvre, 1991). Form is the aesthetics of the space, its boundaries and its volume, its lines and its shapes. Function is how the space is used and for what purposes. Structure is the correlation between function and form; it is how the objects and behavior in the space relate to one another (Lefebvre, 1991 and Lorenz, 1974).

Lefebvre called for a change in how these functions of the urban spaces are analyzed. In Lefebvre’s opinion this would constitute of a method that would lift focus from the objects that physically make up the space. It would instead be a comparative method where the relationship between the objects and the people interacting with the objects and each other was the focus of the analysis (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 89). When researching the human relationship to its surrounding space it is important to not only focus on the physical structures, but to combine the symbolic and architectural analysis with the analysis of human movement, communication and activity, into a more dynamic approach (Madanipour, 2003). As we often do in modern urban planning, we measure and analyze the objects in order to get an answer to what the space contains. But, buildings and physical objects should not be examined and viewed on their own, instead they should be considered as being a part of the whole space (Lefebvre, 1991). In some urban projects there has been a shift in how the analysis of spaces have been made, as through the words of the architect Jana Revedin (2012b, p. 693): “We try to analyze space through the human life that they contain”. The objects, therefore, are to be treated only as parts that make up the whole of the sum of the space, in order to create a holistic approach to space analysis. The physical objects in the space can then tell us a story of how the sum is constituted as the objects form codes and signs in the space (Lefebvre, 1991). These codes within the urban landscape will not tell us the character’s origin, but it can help us to decipher the current character of the physical space into stories that, in turn, can be related to the culture and the people that inhabit the space (Lefebvre, 1991).

When mapping a space it is important to establish where the sources of the data come from, and also to use more than one method. Experience
judgment and reflection. These phases are present both in the user's and the observer's perception of the space, although the span of the phases differ (Sennett, 2007).

How the users use the space for interaction is a significant segment in the analysis of its function and composition. If the interaction between the space’s users and the exact place of this interaction are recorded, the analysis gains several layers to its outcome. This method does not only consider physical objects or movement, factors that are usually considered in character analysis, but it also adds a dimension of social interaction that is the quintessence of what the public space is used for (Lefebvre, 1991).

3.2 WHY PUBLIC PARTICIPATION?

Our cities are reservoirs of collective memories. Sustainable change means to enhance authenticity through participation.

When a new urban development program is being planned, whether or not there already exists some form of building structures or if the plan is for an unobstructed piece of nature, the plan's outcome will consequently affect people, be they many or few. Thus, all possible interests will have to be taken into consideration in order to create a master plan that will sustain the effects of time and nature (Revedin, 2013). In today's planning process the approach of public participation often fails as the profession, the planner or the architect, start their work from the standpoint of the interests and "demands" of the inhabitants and the users of the space, but later bend these demands to suit the "commands" of the politicians and the plan’s developers (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 95). The approach the planner, in the case of Lefebvre’s example, started out with is also known as a bottom-
up planning approach. But, as the commands from the higher instances got more powerful than the demands of the users the plan turned into what is called a top-down planning approach, and the initial method failed to deliver what it was originally set out to do.

There are different types and layers of public participation as seen in the eight steps of Sherry Arnstein's *Ladder of participation*. Common methods of involving the public involve methods such as education (step 2), information (step 3) and consultation (step 4), but although being well-used methods to increase involvement the actual outcome often results in nonparticipation or tokenism. Tokenism can be described as a form of symbolic participation where the participants' opinions are recorded but have little or no affect on the final decisions made (Lane, 2006).

True participation occurs further up in the ladder in forms of partnership (step 6) or delegation of power (step 7) (Lane, 2006 p. 285). One conclusion from this could thus be that the commonly used method of consultation, where the public concerned is given the opportunity to share their opinion is simply not enough in order to reach full potential of participation. Involvement in the form of trust and responsibility are important factors when including the public and ensuring a consensus before the plan is set in action, for when people feel that they have some form of power they also get attached and involved and henceforth a more democratic process of decision making can be obtained as not only the planner, or the developer stands for the final decision (Lane, 2006).
3.3 COLLECTION OF DREAMS

Each one of us has, somewhere in his heart, the dream to make a living world, a universe.

Christopher Alexander, 1979 p. 9

People do not only exist when being conscious, but dreams, evoked both during night and day, are also a large part of the human means of existence (Jung and Shamdasani, 2009). Every person has a relationship to the urban environment that he or she uses, in one way or the other (Arendt, 1998). Each one of these individuals have an opinion and often a dream of how they wish the space to be. Dreams are different from actual proposals, they do not have to be feasible, economical or concrete; dreams are more of a conceptual form where no limits exist and everything is possible. Dreams are the media in which thoughts are allowed to roam freely and without being questioned. As through the words of Jung: “Our life is spent in struggles for the realization of our wishes: all our actions proceed from the wish that something should or should not come to pass. It is for this we work, for this we think. If we cannot fulfill a wish in reality, we realize it at least in fantasy” (Jung, 2010 p. 5). By collecting the dreams of the inhabitants and users of a space an understanding of how the space is now, how it has been and how it could be used can be recognized (Alexander, 1979). These collective dreams are together one of the parts that form the uniqueness of the space and they are also one of the many components that create the special bond that becomes a community (Alexander, 1979). The collection of the dreams of the inhabitants of Dharavi hence gives this essay an insight into how the people who actually use the place would like to see it evolve into – no limitations to what is realistic or not.

This part of the essay will be executed in the form of qualitative interviews. Interviews are often seen as a qualitative base for analysis since they collect the opinions and thoughts of a select few; a method that keeps a high standard and which data is most often uncomplicated to apprehend (Denscombe, 2010). In comparison to questionnaires that are time effective and can reach more individuals, personal interviews take more time and effort from both the interviewer and the interviewee and fewer answers will be examined in the analysis. But interviews are also a form that incorporates a chance to obtain more complex answers and formulations than a questionnaire would, and it does not exclude participants because of obstacles such as illiteracy (Denscombe, 2010). The form of the interviews in the research here made, are chosen to be the kind that Martyn Denscombe labels as being of a semi-structured nature (Denscombe, 2010 p. 175). In semi-structured interviews the participants are allowed to elaborate and give a story behind the answers to the questions given and the interviewer have a more flexible approach to the order of which the questions are asked and the answers are given (Denscombe, 2010). The method for asking the questions has also been based on parts of the theory of Divergence-Emergence-Convergence, also known as the Diamond of participation (Meisterheim, Cretney and Cretney, 2011 p. 23).

Divergence: The start of the conversation where the questions asked are designed to establish trust between the interviewee and the interviewer. This stage is also where the interviewee begins to answer more freely and openly without being rushed.

Emergence: This stage is a further development from the free associations and the interviewees are encouraged to make associations with other perspectives or other places that they know of or have heard of. “This is where ‘the magic happens’, when perspectives stretch to include other worldviews and new mental models” (Meisterheim, Cretney and Cretney, 2011 p. 23).
In other words, the participants in this research will be chosen from relevance to the researched street, such as homeowners, shopkeepers and frequent users. The sampling of the participants do not set out to represent an accurate cross-section of the population of Dharavi but the focus is here on the individuals and their stories.

3.4 Quantitative Mapping Through the Senses

The second part of the method in this essay consists of an attempt to read the urban fabric that Dharavi is made up of. In other words a quantitative mapping method in order to be able to explain what is being seen and what may be not. Space specificity is complex and cannot be wholly and truthfully depicted only by the use of words, drawings or photographs, a space is more multifaceted with dimensions beyond the visible (Speed, 2010). When mapping a space, not only sight should be used as a tool since sight is just one of many parts of our body that can sense space (Lefebvre, 1991 and Pallasmaa, 2012). The static components of the space are well represented by the visual structure of the buildings but the dynamic components cannot be found solely by vision (McMeel and Speed, 2013). As described through the words of the architect Kenneth Frampton: “one has in mind a whole range of complementary sensory perceptions which are registered by the labile body: the intensity of light, darkness, heat and cold; the feeling of humidity; the aroma of material; the almost palpable presence of masonry as the body senses its own confinement; the momentum of an induced gait and the relative inertia of the body as it traverses the floor; the echoing resonance of our own footfall” (Frampton, 2002 p. 31). It is thus not only the visible vertical and horizontal boundaries or the layout of the space that defines its character. How the walls feel when touching them, how the ground sounds when walking on it, how...
the street smells just after rainfall and how the children's laughter fill the space the hour after school finishes; these are all components of the sense of the space as they affect the individual instantly (Pallasmaa, 2012). Also, these components etch memories in the mind that becomes symbols and associations to the place's history, thus the physical objects in our urban landscape become both curators and stimulators of memory (Lefaivre, and Tzonis, 2003). Frampton wishes through his writings, to raise the understanding of space and establish a new approach to the process of architecture to a new level, which is in a sense more poetic and desirable. A method where not only the eyes are used as the tool for making the space readable and pleasant to the human mind but where the whole body is used as both a receiver and a contributor to the experience (Frampton, 2002 pp. 32-33). The architects Liane Lefaivre and Alexander Tzonis refer to this method as “a bottom-up approach to design that recognizes the value of the identity of a physical, social and cultural situation” (Lefaivre and Tzonis, 2003 p. 11). This approach called Critical Regionalism was established in the 1970s, it aims to bring the focus away from the universal solutions and trends and that instead focuses on the local context and codes (Lefaivre and Tzonis, 2003). The character of a space is hence defined by several more dimensions than what can be described through the usual tools used when describing a space, like the usual visual aid of that of a picture or of a drawing (Lefebvre, 1991, Frampton, 2002 and Pallasmaa, 2012).

As a part of the sensory mapping of the space, the book *Man and his symbols*, edited by the psychologist Carl Gustav Jung, has been one of the sources of theory. The book offers several chapters on different symbols that can be found in dreams, art and in everyday life. The main theses of Jung's symbols are closely related to religion, life and death, and these symbols can be very obvious or hidden under layers of behavioral patterns and norms (Jung, 1968). The symbols that are noticeable in the space can be sensed both through vision but also through the unconscious where innate moral and ethical emotions are based, we might see, smell or hear something but for some symbols; it is first when the feeling hits the unconscious that an emotion is evoked (Jung, 1968).

### 3.5 A combined method

Qualitative and quantitative methods have been used in an aspiration for the results of this essay to progress and to become a third dimension of character analysis that combines both hard facts and more unexplained theories on why we behave as we do in our urban setting. A city consists of buildings, where the physical structures are its frame, its limits and its boundaries – the buildings become the pattern in which we read the city (Heidegger, 2001). A city also contain processes of how the individuals use the structures, how the built structures contain and restrict them and how they nourishes and frees the individuals, both their physical bodies and also their dreams and hopes (Alexander, 1979). To combine the readings of the physicality of Dharavi and the way in which the users move through the space and what these individuals' dreams are, a matrix of quantitative and qualitative analysis can be made.

Images, photographs and drawings, can be helpful when describing a space and its characteristics. But images as a tool of analysis can also become obtuse as a method since a photograph or a drawing tend to hide the errors and the flaws of the space being portrayed (Lefebvre, 1991). Also, an image can never portray the whole space since they are limited by their own format; “images fragment; they are themselves fragments of space” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 97). Therefore, an image could be used, together with other methods so as to work as a mean for visual aid and to give a back up
for the narrative being told. An image should not, on its own, constitute as the lone component in the method of analysis and representation, given the above reasons for its lacking form of true demonstration. The senses of the body, except that of sight, are often forgotten when experiencing and analyzing a space (Pallasmaa, 2012); “so far has this trend gone that the senses of smell, taste, and touch have been almost completely annexed and absorbed by sight” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 139). Another sensory experience to consider in Dharavi is also that of sound. Mumbai is never quiet, all day long; all year around, the city emanates sound. Dharavi should therefore not only be analyzed through sight, through images and drawings; but to give a proper description of its spaces sounds, smells and textures has to be accounted for in the story.

The senses are also a limitation to the individual perception, no one person can ever claim to fully understand an object or, in this case, a space. Jung wrote: “man […] never perceives anything fully or comprehends anything completely. He can see, hear, touch and taste; but how far he sees, how well he hears, what his touch tells him, and what he tastes depend upon the number and quality of his senses” (Jung, 1968 p. 4). Hence, the senses we use to comprehend the space we are situated in, helps us to some degree but they also limits us. But since each person’s composition of his or her senses is unique, hopefully, through the use of public participation, more than one view or explanation of what is being experienced can be portrayed.
4 DHARAVI AND ITS CONTEXT

4.1 DHARAVI

We wish they would not exist, but we cannot wish them away. Sixty percent of our city is a slum and it all started here, in Dharavi.
Rashmi Bansal, Deepak Gandhi and Dee Gandhi, 2012 p. 2

Over 10 million of the inhabitants of the Mumbai Metropolitan Region live in unplanned settlements; that is more than 50 percent of the total population sharing 8 percent of the land (London School of Economics, 2007 and Engqvist and Lantz, 2008). The official number of the inhabitants in Dharavi is 376 000, but the records on how many individuals Dharavi actually inhabit are far more as the official statistics only consider the registered residents (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008 p. 107). Unofficial data, on the other hand, also include the unregistered dwellers as well as the registered and they refer to numbers between 700 000 up to over one million people (Boano, Lamarca and Hunter, 2011). If Dharavi inhabit the estimated 700 000 individuals on its 236 hectares, it means that there is approximately 296 000 people per square kilometer. In comparison, the whole of Greater Mumbai has a population of 12.5 million inhabitants which makes it one of the most densely populated cities in the world with an average density of 48 000 people per square kilometer (London School of Economics, 2012).
THE HISTORY OF DHARAVI

Dharavi was a no-man’s land considered to be outside the city. And, hence, it was the place which outsiders made their own.
Rashmi Bansal, Deepak Gandhi and Dee Gandhi, 2012 p. 24

The first official recordings of Dharavi dates back to the later half of the 18th century, although, the Koli fishermen established their village on the shores many centuries prior to that. Situated on Parel Island, one of the seven islands that later became Mumbai; Dharavi was a swampy and flat landscape with few inhabitants (Sharma, 2000). As the population of the city grew so did the pressure on the need for land and so the project of filling in the bays between the islands began. After the linking of the seven islands, Dharavi was situated at the outskirts of the new city. Due to the increasing amount of pollution that infested the water around Dharavi and because of the low quality of land the city authorities proclaimed the area to be a “no-man’s-land in a roundabout, and of no economical value” (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008 p. 48). The first immigrants to settle in the village were poor workers searching for job opportunities in the new city. Most of them first settled in the southern parts of Mumbai, but as the city grew in prominence and prosperity the authorities forced the settlers to move to the outskirts of the city (Sharma, 2000). Dharavi consequently became an area for those who could not afford the rising prices of land and tenure in the blooming south Mumbai (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008). As Dharavi was considered to be a no-man’s land, the authorities kept a blind eye to the illegal businesses growing in the area. It was first in the 1980’s that the government started funding projects to break the prosperous criminal activity, and today Dharavi is seen to be a safe community with very low criminality in comparison to the rest of Mumbai (Sharma, 2000 and Slumming it, 2010a).
DHARAVI TODAY
The city began to expand into the hinterland. As a result, Dharavi became much more central; it was not at the edge of the city as in the past. Ironically, this heart-shaped settlement is now located literally in the heart of Mumbai.
Kalpana Sharma, 2000 pp. xxii-xxiii

As the city grew, Dharavi was no longer at the outskirts but all of the sudden jammed in the middle and seen as a part of Mumbai city center. Dharavi is often described as a city within a city as the district is a functioning and self-sufficient community. Many of the inhabitants are born and raised in Dharavi. They go to school there, work there, get married and start a family there and eventually they die in Dharavi; living their whole lives within the borders of the 236 hectares large unplanned settlement (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008).

The settlements in Dharavi are identified as being illegal as the land belongs to the city and not to the dwellers; this means that the city council at any time has the right to evict the inhabitants without providing any alternative place for living. Although, due to public political pressure from several NGOs the city of Mumbai has officially recognized some of the dwellers that has lived in Dharavi for a specific amount of years as being “identified encroachers”, this recognition does not give the inhabitants right to the land but it gives them certain privileges, such as monetary compensation or a new residence, if and when their homes are removed (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008 p. 47).

Due to the city council being pressured into recognizing Dharavi as a part of Mumbai’s central municipality there have been several projects on the urban structures such as installments of public latrines and water taps.
Water leaks into the fresh water pipes and consequently contaminates the drinking water. Together, these three sanitary concerns result in over 4,000 cases of water contamination-related health issues being treated every day in Dharavi (Slumming it, 2010a). As well as projects regarding sanitation and electricity, some high-rises have been erected in the area over the last 20 years. These buildings are the products of governmental plans that set out to heighten the standard of living in Dharavi. Although a commendable project, the buildings are falling apart as no one wants to take responsibility for the maintenance (Sharma, 2000). Some buildings, only ten years of age, look as if they were built over fifty years ago; the elevators are not working and the concrete is crumbling. These vertical features in the otherwise horizontal urban landscape become almost like symbols of an amiable idea that in reality have a hard time of persisting the reality.

Kalpana Sharma, 2000 p. xxx

Dharavi is divided into 85 neighborhoods, known as nagars. The word nagar originates from the Hindi word for city or town but has a different meaning in Mumbai. Engqvist and Lantz’s definition of the word is that a nagar “[…] is a description for a geographical area which its residents feel they belong to” (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008 p. 118). Every nagar is itself then divided into different amounts of several smaller communities. Inhabitants from the same origin, religion or caste usually live in the same community and therefore Dharavi is made up of hundreds of smaller communities that are different from each other in age, architecture and...
hazardous environments for a very low salary (Sharma, 2000 and Mehta, 2007).

DHARAVI REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

It is a city in which no one dies of starvation but the vast majority are forced to endure living conditions that no enlightened zookeeper would allow for his animals.

Jerry Pinto and Naresh Fernandes, 2003 p. xi

Filled with negative comments and preconceived notions, Mumbai has gained quite a bad reputation around the world as a city filled with problems and no positive future to come. The people of Mumbai are not as negative, but rather they show strength and will to change and to prove the rest of the world wrong. In this fight for change there are many attempts made to find the answer that will feed this change. One of these attempts in finding an answer, and one of the biggest, revolves around the issue regarding the large amount of dwellers living in unplanned settlements around the city (Patel, Arputham, Burra and Savchuk, 2009).

Until 2004, few major changes had been done in Dharavi. The residents of Dharavi being a large group of voters made the leaders for several different political parties give promise after promise for change in order to win votes; these promises leading in reality to few changes and little improvement of the standard of living (Sharma, 2000). Changing and improving Dharavi has been on the political agenda for decades and the district has been the receiver of many monetary aid programs. In 1985, Dharavi received 350 million rupees from the Prime Minister Rajeev Gandhi's grant project. The money went to relocating certain businesses within the area and improving the living conditions in specific parts of Dharavi, but for the large portion of the population who live in the unplanned settlements, little change was noted. The businesses are thriving in Dharavi with over 15 000 factories of different kinds; leather bags, recycled plastic becoming new goods, ancient techniques of making clay pots and baking are only a part of the mass industry that is Dharavi today (Slumming it, 2010a). Many of the businesses date back to the beginning of Mumbai as a city when the Koli fishermen together with immigrants from other Indian districts formed what today is the area of Dharavi. In total the annual turnover in Dharavi is a staggering 650 million US dollars (Bansal, Gandhi and Gandhi 2012). Over 85 percent of the population of Dharavi have a job inside the unplanned settlement and many others have jobs outside, making Dharavi a self sufficient community most countries envy (Slumming it, 2010a). In spite the blooming businesses, Dharavi shows large differences in its social structure. The standard of living differs immensely; the demographic of the area include people from the very poor to the middle class and the very rich (Engqvist and Lantz, 2008). The very rich being everything from entrepreneurs, politicians and business owners to criminals and mob leaders and the very poor being the newly arrived living on the outskirts of Dharavi in temporary sheds or the employees working in sweatshops in
of the population, the real effects were insignificant (Arputham and Patel, 2007). For the people of Dharavi little has happened since. In 2004, the Dharavi Redevelopment Program (DRP) focusing on plans for a new future for Dharavi was unveiled (Patel, Arputham, Burra and Savchuk, 2009). The DRP is the production of the Mumbai Metropolitan Region Development Authority (MMRDA) and the DRP is part of the Mumbai Business Plan that sets out to guarantee a competitive, functional and well-governed metropolitan region that will make the GDP grow annually with 8-10 percent whilst the unplanned settlements are being reduced from 60 percent to 10-20 percent (London School of Economics, 2007). The plans of the DRP divide Dharavi into five smaller sectors where national and international companies can bid for the land in a promise to provide the qualified inhabitants of Dharavi with new homes “and work places in high-rise buildings (Patel, Arputham, Burra and Savchuk, 2009). The “qualified inhabitants” are defined by the MMRDA to be those who can show proper documentation that they have kept a ground floor dwelling in Dharavi since before January 1, 2000. This date, known as the cut-off date, makes 87 000 families in Dharavi eligible for relocation or compensation (Times of India, 2007). Excluded from this group of inhabitants that will get compensation through the new development are the hundreds of thousands of people who are staying above ground floor, sleeping at their work places, renting a bed by the hour or who arrived after the cut-off date (Patel, Arputham, Burra and Savchuk, 2009).

The DRP shows clear indication of a top-down approach to planning, and the way in which the process has foregone has been highly criticized by numerous NGOs. It has even been made clear through the government that since Dharavi is situated on land owned by the state, “no consultation with its residents is needed” (Arputham and Patel, 2007 p. 503). Several articles, written by Indian NGO representatives, show the inhabitants perspective in the discussion on Dharavi’s future “[…] the people who live and work in Dharavi accept the need for redevelopment. They recognize that this must include new residential buildings with units for sale to outsiders and some commercial developments as a way of helping finance Dharavi’s redevelopment – all they are asking is to be fully involved in its design and implementation” (Arputham and Patel, 2007 p. 502). In June of 2007 a demonstration took place in Dharavi where 15 000 inhabitants participated in what was called the Black Flag Day, this demonstration together with the pressure from the NGOs made the DRP representatives open up the process to the public and somewhat involve them in the discussions on the future. Today to find current and updated information and plans on the DRP is still a hard task to perform, the project is almost shrouded in secrecy and only small portions of the plans are made public. As reported through the article of Patel et al. (2009 pp. 242-243): “[the] dialogue remained irregular, there was no formal role for public participation and the authorities made it clear that, while the outputs of studies and conversations would be considered, the project would fundamentally proceed as planned”.

The plans of the upgrading and redevelopment of Dharavi could be seen as a front for lesser noble quests than the politicians might want to be publicly known. David Satterthwaite questions the true source of the reasons for the future plans of Dharavi. He states that the primary reasons for starting the project were not to improve the conditions of the inhabitants but to “free up land for development” (Satterthwaite, 2010 p. 15).
5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

5.1 CHARACTER OF A SPACE

The city is not [...] merely a physical mechanism and an artificial construction. It is involved in the vital processes of the people who compose it; it is a product of nature and particularly of human nature.

Robert Park, Ernest Burgess and Roderick McKenzie, 1967 p. 1

That the spaces in which we live in are only made up of physical structures and nothing else is a theory that has been forsaken a long time ago. The human relationship to the structures in a city is present in everything that is being, and that has been, built (Alexander, 1979). The city is originally formed out of the behavior and the culture of its inhabitants and as the structures are set in the environment to become an entity, they themselves form the people. The built structures in the urban environment thus create certain human behaviors that because of its structure prevent and encourage certain types of patterns in the way the people behave (Boano, Lamarca and Hunter, 2008). This relationship, where the human change the environment to suit its own needs and where this built environment then in turn force the human to change its behavior to suit the physical structures, forms into a spiral that continues and continues until something or someone from the outside breaks this pattern by introducing something new (Park, Burgess and McKenzie, 1967). Hall discusses the same theory out of the conception that everything that happens to a person, always takes place within some form of spatial setting and the space in where the experience is obtained will always in some way affect the person (Hall, 1969).

Every culture and every society build their own physical, and mental, spaces. The importance here being that every space has its own distinctive sets of physical structures, ambiances and norms for how the people should behave in the public setting, i.e., all societies have their own unique character (Lefebvre, 1991). But space is not only a place in which physical structures are placed, space and place “serves as the condition of all existing things. This means that, far from being merely locatory or situational, place belongs to the very concept of existence” (Casey, 1993 p. 15). Every space also show an unique arrangement of characteristics merely based on the site in which it is set in, the land that it occupies cannot be occupied by any other space at the same time, hence it is unique (Lefebvre, 1991).

A physical space must always be connected to time and to different types of energy, in other words; to other structures and rooms. As well must it at some point in time have a relation to human presence. A space should as well not only defined by its own structure but by its context and by its boundaries, it is what exists around the space that makes it in to what it is (Heidegger, 2001). As Lefebvre (1991 p. 12) put it: “space considered in isolation is an empty abstraction”. Hence, a space that is not public and that has no connection to a physical place can therefore not be seen as existing in the real.

5.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF SPACES FOR INTERACTION

When we speak of man and space, it sounds as though man stood on one side, space on the other. Yet space is not something that faces man. It is neither an external object nor an inner experience.

Martin Heidegger, 2001 p. 154

According to Lefebvre, public spaces have primarily three specific functions: those of reproduction, production and symbolism. Reproduction in the words of Lefebvre is: “the bio-physiological relations between sexes and between age groups, along with the specific organization of the family”,
Buildings stabilize social life. They give structure to social institutions, durability to social networks, persistence to behavior patterns. What we build solidifies society against time and its incessant forces for change. Thomas F. Gieryn, 2002 p. 35

The relationships between humans are built on how we interact with each other and where we physically exist when this interaction occurs. Arendt summarized in her book this discourse with the opinion that human life is impossible without the presence of other humans (Arendt, 1998 p. 22). Meaning, we need to interact with other people in order to function as humans. As the anthropologist Brian Morris (1994 p. 15) calls it; “[…] humans are intrinsically social”. The places for where human interaction takes place can be divided into four categories of mental dimensions: intimate, personal, social and public (Hall, 1969). A simple way to define the urban environment from these four categories is to divide them into two separate constructions, private (intimate and personal) and public (social and public). These two realms are separate entities but neither can exist without the other (Madanipour, 2003 p. 1). The urban designer Ali Madanipour claims that, although the structure of the relationship may differ, the division of physical space is universal “as cities of all cultures, at all historical periods, are organized along some form of public-private lines” (Madanipour, 2003 p. 2). Arendt also considered the public and the private realm as being two separate, but interdependent, entities. Her thoughts on the origin of the two are that they are both constructed out of the human necessity of freedom. The private realm was constructed out of the need for a free and private sphere, and the public realm was constructed out of the need for freedom of democracy and social community (Arendt, 1998).
Yet irrespective of the particular insulated state of each individual, respectively left unto himself, what we face are always co-isolated islands connected to networks, and which have to be linked to neighbouring isles, be it momentarily or chronically, to form medium-sized or large structures [...].

Peter Sloterdijk, 2008 p. 48

The private and public functions in the urban environment can also be linked to the constitution of the human mind. The inner thoughts and feelings of a person – private – can be kept secret within the individual but in order to gain more personal knowledge, connections to the outer world – public – needs to be done through communicating with other people (Madanipour, 2003). In order to unite these two realms the individual body needs to be in a space where it can integrate with others – the public room (Arendt, 1998). Even though every person in the space can be seen as an individual, a lone entity, the actuality is that in an urban setting when other people are present, no one is alone. The philosopher Peter Sloterdijk compares this to the structure of a cell where each and every cell subsists of its own separate unit, but they are at the same time all connected with another cell through the cell wall, hence all individuals in an open space are connected at any given moment of time (Sloterdijk, 2008 p. 48). Public space does not only provide a scene for interaction to display its self, the public space is also the creator of interaction, behavior and activity. It is the specific space that decides what actions may take place and when they can appear, in this the space also provides a certain order in which the users have to conform to. This purpose of creating order and directing behavior is, as said by Lefebvre (1991 p. 143), the “raison d’être” of the space. The layout of the buildings makes up the framework in which the spaces of interaction exist. The buildings become a border that contains the public spaces inside its edge, it frames it from the outer world and at the same time it provides a scene for world events to take place (Heidegger, 2001). The buildings therefore both reveal and conceal social interaction as it can be seen as both open for the public as well as enclosed for those who do not understand the space’s cultural and social meaning (Gieryn, 2002).

According to Arendt, the actions that take place in the public are considered to be reality, as more than one person see them when they occur. In comparison, the nature of the actions going on within us remains uncertain until we bring them forward into the public. The process of when the personal thoughts become public is what Arendt calls the “deprivatization” and the “deindividualization” of the mind (Arendt, 1998 p. 50). This deprivatization and deindividualization of one’s inner mind will only become public when they are shared through interaction with other human beings (Arendt, 1998).

Each time we talk about things that can be experienced only in privacy or intimacy, we bring them out into a sphere where they will assume a kind of reality which, their intensity notwithstanding, they never could have had before.

Hannah Arendt, 1998 p. 50

Hence, Arendt claims that until something is made public its existence can be disbelieved. Linking this with Lefebvre’s thoughts on the existence of space, it can be noted that no humans, nor space, are real until they are confronted with the presence of other humans in a public setting. Therefore, the space in which we interact with others is immensely important for human existence. The importance of the public space should not be refuted, as it is the provider of human consciousness. Without interaction with others, who will know of our existence?
The thought of a home is not just to be seen as a place where the family and the belongings can be kept from the outside world, but the concept of a home has a more philosophical importance one might not think of in today’s society (Arendt, 1998). Arendt (1998 pp. 29-31) stated “that without owning a house a man could not participate in the affairs of the world because he had no location in it which was properly his own”. Hence, without access to a private space in which one can keep themselves and their family, being a part of society becomes a very hard task to obtain. Private or personal space is thus essential for each individual’s access to democracy and self-worth. Becoming totally private, on the other hand is to the human being an unnatural behavior. In order to subsist as a person, we need others to prove our existence, and that can never occur in a society where all people are completely private (Arendt, 1998).

The importance of a space for interaction between people is thus evident from the above theoretical standpoints. A significant point to remember though in the analysis of a public space is that the one single space actually contains several public spaces. As people meet and interact they create clusters that in themselves become spaces for interaction and since they are outside of the privacy of the home they are categorically public and social (Lefebvre, 1991 and Arendt, 1998). When the private sphere meets the public, the intersection between the two presents a new arena for public space. Hence, where one public space starts and where the other ends is impossible to say, even if there are physical obstacles that visibly separates them they are in fact connected. Therefore a web of interconnected public spaces appears that together create the urban landscape as we see it (Lefebvre, 1991).

When humans interact with each other the persons do not only display their self-identity or their self-consciousness but as well, through interaction with others, the structure of the society in which they belong (Arendt, 1998). Ethnicity, gender, age, class, and in the case of the Indian society, caste; all come forth in the daily communication with others as it is what is expected. The person behaves and acts as both a reflection of themselves and as a consequence of how they think society wants them to behave (Morris, 1994). Important in this discussion of interaction between individuals, according to the anthropologist Brian Morris, is the definition of what a person is. He claims that the word person differs in meaning depending on the context in which the person belongs (Morris, 1994). The western definition of what an individual or a person is lacks in mysticism as it describe a rational and materialistic being that stands outside the social world (Morris, 1994 p. 16). This is an important definition to remember in the discussion of the individual’s role in society, as what is believed by westerners is not the universal truth. Where Arendt talks about the society in philosophical terms where the individuals come together to form one giant societal family, Morris makes us remember that anthropologically, that is not always what we see as depending on where we are brought up, our frame of reference will be different. Further, he discusses that the Indian culture lacks individualism and that the Hindu way of defining one’s identity is foremost described out of the relationship to others and one’s caste membership and that the “‘empirical’ ego comes last in the formulation of identity” (Morris, 1994 p. 93).
5.3 SYMBOLS AND SIGNS IN THE CITY

The creation of a symbol is a complex event with many layers with, for example, historical, sexual, religious and social dimensions. But although born out of complex elements, the actual symbol can appropriate itself on any type of object; man-made, abstract forms or natural alike (Jaffé, 1968). The symbolic meaning of a space or an object can be both collective and personal. The symbols one associates the space to when walking through it can be generated by images, sounds, smells and touch and these triggers can produce a familiarity with something in the personal or in the collective memory, or in both (Jung, 1968).

As was said in the earlier chapter; *The importance of spaces for interaction*, Lefebvre identifies public space to be the bearer of three main functions, reproduction, production and symbolism. The spaces in an urban setting show in themselves different symbols that make the functions of reproduction and production noticeable. The symbols do not only reveal or hide the other functions, it also perform so as to maintain the interdependence between the two functions so that one of them does not start overshadowing the other (Lefebvre, 1991).

The city and the urban environment are an expression and a reflection of the habits and culture of the people who inhabit them, both the physical elements and the character of the space are affected by the people who move through it and who live within it (Park, Burgess and McKenzie, 1967). The spaces experienced by its inhabitants and by its users are made out of two different entities; the physical structures, and the symbolic imagery that these structures represent. Humans do also leave their mark on the space it uses, either by concrete remnants such as objects, sounds and smells, or by abstract fragments such as symbols and behavior patterns (Lefebvre, 1991). The symbolic meaning cannot always be verbalized and hence it lives in its own sphere of mystery. The psychologist Anelia Jaffé explains this as when the rational mind has no explanation for what is being experienced or why a certain emotion has been procured, the unconscious sets in and leaves the mind with mystery (Jaffé, 1968). But this mystical feature does not only affect humans and their behavior, it is also what gives the urban structures in the space character and meaning; it is what differentiates it from any other room in the city or in the world (Lefebvre, 1991). When an individual is faced with architecture that is close to his or her cultural setting or moral mind, the individual will experience affection towards the built structure and consequently a relationship between the individual and the building is created (Lefaivre and Tzonis, 2003).

The symbols and signs that a space holds should not be ignored when something is to be changed in that space. The design of a space or a building always has two functions; one is the construction of the architecture and the other is the social and the symbolic usage (Gieryn, 2002). Although if a building is torn down to be replaced by another, the new building ought never be conceived as entirely new as it correlates to what is around it and also to what was there before. A supporting theory to this statement is that of Lefebvre (1991 p. 144): “nothing can be taken for granted in space, because what are involved are real or possible acts”. The current space has thus not only a history and a present but also a possible future, and by changing the future some incidences might never take place. There is often an architectural past present and always an atmospheric precedence to consider, and a context to relate to when designing a new structure (Bourriaud, 2009). Lefebvre even goes so far as to describe the expression “producing space” as “bizarre”, since no space can ever be seen as being produced out of nothing merely because there are no prior physical structures inside it (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 15). Still, all over the world this type of architectural perspective of the tabula rasa, is used and in this the
An interesting perception of the powers of symbols is that they can be considered to have an expiration date. After they have been created and exposed and in length have evoked provocative feelings within the people subjected to them, the symbols lose their meaning (Lefebvre, 1991). The individual interpretation of the symbols differs from person to person and over time one's own initial association might have changed to evoke feelings that are either stronger or weaker (Jung, 1968). The intensity of how an object or space might be perceived varies thus in time as the personal preferences change.

5.4 WHAT WE KNOW, AND WHAT WE DO NOT THINK OF

Beyond the body, beyond impressions and emotions beyond life and the realm of the senses, beyond pleasure and pain, lies the sphere of distinct and articulated unities, of signs and words.

Henri Lefebvre, 1991 p. 139

Somewhat, the theories of the subchapters prior can be summarized into a conclusion that the human being is very much dependent on its built environment. Every day people pass through physical spaces and they define what they see and they create a connection to the space emotionally and physically. Why then do we not think of this connection when we as users of a space move through it? And why are the meanings of the symbols we see so often neglected when something new is added to the space? The space is perceived and analyzed daily but this is mostly happening in the unknown, in a process that is hard to describe (Lefebvre, 1991). We see symbols and patterns in the spaces we move through and in order for us to decipher them we need knowledge on their meaning (Jung, 1968). Lefebvre argues that prior to this knowledge exist the bodily world becomes more and more monocultural where, as a consequence, the symbols in the built environment get lost, as they are “no longer anchored by the weight of history” (Bourriaud, 2009 p. 49).

Nature as we know it is disappearing, it is being forced aside by the built urban forms created by man (Lefebvre, 1991). The earth is no longer the work of nature but for the most part the product of the human hand (Cattaneo, 1925). Because of this erasure of the natural element that preceded everything else, nature has become a symbol. According to Lefebvre, some of the most valuable symbols in the urban context are the elements that for the urban human are scarce. The symbols that represent nature are therefore powerful as they convey something that has been lost in the particular setting (Lefebvre, 1991). Sometimes though, the messages and the symbolism in the urban realm can become overbearing. As with the case of many CBDs around the world, they do not only provide a workplace for their employees, their glass and steel buildings also symbolize power, wealth, prosperity, stress etc. Through this overload of images and symbols being represented by this type of architecture, the buildings become “over-signifying” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 160). As a result of this surplus of symbols, the perception of the users of the space get clouded, and the overall main message becomes, in consequence, hidden, empty and demolished (Lefebvre, 1991). The human geographer Nigel Thrift (1996 p. 257) writes about the globalized and monocultural urban planning that has arisen with modernity: “[...] we now live in an almost/not quite world – a world of almost/not quite subjects; almost/not quite selves; almost/not quite spaces; and almost/not quite times”. Although this approach to architecture as a symbol of power and superiority is not something new, buildings as a mean for expressing different values has been used for millennia, tracing back to the dwellings of ancient Greek and Egypt communities (Lefaivre and Tzonis 2003).

Somewhat though, the theories of the subchapters prior can be summarized into a conclusion that the human being is very much dependent on its built environment. Every day people pass through physical spaces and they define what they see and they create a connection to the space emotionally and physically. Why then do we not think of this connection when we as users of a space move through it? And why are the meanings of the symbols we see so often neglected when something new is added to the space? The space is perceived and analyzed daily but this is mostly happening in the unknown, in a process that is hard to describe (Lefebvre, 1991). We see symbols and patterns in the spaces we move through and in order for us to decipher them we need knowledge on their meaning (Jung, 1968). Lefebvre argues that prior to this knowledge exist the bodily
functions, such as those of suffering, desire and pleasure (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 135). These bodily functions are innate and they make us react and behave in ways that has little connection with what we have learnt through the course of our individual lives.

Some experiences that an individual faces may not even be registered in the conscious mind; the event stays hidden until the experience gets triggered through association with other events (Jung, 1968). But not all experiences and emotions can be explained and connected to a personal memory or preference; certain reactions to the world that we live in are primal and somewhat inexplicable. The human behavior is hence not only a consequence of personal and cultural knowledge; it is also a reflection of biology and physiology (Hall, 1969). In our unconscious there exists a sort of innate instinct that control part of our perception and understanding, which in turn creates our mood and our emotions and thus make the outcome of some of our feelings uncontrollable (Jung, 1968). These innate instincts are the basis on which the individual's moral and ethical attitudes are formed from, and which in turn affect the way the individual choose to live (von Franz, 1968). Some emotions and attitudes that an individual demonstrate when reacting to an event or an object are thus instinctive and involuntary. There are also innate dreams and desires of the physical built environment that in modern age has been suppressed into almost oblivion as the individuals' creativity has been foregone in order to make place for architects and urban planners (Alexander, 1979 and Hays, 2010). The emotions of our needs and the instincts of our perception can therefore be seen not to have disappeared; they are merely dormant and can be brought forward with the help of participatory methods where the dreams of the individuals and the collective are exposed (Alexander, 1979). Even though today's human beings have learned to control some of the instinctive reactions to stimuli and symbols, this innate primitive behavior has not been lost; it is merely tucked away in the unconscious part of the mind (Jung, 1968). This notion of the human behavior being deeply rooted in our collective biological past is important to remember as we often think of ourselves as a species above nature, acting in a different sphere than the rest of the organisms on earth (Hall, 1969).

As we have seen in the previous chapters, physical space and mental space are consequently inevitably intertwined. The human mind sets its mark on the physical space that it walks through (Heidegger, 2001). The space can therefore be said to possess a certain behavior that reflects the stories on the lives of the individuals’ that it has met (Lefebvre, 1991). Lefebvre (1991 p. 27) explained it as if the social and the physical spaces are “indistinguishable” from the mental. It is as though the physical space should be seen to be incorporating parts of the mental and collecting them in a democratic arena where each individual can choose whenever and wherever he or she wants to reveal their inner thoughts, and by that deliver the mental spaces into reality. The physical objects in the urban landscape are hence a bearer of our collective mental and physical history. The structures do not only give us reference of time or a physical frame in which we can move around in; they also give us a somewhat inexplicable reference to each others' internal dreams and feelings.

To say that certain architects or planners have produced a specific city is a wrong statement (Lefebvre, 1991). No city can show structures influenced by only one or a few persons as everyone who walks past it, uses it or watches it sets their personal mark on that structure; they “compose” the space (Lefebvre, 1991). A city, any city, every city, combines its own “reality with its ideality, embracing the practical, the symbolic and the imaginary” (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 74) and hence it cannot be said to be a product as the city is continuously working to shift form and change its outcome. An
To construct a shelter over one’s head, and to build something is a human instinct. This instinct derives from the fundamental necessity and desire to shelter, and to leave a personal mark of human presence in the otherwise untouched scenery that is nature (Heidegger, 2001). Buildings in consequence becomes the constant in which humans can relate to the changes in time and space and it provides a point of reference in which its users can find a meaning for existence in (Pallasmaa, 2012). Although, in today’s urban society few intact natural spaces still exist, the desire to leave a mark persists (Alexander, 1979). This mark is as well one of the few signs of continuation or change that the modern urban person can understand (Harvey, 1989 and Pallasmaa, 2012). In other words, even though the building or the open space is in theory built and designed by someone else, every user will continue to appropriate the space to their own liking and need as a result of the innate desire to leave a mark of one’s presence and the need to find some indication of time passed.

5.5 THE HUMAN NEED FOR THE UNIQUE

In a world that for every day that passes becomes more and more monocultural the need for urban development to become further rooted in its surrounding culture and context becomes evident. The sociologist Saskia Sassen (2001 p. xix) calls the cities that have undergone this monocultural process for “global cities” as they, independently from each other and from their own historical and cultural context have evolved to create a global aesthetic of urban planning. Thrift even calls this process for being “self-referential” as it repeats the same patterns over and over again with no reference to its origin (Thrift, 1996 p. 257). This monocultural approach to planning stems out of the idea that urban development projects of a large scale has to be designed in a manner suitable for global competition (Sassen, 2001 and Baeten, 2012). The architecture of these buildings gives a worldly feeling to the place, a feeling that the rest of the world is accessible for everyone and closer than ever before (Lefaivre and
Henri Lefebvre, 1991 p. 75

History and culture are important but in order to be progressive, and not get stuck in old habits conserving both the good and the bad in an unchangeable urban environment, a change in the way we think of, and in what way we relate to our urban spaces is needed (Bourriaud, 2009). Building a home and settling down is ultimately the final step in the social process that is life. “Homes are stops for halted life. They enable time to break into space” (Peter Sloterdijk, 2004 cited in Revedin, 2012a p. 23), and through this it can be read that the initial design process is the key element of true change in the urban environment. This opts for a more thought through process instead of the sometimes hectic and haphazard way of designing as that of the global city described by Sassen. The method of quick decisions, that often is the case of the top-down planning doctrine, gives birth to consequences that affect the human relationship to the built environment. The focus is on money and time and not on the user, which in turn leads to a result that is askew. When the user of the space is not the end-consumer in mind the space can never become a desirable habitat for humans. As through the words of the ethologist Konrad Lorenz (1974 p. 19): “Present-day haste leaves people no time to think before they act. They are proud of being ‘doers’, little suspecting that they are undoers of nature and themselves”. It is how we combine the old with the modern, the fast with the slow, that is the key to moving forward and making unique physical spaces that are both place specific and inhabitable to the people of the 21st century (Bourriaud, 2009), the century of the largest urban migration in the history of mankind. Bourriaud wants us to go beyond postmodernism and multiculturalism into something new where...
the present and the future blend with history and culture into what he calls an “altermodernity” (Bourriaud, 2009 p. 39). Complexity, contrasts and textures in architecture that offers depth and layers to the space are what people appreciate and respond to, straight lines and glass façades are not what the human mind desires and what it best interacts with (Slumming it, 2010a).
6 EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

6.1 SANGAM GULLY, SHIV SHANKAR NAGAR, DHARAVI

The two areas chosen for this essay are one small and quiet residential lane and a wider and busier market street. The lane and the street are perpendicular to each other and were chosen for their accessibility as many parts of Dharavi are closed off to the public and require a permit from the community in order to gain admittance. Both, when the interviewees were asked, are called Sangam Gully located in the Shiv Shankar Nagar. For the sake of clarity and to minimize confusion, the lane and the street will be referred to as the residential lane and the market street respectively.

THE RESIDENTIAL LANE

The residential lane connects to one of Dharavi’s largest street, 90 Feet Road. 90 Feet Road cuts through Dharavi like an artery connecting the two outer roads 60 Feet Road and Station Road. The residential lane is narrow and quite dark due to the walls of the buildings’ proximity to each other. The buildings are two stories high where both stories are owned by the same family or owned by two separate households. In total the lane is approximately 30 meters long and the width varies from one to one and a half meters. The lane branches out once to each side into two connecting lanes that are even more narrow and dark than the main lane. The entrances to the residential lane are from both sides very anonymous and they give no indication of what lies behind. As in many other parts of India there are no street names, and hence this could be the reason for why both the residential lane and the market street are called the same thing. There are no actual signs to give any indication on what the street is but the symbols are thus plenty.
The overall feel of the lane is damp and a bit colder than the larger and wider streets. This is a consequence of the minimal amount of daylight that is being emitted through the roofs that covers most part of the lane. The colors are dampened and dark, which contributes to the tranquil state of the lane. The main materials used in the buildings are concrete, corrugated steel sheets, timber and bricks. All buildings are painted in different colors shifting from beige, to light pink, orange and turquoise. Most of the groundwork is stable, made out of concrete bricks. Some parts of the lane however, where the open sewage runs, are left exposed or covered by unsteady concrete slabs.

The pace here is slow and most people that are in motion are young children playing or women chatting with each other through the windows or doorways of their homes. For those who do not live along the lane or on one of the even narrower connecting lanes, use the lane for access between 90 Feet Road and the market street, these people have far a faster pace and hurry through to quickly get to their destination. Hence, here fast meets slow in the movement of people. The residents, almost static, become onlookers and mainly stay along the walls of the buildings as the other users, the ones who use the lane as a shortcut, take the primary position in the space. The street, during the course of the day transforms as it is used in different ways and by different groups of the users. In the early mornings the women go to fetch water at the closest tap whilst the men and the older children leave the homes for work and school. This period of the day is one of the busiest, as most people are in motion at the same time all over Dharavi. During the day the lane shifts in the way it is being used and it becomes everything from a playground for the children to a kitchen as the women bring their cutting boards out on the ground to prepare the food or their dishes to clean up after dinner. Being a street only inhabited by Muslim families the lane becomes empty, except for a
few playing children or a random passerby, when the residents go inside their homes during the five daily *salats*, the Muslim prayer time. Other than during the prayer times and the nighttime the lane is always occupied with people.

The audio clip demonstrates a walk along the whole length of the lane. As can be heard it is a very quiet street with low volume and little noise.
THE MARKET STREET

The market space is, compared to the residential lane, a far busier street, with more people in motion and a more vibrant feel to it. Shifting in width between two to four meters wide it is one of the lightest and most open spaces in this part of Dharavi. The colors are vibrant, and the volume is high. The smells differ as you walk past different shops and the overall feeling is warmth and openness. The colors of the buildings show almost every shade of the rainbow and the products pouring out from the different shops add to the energetic color scheme of the street. The start of the street from the opening on Station Street is wide and welcoming and flanked by shops, which means that the indications on what lies behind are obvious when entering. At the start of the street the individual buildings are two stories high with shops at the bottom and residential spaces for the shop owners’ families on top. Further in on the street just before it turns to the north, some old homes have been replaced by multi-story apartment...
buildings. These buildings break up the otherwise chaotic order and add a different dimension to the space where the old meets the new.

The differences in tempo, in mood and in ambiance between the two streets are significantly dissimilar from each other. Leaving the residential lane and entering the market street makes one face a completely different world. This is not only due to the difference in number of people, the light or the pace of the movement; the two spaces are also different in ambiance. The market street is more open and public and it is a space for spontaneous interaction and conversation. The interaction here consists of several layers of different types of groupings and situations; between young kids walking home from school, between the shop keeper and the female customer haggling for the price of rice, between groups of men conversing about politics and the interaction between strangers as they all become one entity as a group sharing the same space at the same time. The residential lane on the other hand is more private, no stranger stops here to talk or rest; most of the conversation happening is between those who live there and who already know each other. Both spaces are open to the public, but the market street's layout and function are more showing of this characteristic than the residential lane. One characteristic of both the street and the lane is that there are almost no women walking alone. The market street is practically dominated by men; mostly there are men working in the shops and most individuals occupying the space are men. Women do move along the street, but when they do they usually move in a group together with other women. The same is for the residential lane, the women you see are the ones staying close to their homes, almost no women choose the lane as a shortcut to get from point A to point B, like the men do.
Both streets are in a sense also anonymous but in two different ways. A resident of Dharavi can easily walk down the market street without being noticed, given they do not meet anyone they know. As well can one walk into the residential lane and in a way disappear from the rest of the world as when standing outside on the market road or 90 Feet Road there is no way of knowing what is going on inside the lane. In a way this is what makes Dharavi so very unique, there are over 700 000 people living together in a very confined space, but nevertheless an individual can stay completely anonymous if so is his or her wish.

In comparison to the audio clip from the residential lane the audial recording of the market street indicate a far busier atmosphere, higher pace and more people.

6.2 THE COLLECTION OF DREAMS

For this part of the empirical study the method of qualitative semi-structured interviews was used with the help of the Divergence-Emergence-Convergence model, as described in the methodology chapter. Since one of the aims for this essay has been to collect stories, the choice was made to conduct qualitative and not quantitative interviews. Because of the nature of the type of the interviews that were made, no comparable data in form of diagrams or percentages could be produced instead here follows parts of the stories as they were told. The empirical data from the interviews has been reproduced both in quotation form and as well with a short summary of each interview so as to give the stories that were told the most accuracy and credibility possible. The reason for not including the interviews in their full entity is to procure the anonymity of the participants as far as possible. The questions asked are shown in **bold**, and the answers are shown in *italics*.

Since most inhabitants in Dharavi are not fluent in English the interviews were conducted through the help of a translator. The interviews were conducted in four different languages, English, Urdu, Hindi and Marathi and translated simultaneously throughout the interviews.

There were a total of four deep interviews conducted, each lasting between 30 minutes to 1 hour. Two interviews were conducted with two interviewees present, these being the conversations with W1 and M1 as well as M3 and M4. More individuals than the six interviewed were asked but many declined, especially difficult were the participation of women and only one woman decided to partake in the interviews. The age demographic of the interviewees were otherwise quite diverse, some old, some young and some middle aged. The cultural diversity and the societal heritage were also different between the participants, some being Muslims, some
Dharavi has stayed very much the same throughout the years with a slow pace of change in the layout of the streets or in the built structures.

W1: 40 years I have been waiting for a change to happen in Dharavi. But still nothing major has happened. So many people move here every year and there is just not enough room for all of them, for the last 15 years the government has promised and promised something new but still nothing has been done.

W1 has lived in Dharavi for over 60 years and when she moved to Dharavi with her husband the place was totally different from what it is now. She tells the story of how they had mud up to their knees when they arrived, that the whole area was a big swamp.

W1: In that way Dharavi has changed, now it is livable and we have real homes with walls and roof, which we did not have when we got here.

W1 continues her story about the changes and the non-changes Dharavi has gone through and she concludes that she has no idea what the future holds as the information from the government is none, this is in turn affecting the way she lives her life and the way she takes care of her home.

W1: I spend money each month on my house but I have no idea when they will tear it down and build something new. I am not against the change, I am for it but I don't want to spend money if it is all disappearing next month.

There are so many politicians coming here before every election promising and promising change but nothing ever happens. They all are from different parties, promising the same thing. Who should I vote for? Nothing will
W1 asks for the same things as M1. She explains that she left to go to Saudi Arabia to work for 10 years and when she came back to Dharavi little had changed. She says there are not that many material things to wish for that would make a difference in her life but that all she wants is happiness in her family.

W1: The dreams I have for the future is that I wish just two things for my children and me, good business and good home.

M1 has lived all his life in Dharavi and even though he is young he has no plans on leaving, he has his whole family in Dharavi, his business and his friends.

M1: My dream for Dharavi is that my family and I will be able to stay here. The only place I can imagine living is here. This is where I belong. I don't want to move anywhere else.

W1: I have stopped dreaming of change for Dharavi because I have lost hope that anything will ever happen, at least not under my lifetime. I still wish for change for my children and grandchildren, I hope they get to see a different Dharavi.

What are your dreams for yourself and your family?
M1 explains how his family suffered a great loss as one of the family members past away last year. He had to quit school and start working in order to help the survival of the rest of his family and still suffering from grief and pain he has few dreams for his own future.

M1: After the death of my family member 8 months ago I have few dreams, the only thing I wish for is that my business will settle and then I will be peaceful. I started my business one year ago and it is hard work. A good business is all I want in the future.

W1 asks for the same things as M1. She explains that she left to go to Saudi Arabia to work for 10 years and when she came back to Dharavi little had changed. She says there are not that many material things to wish for that would make a difference in her life but that all she wants is happiness in her family.

W1: The dreams I have for the future is that I wish just two things for my children and me, good business and good home.

THE MARKET STREET
The second interview with M2 and M3 was held on the 7th of April 2013. The two brothers own a shop situated on the market street in Shiv Shankar Nagar, Dharavi. The third and fourth interview with M3 and M4, also shop owners on the same street were executed on the 13th of April 2013.

What are your dreams for this lane that you live in/work on?
M2 and M3 are brothers and they have lived on the same street and in the same house all their lives. Now, both married and parents they still live together, sharing a home and the shop. The shop is situated underneath their apartment and some of the family sleep on the shop floor at night. M1 and M2 both agree that the only ones who can bring Dharavi forward and change it to the better are the children. They have little trust or hope in the competency of politicians.

M1: My dream for Dharavi is that my family and I will be able to stay here. The only place I can imagine living is here. This is where I belong. I don't want to move anywhere else.

M3: Education is important. That is what I wish for the future, that all children could go to school. I can afford to send my children to school but not all families can. This is the most important thing and the only thing that really will be able to change Dharavi in the future. Education
M3 continues to discuss the plans of the DRP and how new buildings and a new urban layout would change the people of Dharavi. He is not against a transformation from the now horizontal layout to a vertical where all people live in high-rises instead of the individual houses of Dharavi as it is today.

M4: Education and knowledge is the key to change. If the kids go to school their values and minds will be better than ours and through that Dharavi can change. But Dharavi is a very large place so change will take time and will not be easy to achieve. One thing that can become better through the new plans is that a new Dharavi can attract people from the outside and that might help our values as well.

In the third and the fourth interviews the opinions are in large parts the same. M4, a shop owner of third generation has lived in Dharavi his whole life and he inherited the shop from his father. M5 arrived to Dharavi two years ago and his family stayed in the village as he moved to Mumbai to earn more money.

M5: We are not against the plans of the government. We need to bring Dharavi into the future, but we also need to make sure that everyone can keep their factories or their shops. Without our income we are nothing.

Both M4 and M5 discuss the fact that they know little about the plans of the DRP. None of them have seen any plans or documentation all they

M3 continues and says that Dharavi, even though it is safer and more prosperous than ever before, still has a bad reputation with those whom have never visited Dharavi. M2 and M3 discuss this and they say that it is as if the overall opinion of the middle and upper classes is that Dharavi is something bad and ugly that only costs the society money and that the city of Mumbai can blame its problems only on the slums.

M3: Business has grown the last 10 years thanks to the large number of people coming here. Even tourists come here now, but the rest of the inhabitants of Bombay still think of Dharavi as a dangerous place. We have to change that mindset; everyone should know what Dharavi is like. All businesses that exist in the rest of the world exist here. There is a business or a factory for everything. We make the rest of the city work. No one in Bombay can survive without Dharavi.

In a modern city everyone wants McDonald's. There is no McDonald's here now, but in the future someone will have to build one because our behavior will change as we learn what we have been missing and we will want other things than what we want today. The mindset of the people who live here will change and that will mean a different future for our business. But then we will change; we have to in order to survive. Dharavi has changed many times before, it changed from being one of the most criminal places in India and now it is very safe, so we can change again if we have to.

M2: We are not against the plans of the government. We need to bring Dharavi into the future, but we also need to make sure that everyone can keep their factories or their shops. Without our income we are nothing.
know is what they have heard through others.

M5: Most people here wants Dharavi to change, so do I but the most important thing is how and when this will happen. I have no idea if my shop will be here tomorrow because I don’t know what will happen. Now I’m loosing money on this shop and I do not want to invest more money in it because I do not know for how long I can stay here.

M5 has only lived in Dharavi since 2011 and because of this he falls outside of the category of inhabitants who can claim a replacement home since the cut-off date for this is January 1 2000. This means he will have to leave Dharavi as soon as the government decides to take the buildings down, and he does not get any compensation even if he pays several thousands of rupees in rent every month.

What are your dreams for yourself and your family?
All interviewed on the market street, as on the residential lane, answered that a steady income and a good home are the most important things they wish for in their future life.

M2: All I wish for is that we get to keep this house and our shop in the future. A good job and a healthy and happy family is all I need.

M3: Yes, a good future for both my brother’s children and mine is what I wish for most and that will only happen if our business keeps growing. So that is what I wish for: our business to survive and grow and a house for our children to inherit.

M5: I might have to leave Dharavi soon, I am loosing money and I do not know if and for how long I can stay so if I have to say one thing it would be for my shop to make more money. A good job is everything to a man like me.

M4 contemplates over how diverse Dharavi is and that you can never tell if the man next to you is poor or a millionaire. He likes the equality between different groups that this brings and he wishes that he himself one day will be rich but that he will always remember the hard times in his life.

M4: I am not the richest on this street but I am not the poorest either. I have a good life but I want to make an even better life so I can marry and provide a good life for my wife and future kids. Dharavi is my whole life, my parents and brothers live here, my friends are here, and my costumers are here. Why should I leave? If I leave I will have to start all over again so I will never leave Dharavi. The future here is very good. We have everything we need here.
7 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

7.1 THE METHOD OF RESEARCH
The method of the original chosen form of interviewing has proven itself to be at the same time both beneficial and restrictive. The initial aim was to conduct one-to-one interviews about the dreams of the future. As has been shown here in this essay, few people are ever alone in Dharavi and that makes one-to-one interviews hard to conduct. There is most always someone standing on the side commenting on the questions or the answers and that was the reason for why some interviews in this essay had two participants rather than just the originally asked interviewee. This on the other hand showed it self to be beneficial to the conversation as more thoughts and more associations were discovered. As through the words of Martyn Denscombe: “the inclusion of more participants is likely to mean that a broader spectrum of people are covered by the research and that there might be a greater variety of experiences and opinions emerging from the investigation” (Denscombe, 2010 p. 176).

What is being described either by the user or by the observer is never the reality that truly exists (Lefebvre, 1991). This poses issues with the type of research here performed, how can one set out to describe a space when the description will not be completely truthful? The answer merely lies within the theories of the inexplicable. There are characteristics, symbols and ambiences that simply cannot be described scientifically since they do not contain exact values that can be counter-measured. The truth therefore is not expressed in numbers or diagrams but in the human condition of experience. Some of these factors might be easier to understand for the user, some more perceptible for the observer. But between these two stories of the same space is a grey zone that is hard to breach for any of the two involved. This grey zone is made up of that innate sense of being that no one can escape but that is difficult to define, those “bodily functions” that precedes any thing we have ever learnt; suffering, desire and pleasure (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 135).

When it comes to the analysis of the data collected in Dharavi; Frampton’s quote on the impossibility of the retelling of the experience of a space comes to mind. “the tactile resides in the fact that it can only be decoded in terms of experience itself: it cannot be reproduced to mere information, to representation or to the simple evocation of a simulacrum substituting for absent presences” (Frampton, 2002 p. 32). This is simply because an image or an audio clip might be easy to understand but it never tells the whole story, it is just a snapshot that leaves out its context and the subject of time. Smell and touch is impossible to reproduce in full and hence another dimension is lost to the reader who has not experienced the space on their own. The Mumbai based journalist Kalpana Sharma writes about this theory in the case of Dharavi when she says that: “there is an order in the apparent disorder, an order which you can only really know about if you live in one of these lanes” (Sharma, 2000 p. xxviii). Even to attempt to create a full description or an exact replica can thus be seen as an impossible task as the dimension of time and history is irreproducible (Casey, 1993). With this in mind, the conclusion can be that an all inclusive character analysis can never wholly and truthfully become an exact representation of the original space. As a consequence to this; a new form of analysis of spaces can be derived, one that deals with its own shortcomings and that in turn understands the many dimensions and layers that a space consists of, not only the geometrical forms of its physical structures.

7.2 DHARAVI – A CITY WITHIN A CITY
Lefebvre describes the type of planning theory that can be found as being the basis of the proposals of the DRP, as an uneven relationship, where the “dominant form of space, that of centres of wealth and power, endeavours
7.3 SYMBOLS IN DHARAVI

Settlements like Dharavi emerge from the life stories of the people who inhabit them. They are not planned townships much desired as a solution to urban blight. The way they grow merges with the lives of the men and women who imbue them with a personality.

Kalpana Sharma, 2000 p. xxiv

The theory of Park, Burgess and McKenzie (1967, p. 4) on the urban structure as being a product of its inhabitants that evolves into an organism that in itself affects and forms the people, is highly applicable on the urban environment Dharavi. The streets researched in this essay are under heavy influence of religion. Through large portions of the day prayers are being chanted out through the speakers of the minarets and here and there are small shrines incorporated in the walls for offerings to the Hindu gods. As well, as noticed especially on the market street, are small indications of the religion of the shop owners as most have some sort of symbol visible as to what religion they belong to. This system becomes a system for differentiation and at the same time inclusion of the cultural groups of Dharavi, as it is helps determine whom the space “belongs” to. Jung wrote that: “it is the role of the religious symbols to give a meaning to the life of man” (Jung, 1968 p. 76). Through the religious symbols in the space and on the users, certain patterns of behavior portrayed in the public spaces arise; where to walk and how fast, where to play, who to talk to, what to say and foremost who is “allowed” at all to use the space. Obvious when observing the residential lane is that some individuals rush through the lane, not because they are in a hurry to go somewhere else but because they do not “belong” there. The words “allowed” and “belong” are her put in citation marks, because Dharavi does not have any rules or limitations to who is permitted access and where they can go. But there exists unwritten rules of how to behave proclaimed by others occupying...
the space or by the disposition of the buildings’ relation to each other. Depending on who normally occupies the space becomes the norm of who else can feel comfortable there. This is much due to the nature of how the community works; shops and workplaces occupy the space in daytime and they spread through both building and street, in night the shops turn into homes. The same families, all through the day and all year around, are thus the main occupants of the space and they create the symbols that become the norms for others to comply with of that particular space. When symbols are working at their best they are beneficial for the individuals’ emotions, creativity and inspiration, but if the symbols instead portray messages that the users cannot identify with; the effect might instead be harmful and disruptive as the symbols instead might become the source for prejudice and discriminating behavior (von Franz, 1968). Dharavi is open and welcoming, but its symbols and norms create a certain behavior amongst the users and inhabitants, and these create in turn both beneficial and burdening consequences for its community. All in all, as many urban planners and sociologist before have concluded, the community of Dharavi is uniquely strong and productive (Slumming it, 2010a), but if the community along with its symbols were to be uprooted from its original state and placed in a new setting and context the symbols might lose their meaning and instead of working as the glue that keeps the community working with its norms and social manners, the symbols might create a negative atmosphere as described by von Franz.

Even though the residential lane is more quiet and calm compared to the hustle and bustle of the market street the movement of the people passing through is quite different. The public spaces of the market street conduct a far slower pace than the narrow and dark alleyway that people hurry through in order to get to a more accessible street. The architecture and the behavior of the users hence contradict each other, where the layout is open and wide and the noise and the pulse is high the people move slow and where the layout is enclosed and quiet the people hurry through quickly. This could be related to the individual and personal sense of belonging, as where someone feel like they belong their confidence grows and they in length start appropriate the space far more than if they feel like an intruder (Arendt, 1998 and Lefebvre, 1991). The streets therefore show different symbolic meanings and they provide a structure and an order to the society that is Dharavi, all spaces are free for everyone but some are to be considered semiprivate and hence become more excluding to those who have no reason to occupy it.

The colors and textures of the two streets are also important for the feel of the place and the sense of uniqueness. Aesthetically Dharavi is vibrant and chaotic with its a mishmash of different materials, textures and colors and this ordered chaos serves a symbolic value to the space as well as it has its functions. In a streetscape where no street names or house numbers exist, color works as an identification of location in Dharavi. A pink door marks the home of one family, as does the turquoise wall color for another. The choices of color and texture are therefore not only aesthetical they also serve a purpose of differentiation from other homes. The symbolic value in this system is subtle but yet powerful as no home or shop looks like any other. Only those initiated to the societal and cultural meanings of these differences can truly understand their meaning and the order in which they are related to each other. The textures and colors of the physical materials also serve a psychological meaning connected to the human need for uniqueness and differentiation; too much of the same material with the same surface disturbs the awareness of orientation and contributes to placelessness and monotony (Hesselgren, 1969). The materials used are also a reflection of the people who built the structures. Clay, brick, concrete and corrugated steel sheets are fairly inexpensive
materials and most buildings show innovative architectural solutions with lots of character and individuality. The homes are built with the most suitable material available at the time to provide shelter, and after the basic structure has been erected they are adorned to show who they belong to, so as to stand out from the rest in order to form place identification and uniqueness. The buildings are in consequence an obvious as well as a symbolic reflection of the people who have built them and who live within them.

Symbols and signs that affect human behavior are not only visible, they can also be audible. In the two audio clips two totally different spaces are being portrayed. The sounds of the residential lane are quiet and muted, which in turn indicates a slow pace and an intimate feel. As a consequence, the sounds, or in this case the lack thereof, adds to the effects on the overall behavior of the users. The lane feels private and therefore not really available for everyone’s use and hence few people who have no actual reason to use the street pass by. The market street on the other hand, all though so close by, has a totally different soundscape. It is loud and noisy, and the pace is higher. Here the sounds provide a feeling of openness and inclusion, everyone is welcome and the speed of the movements is fast.

Anelia Jaffé’s text on symbols in art with the comments on the work of Jackson Pollock has a description that could easily be transferred to be a description of the streets in Dharavi: “in their lack of structure they are almost chaotic, a glowing lava stream of colors, lines, planes, and points. They may be regarded as a parallel to what the alchemist called the massa confusa, the prima materia, or chaos – all ways of defining the precious prime matter of the alchemical process, the starting point of the quest for the essence of being” (Jaffé, 1968 p. 309). The philosopher Edward S. Casey also refers to chaos as the primal order from where every thing originates, and that chaos might be disorganized but it is nevertheless a space that is organic and alive (Casey, 1993 pp. 18-19). In other words, in spite of, and maybe because of, the chaos that is Dharavi one conclusion might be that the way these streets portray themselves is an image of the human essential need. Dharavi might just provide the exact concoction of what is fundamentally necessary for us, and it might be because of this that the community has such a tight knit and the businesses are blossoming.

7.4 Dharavi and the people

Crowded together in our huge modern cities, in the phantasmagoria of human faces, superimposed on each other and blurred, we no longer see the face of our neighbor.
Konrad Lorenz, 1974 pp. 12-13

The mere mass of people living in Dharavi causes large problems when it comes to both the current maintenance and the proposed future move of the inhabitants. But the problems are not only logistical, economical and political; they are also biological and social. Although there are many social benefits to the way in which the Dharavian society is built around, the negative impacts are important to bring forth. Biologically to function, as priory discussed, humans need an arena to meet in in order to function. This arena, often the public room, has its physical and spatial constraints. A notion obvious within Dharavi where over 700 000 individuals share 236 hectares of land. Arendt stated that: “What makes mass society so difficult to bear is not the number of people involved, or at least not primarily, but the fact that the world between them has lost its power to gather them together, to relate and to separate them” (Arendt, 1998 p. 53). With this quote in mind the aspects on the effects of the social structure of Dharavi is thus not only positive. Too many people in a very restricted
The structure of Dharavi’s layout is finely tuned and intricate. As it has gradually grown over the last 200 years the development has been slow and well adjusted, only what has been needed has been built and the overall feel to Dharavi is that its structure is entirely made for its users and that it has been built on their own terms. According to Gieryn buildings and spaces are designed out of the notion that they are to be used by humans, and hence the human movements and patterns of interaction are the basis of any designed space (Gieryn, 2002 pp. 42-43). With this in mind it is interesting to see how Dharavi as an unplanned settlement has been able to produce the essential thing that the planned city strives to do but so often fail to achieve – optimal usage. In Dharavi there are no unused or so called “dead” spaces, every lane has a purpose, every corner is occupied by someone and so it becomes a society where the users overtime has shaped the settlement after their own basic needs and not under the influence of what someone else consider is the optimal way of living. For, when the area take its toll on the social and biological needs of the human race and this is nothing that can be foreseen.

The writer Suketu Mehta (2004 p. 589) reflects on the individual’s place and space in a city like Mumbai as: “the battle for Bombay is the battle of the self against the crowd”. Each individual needs space but space is limited and this fact has significant effects on Dharavi and on Mumbai as a whole. Considering the fact of the large amount of people living, in terms of size, on such a restricted area, the inhabitants’ relationship to the restricted space is distinctive. It is as if the space becomes flexible and changes depending on how many people are occupying it and what time of the day it is (Slumming it, 2010a). The only reasons for any place that involves such big groups of organisms, in this case human individuals, to not evolve into a place of utter chaos are the space’s ability to adjust and become inorganic in its structure (Lorenz, 1974). This is very evident in Dharavi, at least during the weekly jumu‘ah, the Muslim Friday prayer, where thousands upon thousands of Muslim men turn the largest road of Dharavi into an open-air mosque. The mere mass of people is also one of the key functions of why Dharavi as a community works so well; there is just no room or opportunity to be alone or to be selfish. In a place where every centimeter has its function and every space, public or private, is filled with people the connection between the individuals is the glue that keeps the community together.

In a Mumbai slum, there is no individual, there is only the organism. There are circles of fealty and duty within the organism, but the smallest circle is the family. There is no family around the self.
Suketu Mehta in London School of Economics, 2007 p. 43
Participatory approaches, such as the one used in this essay with the collection of people’s dreams, can be a helpful instrument in the discussion of the future of Dharavi. If an individual or a group are encouraged and given an arena to show their individual or collective aspirations, their proclamation can be the starting point of what the architect Christopher Alexander calls “the timeless way of building” (Alexander, 1979 p. 7). This approach to architecture and urban planning is very much like the one of Frampton and Lefaivre and Tzonis, it is a theory based on the importance of genius loci, culture, history, time and foremost the human relationship to its built environment. No one knows more about its environment than those who use it and who have individual and cultural emotions attached to their surroundings (Frampton, 2002 and Alexander, 1979).

As noted in the interviews, none of the interviewees were against change in Dharavi. The two main answers to the question “what are your personal dreams for the future?” were: a steady income and a good home. The home is central to the people in Dharavi, they see how people struggle for land in Mumbai every day and they all know they are living in an illegal settlement where eviction is a daily threat. They want change; they want running water, their own bathrooms and more privacy. The question is just how and when? None of the people that were interviewed for this essay had seen any plans for the government, what they knew had been gained by hearsay. One conclusion can thus be that for the people in Dharavi their dreams for their personal life is closely linked to the buildings, the urban spaces and the structure of the society. They wish for better homes and for

7.5 DREAMS FOR THE FUTURE
One part of the study of Dharavi was to ask people in each of the spaces researched about their dreams for the future, their personal dreams and their dreams about the space in which they move through, work in or live by. This part of the study was made to involve the users of the spaces and to make them reflect upon what their dreams are in comparison to those of the Mumbai council and the DRP. Dreams as much as daydreams, collective story telling and hopes for the future are an important part of self-appreciation, creativity and perseverance (Freud, 1950). The collective thoughts and dreams of a community can, if collected and proclaimed, be a strong tool in the shift from a top-down approach to a bottom-up approach of urban planning (Alexander, 1979). Through the words of Suketu Mehta: “a city is an agglomeration of individual dreams, a mass dream of the crowd. In order for the dream life of a city to stay vital, each individual dream has to stay vital” (Mehta, 2004 p. 589).

It is so powerful, that with its help hundreds of people together can create a town, which is alive and vibrant, peaceful and relaxed, a town as beautiful as any town in history.
Christopher Alexander, 1979 p. 8

As noted in the interviews, none of the interviewees were against change in Dharavi. The two main answers to the question “what are your personal dreams for the future?” were: a steady income and a good home. The home is central to the people in Dharavi, they see how people struggle for land in Mumbai every day and they all know they are living in an illegal settlement where eviction is a daily threat. They want change; they want running water, their own bathrooms and more privacy. The question is just how and when? None of the people that were interviewed for this essay had seen any plans for the government, what they knew had been gained by hearsay. One conclusion can thus be that for the people in Dharavi their dreams for their personal life is closely linked to the buildings, the urban spaces and the structure of the society. They wish for better homes and for
a steady income, two things that society could provide the tools for. And hence, in consequence, the answer to the question on their personal dreams could be translated into being an answer for what the physical structures and public spaces in the future should look like in order to cater for and accommodate the dreams and the well being of the people of Dharavi.

According to the sociologist Thomas F. Gieryn (2002, pp. 38-39), the buildings that are being built can both be a depiction of the dreams come true and the dreams shattered as “buildings hide the many possibilities that did not get built, as they bury the interests, politics, and power that shaped the one that did”. With this quote in mind one conclusion can be that the dreams of the inhabitants of Dharavi will get buried and somewhat shattered the day the building of the new Dharavi commences. This however, is only true if the DRP continues to exclude the inhabitants in participating in the plans. If they would open up for more public participation, the dreams of the public would consequently be incorporated in the buildings, which in turn could lead to a future Dharavi where the inhabitants feel equally fond and proud of their home as they do today.

7.6 Dharavi: an Urban Renewal

When the city operates as an open system – incorporating principles of porosity of territory, narrative indeterminacy and incomplete form – it becomes democratic not in a legal sense, but as physical experience.

Richard Sennett, 2007 p. 296

The main aim of this essay has not been to give reasons to keep Dharavi exactly as it is and set aside from change. The aim has merely been to show different means on how to go forward without radically changing the physique of the place. Hence experimenting with new ways on tackling the same problem through a will to bring the discussion on the future of Dharavi into a modern frame of mind. As Bourriaud has said it: being modern does not mean to follow the path of others and do what has already been done, being modern means “venturing, not resting contentedly with tradition, with existing formulas and categories; but seeking to clear new paths, to become a test pilot” (Bourriaud, 2009 p. 16). The modernity of the current plans on the future of Dharavi can be questioned, the process started in the early millennium, and still now in 2013 not much has happened to the original plans (Patel, Arputham, Burra and Savchuk, 2009). As well, how true to the Indian culture are they?

“Cleaning up” the city from unplanned settlements has been a task for the Mumbai authorities for centuries. The demolition of Dharavi is hence not something new. The first immigrants to Dharavi were forced to move there since their first settlements in south Mumbai were demolished. In other words history keeps repeating itself when it comes to the unplanned settlements of Mumbai and their inhabitants (Sharma, 2000).

In a world growing ever more uniform with each passing day, we can defend diversity only by raising it to the level of a cherished value, one that exceeds the immediate attraction of the exotic and knee-jerk instincts of conservation – that is to say, only by establishing it as a conceptual category.

Nicolas Bourriaud. 2009 p. 20

The significance of the thought of the tabula rasa as a non-existing concept in architecture is in Dharavi ever so important. By moving the people and changing the character of the space and the pace of Dharavi would be to ignore the symbols, the signs and the somewhat indefinable essence that Dharavi is built out of. The problem of these signs and symbols is that they
The symbolic meaning of an urban setting coat the physical structures with a characteristic that is hard to define and pinpoint (Lefebvre, 1991). By replacing the existing buildings with those that are being proposed, large steel framed high-rises with glass façades; Dharavi’s symbolic meaning will be changed. The problem, according to Lefebvre, with the type of homogenous architecture that often is represented in developments for new business districts around the world is the overbearing amount of symbols these buildings present, and that the greater the number of symbols that are being intentionally incorporated, the more their true meaning gets lost (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 160). And as noted by Thrift, as the architecture and planning of the public spaces become more alike each other; so do we (Thrift, 1996 p. 257). Time, character and individuality get lost as the urban landscapes of the world become copies of one another.

Wealth, power, uniformity, happiness etc. can all, through the hands of an architect, be integrated into the urban landscape. The list of symbols represented in this type of architecture is long, and the resemblance of Lefebvre’s examples to the proposals of the DRP is a tempting connection to make. Although, as Lefaivre and Tzonis argue the symbols represented in this type of monocultural architecture lack in depth, the symbols are profound, naïve and on a nonhuman scale (Lefaivre and Tzonis, 2003 p. 18). Dharavi as it is today, filled with intricate symbols and hidden meanings are thus proposed to change into an urban setting consisting of symbols that are both foreign and somewhat diluted. The buildings of the type that are proposed by the DRP then can be seen as what the architect Kenneth Frampton calls “scenography” (Frampton, 2002 p. 21). Scenography relates to the stage of a theatre where the background is built to help the understanding of the story being played as though it would be reality. But in Dharavi, the future proposed to happen by the DRP will have difficulties in becoming realistic since the history and culture are so deeply rooted in the inhabitants’ memory that no matter how great the scenographer/architect might be, the people of Dharavi will always remember what is behind the scene.

There is also a choice to be made on what type of “product” the government wishes to acquire from Dharavi. According to Arendt, there are two types of products: the fast produced, made for quick consumption, and the time persistent product made with a unique sense of design and purpose (Arendt, 1998 pp. 136-137). The question in Dharavi is thus, what type of place the DRP wishes to create? A quickly consumed one where time and money is the main factor of purpose or a slow evolving process where each and everyone of Dharavi can help form the spaces in which they live and hence create a more viable urban landscape.

It can be argued that, from the results of the quantitative mapping, the symbols in the studied streets of Dharavi are not deliberately manufactured. Since no architects or urban planners have been involved in the planning of the position of the structural objects or the layout of the streets, Dharavi is by definition unplanned, and its symbols are therefore also unplanned. According to Jung, new symbols cannot be produced as the production of symbols happen naturally and spontaneously without intentional interference. Albeit, already established symbols can be appropriated and incorporated when a physical object is being built (Jung, 1968). The symbolic meanings found in the public spaces have therefore been made by the inhabitants, for the inhabitants, but this process has been unconscious. To change this structure of the symbolism in the urban landscape, from community made and unintentional to a process of prefabricated and predefined symbols imposed by politicians and the architecturally educated, could have consequences on the prosperity of the community of Dharavi as it is today. When symbols and opinions of others are imposed
on individuals, behaviors and instincts can change; “influences may cause us to live in ways unsuited to our individual natures” (Jung, 1968 p. 35).

The importance of public spaces and why and how people interact with the built environment was discussed in an earlier chapter through the theories of Arendt, Lefebvre, Hall and such alike. These theories are also applicable on the case of Dharavi. Dharavi as it is today is, as many before have called it, a city within a city, and Dharavi is in many ways the ideal type of community (Engqvist and Lantz, 2007). There are hardly any cars, all you need in terms of food and commodities are within a five minute walking distance from your home, many buildings are rich in architecture and full of texture and color, and most families have lived in the same nagar for generations (Slumming it, 2010b). People meet on the streets and in the public spaces and in consequence, different ages and religions mix in an assembly of stories of their collective history and everyday life. The public spaces, the streets and the character of how the built structures correlate with each other are important for Dharavi’s survival. The spaces between the buildings and the nature of the existing architecture are what make Dharavi work as a society. The layers and the fine grain that the buildings together compose, and the different textures and the contrasts that the individual structures provide are, to the human mind, the ideal form of architecture; it is what we desire (Slumming it, 2010b). People in a high-rise building might never be completely lonely but the nature of the high-rise as a physical and psychological construction might lead to the feeling of loneliness. Loneliness is, in the words of Arendt, the “most antihuman form” of being (Arendt, 1998 p. 59). Loneliness on the other hand should not be seen as having the same meaning as the word solitude. To have a space for solitude is a human need and Dharavi as it is today provide few places for where an individual can remove him- or herself from the crowd into a moment of isolation.

“This place has a sense of community, and you will not find anybody here that is lonely” (Slumming it, 2010a), in a vertical setting life becomes more private, and parallels to Arendt’s thoughts on privacy can here be made. Although never as grave as her visions, the privatization of the individuals of Dharavi might conduce to become a society where more and more people “seize to exist” in the eyes of the others (Arendt, 1998). If no one sees you and you have nowhere to interact with others who will know of your existence in the world? Although Arendt’s views might be a bit too dystopian for this particular instance, the question is nevertheless important to bring forth. People in a high-rise building might never be completely lonely but the nature of the high-rise as a physical and psychological construction might lead to the feeling of loneliness. Loneliness is, in the words of Arendt, the “most antihuman form” of being (Arendt, 1998 p. 59). Loneliness on the other hand should not be seen as having the same meaning as the word solitude. To have a space for solitude is a human need and Dharavi as it is today provide few places for where an individual can remove him- or herself from the crowd into a moment of isolation.

The greatest luxury of all is solitude. A city this densely packed affords no privacy. Those without a room of their own don’t have space to be alone, to defecate or write poetry or make love.

Suketu Mehta, 2004 p. 137

Within this there lies an opportunity for the future of Dharavi. The new spaces created should not be of a fixed kind with concrete and glass boxes stacked on top of each other with open spaces on the sides. The grain of Dharavi is finer than so. The urban landscape here needs open and enclosed spaces intermingled and close to each other. The built structures are more well suited if correspondent to a human scale rather than being seven stories high. The arbitrary design proposed by the DRP where the
community is thought to survive although the structure of its arena is altered could be associated to the conclusions of Lefebvre: one should not mix the function of one need with the form of another (Lefebvre, 1991 p. 149). The philosopher Paul Ricœur compared this type of architectural dilemma as being a paradox; where the aspiration to become modern has consequences on the cultural and historical, and if the cultural and historical is to be completely preserved; modernity can never be achieved (Ricœur, 2002 p. 18). A dilemma and a paradox hard to solve, but its existence is thus important to bring forth in the future plans of Dharavi. The paradox might never be solved, but its existence should, for the sake of the cultural, historical, social and modern aspects to urban planning, not be avoided. As through the words of the architect Minnette de Silva on how to approach modernity in developing countries the “community and social needs should find regional expression in town plans, housing schemes and public buildings. What so often happens is that we copy the closed-in types of western building quite unsuited for our region, or adapt traditional architecture in an equally unsuitable way” (de Silva, 1955 cited in Lefaivre and Tzonis, 2003 p. 47). Hence, intricate care has to be taken when redesigning places like Dharavi but that does not imply that nothing should happen or that conservation is the only answer. The planning doctrine proposed by architects like Frampton and Lefaivre and Tzonis call for a careful mixture of modern technology and site-specific solutions.

7.7 DHARAVI – A CONTRADICTION IN TERMS
This essay does not set out to sentimentalize the present living conditions in Dharavi, and so it is important to acknowledge the situation of the unsanitary conditions in which Dharavi’s inhabitants live under. The lack of latrines and fresh water and the system of the open sewage pipes result in an unseen amount of health issues every day. These problems seem to often be forgotten in other research that has been executed about the community and the network of public spaces for interaction that makes up Dharavi. As said by the designer Kevin McCloud: “one thing about Dharavi that planners and architects get exited about is its neighborhood meeting places, but reality, though social, is also squalid and toxic” (Slumming it, 2010a). Although many parts of Dharavi could be regarded as functioning and well established with proper structures as homes and where most families have a steady income, several parts of Dharavi are not as well functioning. Along the gas pipes and at the edges of Dharavi, newly arrived inhabitants live in temporary sheds made out of sticks, metal scraps and fabrics, whose dwellers live on less to no money at all, surviving by begging or collecting garbage that they sell to the recycling businesses. These parts of Dharavi are often forgotten in the current discourse of how well functioning the society of Dharavi is. Hence, reality is less romantic and more problematic than what planners and architects often portray when they study places like Dharavi. The human health conditions should not be foreseen, however powerful and intricate the social life is. As can be noted in this essay, the areas that have been researched could be considered to belong to the better functioning parts of Dharavi. The choice of the spaces analyzed have not been made to further deepen the architectural discourse but it has been made out of a decision to highlight what is working and why they work in order to make the whole of Dharavi a healthy and prosperous environment to live and work in, for all inhabitants.

Dharavi is a contradiction in terms. Everything said about Dharavi could be said differently, every understanding can also be understood in other ways. Speaking about Dharavi is like trying to talk with all those voices at the same time. Impossible.
Jonathan Habib Engqvist and Maria Lantz, 2008 p. 44
The economical cost for the DRP is substantial and one might even say unimaginably high. The way the architects have tackled the future is by regarding Dharavi as a place that in its whole has to be torn down and replaced. Kenneth Frampton writes in his book “the tabula rasa tendency of modernization favors the optimum use of earth-moving equipment inasmuch as a totally flat datum is regarded as the most economic matrix” and that this demolition of the existing structures “into a flat site is clearly a technocratic gesture which aspires to a condition of absolute placelessness” (Frampton, 2002 pp. 28-29). In other words, the said economical benefits of a total demolition become the masque for the real reason; the ambition to erase the past and create a future that has no recollection of its original culture. “Time is money” is a well-used phrase in the world of business, but it is also true for the modern day architect and developer. Because of this concept of rushing the process to maximize the profit, the architects often use a “boilerplate design” to avoid too many choices having to be made (Gieryn, 2002 p. 55). This in turn then leads to a homogenic architecture that in many parts of the world resemble each other, because why spend time coming up with something new when the already designed can be copied?

Looking at the plans of the DRP one might start to think if this is made to increase the living standards of the inhabitants or if the buildings that are proposed to be for them are an afterthought as completely moving them from the site might be a too politically charged subject to handle. If the main reason for the DRP is not the wellbeing of Dharavi’s inhabitants but the establishment of high revenue businesses offices, new ways to approach the future is called for. The answer to Dharavi’s future might not lie in the word redevelopment but in the word remodeling. Remodeling implies, not a totally new plan that destroys the essence that is Dharavi, nor does it mean bringing forward an uncertain future for its inhabitants.

Remodeling stands for intricate and finely tuned necessary changes such as: proper drainage, buried sewage pipes, clean water, more latrines and better working conditions that is needed for the health of the inhabitants. The fine grain and the millions of layers that make Dharavi what it is should not be seen as easily transferrable to the plans of the DRP, the plans that set out to make Mumbai a new Shanghai or Singapore (Arputham and Patel, 2007). It does not matter where you are in the world, a pear can never pretend to have the same components, to taste, smell and feel the same as an apple. Frampton, raises the architectural theory of “in-laying” a building into a site to become a part of the already existing urban fabric in doing so the building has a “capacity to embody, in built form, the prehistory of the place, its archeological past and its subsequent cultivation and transformation across time” (Frampton, 2002 p. 29). Several new multi-story buildings have been erected in Dharavi over the last decades but because of the cheap materials used, the construction of the buildings and the poor maintenance, the buildings are already starting to fall apart despite their young age. In order to bring the development further, the organization of the ownership of these, and future buildings, must be revised.

There are other methods than the concepts of modern urban planning, methods of creating spaces and buildings that will reflect the people who use it and that will grow organically to become better, safer and healthier. This method goes back to how we originally looked at dwelling and building, when man kind built to shelter and to create a community where the individuals could be a part of something bigger than the alone self (Alexander, 1979). This step back in the evolution of urban planning does not imply a step back in technology or living standard; it is merely a method of finding the essence of what we need as a community and as individuals to function in the urban setting and to apply these to modern
techniques of building. In other words the method of analyzing the space should be used as a primary tool to further development and not so much the method of inspiration of other already developed sites. Inspiration is good for creativity but in many cases it becomes more of a ritualistic doctrine than an innovative thinking process, which in turn can clog the mind and diminish the importance of context, human movement and local history (Alexander, 1979).
8 CONCLUSIONS

HOW DOES THE CHARACTER OF THE PUBLIC SPACES IN DHARAVI REFLECT THE PEOPLE LIVING THERE?

As shown through the empirical data and the analysis, the public spaces are important for the way the inhabitants of Dharavi interact with each other and how they live their lives. The public rooms become market spaces, mosques and kitchens as the day passes through in an endless variation of flexibility. Even though the public spaces offer openness and elasticity to its usages there still exists some sort of order in the chaos that first meets the eye. Everyone has their own space and place within the area and everyone knows how to act and behave according to the social norms that exists. Most people of Dharavi are also very proud of their homes, they acknowledge the imperfections and they wish for improvement but still they are content with their living spaces because they have a home. It is as simple as that, in Dharavi the knowledge of homelessness and poverty is a constant factor the people face everyday, and with that everyone with a home is rich and fortunate. As said by M4 in one of the interviews “Dharavi is my whole life, my parents and brothers live here, my friends are here, and my costumers are here. Why should I leave? If I leave I will have to start all over again so I will never leave Dharavi. The future here is very good. We have everything we need here”. Few people in Dharavi wish to leave, they belong there because of the strong sense of community, because they have their family there, because they have a history there – in other words: the people of Dharavi have a context in which they live in. This context; the cultural, historical and social; that most architects and urban planners can only wish to find a connection to when planning or building something in an urban setting, is the essence that defines the physical and mental structures of Dharavi.

HOW IMPORTANT IS PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE UNDERSTANDING OF PUBLIC PLACES?

The second conclusion that could be done from the research in Dharavi is that public participation is the key in understanding existing spaces and also the main feature in the creation of new livable and loveable spaces. The dreams of the inhabitants and users, may they be personal or cultural, are thus important to consider and incorporate since the buildings become symbols of who the dream belongs to. By using the methods of asking the inhabitants of their dreams for the future, not only did they start thinking about how they live but also how they wish their personal lives to be. Almost all interviewees answered that the two most important personal goals are a good job and a good home. The physical structures for homes and places for work is exactly what urban planners and architects can provide. But it is also important to acknowledge how these people want to live and how they keep their businesses, if not the social and cultural strings can never be kept tied in the same way as they are today and the society of Dharavi might get lost. Through public participation an understanding of how the space will be used can be made as well as ensuring that the space will be used and taken care of as the residents and users can see their own dreams reflected in the physical structures. What we feel attached to and emotional towards, we tend to take better care of and this in turn gives us joy and social cohesion (Arendt, 1998).
HOW CAN THE FINDINGS MADE IN DHARAVI CHANGE THE WAY THE HUMAN RELATIONSHIP TO ITS BUILT ENVIRONMENT IS ASSESSED?

“[…] above all, Dharavi is the intermingling of the stories of its residents – ordinary and extraordinary – of their lives, their histories and the history of the city of Mumbai” (Sharma, 2000 p. xxv). If this quote is the truth behind the secret and the story of Dharavi then the same conclusion can probably be made for all other urban spaces in the world. We build cities and buildings for people but most often we overlook how big a part each and every individual add to the character of the space. The human relationship, and the history of this relationship, to the built environment should not be foreseen as it is what makes spaces different from each other. Without the elements of history, religion, culture, context and the human relationship; there cannot be any unique urban settings, they would all just look the same.

One conclusion that can be drawn from this work is the notion of how every culture affects and appropriates its urban formations. Even within what we today (often in western society) consider to be “one culture” as that of Scandinavia, Eastern Africa or Latin America, the cultural differences are in fact substantial. The cultural differences within one country, or even within one city can be several and for every new project in the urban environment the differences in the culture and the history needs to be addressed and thought about. As has been shown in this essay the differences between one street and another within the same nagar can in fact be extensive, and as well also a critical factor for the composition of the community. Finding solutions for the change of living situations for the people in Dharavi, cannot be applied in its entity when changes are made in other unplanned settlements, such as for example Kibera in Kenya. The same methods for change cannot even be used in the unplanned settlement Bhagwanpura in New Delhi, as the people there will be different from those in Dharavi. There is no one universal answer to the future of the world’s unplanned settlements. The answer lies in the task of pinpointing of what is unique, for in that search lies the answer to the question on how to make useable, productive, symbolic, creative and human new dwellings. It is the individual unique components that the street, the square or the town consists of that should be the basis of every new plan or building (Alexander, 1979).

The methods for the implementations can thus not be universalized, but the methods for the information gathering of the culture and the human relationship to the built environment can be the same. One conclusion made from this essay could also be that, for the sake of the users well being, urban landscapes should not be planned in order to impress or make a statement. Buildings and public spaces should be built for the ones who will use it, all other factors being insignificant.
9 REFERENCE LIST

9.1 LITERATURE


9.2 INTERVIEWS


9.3 AUDIO CLIPS

