

INFORMALITY AND STATE 'JUGAAD': HOW URBAN GOVERNANCE WORKS IN MUMBAI

Abstract

*How does the state govern cities where much of the economy is informal, on the margins of state regulatory institutions? In this paper, I draw on field research in Mumbai to present an empirically-based conceptualization of the workings of the state in cities like Mumbai, where 'informality is a mode of urbanisation.' I draw on the popular Indian notion of 'jugaad,' which refers to makeshift adaptations, workarounds and improvisation under constraints, to describe the state in Mumbai. 'Jugaad' practices and strategies of governance – adaptive, flexible, negotiated and contingent – are routinely applied by state actors at different levels in Mumbai, in spaces "illegible" to formal state institutions. 'Jugaad' governance practices are not arbitrary or merely corrupt, but rational, if ad hoc and extra-legal, adaptations around formal rules. These processes embed state actors in local power structures and crosscutting networks that span state, market and political organisations. While they enable the state to apprehend and partially incorporate the city's informal spaces, they dissipate centralised state power and cohesiveness. The 'jugaad' state concept encapsulates how the formal and informal workings of the state interact and shape urban governance in largely informal cities. It draws attention to tensions and disjunctions within the state and in state-society relations in such contexts.**

Introduction

Informality is a pervasive and structural feature of India's urban economy. In Mumbai, the informal economy accounts for the majority of jobs, and plays a major role in the production of the built environment. It encompasses politically organised groups of 'unorganised' workers and 'non-corporate' enterprises with links to state actors at various levels. Mumbai's variegated realm of informal activity is imbricated¹ with the formal. Not a separate, non-accumulative 'needs' sector, it is part of the dynamic, actually-existing 'real' economy (Harris-White, 2003). While neither economically nor politically marginal, this informal realm is largely 'illegible' to the state (Scott, 1998), operating in the margins of

* * My arguments were developed and refined through discussion with Atul Kohli, Patrick Heller, Doug Massey, Saskia Sassen, Michael Walton, Partha Mukhopadhyay, Susan Wachter, Bish Sanyal, Patrick LeGales, Sukriti Issar, Durba Chattaraj, Narayani Lasala, Mukta Naik, Nicola Banks, Melanie Lombard, Diana Mitlin and blind reviewers. I am deeply grateful for their feedback.

state regulatory institutions and formal bureaucratic structures. How does the state govern and control the city, and implement its projects of modernisation, in such contexts?

In this paper, I present an empirically-based conceptualisation of how the state works in cities like Mumbai, where 'informality is a mode of urbanisation' (Roy, 2005). My fieldwork centred on the implementation of the Mumbai Transformation Project (MTP), a comprehensive ten-year programme of infrastructure building, urban renewal and governance reform (GoM, 2004) catalysed by Mumbai's business elites.² While the informal economy comprises activities that operate outside formal regulatory institutions, its contours are shaped by the state, as both Marxist-Structuralist (Portes, Castells and Benton, 1989; Breman, 2013) and (neo)liberal (de Soto, 1989) scholars emphasize. I extend this argument by focusing on how informalisation, in turn, modifies the state. In addition to literature on the informal economy, my research is informed by literatures on the modern state (Mann, 1984; Scott, 1989), Indian political economy and state-society relations (Rudolph and Rudolph, 1987; Migdal, Kohli and Shue, 1994; Evans, 1995; Kohli, 2006).

A defining feature of the 'informal' economy – empirically and conceptually – is its vexed relationship with the state, which alternately seeks to curb, 'formalise,' disregard or accommodate informal economic activities (De Soto, 1989; Portes et al, 1989; Fernandez-Kelly and Shaefer, 2006). In Mumbai, the state, furthermore, tacitly or directly, collaborates in facilitation and informal regulation. State actors, we know from academic and popular accounts, enable informal business and households access to land and public services (Anjaria, 2006; Weinstein, 2008; Hansen, 2009; Zaidi, 2012; Bjorkmann, 2013; Chattaraj, 2016). They help provide protection from enforcement, provision documents and facilitate 'regularisation'. Mumbai's politics of informality is largely not a 'politics of stealth' conducted surreptitiously under the radar of state authorities (Bayat, 1997). Nor is it 'insurgence' or mobilisation through social movements to democratise and transform formal state institutions as in Brazil or Kerala (Heller, 2001; Holston, 2008). Mumbai is characterised by fragmented and localised patterns of political incorporation, rent sharing and mobilisation around access to state resources (Hansen, 2001; Weinstein, 2009; Auerbach, 2016; Chattaraj and Walton, 2017). As scholars of informality in India have observed (Roy, 2005; 2009; Breman, 2013; McFarlane, 2012), in such contexts the state itself becomes 'informalised,' its governance practices skewed in widely observed, but under-theorised, ways.

² See Bombay First/ Mckinsey's (2003) Vision Mumbai report; available at Mumbai First <http://mumbaifirst.org/>

I draw on the Indian notion of 'jugaad,' originally a term for vehicles cobbled together of discrepant parts, to describe the state in Mumbai. 'Jugaad' refers to makeshift structures and ad-hoc fixes, a way of improvising under constraints and working around problems that is ubiquitous in contemporary India (Rajdou, Prabhu and Ahuja, 2012). Its flipside is a reliance on sub-optimal, expedient solutions and an association with cutting corners and resource deficits. In existing accounts, the Indian state – bureaucratic, rigid and rule-bound – is a foil for 'jugaad' strategies used by businesses and citizens, often to get around onerous regulations and state incapacities (Jeffrey and Young, 2012; Rajdou et al, 2012).

I found, during the course of fieldwork, that 'jugaad' practices and strategies of governance – adaptive, flexible, negotiated and contingent - were routinely applied by state actors at different levels, and across domains of state intervention, in spaces where the state's formal institutions were circumscribed. Mumbai's informal economy burgeons in inconsistencies and gaps between the state's regulatory framework and its organisational capacities. The fact that much of daily economic life in Mumbai occurs in this grey space is at the heart of the 'jugaad' state. 'Jugaad' practices are not arbitrary or merely corrupt, but instrumentally rational, if ad hoc and extra-legal, adaptations around formal rules, shaped by the constraints of an incongruous regulatory-institutional framework and limited state power. These processes embed state actors in local power structures and crosscutting networks that span state, market and political organisations. While they enable the state to apprehend and partially incorporate the city's informal spaces, they dissipate centralised state power and cohesiveness.

The 'jugaad' state concept draws attention to the mismatch between the state's formal institutional and regulatory framework and the organisation of the urban political economy in Mumbai. It encapsulates the politically-mediated, expedient and ad hoc ways in which this mismatch is 'worked around,' and the associated weaknesses and contradictions that emerge within the state. The more the city informalises, the greater the gap between what the state formally 'sees' and what exists on the ground. This, in turn, further weakens state power and capacity to effect transformation.

The 'jugaad' state is an attempt to theorize from the South (Parnell and Robinson, 2012). It describes a particular mode of state governance prevalent in Indian cities that can

best be understood as neither strictly formal nor informal, but as 'jugaad,' using a popular term that has migrated into academic literature (Birchall, 2001; Jeffries and Young, 2014). My conceptualisation is at the same time rooted in empirical and theoretical work on the informal economy, the modern state and state-society relations, and Indian political economy. It shows how states, embedded within societies, reflect wider social tendencies in their workings (Migdal, 2001).

The 'jugaad' state concept unfolded as part of a larger research project on urban policy, political economy and governance in Mumbai, detailed in a forthcoming monograph.³ I investigated these themes by studying the implementation of the Government of Maharashtra's as yet unrealised Mumbai Transformation Project, and its partnership with the city's business elites. My research sought to explore how state power operates and intersects with political interests to shape India's globalising cities. In Mumbai, I found that corporate industry re-shapes urban policy to align with its interests, but bumps up against a fragmented state and entrenched local power structures. While I cannot in this paper lay out the full theoretical and empirical groundwork underlying my arguments, I believe the 'jugaad' state concept can be usefully introduced in this article.

Methodology and outline

Research for the larger book project involved over 18 months of fieldwork in Mumbai, conducted between 2009-2015 (15 months continually in 2009-2010 and seven weeks between 2013- 2016), along with three months fieldwork in Shanghai.⁴ Research design integrated comparative case study methods with ethnography, adapting Burawoy's (1998) extended case method, which locates ethnographic research within larger political and social structures. I began with participant observation with an elite state-business partnership for the MTP, focused on studying state-business interactions and interactions between different parts of the state. I then extended the scope of fieldwork to observe the workings of the state and the organisation of informal activities in a range of sites in Mumbai,⁵ acquiring accumulated ethnographic detail and identifying patterns across sites and domains of activity. I also conducted interviews with state officials at different levels, elected representatives, local leaders, developers, brokers, consultants, business leaders,

³ Chattaraj (forthcoming). *Shanghai Dreams. State Power and Politics in the Project to Transform Mumbai*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

⁴ A comparative analysis of Mumbai and Shanghai underlies my argument but is outside the scope of this paper.

⁵ Sites included my neighbourhood of Andheri; the Dharavi slum, Mumbai's CBDs and 'vernacular' commercial district.

practitioners, civil society activists, academics, informal businesses and workers, speaking to some informants multiple times over the course of research. After analysing findings, I returned to Mumbai in 2013, 2015 and, briefly, in 2016, for additional research and follow-up interviews. My goal was to develop an account of how the state, as a whole, governs Mumbai, and ethnographic fieldwork was broad rather than deep. In addition to primary data, I use local news reports, published literature, and official documents including meeting minutes, reports, court rulings, administrative orders and manuals, strengthening validity by triangulating across a range of sources.

My research, in contrast with the micro-scale of most urban research in India and the national scale of Indian political economy research, is focused on the intermediate or meso-scale. It centres on the sub-national state that governs and controls the Mumbai region, and the municipal administration it oversees. This meso scale helps bring into view, and think about, how macro and micro, structures and practices, institutional and political logics, fit together (LeGales, 1998). It provides a depth of field that allows me to splice across domains, sectors and spaces of state intervention, and agglomerate iterations of strategies, practices and outcomes. These coalesce into the concept of 'jugaad' state. The 'jugaad' state approximates a (very non-ideal) 'ideal-type' in the Weberian sense, a 'middle-range' concept that helps explain variations and divergences in widely prevalent social structures – such as bureaucratic states - within particular social contexts (Merton, 1957; Sartori, 1970).

The scale of analysis influences what we observe, and how we interpret it. While my perspective helps give shape to an emergent 'big picture' account of urban governance in Mumbai, it necessarily loses detail and complexity in abstraction. In the tradition of urban political economy research, I seek to explain how power operates in the city (Mills, 1956), and my research centers the state and its interactions with groups and interests that exert influence on its workings. It does not account for the struggles of the informal poor and marginalised groups in Mumbai. I benefit, however, from the rich empirical literature on interactions between the state and poor communities in Mumbai (Hansen, 2001; Chatterji, 2005; Anjaria, 2006; Weinstein, 2009; Anand, 2011; Bjorkmann, 2013).

In the next section, I present my conception of Mumbai's 'jugaad' state. While constraints of space limit empirical detail, I weave in illustrative examples and findings. I then discuss how 'jugaad' practices, associated with informalisation within and outside the state, fragment and weaken state power and capacity, linking informality to literature on

modern states and state-society relations. I distinguish the 'jugaad' state from theoretical perspectives prevalent in urban informality literature, concluding with a consideration of questions the concept raises for future research.

Contribution to Urban Informality Literature

The 'jugaad' state, as a conceptual and analytical tool, tries to encapsulate how pervasive informality shapes state governance practices, power and developmental capacity. It contributes to debates on the state-informal economy relationship (De Soto, 1989; Portes et al; 1989; Fernandez-Kelly and Shefner, 2006; Roy, 2009) and informalisation within the Indian state (Benjamin, 2008; Roy, 2009; McFarlane, 2012). I centre the analysis of urban informality on interactions and relations between formal and informal institutions and practices, and the political, economic and social factors that shape them.

The state's approach to activities and spaces it deems 'informal,' Portes and Centeno (2006) argue, depends on state ideology and regulatory intent, capacity for enforcement and larger political and policy objectives. To understand the nature, and implications, of state 'informalisation,' it is then necessary to examine the relationship between 'formal' state structures and institutions and 'informal' mechanisms and practices of governance it applies. These relationships, I argue, applying a 'state-in-society' perspective (Midgal et al, 1994), are shaped by political dynamics; the pattern of interlinkages between the state, corporate capital and local interest and demand groups (Rudolph and Rudolph, 1987; Kohli, 2006) including 'non-corporate' capital and informal businesses and workers. The 'jugaad' state concept focuses attention on these relationships, within the state and at the interface between state and the informal economy.

Critical scholarship on India's informal economy challenges prevalent beliefs – that it is a transitional sector that will be absorbed into the 'formal economy, or that its denizens are disconnected from state and market processes, and incapable of political organisation. Breman (2013) and Harris-White's (2003) penetrating research on informal work and enterprise in India, illuminates our understanding of contemporary Indian economy and society. Hansen (2001) and Benjamin (2008) show us the embeddedness of state actors in the informal power structures and networks that organize informal spaces. Roy (2005,

2009), arguing that informality in India is a 'mode of urbanisation,' used by the state, elite groups, as well as the poor, shapes our understanding of Indian urban development. Heller (2001) and Agarwala (2013) show how political mobilisation amongst informal workers intersects with state ideologies and goals to shape their incorporation within the state. In a similar vein, through my account of 'jugaad' governance, I hope to complicate widely-held but limited notions of 'good' governance, centred on adherence to formal rules, that fail to consider how rules are made and institutions are structured, which groups they favour or exclude.

Although there is an extensive critical literature on India's informal economy, research on informality in governance and institutions; in labour and production; and in the built environment has proceeded on parallel tracks. Indian urban scholarship has been largely focused slums and urban poor communities, with relatively little work on urban political economy, policy and governance regimes, although there is an emerging body of research in these areas (Zerah, 2009; Harris, 2007; Auerbach, 2016, Kamath and Raj (2016). Roy, perhaps the most influential scholar of urban informality in India, highlights the state's utilisation of informality to achieve its goals. Hansen's (2001) account of Mumbai's informal governance networks, invaluable for my own work, reveals the political and social embeddedness of the lower-rungs of the state. Benjamin (2008), describing the 'porous bureaucracy's' role in land encroachment and McFarlane (2012), discussing formal and informal governance practices, help uncover how the state works in Indian cities. Bhan (2009) and Ghertner (2011), show how the state treats different informal spaces differently, discriminating against and demolishing squatter settlements while sanctioning informal development that looks planned and caters to middle-classes. There remains a gap in the literature for accounts of how the state, as a whole, governs cities in India and theoretical perspectives that help explain urban political economy in highly informal cities. My conceptualisation of the 'jugaad' state is informed by existing accounts, but is distinct in its focus as well as disciplinary/methodological approach, grounded in sociology, politics and political economy rather than anthropology and geography.

State Jugaad: Iron Cage meets Makeshift Shed

Mumbai's 'jugaad state' is formally organised, and partially operates, as a rational-legal bureaucratic state, with an extensive body of laws, rules and procedures, and a

durable institutional structure. The Government of Maharashtra (GoM) has policy-making authority over Mumbai and its extended region. The city is governed by the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai (MCGM), a centralised administrative bureaucracy with colonial roots accountable to the GoM (Pinto and Pinto, 2005) and specialised GoM parastatals such as the Mumbai Metropolitan and Regional Development Authority (MMRDA). The scale and scope of informalisation in Mumbai can be understood to be the product of a high-modernist planning and regulatory regime combined with limited state capacity for implementation (Chattaraj and Walton, 2017). In order to govern and maintain social control in a city where informal economic activities are pervasive, I propose, the state adapts. State actors at different levels, I found, routinely apply improvised, flexible, locally-negotiated practices and strategies of governance, at variance with official rules and procedures, in order to intervene in spaces 'illegible' to the formal state (Scott, 1998).

The case of the Assistant Metropolitan Commissioner (AMC), a senior IAS⁶ officer responsible for major infrastructure projects under the MTP, is illustrative. In her office at MMRDA, I observed her interactions with representatives of a community of former slum residents displaced for the construction of an elevated highway. Resettled in MMRDA housing, they had come to the AMC for help with problems in building maintenance – the lifts in their high-rise tenements were not working. The problem, the AMC told me, was that about 350 displaced households were living in MMRDA housing 'informally,' without official status or legal occupancy rights, as they did not meet the state's criteria for rehabilitation.

A statutory 'cut-off' date of 1 January 2000 determined official recognition as 'project-affected persons' (PAPs). To be eligible for state rehabilitation, slum households had to provide documentary evidence of residence in structures slated for removal prior to the 'cut-off.' 'Cut-offs' pertained not just to project displacees, but were applied citywide. They granted access to state programs and services to a section of slum residents, deemed, after the fact, to have legitimate claims on urban space and public resources, excluding more recent migrants and newer settlements. Extended periodically by law, they exemplify state power to 'construct and reconstruct categories of legitimacy and illegitimacy' (Roy, 2005). According to state officials, 'cut-offs' are intended to bar opportunists and profiteers, and deter new encroachments. But they were aware that the 'cut-off' was a blunt instrument to

⁶ The Indian Administrative Service (IAS), is an elite, professionalised national administrative service with colonial origins

apply in Mumbai's dynamic, heterogeneous slum communities. Said the AMC of the 'unofficial' PAPs (personal communication, 7 August 2013):

These families were from Mumbai, but had purchased the property after the cut-off date. On Government land, all buying and selling of structures are illegal, but they have informal property titles and leases..... to be eligible both household and structure have to be before the cut-off date. We thought, since the Government rehabilitation policy for the airport is still being considered, and they are considering that maybe all will be resettled, these people should not suffer unfairly, if the policy is going to be changed. After all, it is now thirteen years since the cut-off date.

The AMC recommended, in writing, that the 350 households with evidence of residence in the slum settlement (if not specific structures) pre-2000 get official PAP status. The GoM refused to grant official status for 'ineligible' households, as the decision had larger implications – it might invite charges of preferential treatment or corruption. Changing eligibility criteria across the board, on the other hand, would generate additional demands and costs, delays and legal challenges. For reasons of expedience as well as fairness, the AMC devised a solution by provisionally accommodating the ineligible households in MMRDA-owned tenements as 'unofficial' PAPs. She sought to square decisions with rules and policies, and maintained records, if partial, in official files. She thus framed the decision as a matter of consistency with the GoM's proposed policy to extend 'cut-offs' for all major infrastructure projects. But the 'unofficial' PAPs, moving from one space of informality to another, without access to formal MMRDA channels or rehabilitation assistance, appealed to the AMC personally to sort out problems. Suggesting that their temporary stay might be long-term, she advised them to set up an 'informal committee,' organise themselves and figure out a way to manage building repairs and maintenance themselves – she could not keep helping them whenever there was a problem.

The AMC had a Weberian sense of her role as a state bureaucrat, making impartial and consistent decisions based on state laws, institutional rules and procedures and official records. The most challenging part of executing infrastructure projects in Mumbai, she said, was organising the removal and resettlement of project-affected households and businesses. Although the process was, as the AMC said, "very institutionalised," the rule books were insufficient for the task, and often inapt. Mumbai's slums are concentrated in

state-owned land or land 'reserved' for infrastructure, state projects or public amenities. Road rights-of-way are dense with 'unauthorised' structures – shops, homes, factories and workplaces. Councilors and state legislators have an interest in keeping their voter base *in situ* - slum residents in Mumbai vote at higher rates than non-slum households and local elections are highly competitive.⁷ Political intercession could delay or hold-up projects, escalating costs, as could dispute adjudication, judicial injunctions and stay orders. In Mumbai's protean, 'illegible' and politically-charged informal spaces, the AMC had to interpret rules plially, adapt her approach to each situation and improvise solutions to problems as they came along. She explained the process (personal communication, 7 August 2013):

It is very complex, each case was different, and it can take a long time. Politicians, corporators, local leaders, they are all there. Sometimes the engineers could resolve the issue; sometimes I had to get involved. You can't do it in a mechanical fashion, say 70 percent eligible, 30 percent not...we had to learn how to talk to the representatives, listen to them, go back to the drawing board, persuade and convince. We work with NGOs also, of course, but you can't outsource these things...you have to strategize, balance all the needs, the timeline, coordinate with other units. Usually we can come to an agreement, but in one case, after two years of negotiating, we had finally had to force them...

There were 30-odd temples, mosques, crosses and shrines in the project area. The removal of places of worship, often built as an anchor for encroachments, could trigger a flashpoint in Mumbai. The AMC devised a system to relocate religious structures within the remaining slum settlement, by identifying suitable sites and seeking out eligible households amenable to relocation to 'host' them. These households were then designated official 'PAPs,' and re-housed in state housing. In the course of intervention, the AMC and her engineers acquired a degree of what Scott (1998, p.311) calls 'metis' – an "array of practical skills and acquired intelligence in responding to a constantly changing natural and human environment." Metis contrasts with 'techne,' codified technical knowledge and systematic procedures that can be universally applied, which undergirds the administrative practices of the bureaucratic state (Scott, 1998).

⁷ India Slugfest over Mumbai Votes. (2014, March 12) *Al Jazeera*
_Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2014/03/india-slugfest-over-mumbai-slum-votes-2014311103550986896.html>

The AMC's intervention strategies and practices are neither clearly formal nor informal, but 'jugaad,' in the sense of an "adaptive mode of practice, geared towards solving problems as they come up". They may be at odds with the consistent application of rules and procedures, but are 'rational' in that they are geared towards realising state objectives efficiently, given constraints and limitations, and are indeed 'rationalised' as such. Bjorkmann (2013) found similar forms of state practice amongst municipal engineers provisioning water to 'illegal' slums and informal settlements. Anjaria (2006), observed the Municipal Corporation's use of informal licences for unlicensed street hawkers, a practice that enabled the state to regulate and extract revenues from activities that were rife but officially prohibited. Staff at the lower-rungs of the state routinely engage in such practices - municipal officials negotiate requirements to access a state service, obtain a permit, clearance or approval, operate a business. A typical example - a tour company in a Mumbai slum, seeking to expand operations, sought a state license. Because licensed 'tour and travel' companies are required to own vehicles, the municipal official proposed that the company operate unlicensed for a few years, till it could purchase a vehicle.

Jugaad governance typically involves negotiations, bargains and accommodations around the state's framework of laws, statutes, rules, standards and protocols that regulate how citizens and firms occupy and utilise space, conduct business and access public resources and services. While these practices may be associated with clientalism and rent-seeking,⁸ they cannot be understood as merely corrupt or arbitrary. They contribute to core state functions, even as they contravene or sidestep formal rules and institutional processes. Managers and supervisors may be directly involved, taking a share of rents, but more fundamental to the concept is that they are not unaware of these practices. They apply rules pragmatically, identify loopholes and avoid measures that impose heavy financial, administrative or political costs on the state, such as the prevention and consistent demolition of 'unauthorised' constructions. State elites, occasionally 'cracking-down' to demonstrate capacity to impose order, largely ignore, tolerate or profit from such practices, overlooking infractions that serve to satisfy demands that might otherwise be expressed in more disruptive ways.⁹ A former Municipal Commissioner¹⁰ explained why state authorities often turn a blind eye (personal communication, 20 August 2015):

⁸ I bracket corruption and rent-seeking in this paper, but discuss these aspects in Chattaraj and Walton (2017)

⁹ The State also undertakes evictions and demolitions, as researchers and activists have documented. It is important to investigate these processes and their outcomes, particularly on poor and vulnerable communities. It is also

Plots get encroached; there is involvement of politicians and officials...you have these illegal things, you have a lot of undesirable transactions, and the matter is settled, all you are required to do is ignore it. The slum status keeps shifting, if you manage to construct something and stay for a few years, get 'semi-authorised', 'tolerated', additional slums are brought under 'toleration.' After all, an elected representative is expected to look after voters. After 2000, they are not notified, so we are not obliged to give water and electricity, but it becomes necessary. Lower level officials are involved and it is something we can't stop.

Removal of encroachments no one likes to do... they will suffer, their children will suffer and they won't go away. We can't offer alternative livelihoods, there is no affordable housing and there is a need for labour. That's why we usually don't remove them.

Municipal officials also 'tolerated,' or 'facilitated' rule-violating outdoor gyms, mini-parks and 'illegal' public amenities for slum communities on state land, including pavements and roadways, 'sponsored' by local leaders and politicians. As the ex-Commissioner explained, the municipal administration required their assistance and co-operation to maintain order and oversight, acquire information and carry out routine interventions such as vaccination drives and public health checks. Mumbai police, as well, relied on relations with local politicians, brokers and 'big men,' to police the city's dense, fluid and 'illegible' informal neighbourhoods (Hansen, 2001; Zaidi, 2012), a symbiotic relationship in which local leaders used their relationship with state and municipal officials to gain power and influence. The state's need to extend its law and order and surveillance apparatus within the informal city led to the peculiar situation where the head of the Maharashtra state administration dealt with a complaint from the Municipal Corporation about fifty-eight 'unauthorised' police posts that violated municipal regulations and planning laws (personal communication, 27 August 2015).

important to understand why the state *at large* 'tolerates' encroachments and unauthorised development and selectively enforces rules.

¹⁰ The Municipal Commissioner heads the Greater Mumbai Municipal Corporation's administrative wing, and is recruited from the senior ranks of the IAS.

In Mumbai, given the size and scope of the informal economy, the accommodation and control of informal economic activities is not a marginal process that occurs at the edges of the state, but a core task of governance. 'Jugaad' shapes day-to-day state practices as well as broader strategies and on occasion, official policies. The state's use of 'cut-off' dates can itself be considered a 'jugaad' mechanism, an after-the-fact, politically-deliberated workaround that formally incorporates within the state a segment of slum residents that are already politically incorporated. By granting blanket legal status to settlements set up before a particular date, it sidesteps the administrative complexities, political and legal challenges that a systematic process of establishing occupancy rights for slum households on public land would entail. Ambiguously enforced, because slums grow and change, each 'cut-off' provides opportunities for political leader, brokers and fixers to mediate connections to the state for those formally excluded.

Jugaad governance involves an informal and provisional delegation of power and functions, bridging the gap between the state's centralised and insulated bureaucratic structures and the informal city. The localised governance structures and cross-cutting networks that organise Mumbai's informal spaces and span state and non-state actors, detailed by Hansen (2001), can be conceptualised as part of the 'jugaad' state machinery, connecting the state and the informal economy. A continuous process of interaction, negotiation and collaboration ties the lower-levels of the state and local powers within the informal city into an embedded and interdependent relationship. (Hansen, 2001; Chaterji, 2005; Anjaria, 2006; Weinstein 2008, Zaidi 2012; Bjorkmann, 2013). Lower rungs of the state, through 'jugaad' governance processes, acquire information, political connections and functional skills and capacities beyond their official roles and responsibilities. Municipal engineers in the MMRDA case described earlier, for example, gained skills in negotiation, brokerage and problem-solving in complex situations.

State complicity, both explicit and indirect, undergirds the stability and dynamism of Mumbai's informal economy, the continuation of transactions and investments in an ambiguous regulatory environment (Chattaraj and Walton, 2017). Mumbai's state authorities are expected – as per formal duties and responsibilities (MCGM, 2011), periodic official pronouncements and judicial orders – to actively curb informal activities. Local politicians and councillors in Mumbai have little rule-making power or formal authority over the state's administrative machinery, but intercede around implementation, establishing links with the frontline municipal offices, district and ward-level officials, local police and

civic courts (Mukhopadhyay, 1999; Pinto and Pinto, 2005). They help provide informal enterprises and households protection from enforcement, and access to water, electricity and various kinds of state documents. Links with state officials and elected leaders are intermediated by local brokers and fixers, cynically referred to as 'social workers,' whose power and influence is related to their ability to deliver votes to parties and services to their 'constituents' (Auerbach, 2016).

State officials involved in these processes may illicitly enrich themselves, but also contribute to state revenues – 'illegal' water connections contribute to the water department's profits (Anand, 2011), 'regularisation' involves substantial fines and 'unauthorised' properties pay property taxes. The strict enforcement of rules, regulations and statutory plans, on the other hand, would result in severe social, political and economic disruption. 'Jugaad' governance may thus constitute a more rational and effective response to the city's economic and political realities and the state's limitations than strict accordance with formal rules and procedures. Tilly (1985), in his famous conception of the state as 'protection racket,' proposed that the state's core functions are to offer 'protection' by maintaining order and not expropriating property, in exchange for extracting revenues to fund operations. Portes and Centeno (2006) deduce that the state can neither offer protection nor extract taxes from 'unregulated' informal enterprises. 'Jugaad' governance mechanisms in Mumbai provide an informal way for the state to perform its 'protection racket' function.

'Jugaad' governance also serves to bring those outside the ambit of the state within it, enhancing state-society interpenetration. This process, in modern states, occurs through the ever-expanding reach of the 'iron cage' of rational bureaucracy (Mann, 1984). Drawing a parallel with makeshift "jugaad" structures, the 'jugaad state' can be visualised as a makeshift net that incorporates, after a fashion, parts of the urban economy and society outside the 'iron-cage' of the state's formal bureaucratic institutions. Politically-mediated interactions with state officials, the accumulation of official documents, participation in state projects and processes of 'regularisation', incrementally render informal households and businesses 'visible' to state (Chaterji, 2005). In some cases, 'jugaad' processes may lead to the revision of laws and policies, such as the periodic extension of 'cut-off' dates or the MCGM's decision to legally supply water in 'illegal' (post 'cut-off') slums. The Corporation argued that they were already informally providing water in these slums, and would be better able to plan and manage water supply if they could account for connections obtained

by “begging, borrowing or stealing.”¹¹ ‘Jugaad’ governance thus links popular demands, albeit in an indirect and suboptimal fashion, to policy outcomes, in an institutional context that offers few channels for local democratic participation in, over influence over, policy-making.

Yet ‘jugaad’ is a ‘cobbled-together’ model of governance, fitting together incongruous modes of practice. Although informal practices of governance are widespread in Mumbai, the formal rule-based system is dominant ideologically and normatively. That official rules, laws and procedures should be strictly followed is axiomatic to state elites, governance activists as well as the Judiciary. ‘Jugaad’ practices may be subject to Court orders requiring the state to enforce its rules and regulations. A High Court order responding to a petition by elite civil society activists curtailed the Municipal Corporation’s informal licensing system for street hawkers (Anjaria, 2006). Such enforcement directives do not effect a fundamental realignment of state practices, as they do little to address the conditions that produce rule-fudging ‘jugaad’ modes of governance. But they increase harm and risks for vulnerable groups on the margins of the formal regulatory system (Anjaria, 2006).

In another case, the Bombay High Court urged the MCGM to take measures against unplanned development, stating, “Total lawlessness is prevailing in this city, so far as unauthorised constructions are concerned....Corporation should maintain transparency and act in accordance to law.”¹² Following the order, the Corporation instructed ward officers to demolish structures that violated planning laws, which would number in the thousands (Pethe et al, 2014). Municipal officials were caught between directives from supervisors, political pressures and demands from below. Few demolitions were undertaken, and many buildings regularised, leading activists to accuse municipal officials of “obfuscation in connivance with politicians.”¹³ Given Mumbai’s chronic housing shortages, the MCGM is reluctant to destroy, rather than ‘regularise’ housing stock, even if built in violation of plans and regulations.

Jugaad Governance: Seeing Somewhat like a State

¹¹ No slum cut-off, give legal water connection to all. (2013, Aug 22) *Times of India*
Retrieved <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/mumbai/No-slum-cut-off-give-legal-water-connection-to-all/articleshow/21966653.cms>

¹² High Court Raps BMC for Illegal Buildings. (19 February, 2011) *Times of India*

¹³ BMC sits on 200 illegal construction cases (2013, Apr 12). *DNA*.
Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai/report-bmc-sits-on-200-illegal-construction-cases-1821503>

With the 'jugaad' state, I turn on its head Portes and Centeno's (2006) argument that the nature and capacity of the state shapes the informal economy, to propose that the scale and scope of informality in turn shapes the workings and capacity of the state.

Modern states shape societies and realize development goals through their 'infrastructural power' – the capacity to penetrate society to enforce rules and implement policies (Mann, 1984). Widespread informality is evidence of the state's lack of infrastructural power, but also advantageous for relatively weak states - it makes up for state incapacities in fulfilling citizens' basic needs, reduces costs for 'formal' firms and allows for 'flexibility' and adaptation to demands in a rapidly changing environment (Portes et al, 1989; Bayat, 1997; Fernandez-Kelly and Shaefer, 2006; Roy, 2009; Breman, 2013;). At the same time, pervasive informality undermines state capacities for administrative control and presents challenges to state power and authority. In this final section, I discuss how 'jugaad' governance practices are related to, and exacerbate, weaknesses in the state's organisational cohesion and capacity to design and implement plans and policies.

There is an inherent tension between the operational logic of the bureaucratic state (Scott, 1998; Mann, 1984), and the flux of informality. The state preserves institutional knowledge and organisational coherence through written rules, procedures and records, while informal transactions skirt rules and are unrecorded or mis-recorded, obscure to the state. Much of what is not formal is not clearly categorizable, as I showed earlier. Bureacracy operates through codification, data-fication and standardisation, and for state bureaucrats activities deemed informal or, variously, 'unorganised', 'unregulated,' 'unauthorised,' or 'unplanned' are inherently problematic, difficult to survive, measure, order and tax. As perceived by state bureaucrats and enforcers of the law, or experienced by citizens dealing with the state, these categories are more than semantic. They vitiate attempts to apply standardised rules and procedures, require time-consuming negotiations and ad-hoc solutions — and what one official referred to as a level of "tact", or sensitivity to complexity and context at odds with the nature of the bureaucratic state (personal communication, 13 August, 2013). The informality literature now widely recognises the complexity of the informal economy and constitutive linkages between formal and informal spaces and economies (Portes et al, 1989; Fernandez-Kelly and Shefner, 2006; Roy, 2009). Here I draw attention back to analytical and empirical distinctions.

Khan (2010) argues that states effectively enforce rules and implement developmental policies if formal institutions correspond with the distribution of power in society. Where significant political power and organisational capacity exists outside the state and in 'non-capitalistic' (or "non-corporate") sectors of the economy, as in Mumbai, patronage politics and informal adaptations around rules help bring resource allocation more in line with existing power distributions (Khan, 2010). In Mumbai, the state lacks the institutional capacity to eliminate or formalise informal activities, but must instead accommodate and informally regulate them, to ensure a reasonably predictable environment for economic transactions (including informal ones) to take place (Chattaraj and Walton, 2017). In Mumbai's competitive, if not strictly democratic, electoral polity, the state is obliged to provide access to state resources, land as well as economic opportunities to large groups of people excluded from formal housing, services and employment.

The 'jugaad' state's informal delegation of power and governance functions to local power structures fragments the state's centralised and hierarchical chain of authority, the source of power and domination in modern bureaucratic states (Mann, 1984; Scott, 1998). As state actors are embedded in localised governance structures, formal authority competes with and often yields to horizontal political networks, impeding the capacity of the state to implement its policies.

In Bombay, the post-independence state's control-based regulatory and planning framework, intended to promote 'balanced' urban and industrial development in Maharashtra, had potent unintended consequences. As I discuss elsewhere, it created on the one-hand widespread informality, and an associated array of intermediation mechanisms and brokerage relations between the informal economy and the state. A land-based nexus between state officials, elected representatives and private, largely non-corporate actors, emerged during this period, organising the production, servicing, regularisation and subsequent redevelopment of slums and informal developments – activities concentrated on public land, land notified for acquisition or 'reserved' under the masterplan (Narayanan, 2003; Weinstein, 2008; Chattaraj, 2016. According to another former Municipal Commissioner (personal communication, 20 March 2010),

In Mumbai, you can hardly say the state exists as an independent entity; it is so manipulated by land developers...They are very

organised, but not a formal organisation. It is organised without an organisation; there are people who infiltrate into the political parties, into the political leadership and the decision-making process.

The so-called 'land nexus' is deeply corrupt,¹⁴ but also produces a large proportion of the housing stock for Mumbai's lower-income groups, and almost all the rental housing available for migrants and the informal poor, groups with little access to 'formal' state and market produced housing (Chattaraj, 2016).

The state in Mumbai 'sees' the city partially and intermittently, lacking the 'God's eye view' (Scott, 1998) on which rational administration and planning is premised, even as it initiates comprehensive projects of modernisation. Gaps and inconsistencies in official records across agencies and departments are common. Due to encroachments, informal sub-divisions, exemptions and legal disputes, state policy-makers lack an accurate account of land the state itself owns and is in possession of. The Mumbai Transformation Support Unit (MTSU), an in-house state think tank, seeking to 'rationalise' policies on urban villages or 'gaothans,' found that, as per the records of different state departments, Mumbai had been between six and thirty-seven state-recognised 'gaothans.' The introduction of GIS technologies failed to clarify the state's powers of sight, as maps were based primarily on existing records, and different municipal and state departments sought to maintain their own databases.

Different parts of the state 'see' things as needed, in order to perform particular functions within particular contexts. Municipal tax officers, for instance, assess and collect property taxes from 'illegal' and 'unauthorised' structures (Mathur et al, 2009), strengthening owners' legal rights to occupy encroached, illegally transferred or informally developed land.¹⁵ The MCGM, operates on its own sizeable revenues¹⁶ and has amongst the highest property tax collection rates in India (Mathur et al, 2009). It has a strategic interest in ignoring encroachments on land owned by higher-level state authorities – it cannot impose taxes on higher-levels of the state, but pragmatically interprets rules to tax all 'structures,' legal or illegal.¹⁷ Because state expenditures are guided by what the state

¹⁴ There are well-known cases of high-level collusion in real-estate in Mumbai, but these cases are more straightforwardly explained as corruption rather than 'jugaad' governance

¹⁵ Legal rights are acquired through the principle of 'adverse possession' of property in Indian jurisprudence.

¹⁶ MC Election Result 2017: Why Everyone Wants A Share In BMC, India's Richest Civic Body. *NDTV*. (2017, 24 Feb) Retrieved from: <http://www.ndtv.com/>

¹⁷ Bombay High Court. *J.A Karia vs BMC* (2001). Retrieved from <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/995634/>

officially 'sees,' and can expend as per law, local demands, remain unmet and the state housing budget is largely under spent.¹⁸ The more the city informalises, the weaker the state's 'sight' and the more ineffectual its tools of 'rational' administration and technocratic planning and policy-making (Scott, 1998).

In Mumbai's complex informal environments, the division of functions and duties within the state is fuzzy. I observed recurring and unresolved disputes and negotiations between state agencies about responsibility for monitoring and clearing encroachments, delivering services in particular areas, building and maintaining infrastructure. The MMRDA, for example, had inadvertently and unanticipatedly come to play a major role in public housing, due to displacement caused by MTP infrastructure projects, and an estimated 75,000 official project-affected people were re-housed in its tenements. Lacking the mandate and capacity to manage public housing and urban services and unable to come to an agreement with the MCGM, MMRDA was encouraging even official PAPs to informally manage waste collection and building maintenance.

Because much of the informal economy falls outside the remit of industrial and labour regulation, state actors with greater ground-level presence – municipal engineers, police, district officials, departmental clerks play a role in informal regulation and oversight, outside official mandates and responsibilities. Institutional knowledge inheres in particular individuals – the long-serving clerk, ward-level engineer or close to retirement mid-level official. The knowledge and information acquired by these officials, who are afforded little formal discretionary authority, is not filtered up through official records and formal institutional channels, creating information asymmetries and attenuating hierarchical authority structures.

I illustrated 'jugaad' governance earlier with a focus on the state's upper bureaucracy to highlight that it is not solely the domain of frontline workers (Lipsky, 1980) or the so-called Indian 'administrative underworld' (Kaviraj, 1987). The 'transgression of the lines of legal and illegal' (Chatterjee, 2004, p 40), or, more accurately, of rules and procedures, is part of the daily functioning of the state in Mumbai. Overtime, 'jugaad' strategies may be 'regularised,' and informal spaces incorporated, in contingent, partial and unequal ways,

¹⁸ A year on, Maharashtra Govt's towering 'housing for all' claim falls flat. *Hindustan Times* (2016, 7 December) Retrieved from <https://www.hindustantimes.com/mumbai-news/a-year-on-maharashtra-govt-s-towering-housing-for-all-claim-falls-flat/story-tZJU4VXKlinvdrVzBB7rL.html>

into the formal state. 'Jugaad' governance thus permeates the state, ingrained in the socio-political configuration of a city where informality is normalised but not the norm.

The state's 'jugaad' strategies are susceptible to internal as well as external pushes for administrative discipline and rule-enforcement. Governance reforms are central to the Mumbai Transformation project, intended to consolidate an effective state apparatus to work with corporate capital to enhance Mumbai's global competitiveness. I argue elsewhere that these reforms seek to centralise power in the state executive, and to 'rationalise,' 'corporatize' and 'de-politicise' (Ferguson, 1990) decision-making in various domains, from budgetary allocations to planning and urban management. They remain largely unrealised, internally contested within the state, reflecting a larger struggle between the centralisation and localisation of power playing out in India (Kaviraj, 1997). The *implementation* of law and policy in Mumbai, despite the growing influence of corporate and civil society elites on state policy, remains an essentially political terrain.

How does the 'jugaad' state differ from available theoretical perspectives in the urban informality literature? It has parallels with 'institutional bricolage,' which McFarlane (2012) applies to Mumbai. The concept refers to a blending of socio-cultural and institutional values and practices to bring in alternate values within bureaucratic states (Leaver, 2001; McFarlane, 2012). The 'jugaad,' state on the other hand, highlights tensions and disjunctions within the state and in state-society relations. 'Jugaad' governance does not arise from alternate values – informal power and influence in Mumbai derives from connections with the state, not 'traditional' forms of authority (Hansen, 2001), and informal practices configure around, and mimic, formal rules and procedures. While McFarlane (2012) emphasizes formal and informal state practices, the 'jugaad' state concept attempts to draw out the relationship between state structure and practices in informalised contexts.

The jugaad state is also not a 'state a exception,' or abrogation of the law in an extension of sovereign state power (Agamben, 2005). As applied by Roy to characterize the state's informalised planning practices, the 'state of exception' assumes a hegemonic, monolithic sovereign state acting to realize its objectives, rendering contextual political dynamics, economic and social structures epiphenomenal or irrelevant. The mechanisms through which an informalised state strategically uses informalisation to realize future-oriented goals, as Roy proposes, given what we know about how states exercise power and effect change, remain unclear. The 'state of exception,' in an example of what Sartori

(1970) calls “conceptual stretching,” is used in Indian urban research to characterize everything from permanent curfew in militarised territories to Special Economic Zones, to corrupt real estate-dealings to slum regularisation. It becomes unclear what the research cumulatively tells us, or what a situation that is not a ‘state of exception’ would look like.

In the ‘jugaad’ state, discretionary exemptions and flexible applications of rules are routinely utilised not just by decision-making elites, but state actors at various levels. Exemptions under the Maharashtra Urban Land Ceiling and Regulation Act, for instance, a state planner told me (personal communication, 23 March 2010), “everyone could use, politicians, bureaucrats, officials.” Such practices do not amount to a ‘state of exception,’ but are the product of state incapacities, corrupt dealings, political bargains and accommodations. That the law is not in suspension in Mumbai is evidenced in elite civil society activism, petitioning Courts to enforce planning, municipal and environmental laws and regulations.

The ‘jugaad state’ exerts power not through its power to ‘make the exception,’ but to selectively enforce the rule. Mumbai’s ‘jugaad’ state deploys its coercive and infrastructural powers strategically, to realize specific policy or political objectives. An example is the Maharashtra Government’s campaign, following the MTP launch in 2004, to demolish all post ‘cut-off’ slums in Mumbai. The GoM marshalled state machinery for the demolition drive, intended to demonstrate its ability to impose order and commitment to enforcing law. The harsh evictions were halted through a campaign of local resistance and national political mediation, and most slums were re-established and the ‘cut-off’ extended. In similarly selective rule enforcement, the current Hindu nationalist GoM administration undertook a drive to seal ‘illegal’ slaughterhouses, owned largely by minority Muslim communities, allowing similarly unauthorised dairies and fisheries to operate.¹⁹

It is useful here to also distinguish the ‘jugaad’ state from other models of state governance. I set up the concept as a ‘jugaad’ variation within India’s bureaucratic state structures in widely informal cities. Its distinctive characteristic is not so much that state actors apply informal as well as formal practices –we know from Lipsky (1980) that non-routinised, non-scripted forms of state practice exist in even the most formalised states, but unlike in the ‘jugaad’ state, the state governs largely in accordance with formal rules,

¹⁹ Meat ban: When religion influences administration in Mumbai. (2015, Sep 9) *DNA*. Retrieved from <http://www.dnaindia.com/analysis/editorial-meat-ban-when-religion-influences-administration-in-mumbai-2123224>

institutions and laws. Rather, the distinguishing characteristic is the centrality that 'jugaad' practices assume given the incompatibility between formal institutional and regulatory structures and the organisation of the urban political economy. The 'jugaad' state is not a fragile or failed state, or one where formal rules and institutions have no significance. In my current research, I see similar patterns of governance in metropolitan cities like Delhi, with established, institutionalised but conflicted state structures, but not in mofussil towns and urbanising rural regions in surrounding UP.²⁰

Unlike 'jugaad' narratives in the popular media, I do not suggest that 'jugaad' governance is to be celebrated. It is a way of making do whose limitations are apparent. As a former municipal commissioner cautioned (personal communication, 20 August 2015), "There is a limit to all this adjustment and improvisation, we will run out improvisations and adjustments, at that point the clock will start reversing."

Jugaad, as a metaphor, is inherently ambivalent, connoting both a compromised ingenuity as well as its limitations. As informality as a mode of urbanisation spreads from single-story slums to multi-story housing and peri-urban development, the ability of the 'jugaad' state to maintain social control and meet demands for public services is thinly stretched. The 'regularised' rule violation and corruption associated with 'jugaad' governance corrodes state legitimacy. Mumbai's 'jugaad' state makes do, and is able, in a piecemeal fashion, to get some projects realised, but is ineffective where long-term planning is required, for example, in mitigating and adapting to climate change. Its formal policy and rule-making processes remain centralised, rigid and divorced from local democratic politics. Riven with internal contradictions, the state in Mumbai lacks the capacity to develop and implement inclusive, grounded policies for the city. Instead, it aspires to chimeras of a slum-free, 'World Class' Mumbai, blind to its inability to implement its transformative projects.

Conclusion

²⁰ Rather than 'jugaad' governance, I find an institutional vacuum, as rural governance arrangements are destabilised without new governance structures and institutions established.

The 'jugaad' state concept encapsulates how the formal and informal workings of the state interact and shape urban governance in largely informal cities. The juxtaposition of the city that exists on-the-ground, and the 'intended' city of state plans, rules and policies is key — the 'jugaad' state' is defined as much by its modernising ambitions and centralised, insulated formal institutions as by its flexible, negotiated and improvised governance practices. My account reframes these practices as something more than corruption and clientalism, while capturing their inherent tensions. Similar state structures may be found in cities where state institutions have high-modernist designs and projects and substantive informal economies. Comparative analyses with cities in Africa, Asia and Latin America will help develop conceptual models that explain global urban processes better than dominant narratives of modernisation or neoliberalism (Parnell and Robinson, 2012).

The concept, like the notion of jugaad, works at two levels. First, it describes an improvised, 'adaptive mode of governance, applied by state actors to maintain social control and intervene in spaces 'illegible' to state institutions. Second, it situates these practices within the larger structure of the bureaucratic state and the context of state-society relations. A key research question raised through the lens of the 'jugaad' state is to explain where/when 'jugaad' governance mechanisms are formalised, regularised or tolerated by the state, and when actively curbed and restricted. Informality, in such an approach, is not a residual or marginal category, but a site to investigate political struggles over state power and policy. Does the 'jugaad' state's ability to incorporate sections of the city's informal groups preclude broad-based political mobilisations to effect more inclusive and relevant formal state institutions (Heller, 2001; Holston, 2008)?

There is a question, as well, if state 'jugaad' is an enduring feature of Indian urban governance, or a product of a particular moment in time. Contradictions within, and power struggles over, the state may have a particular valence today. Two decades after liberalisation reforms to dismantle India's post-independence statist and more redistribution-oriented regulatory regime, the Indian state has re-aligned rules to favour corporate industry and is re-asserting centralised control over urban policy. Its recent push for formalisation aims to bring informal businesses under regulatory control and within the tax net, and technology offers new tools for state surveillance and penetration. These processes, if successful, will change the state's relationship with the informal economy.

'Jugaad' practices of governance, while pervasive and even informally 'institutionalised', are widely considered, by state elites, their corporate allies and civil society activists to be illegitimate and inherently corrupt departures, rather than viable adaptations, from governance based on laws, rules and regulations. Governance reformers thus seek to curb the influence of informal power structures on the workings of the state and divorce urban policy from the messy realm of urban politics, making the state itself an arena of contestation. How does the shifting balance of power over the state towards corporate industry and away from 'local powers,' seen not just in Mumbai, but metropolitan cities across India, influence outcomes for the informal poor, who typically access state resources and services through local political intermediation?

Debate and dialogue across competing theoretical perspectives, contexts and fields of study strengthen empirical research, sharpen analysis and generate new questions and concepts with which to understand the social world. The analytical frameworks that currently dominate urban studies in India, generated from micro-scale research enmeshed with the ideas of continental philosophers, offer revealing insights and critiques. But largely divorced from wider empirical social science research on Indian politics, economy and society, they constitute an insufficient theoretical and methodological apparatus for the study of India's varied, fast-changing and complex urban reality. Informality in Indian cities spans sites, sectors, classes and social structures, and its analysis must take into account political, economic, social and spatial dimensions.

REFERENCES

Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Agarwala, R. (2013). *Informal labor, formal politics, and dignified discontent in India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anand, N. (2011). Pressure: The Politechnics of water supply in Mumbai. *Cultural Anthropology*, 26(4), 542-564.

- Anjaria, J.S (2006) Street hawkers and public space in Mumbai. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2140-2146
- Auerbach, A. M. (2016). "Clients and Communities: The Political Economy of Party Network Organization and Development in India's Urban Slums." *World Politics* 1(January): 111-148..
- Bayat, A. (1997) Uncivil society: The politics of the 'informal people'. *Third World Quarterly* 18.1, 53-72
- Bhan, G. (2009). "This is no longer the city I once knew". Evictions, the urban poor and the right to the city in millennial Delhi. *Environment and Urbanization*, 21(1), 127-142.
- Benjamin, S. (2008) Occupancy urbanism: Radicalizing politics and economy beyond policy and programs. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32.3: 719-729.
- Birtchnell, T. (2011). Jugaad as systemic risk and disruptive innovation in India. *Contemporary South Asia* 19(4), 357-372.
- Björkman, L. (2013) Becoming a Slum: From Municipal Colony to Illegal Settlement in Liberalization-Era Mumbai. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38.1, 36-59
- Breman, J. (2013) *At Work in the Informal Economy of India: A Perspective from the Bottom-Up*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press
- Burawoy, M. (1998). The extended case method. *Sociological Theory*, 16(1), 4-33.
- Centeno, M. and A. Portes (2006) The informal economy in the shadow of the state. In P. Fernández-Kelly and J. Shefner (Eds), *Out of the Shadows: Political Action and the Informal Economy in Latin America*. State College: Penn State Press
- Chattaraj, S. (2016) Property markets without property rights: Dharavi's Informal real estate markets. In E.Birch, S.Chattaraj, S. Wachter, (Eds.). *Slums: How Informal Real Estate Markets Work*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Chattaraj, S and M. Walton (2017) Functional Dysfunction: Mumbai's Political Economy of Rent Distribution. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 33.3 (2017): 438-456

Chatterjee, P. (2004) *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*. New York: Columbia University Press, New York

Chatterji, R. (2005) Plans, habitation and slum redevelopment: The production of community in Dharavi, Mumbai. *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 39. 2, 197-218

Cleaver, F. (2001). Institutional bricolage, conflict and cooperation in Usangu, Tanzania. *IDS bulletin*, 32(4), 26-35.

De Soto, H. (1989). *The Other Path*. New York: Harper & Row.

Evans, P. B. (2012). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ferguson, J. (1990). *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fernández-Kelly, P. and J. Shefner (2006) (Eds) *Out of the Shadows: Political Action and the informal Economy in Latin America*. State College: Penn State Press

Ghertner, D. A. (2011). Gentrifying the state, gentrifying participation: Elite governance programs in Delhi. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35(3), 504-532.

GoM (2004), *Transforming Mumbai into a World-class City: An Action Plan*. Mumbai: Government of Maharashtra

Hansen, T.B. (2001) *Wages of Violence: Naming and Identity in postcolonial Bombay*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Harriss, J. (2007). Antinomies of empowerment: observations on civil society, politics and urban governance in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2716-2724.

Harriss-White, B.(2003). *India working: Essays on society and economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, P. (2001). Moving the state: the politics of democratic decentralization in Kerala, South Africa, and Porto Alegre. *Politics and Society* 29. 1, 131-163

Holston, J. (2008). *Insurgent citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jeffrey, C., & Young, S. (2014). Jugād: Youth and enterprise in India. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104(1), 182-195.

Kamath, L., & Raj, R. (2016). City building and Regime Creation in the peripheries for Mumbai.

<https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspacedirect.org/handle/10625/56488>

Khan, M. (2010). *Political settlements and the governance of growth-enhancing institutions*. London: SOAS.

Kohli, A. (2006). Politics of economic growth in India: Part II: The 1990s and beyond. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1361-1370.

Le Galès, P. (1998). Regulations and governance in European cities. *International journal of urban and regional research*, 22(3), 482-506.

Lipsky, M. (1983). *Street-Level Bureaucracy: The Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mann, M. (1984). The Autonomous Power of the State: its origins, mechanisms and results. *European Journal of Sociology*, 25(02), 185-213.

Mathur, O. P., Thakur, D., Rajadhyaksha, N., & Bahl, R. (2009). *Urban property tax potential in India*. New Delhi: National Institute of Public Finance and Policy.

McFarlane, C. (2012). Rethinking informality: Politics, Crisis, and the City. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(1), 89-108.

MCGM (2009). *Mumbai Human Development Report*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press

Merton, R. K. (1957). The role-set: Problems in sociological theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 8(2), 106-120.

Migdal, J. S. (2001). *State in Society. Studying how states and societies transform and constitute one another*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Migdal, J., A.Kohli, and V.Shue. (Eds) (1994) *State power and social forces: domination and transformation in the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Mills, C. W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mukhopadhyay, A. (1999). Politics and Bureaucracy in Urban Governance: The Indian Experience. In Mathur, O. P. (ed), *India: The Challenges of Urban Governance*. New Delhi: National Institute of Public Policy

Narayanan, H. (2003). In Search of Shelter: The Politics of Implementation of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act of 1976 in Greater Mumbai. In S.Patel and Messelos (Eds), *Bombay and Mumbai: The City in Transition*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press

NCEUS. (2012). *Contribution of the Unorganized Sector to GDP: Report of the Sub-Committee of a NCEUS Task Force*. New Delhi: Government of India.

Parnell, S& Robinson, J. (2012). (Re) theorizing cities from the Global South: Looking beyond neoliberalism. *Urban Geography*, 33(4), 593-617.

Pethe, A., Nallathiga, R., Gandhi, S., & Tandel, V. (2014). Re-thinking urban planning in India: Learning from the wedge between the de jure and de facto development in Mumbai. *Cities*, 39, 120-132.

Pinto, D. and M. Pinto. (2005) *Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai and Ward Administration*. Konark Publishers, Mumbai

Portes, A., M. Castells, and L. Benton, (Eds). (1989) *The Informal Economy: Studies in advanced and less-developed Countries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press

Radjou, N., Prabhu, J., & Ahuja, S. (2012). *Jugaad innovation: Think frugal, be flexible, generate breakthrough growth*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Roy, A. (2005). Urban informality: toward an epistemology of planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 71(2), 147-158.

Roy, A. (2009). Why India cannot plan its cities: Informality, insurgence and the idiom of urbanization. *Planning theory*, 8(1), 76-87.

Rudolph, L.I, & Rudolph, S. H. (1987). *In Pursuit of Lakshmi: The political economy of the Indian state*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sartori, G. (1970). Concept Misformation in comparative politics. *American Political Science Review*, 64(4), 1033-1053.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a State: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tilly, C. (1985). War making and state making as organized crime. In *Bringing the State back in*. P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer, and T. Skocpol. (Eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Weinstein, L. (2008) Mumbai's development mafias: globalization, organized crime and land development. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32.1, 22-39

Weinstein, L. (2009) Democracy in the globalizing Indian city: Engagements of political society and the state in globalizing Mumbai. *Politics & Society* 37.3, 397-427

Zaidi, H. (2012) *From Dongri to Dubai: Six Decades of the Mumbai Mafia*. Roli Books, New Delhi

Zérah, M. H. (2009). Participatory governance in urban management and the shifting geometry of power in Mumbai. *Development and Change*, 40(5), 853-877.