

Arup Mitra

Spread of Slums: The Rural Spill-over?

THE popularly held view that the emergence and expansion of slums amidst the metropolises is basically due to migration which can be countered by implementing the slum eradication/demolition programmes, has already led to a whole lot of controversies, invoking at times retaliation from the slum dwellers. In this context, the present paper attempts to quantify the contribution of migration factor in explaining the spread of slums and examines the validity of the characterisation of urban poverty in terms of spill over effect of rural poverty. The data for the paper have been drawn mainly from the following two sources : National Sample Survey Organisation (especially the NSS 31st round survey on socio-economic condition of the slum-dwellers) and population censuses. Section I briefly outlines the analytical framework on the basis of which available evidence, howsoever scanty is, has been examined in Section II. Section III summarises the major findings of the paper.

1. Explanatory Framework

Migration, in fact, is a function of several economic as well as non-economic factors including the social factors. Untouchability, casteism are the more prominent features of the rural society which accelerate the process of rural to urban migration. There seems to be a strong association between the caste factor and the nature of activities performed specially in a rural context. So the lower castes can be said to migrate on a larger scale as the correspondence between caste and occupations is likely to be blurred in an anonymous large

urban surrounding Factors like marriage are likely to figure out prominently in female migration.

Among the economic reasons, a set of factors tends to have positive impact on migration, another set, including the absence of rural-urban continuum giving rise to high transport cost, discourages migration. The economic factors generating positive impact on migration are popularly expressed in term of 'push-pull' factors, "Conceptually, it is difficult to maintain a coherent distinction between 'push' and 'pull' for both sets of accounts imply that the destination is seen as having an economic advantage over the origin".¹ When the 'push' factors like crop failures, rural indebtedness, landlessness compel the rural folk to move into the city, factors like greater employment opportunities, higher wages in the organised sector attract migrants from rural areas. In this context Harris-Todaro model is a basic formulation which essentially explains the rural urban migration in terms of rural-urban wage differential. "The distinguishing feature of this model is that migration proceeds in response to urban-rural differences in expected earnings with urban employment rate acting as an equilibrating force on such migration".¹ The expected rural income is the same as the rural wage which is equal to the marginal product of labour. On the other hand, "the expected urban income is obtained by multiplying w (urban wage) by the probability of finding a job there, which, it is supposed in Harris-Todaro model, is equal to the rate of urban employment".⁸ Therefore, so long as the expected income in the urban area is larger than the rural income, rural to urban migration will continue in spite of urban unemployment. It is an open question how far the use of the urban employment rate as the probability of finding an urban job is justified and gives a realistic estimate of the probability.⁴ Moreover, too much emphasis on the rural-urban wage differential alone in explaining the economic migration may not always be justified in an empirical context. Hence, consideration of other economic factors may explain the situation more realistically.

When there is an absence of rural-urban continuum as said above, the conditions of high transport cost on the one hand and the urgency of moving into the city stipulated by the pressing economic needs of the 'push' factors on the other, force the migrants to behave in the most rationalistic way by moving into the nearest urban centre. So the importance of the 'push' factors will

1. Joshi, H. and Joshi, V., *Surplus Labour and the City : A Study of Bombay*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1976, p. 123.

2. Harris John R. and Todaro, M. P., "Migration, Unemployment and Development", *American Economic Review*, 1970, p. 126.

3. Basu KaushiK, *Less Developed Economy : A Critique of Contemporary Theory*, Basil Blackwell, 1984, pp. 69-70.

4. Majumdar, D., "The Rural-Urban Wage Gap, Migration and Shadow Wage", *Oxford Economics Paper*, Vol. 28, 1976.

essentially be reflected from the regional distribution of migration. Nevertheless these migrants are more likely to arrive at the slums of the cities, as their poor economic condition do not allow them to avail of any better alternative. Even if the migration of several other categories like students, seem to be phenomenal in the metropolitan areas, they are not likely to form slums because of the alternative residential opportunities open to them. Moreover, their migration at the first stage does not seem to be permanent; its duration is determined by the period of study and usually it involves single persons only. But the rural migrants coming to the city in search of employment and to earn a livelihood or even subsistence come with their family members. We discuss these points in detail in order to specify the reasons theoretically in favour of family migration. Discussion on chain migration and the period of stay of the migrants in the cities may provide a deeper insight into understanding this complex process.

In rural to urban migration, induced by economic reasons mainly, or 'push' factors more specifically, two kinds of migrants can be noticed : (a) seasonal migrants, and (b) long-term migrants. Migrants subject to seasonal migration (of earners during the agricultural slack season) during their short and temporary stay in the city are more likely to arrive at the pavements of the city; some of them may go to slums if accommodation is not provided by their employer. On the other hand, the long-term migration occasioned 'push' factors, though not permanent, usually involves the migration of the entire family, mainly because of the reason that the dependents have neither any asset nor any additional source of income to rely on in the village and the earnings of the earners may not be sufficient enough to maintain two establishments. Moreover, the possibility of finding an employment for the earners' wife and children, which may augment the family income, seems to be brighter in the urban setting than in rural areas, and that essentially encourages family migration. Family migration and long term migration usually provides an inducement to undertake housing investment in the city because of an inclination towards better housing facilities. But nature of occupation, level of earning, land scarcity, need to stay near the working place of the worker or at the centre of the city where the scope for an additional employment for other family members is brighter, are some of the most important factors which govern their decision leading to slum-formation and other kinds of unauthorised clusters within the city in situation of acute overall shortage of land.

Landlessness or assetlessness in native village converts the migrants into permanent residents of the city. Even when migration is initially of temporary nature, many of them are likely to spend their entire working life in the city. Moreover, the outflow streams of old ones from the city are always replaced by the streams of new inflow. From this point of view, therefore.

the existence of slums in the cities is expected to be stable over a period of time, even if their appearance appears to be temporary in nature.

The phenomenon of chain migration, which not only refers to delayed family migration but migration of those individuals who are either distant relatives, co-villagers or of the same caste as that of the migrant already working in the city, leads to overcrowding in the slums, and in India where caste structure, village ties and joint family systems are predominant, chain migration is believed to have continued to a greater extent.

On the whole, therefore, slum and pavement dwellers can be said to be overwhelmingly poor rural migrants, primarily from lower castes or disadvantaged communities who migrate to the city through caste, kinship and village networks in search of better economic opportunities.⁵ The character of urban poverty, in fact, according to Dandekar and Rath (1971) is the 'consequence of the continuous migration of the rural poor into the urban areas in search of a livelihood, their failure to find adequate means to support themselves there and the resulting growth of pavement and slum life in the cities'.⁶

The above kind of framework is essentially based on the following propositions which need to be empirically tested. The logical link among them have been established above.

- (i) In the entire migration stream the rural to urban component is the most significant one.
- (ii) Economic reasons are the most important ones, governing the rural to urban migration.
- (iii) Urban poverty, in fact, is a spillover of rural poverty or consequence of migration arising from push factors.
- (iv) Slums are mainly dominated by the lower castes,
- (v) Slums are 'family-slums' but not of single persons,
- (vi) Slums are stable over a period of time.

Below we examine the available evidence to note the empirical basis and strength of the propositions stated above.

2. Examination of the Empirical Evidence

Proposition (1): *Significance of the Rural Component in the Migration Stream:*

Table I shows that the major metropolises have drawn sufficiently large

5. Singh, A. M. and D'Souza, A., *The Urban Poor : Slum and Pavement Dwellers in the Major Cities of India*, Manohar, 1980, p. 26.

6. Dandekar, V. M. and Rath, N., *Poverty in India*, Indian School of Political Economy, 1971, p. 35.

quantum of population from different parts of India over the present century though in recent years the migration rate is on the verge of decline. The ratio of gross decadal inflow of population into the cities from all parts of India over the decade 1971-81 to the total city population in 1981 does not seem to be spectacular (Table 2). However, taking into account the rural urban breakdown of the ratio mentioned above it may be checked from Table 2 that the ratio

of gross decadal inflow of migrants with rural origin into the cities to the total city population, has been larger than its urban-to-urban counterpart except in case of Madras where the reverse is found to be true.

TABLE 1—PROPORTION OF MIGRANTS TO TOTAL POPULATION
IN THE CITIES

<i>Year</i>	<i>Bombay</i>	<i>Madras</i>	<i>Calcutta</i>	<i>Delhi</i>
1901	76.60	31.50	65.72	—
1911	80.40	33.40	—	—
1921	84.00	33.40	—	—
1931	75.40	34.80	33.50	—
1941	72.60	N.A.	—	—
1951	72-10	40.50	66.70	66.40
1961	64.20	37.10	52.67	65.04
1971 (a)	56.48	31.58	33.45	51.28
1971(b)	56.86	31.85	33.73	51.72
1981(LR)	50.10	33.52	22.66	38.21

Note : For 1971 migration is defined in terms of (a) Birth Place and (b) Last Residence. (LR in short).

- SOURCES : 1. Census of India, 1971, Maharashtra, Series 11, Part II D(i), D(ii).
 2. Joshi and Joshi (1976), quoting K. C. Zachariah, *Migrants in Greater Bombay* based on Census data.
 3. Census of India, 1961, Madras, Vol. IX, Part X(i).
 4. Census of India, 1971, Tamil Nadu, Series 19, Part II-D, Vol. I and II.
 5. Ghosh, M., Dutta A., Ray B., *Calcutta, A Study in Urban Growth Dynamics* (1972).
 6. Census of India, 1971, West Bengal, Series 22, Part II-D(i) and D(ii).
 7. Census of India, 1961, Delhi, Vol. XIX, Part II-C.
 8. Census of India, 1971, Delhi, Series 27, Part II-D.
 9. Census of India, 1981.

TABLE 2—MIGRATION RATES IN THE CITIES, 1981

	<i>% of all duration migrants from within India to 1981 city population</i>		<i>% of decadal inflow (1971-81) of migrants from within India to 1981 city population</i>	
	<i>Rural to urban</i>	<i>Urban to urban</i>	<i>Rural to urban</i>	<i>Urban to urban</i>
Bombay	33.98	16.12	13.35	5.54
Calcutta U.A.	14.69	7.97	4.99	2.84
Delhi U.A.	19.48	18.73	10.98	9.38
Madras U.A.	13.10	20.42	5.78	9.71

SOURCE: Census of India 1981.

For slums, migration data are available from NSS 31st Round Survey (1976-77), but that refers to principal earners (as defined below). It should be noted that they are not comparable with census data because of a totally different definition of migrants used therein. The survey (NSS : 1976-77) denned "principal household earner" as the member of the household whose income from gainful occupation during the last one year was highest and the principal earner was treated as migrant if his native place was not the city of enumeration. The native place was defined as place where the parents or the forefathers of the earner resided more or less permanently and with which the principal earner had at least some occasional connection. The number of principal earners, therefore, was equal to the number of households and the number of migrant principal earner would indicate the number of migrant households in the slums. Table 3 shows that the proportion of migrant households to total households was significant in the slums of all the cities except in Delhi where it was around 32 per cent. In Bombay, it was highest (i.e., 86.83 per cent) and in Calcutta and Madras around half of the households were migrants. However, the share of the rural migrants in total migrant households was more than 80 per cent in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras and more than 70 per cent in Delhi slums.

TABLE 3 -MIGRANTS IN SLUMS

<i>Slums</i>	<i>Percentage of Migrant HH</i>	<i>Migrant US from</i>	
		<i>Rural (%)</i>	<i>Urban (%)</i>
Bombay	86.83	82.19	16.02
Calcutta	51.18	88.02	9.66
Delhi	31.83	73.40	22.07
Madras	44.31	81.90	12.83

SOURCE : NSS 31st Round Survey on Socio-Economic Condition of Slum-Dwellers.

Proposition (2) : *Importance of Economic Reasons in Migration*

Direct data on the economic reasons governing the migration process are not available from census data prior to 1981 census. In 1981 census, the reasons for migration have been elicited. As per Table 4, economic reason such as employment, accounts for a large proportion of the male migrants who are said to have migrated to the cities during the last decade (1971-81). Again, it may be stated that among the rural male migrants in the cities, employment seems to be more important as a reason for migration than among the urban ones.

TABLE 4—PROPORTION OF MIGRANTS MIGRATING FOR EMPLOYMENT TO TOTAL INFLOW OF MIGRANTS INTO THE CITIES OVER THE DECADE 1971-81

	<i>Migrants from within India</i>		<i>Migrants from Rural to Urban</i>		<i>Migrants from Urban to Urban</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>F</i>
Bum bay	61.46	6.25	65.14	5.89	51.11	6.97
Calcutta U.A.	48.40	7.16	53.12	8.02	38.11	5.63
Delhi U.A.	54.82	6.09	60.07	6.67	47.51	5.83
Madras U.A.	45.97	5.85	52.70	5.66	41.97	6.18

Note : Migration defined on the basis of last residence criterion.
SOURCE : Census of India, 1981.

Again, among the migrant principal earners in the slums, the bulk of the migrants can be said to have moved into the city either 'on work' or 'in search of work' thus explaining the dominance of economic reasons as a cause of migration from the rural areas (Table 5).

TABLE 5—PERCENTAGE OF MIGRANT PRINCIPAL EARNERS IN SLUMS BY REASON FOR MIGRATION (1976-77)

<i>Slums</i>	<i>On Work</i>	<i>In Search of Work</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
Bombay	3.90	80.09	16.00	100
Calcutta	5.88	82.78	11.34	100
Delhi	13.58	66.41	20.01	100
Madras	2.99	63.45	33.56	100

SOURCE : NSS 31st Round Survey (1976-77)

The percentage of migrant principal earners moved 'on work' was significantly smaller specially for the slums of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras where it varied from 3 to 6 per cent. In Delhi, however, it was above 13 per cent. On the other hand, more than 80 per cent migrant earners in Bombay and Calcutta slums, and more than 60 per cent in Delhi and Madras slums came 'in search of work'. Age specific migration also revealed that majority of the migrants belonged to the working age groups (NSS 31st Round Survey : 1976-77).

While explaining the interlinkages between migration and slum formation we have argued that the transport cost discouraging migration on the one hand (due to lack of rural urban continuum) and the 'push' factors pressing them to migrate on the other, lead migration to the nearest urban centre. So, *a priori* expectation is that bulk of the migrants are either from the rural areas of the same State or the adjoining States, which are relatively poor. The survey results also reveal that more than 55 per cent of the rural migrant earners in Bombay slums were from the regions of the same State itself (i.e , Maharashtra), and among other States having significant shares was U.P. (19 per cent). Similarly, in Madras slums 80 per cent of the rural migrant principal earners came from the regions of Tamil Nadu. In Calcutta slums, however, the share of the State itself in the total rural migrant principal earners was only 32 per cent. But the relatively poor States like Bihar (45 per cent) and poverty stricken villages of U.P. (16 per cent) contributed significantly. So the plausible explanation of the basic difference between the regional distribution of rural migrant principal earners in Bombay and Madras slums on the one hand, and Calcutta slums on the other, may lie in the fact that when relatively dry villager of Maharashtra and poverty stricken villages of Tamil Nadu send bulk of the migrants to the slums, West Bengal more fertile, constitute smaller percentage of the total rural migrant principal earners in the slums of Calcutta. Share of Delhi rural in total rural migrant principal earners was negligible (as Delhi urban is around 90 per cent of Delhi Union Territory) and, in fact, the adjoining poorer states of U P. and Rajasthan sent bulk of the migrants to Delhi slums.

Proposition (3) : *Urban Poverty as a Spillover of Rural Poverty*

From the large percentage shares of the rural migrants in total migrant principal earners in the slums, however, it will be misleading to jump to the conclusion that urban poverty is a reflection of rural poverty. First the kind of definition used by the NSSO for defining a migrant principal earner (described earlier) in the slums is too wide mainly because of the reason that there a person was reported to be migrant if his forefathers or parents belonged to some other place with which he has some occasional connection at present. These persons should usually be considered as the residents because

of the long duration of their stay in the city. Also it is essential to find out the proportion of city poverty explained by slum poverty, before drawing any such conclusion.

Non-availability of direct data on distribution of city population with respect to various expenditure size classes for the year 1976-77 does not, however facilitate such an estimation without making certain assumptions. Accepting Rs. 20 per capita consumption expenditure at 1960-61 prices as the poverty line and correcting it for the appropriate price changes since 1960-61, proportion of slum poor and city poor have been calculated for the year 1976-77 and 1977-78 respectively, essentially assuming for the estimation of the latter that the percentage of city poor to the urban poor of the State remained constant during 1972-78.

Slum poverty explained nearly 70 per cent of the city poverty in Bombay and Madras, and around half of city poverty in Calcutta and Delhi (see Table 6). Other component of city poverty can be said to be pavement dwellers, unregistered slum dwellers and squatters. Nevertheless, it is evident that in all the cities the proportion of slum poverty to city poverty is substantially larger than the ratios of slum population to city population. Therefore, under such situation, recalling the high proportion of migrant households from rural areas to total households in the slums of Bombay (71 per cent) and Calcutta (around 45 per cent) and also assuming that the migrants from the rural areas constitute slum poverty, the hypothesis that urban poverty is a 'spill over' of rural poverty can be maintained. But in Madras and Delhi where the percentages of rural migrant households to total slum households were just 36 per cent and 23 per cent respectively, substantially lower than the incidence of poverty in the slums (80 per cent in Madras and 70 per cent in Delhi) it can be said that apart from the spillover effect, growth of urban poverty over time is significant too. So, all the urban poor need not be identified with the rural poor. In fact, that migration is not the only factor that contributes to the growth of slums.

TABLE 6-SLUM POVERTY AS A PERCENTAGE OF CITY POVERTY

<i>City and Slum</i>	<i>Derived Poor population in Cities (1977)</i>	<i>Poor Population in Slums (1976-77)</i>	<i>Percentage of City Poor in Slums</i>
Bombay	4,73,327	3,15,616	66.68
Calcutta	7,84,861	3,43,954	43.82
Delhi	10,81,620	5,56,355	51.44
Madras	11,40,157	7,85,830	68.92

SOURCE: (a) NSS 27th and 32nd Round Surveys.
(b) NSS 3 lit Round Survey.

Proposition (4) : *Existence of Lower Castes in Slums*

To show dominance of lower castes in slums, first we examine the proportion of scheduled caste population in the slums to the total slum population and compare it with the same ratio for the city as a whole. Next we have the percentage of scheduled caste population in the slums in the total scheduled caste population in the city. It is evident from Table 7 that this percentage is significantly large, specially in the cities of Madras and Delhi. In Bombay and Calcutta it does not seem to be on the high side (11 per cent and 15 per cent respectively).

It is evident that a large proportion of scheduled caste population in the city were slum dwellers in Calcutta (67 per cent) and almost all of them stayed in the slums of Madras. In Bombay and Delhi the absence of their prominent presence in the slums (23 per cent and 35 per cent respectively) does not imply that they were better-off. It can indeed be argued that it is difficult for them to find an accommodation even in the slums. Bulk of them may be dwelling on pavements. Thus, while it may not be wrong to say that most of the scheduled caste population in the cities are either slum or pavement dwellers, the converse of the statement, i.e. most of the slum dwellers are from lower castes is certainly not correct. The disadvantaged classes have migrated to the cities from the rural areas either recently or decades back through caste, kinship and village net works, but the existence of other castes in slums due to shortage of housing, that is, the phenomenon of downward social mobility, certainly, cannot be overlooked.

TABLE 7—PERCENTAGE OF SCHEDULED CASTE POPULATION IN CITIES AND SLUMS

City	Percentage of Scheduled Caste to total Population		Slum 1976-77	% of Scheduled Caste Population in Slums to Total Scheduled Caste Population in City (1976-77)
	City			
	1971	1981		
Bombay	3.52	4.84	10.75	22.99
Calcutta	3.78	4.53	15.02	66.67
Delhi	14.55	19.41	35.85	34.53
Madras	10.49	13.36	40.69	91.65»

Note : *For Madras, Scheduled caste population in slums (1976-77) is taken as a percentage of total scheduled caste population in the city, for 1981.

SOURCE: 1. Census of India, 1971, See Table III, 2,
2. Census of India, 1981, India, Series 1, Part II-B (ii),
3. NSS, 31st Round.

Proposition (5) : *Family Slums*

Persistence of long-term migrants and the growth of population in the slums for reasons other than migration may indicate the emergence of family slums. For migrants, it is in all likelihood family migration and for the city born slum dwellers it is the natural process of family formation. However, to examine the empirical validity of the 'family slums' we do not have any direct evidence for which we apply the following indirect tests:

Comparison of (a): age distribution, and

(b): sex-composition between city and slum.

A priori expectation is that sex composition in slums should supercede the same ratio obtained for the city, and age distribution in slums should be less weighted in favour of the working age groups compared to that in the city. In justification, one may assume that the number of single migrants would be larger in the city than that in the slums because city as a whole contains several-types of migrants. Therefore, the city sex ratio would be lower and the age distribution of the city population would be weighted in favour of the working ages. The assumption does not seem to be unrealistic as the sex ratio among the migrants in the cities was relatively smaller than that among the rest of the city population (see Table 8).

TABLE 8-SEX RATIO AMONG MIGRANTS AND OTHERS IN CITY (1971)

City	Sex Ratio (F/M) Among Migrants		Sex-Ratio (F/M) Among Others
	Last Residence wise	Birth Place- wise	
Bombay	59.67	59.40	90.48
Calcutta	41.68	41.38	77.61
Delhi	75.70	75.36	84.46
Madras	82.75	82.62	94.15

Note : Se% ratio among others have been calculated after deducting the migrants (last residence-wise) from total population.

SOURCE: Census of India, 1971.

Accordingly, on account of predominance of 'family slums' the sex composition of the slum dwellers would supersede that of the city dwellers and age distribution of the slum dwellers would be less weighted in favour of the working age brackets than that of the city dwellers.

(a) *Age Distribution*

From Table 9, it is evident that both in cities and slums even if age distribution of population was weighted in favour of the working age groups, in the slums it was less weighted than in the cities, thus revealing a relatively higher percentage share of slum children in the total slum population compared to that in the cities.

TABLE 9—PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION IN AGE GROUP 15-59

City	Percentage of Population in the Age Brackets 15-19			
	City Level (1971)		Slum Level (1976-77)	
	Male	Total	Male	Total
Bombay	66.87	63.74	60.48	57.91
Calcutta	69.75	65.45	63.31	60.31
Delhi	59.88	57.84	56.47	55.70
Madras	61.44	59.88	57.58	56.97

SOURCE: (a) NSS 31st Round Survey,
(b) Census of India, 1971.

(b) *Sex Ratio*

With respect to sex composition in Bombay and Calcutta, sex ratio of the total population is substantially smaller than that in the slums, particularly for working age groups. In Delhi and Madras, comparative sex ratios are higher and the sex ratio of slum dwellers exceed the corresponding ratios of the city population (see Table 10).

TABLE 10—SEX RATIO (F/M) IN CITIES (1971) AND SLUMS (1976-77)

Age Groups	Bombay		Calcutta		Delhi		Madras	
	City	Slum	City	Slum	City	Slum	City	Slum
0-14	92.80	89.65	89.05	91.77	89.79	85.46	97.12	95.34
15-19	73.33	74.04	68.00	99.99	79.17	92.02	96.98	99.68
20-24	62.08	79.99	58.46	67.12	77.91	70.55	87.12	87.73
25-29	63.78	96.34	52.59	63.10	76.90	73.67	89.29	96.15
30-59	57.81	60.11	48.69	60.74	69.36	81.97	84.85	90.72
60+	88.31	124.33	75.96	85.20	81.89	94.18	104.48	120.76
Total	71.65	79.32	63.61	76.45	79.82	83.09	90.36	94.56

The highest female-male ratio observed in Madras city as well as slums may allow one to hypothesise that South Indians migrate with their families while there is a tendency among the North Indians to migrate alone leaving their family in the village, provided it is assumed that all the migrants in Madras are from South India and all the migrants in North Indian cities are from North India.

Proposition 5 : *Stability of Slums*

No direct evidence is available from the NSSO's 31st Round Survey (1976-77) which could be used for the examination of this proposition. However, the very definition of migration used by the NSSO (discussed earlier) essentially suggests that the migrants have been staying for a long time in the slums of the cities. Also 1961 Census in the context of Madras slums pointed out that around 27 per cent of the slum dwellers in the city were aged more than 50 years and about 65 per cent were aged more than 26 years.

3. Conclusion

Though migration plays a significant role in the context of formation and growth of slums, it may be erroneous to uphold that the entire process of slum expansion is due to fresh inflow of migrants to the cities. Along with the spill-over-effect of rural poverty, the growth of urban poverty itself also needs to be emphasised while characterising the latter. Evidence in favour of the emergence of family slums and 'stability of slums' amidst the cities quite clearly ensures that the problem of slum is simply not a short-term phenomenon appearing largely due to the migration of seasonal labour or so on. The problem merits consideration in the overall perspective of development pattern experienced by the economy. Migration of disadvantaged or lower castes through caste kinship bonds is believed to have led to slum formation in the cities but the simultaneous existence of other castes in the slums suggests the phenomenon of downward social mobility. To the latter land scarcity and housing shortage contribute. Provision of economic support on the basis of caste factor only, therefore, may have serious implications.

References

1. Basil, Kaushik, 198-t, *Less Developed Economy : A Critique of Contemporary Theory*, Basil Black-well.
2. Bose, Ashish, 1978, *India's Urbanisation 1901-2001*, Institute of Economic Growth.,
3. Dandekar, V.M. and Rath, N., 1971, *Poverty in India*, Indian School of Political Economy.
4. Harris, J.R. and Todaro, M.P , 1970, Migration, unemployment and development, *American Economic Review*.

5. Joshi, H. and Joshi, V., 1976, *Surplus Labour and the City : A Study of Bombay*, Oxford University, Press, Delhi.
6. Majumdar, D., 1976, The rural-urban wage gap, migration and shadow wage, *Oxford Economics Paper*, 18.
7. Mitra, Arup, 1985, Slums, cities and urban Informal sector : An analytical study, *M. Phil Dissertation*, Dept. of Economics, Delhi University.
8. Rao, K.R. and Rao, M.S.A., 1984, *Cities and Slums : A Study of a Squatters Settlement, Vijayawada*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
9. Singh, A.M. and D'Souza A., 1970, *The Urban Poor : Slum and Pavement Dwellers in the Major Cities of India*, Manohar.
10. Todaro, M.P., 1969, A model of labour migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries, *The American Economic Review*, LIX (1).