

## **Resourceful Cities**

**Berlin (Germany), 29-31 August 2013**

**Sites and spaces of Contention and Global cities with reference to New Delhi's  
*Jantar Mantar* as a Site of Protest**

**Paper Presented at RC 21 Conference, 2013**

**Session -Contentious Cities**

**Session No.- 11.3 Contentious Spaces**

**Submitted by:**

**Pushpanjali Jha,**

**Assistant Professor,Department Of Social Work(Faculty of Social Sciences)**

**University of Delhi,**

**Address:3, University Road, Delhi-110 007-India**

**Email: [j.pushpanjali@gmail.com](mailto:j.pushpanjali@gmail.com)**

## Abstract:

The intersections between the concepts of space, place and resistance have recently received increasing attention from social scientists dedicated to the study of social movements where Space and place are not merely seen as providing a physical background for mobilizations but as mutually constitutive of social movement agency. The paper explores these dimensions through a theoretically informed and empirically grounded account of social movement mobilizations at India's national capital and also the 'protest capital', New Delhi and its rallying point 'Jantar Mantar'.

New Delhi symbolizes the core of the diverse, multicultural India. The city forms the node in the network of places, which connect the regions of India while also serving as a vestibule to the transnational places thereby creating a contiguous chain of places connected with each other from regional to transnational levels. It serves as a central location for the production of a counter-hegemonic discourse by a huge plethora of citizens from different nooks and corners of the country as well as the global expatriates finding their second home in Delhi. Ramachandra Guha(2007) in his book *India after Gandhi* has proclaimed that it would have been possible to write the story of India told from a single street and in a single year through chronicling the appearance and disappearance of the protesters, on its central vista. Such is the extent of street performances in the designated and claimed sites of protest in New Delhi that one can find the glimpse of the whole spectrum of contentions in India. It is important to mention here that conflicts run along many axes in India and the scope for contentions has been even greater, given the diversity of competing groups across religion, caste, class and language. India's diversity is wrought with contested notions of citizenship and identity, Religion, caste and ethnicity coupled with ongoing struggle for progressive growth creates multiple sites of contestation. The polymorphous character of Indian Movements have expanded the arena of politics in India beyond the representational institutions of election and political parties and have begun to raise a new discourse on democracy; thus reinventing forms of social action and political practice, creating new spaces and infusing deeper meaning to democracy in a globalizing world. Jantar mantar becomes the nucleus of the confluence of multiple micro-identities, multiple sites of contestation within the larger framework of meta-nationality/nationalism of India. Jantar Mantar, more than over the past two decades, has offered numerous reflections on the 'complex intersection of history, protest, place and democracy'. Witnessing innumerable performances of protest —not simply as modes of political expression, but also manifestations of the democratic success. Jantar Mantar as one such urban space provides a stage for wider political conflicts, or points of symbolic contest where building or monuments stand for more anonymous

structures of power. For years Jantar Mantar has been New Delhi's place of protest and has witnessed thousand of protests of various forms. Jantar Mantar is one of the prominent urban site for protests, situated amidst the 'corridors of power', close to the parliament and prime minister's office. These 'landscape of power', provides a compelling narrative of dominance and subordination, a profile of power relations in urban spaces and for the very same reason these citadels of official power become targets of protest and opposition.

Cities, particularly global cities, have increasingly become political spaces where the concentration of different groups and their identities are intertwined with the articulation of various claims to citizenship rights (Sassen, 1996). The theoretical foundation of the present paper draw upon the work of Henri Lefebvre, who was concerned with establishing an analytical approach to the city within the framework of his theory of social space, in which the city was a political space for claiming rights for social groups. The struggles to define and appropriate the spaces of the city was crucial in claiming these rights (Lefebvre, 1974, pp.410-11). Lefebvre looks at space as holding the promise of liberation, space which is radically open and nurtures the possibilities of revolutionary social change that comes from the streets. In *The Production of space*, Lefebvre articulates his famous thesis that space is becoming a central object of political struggle in the contemporary world- it is no longer merely the 'medium' or 'theatre' of socio-political conflicts but one of their constitutive dimensions. 'Space' Lefebvre (1991: 410) suggests 'is becoming the principle stake of goal-directed actions and struggles.' in this situation , Lefebvre argues, the struggle to gain command and control over social space has become a central element of everyday life, and spatial dimensions of everyday power relations have become more readily apparent and therefore more directly open to socio-political contestation, and calls for a spatialized counter-politics to transcend the abstract space of capital and the modern state (1991:416). As Lefebvre (1991:386) has it, 'How could one aim for power without reaching for the places where power resides.'The present paper aims to explore and analyze one such Sites of protest 'Jantar Mantar' that serves as the emblematic representation of the spaces of contention within the global cities such as New Delhi.

---

This paper aims to present *Jantar Mantar* as a site of protest, located in the heart of New Delhi, the capital of India. Jantar Mantar is India's designated site of protest; where citizens from different part of the country come and register their protest through the different ensemble of protest performances. The paper is set in the context of scholarly debates about urban citizenship, drawing

particularly on the work of urban and political theorists inspired by Lefebvrian notions of 'rights to the city' and Lefebvre's conceptual spatial triad of 'spaces of representation'. It is argued that Jantar Mantar as a Site of Protest, connects the diverse spaces of contention in India. The 'abstract spaces' of contention in the Indian landscape meets the 'concrete space' of Jantar Mantar, thereby creating an alternative geography through their presence, creating spaces of resistance, imbued with multiple meanings.

Jantar Mantar, might be called the microcosm of India Today as it unfolds a never ending narrative of issues and contentions which concern India of present time. It also reflects about Indian peoples' extra-ordinary zeal to make claims on the state and demand the rights which are entitled to them, being citizens of the country. Various contending groups, representing organizations and movements all over India regularly come to demonstrate, organize *dharna*(sit-in) hold rallies or simply march in the 500 meters dimension of Jantar Mantar(that is what is allowed, unless they decide to violate the rule) during all seasons and irrespective of weather condition, with few or no spectators on hand, serves as testimony to the power of places, of 'collective memory' of the site for mobilization. However, the place is not only crucial for protest mobilization; but enactment of 'citizenships'. Jantar Mantar, as one of Delhi's and India's most famous monuments. It was originally one of the five ensembles of astronomical instruments built by a Medieval king, Maharaja Jai Singh II at different locations in India. The astronomical observatory was built to derive accurate astronomical tables. The complex was completed in 1724<sup>1</sup>. The area around the observatory was designated as a site of protest in the early 1990s, New Delhi's 'Rajpath' and conjoined boat club was the earlier site of protest.

### **Cities, Democracy and Contentions**

Way back in 1945, Innis saw the city as a microcosm in which 'city' became synonymous with 'democracy'. For Innis the city was not merely a locus of democracy but its vanguard: 'The fanaticism of party, religion, race, professions, nationalism, and militarism must somehow be met in the government of the city first and last and after that little is left of world problems' (Innis, 1945, p. 486). Cities, particularly global cities, in contemporary literature have been labeled as 'political spaces where the concentration of different groups and their identities are intertwined with articulation of various claims to citizenship rights (Sassen; 1996). It is pertinent to draw upon the

---

<sup>1</sup> Vinayak Bharne, *Monument in Motion* Indian Express Mon Aug 27 2012,

work of Henri Lefebvre, in this context as Lefebvre was concerned with establishing an analytical approach to the city within the framework of his theory of social space, in which the city was a political space for claiming rights for social groups. In the late 1960s, he articulated his concept of the right to the city and the city as work, as oeuvre, which was the dominant mode of its production in western history. By contrast, modern capitalism constituted the city as a product. While the emphasis was on the city's use value in the former, it was on the city's exchange value in the latter. Lefebvre believed that to claim the rights of ages, sexes, and conditions of work, training, education, culture, leisure, health and housing, it was imperative to think through the city (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 157). The recognition of these rights required the pluralization of groups whose everyday lives were bound up with the city. The struggle to define and appropriate the spaces of the city was crucial in claiming these rights (Lefebvre, 1991, pp. 410—11). For Lefebvre, 'the right to the city manifested itself as a superior form of rights: right to freedom, to individualization and socialization, to habitat and to inhabit' (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 173). Accordingly, 'the right to the oeuvre [the city as a work of art], to participation and appropriation (clearly distinct from the right to property), are implied in the right to the city' (Lefebvre, 1996, P. 174). Neither a natural nor a contractual right, the right to the city 'signifies the rights of citizens and city dwellers, and of groups they (on the basis of social relations) constitute, to appear on all the networks and circuits of communication, information and exchange' (Lefebvre, 1996, pp. 194—5). Lefebvre saw the rights to the city as an expression of urban citizenship, understood not as membership in a polity — let alone the nation-state — but as a practice of articulating, claiming and renewing group rights in and through the appropriation and creation of spaces in the city.

Protests and movements now increasingly use landscape of the city to target urban space/sites as the point of struggle and use it as a resource for political mobilization. Tonkiss (2006) has observed that Power though difficult to observe, one of the most visible ways of exercising power is to occupy or control the physical spaces. As cities are pre-eminent sites of official power, modes of political, legal, constitutional, economic, police and military authority are materialized in space, and political power can be mapped around the spaces/sites it occupies; which is aptly captured in the notion of 'corridors of power'. Architecture of authority gives physical form to official sites and concentration of power. Zukin (1993) has argued that urban architecture is readable as a 'landscape of power', a built environment of dominance and subordination. The architecture of authority offers a compelling but incomplete profile of power relations in urban spaces, the citadels of official power can become targets of protest and opposition. David Harvey (1989:237) has written that one of 'the principle tasks of the capitalist state is to locate power in those spaces which the bourgeoisie controls and disempower those spaces which the oppositional movements have the greatest

potentiality to command.’ Thus sites of power are at the same time constituted as points of resistance. The ‘geography of protest and demonstration’ is the spatial expression of an extended sphere of politics. Spaces of protest, even though temporary and unstable, as Tonkiss has asserted gives shape to a conception of power as something that is contested at diverse sites between different social actors. The politics of resistance-using tactics of demonstration, sit-ins, direct action-frequently makes its point in specific place. Urban spaces provide a stage for wider political conflicts, or points of symbolic contest where building or monuments stand for more anonymous structures of power. As Henri Lefebvre (1991) puts it, the city constitutes not only the ‘setting’ but the ‘stakes’ of political contestation.

### **The Strategic Significance of the site**

New Delhi symbolizes the core of the diverse, multicultural India. The city forms the node in the network of places, which connect the regions of India while *also serving* as a vestibule to the transnational places thereby creating a contiguous chain of places connected with each other from regional to transnational levels. It serves as a central location for the production of a counter-hegemonic discourse by a huge plethora of citizens from different nooks and corners of the country as well as the global expatriates finding their second home in Delhi. Such is the extent of street performances in the designated and claimed sites of protest in New Delhi that one can find the glimpse of the whole spectrum of contentions in India. It is important to mention here that conflicts run along many axes in India and the scope for contentions has been even greater, given the diversity of competing groups across religion, caste, class and language. India’s diversity is wrought with contested notions of citizenship and identity, Religion, caste and ethnicity coupled with ongoing struggle for progressive growth creates multiple sites of contestation. As a protest site, Jantar Mantar underscores that there is such a thing as “democratic space” that is distinct from the state — for public debate, deliberation and consensus — created, possessed, claimed or shaped by the people as chosen, contested and negotiated terrains of democratic identity. Jantar Mantar is the only place in New Delhi where public assembly and protest demonstrations are allowed.

### **Protest and Contentions in India via Jantar Mantar**

India happens to be the largest democracy of the world, as far as the numerical strength of the electorates is concerned. Protest movements in India refute any generalization; they are rather a manifestation of wide arena of struggles in the Indian landscape. *Jantar Mantar* is the Kaleidoscope through which the widest spectrum of contestations can be studied and interpreted. *Jantar Mantar* witnesses innumerable performances of protest —which are not simply the modes of

political expression, but also manifestations of the democratic culture of the country. *Jantar Mantar* as a prominent site of protest provides a stage for wider political conflicts, or points of symbolic contest, as the monuments stand for the structures of power, that surround its precincts. For years *Jantar Mantar* has been New Delhi's place of protest and has witnessed thousands of protests of various forms. The *site*-Jantar Mantar is a marker, an emblem of the political opportunity structure being closer precincts of parliament, representing India's democratic regime and centre of bureaucracy, representing the 'state' to which the mobilizing groups attempt to negotiate and put forward their political claims.

In the span of the research Jantar Mantar witnessed a plethora of contentions and a rich diversity of Mobilizing structure, which have been distinguished into two basic types (i) Formal organizations-like trade Unions, Employee Unions and various citizen groups. The second one is identified as (ii) informal networks- that is , the web of interpersonal contacts and exchanges among movement participants here we can include the third kind in Indian contexts of the social groups and community affiliations Indian society is clubbed through a plethora of identities and structures such as regional, linguistic, caste, religion and culture. These pre-existing or formal mobilizing structure both represent crucial resources for any kind of collective action-whether contentious or not – that constitute the basic infrastructure of all social movements. Formal Mobilizing structure meant those forms of mobilizations were identified in which the protest group belong to some formal associational networks as mentioned above. Such a category of protest was visible in different kinds of employee unions representing mainly the employees of public sector undertaking. Amongst these we can identify the major groups who mobilized and protested on the particular grievances and demands they had from the employer organizations. Trade unions, Worker's associations, Farmers groups, Non-governmental organizations, various professional bodies etc. The informal mobilization structure, in specific Indian context can be identified with a plethora of identities based on regional, linguistic, caste, religion and culture and gender identities as well as the Interest groups which come together pursuing specific interest, issues, demand and development/justice agenda.

*Jantar Mantar* —saw over 1.5 lacs people taking part in demonstrations and over 12,000 detentions for breach of law in the first eight months of 2010. Records of Parliament street police station reveal that between January 2006 and August 2010, at least 13,118 dharnas and as many as 5,491 demonstrations, rallies and processions were held at Jantar Mantar. <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Indian Express, New Delhi, Wed Nov 24 2010

## **Jantar Mantar: The political Space of representation**

Spaces are now recognized as an active constitutive component of hegemonic power: both the medium and the message of domination and subordination (Massey,1993). Space is not a lifeless, undifferentiated and neutral entity; it is rather a complicated set of interlocking physical and social relations, patterns and processes. Space is understood as a social product created from mix of political, economic and social practices and structures. A spatial analysis-particularly one recognizing the social production of space, as in Lefebvre(1991)-recognizes the inherent and multiple social meanings of space and the spatialization of all human activity. From this perspective, radical politics may be seen as the effort to change the stories told about contested spaces. Presenting a dialectical approach to the analysis of production of space, he asserted that space is at the centre of a continuing social and historical process, involving conflict and struggle over meanings and values. As Lefebvre argues that there is dialectic in the 'conceived' and 'lived' world, the way spaces of representation are produced from the representational spaces. Such a conceptualization of space entails that spaces are not bound to static meanings or codifications rather the meanings are changed and spaces are remade through the lived spatial practices. It is recognition of the perpetual need to create, conserve and re-create political spaces A similar sentiment is echoed in recent interventions by contemporary critical geographers. For example, Dikec has argued that the political cannot be restricted to institutionalised practices even if such practices may formally constitute the sphere of 'politics' (2005, 184). Political space is not a topographic inscription of the distribution of power and interest, but rather a point of 'openness and undecidability' that 'implies the calling into question of the very structuring principles of the established order' (2005, 184). The political is thus 'shaped by episodic encounters and does not have a "proper place"(2005, 186); rather, Dikec argues, 'space becomes political as a site of the disruption of the "natural" order of domination as the place where a wrong can be addressed and equality be demonstrated' (2005, 183). Jantar mantar analysed from this dynamic perspective was understood as a political space, as it opens up spaces of encounter where the movement participants through their lived practices assign it a new meaning. This site is claimed by the protest participants and challenge the natural order of domination. Most of the protesters identified this as a space where they can confront the power structures, some of the protesters were not even concerned by the outcome of their mobilization, but took the act of challenging the authority as the goal in itself. For them It was the place for contestation to challenge the political power and initiate the counter-hegemonic practices. The most important fact which came out during the research about Jantar Mantar that makes it political is that it becomes a site for establishing various political claims. New Delhi is the being the capital of India attracts many protest movement groups to express grievances and put demand on the central



government, given its semi-federal structure, substantial power have been invested with the central government, in terms of deciding policies and various programmes for various states.

### **Jantar Mantar: Visible public space**

Jantar Mantar is a prominent public space which gives concrete tangible forum to protest participants. Recent instances of protest movements have highlighted the necessity of material public spaces, which makes the movements visible to a large section of population both within the national and international arena. Movements and campaigns might be active in virtual world or in the form of movements, but they become visible only when they occupy or assemble in a public place. As Mitchell has put it – “from the uprisings in Tiananmen Square, Leipzig, Prague, and Budapest in 1989, to the anti-corporate globalization in Seattle, Bangkok, Quebec City, Davos, and Genoa at the dawn of the new century, to the growing “Take back the streets” movements in countless cities in Europe and North America- has proven, that public democracy requires public visibility, and public visibility requires material public spaces. Electronic media are important-but not sufficient for ‘public visibility’ (Mitchell, 2003, p. 148).

Jantar Mantar provides that ‘public visibility’ to countless protest movements from all over India in organization of the protests. The protests at the site also leads to the transformation of the public space itself from a monumental and official space(a space of representation) “into a genuine place of political discourse” (a representational space). Besides helping the small groups to decide their collective strategy, it also helps many mass movement take over a specific-and ‘centrally important physical space’ in the heart of New Delhi(Calhoun,1989,57). Drawing from Hershkovitz(1993, p.417) it can be suggested that appropriation of a physical place such as Jantar mantar serves as ‘incisive evidence of the extraordinary power of apparently ‘placeless’ movements to create and transform space in new and authentically revolutionary ways.” By taking over as we witnessed during Movement against Corruption by Anna Hazare, the movement created a space for representation-representations that were picked up by the media and broadcast in India and around the world. Without capturing the space of the political significance such as *Jantar Mantar* and later *Ram Lila Maidan*, the movement simply would not have been seen-at least not at the scale, and with the impact, that it had on the people who assembled on these sites later on.As Mitchell argues in the context of Tiananmen Square, “Spaces such as Tiananmen Square enable opposition to be extended to wider scales, to radiate out into the wider polity”.This is no less true of Jantar Mantar, even if the events there may not have had the immediate world historical importance of the events in Beijing and Leipzig); it enables oppositional representations expand beyond the confines of the local

struggle, in part because they are broadcast and physically noticed. Without the occupation of the space without taking it, however, the kinds of protests that came to be noticed on Jantar Mantar would have remained invisible. Many protesters emphasized that irrespective of the protest outcome, they wanted to be visible and noticed as group and register their grievances to a wider public and the state and bureaucratic authorities.

### **Jantar Mantar: The Domain of the Political**

The Site has created possibility of operational opening for various new kinds of political actors, in the Indian political domain. Without the availability of such sites the voices which resound in the premises of Jantar mantar, may have been submerged, rendered invisible and would have remained without voice. As Sassen in her discussion of the Global cities has said that a number of people remain marginalized and voiceless because they never got an opportunity and a place to raise their voice (Sassen, 2000). Jantar mantar has provided that space for thousands of marginalized voices. Because of such sites growing number and diversity of disadvantaged are assuming a distinctive 'presence' in their engagement with power. They are not marginal anymore; they are new type of political actor despite lacking formal power. These people have acquired presence in the broader political process of the country, outside the formal polity. Normatively, public space such as the site of Jantar Mantar is where legitimate citizens take part in legitimately and visibly public activities and, in so doing, reaffirm their relationship to a state. Mitchell (1996:155) argues, "public space is constructed through a dialectic of inclusion and exclusion, order and disorder, rationality and irrationality, violence and peaceful dissent." Public space is that complexly interwoven medium in which the relationship between citizen and state, power and resistance, come together in and through space in particularly visible ways, which leads to the groups assuming distinctive 'presence' in the political domain.

Mitchell (1995:115) highlights the importance of the political nature of public space in his definition of public space as "an unconstrained space within which political movements can organize and expand into wider arenas." As he (1995:115) suggests, efforts to materially control and create public space are often efforts by excluded groups to represent themselves—to make themselves politically visible—as a part of "the public": "[P]ublic space is a place within which a political movement can stake out the space that allows it to be seen. In public space, political organizations can represent themselves to a larger population. By claiming space in public, by creating public spaces social groups themselves become public."

## **Expansion and concretization of the Public Sphere**

Jantar Mantar has helped expand the arena of 'Public Sphere' and has imparted it a concrete shape, which largely remain limited to the Bourgeois Public Sphere. Garber makes an important distinction between material and metaphoric space, and wonders what claiming spaces for citizenship would mean in material terms. She takes the post-modern view of the public sphere as metaphorical space to task and argues that a central feature of citizenship as it is enacted in the -global city is its intensely concrete character. 'When individuals and groups articulate and demand rights, they are not simply contesting meanings or representations but also engaging in physical activities of assembling and protesting. These activities generate not a singular, abstract public sphere but plural public spaces, in that they act from, on and in space and make spaces.- Without attention to the concrete activities of creating spaces, it becomes very difficult to understand what is political about the use of 'politics of space' as a metaphor. This sentiment is echoed by Young in her discussion of the publicity of the city. 'Cities provide important public spaces-streets, parks, plazas-where people stand and sit together, interact and mingle'. Moreover, 'she contends, politics, 'critically depends on the existence of spaces and forums to which everyone has access' (Young, 1990). The local connotes a sense of place that is concrete, familiar and bounded, seemingly more compatible with the everyday concerns of the citizens. It advances the idea of community as opposed to individualism, of shared space; of common interest of the public- all those things which are rarely found these days. The local also conjures up images of active citizenship. Arendt's insistence that citizenship also requires public places where citizens can interact, talk and persuade. Public meeting places, as Arendt underscores, are the places where norms are debated, values are confronted and clashes negotiated. However the local is not all about public spaces. Arendt was insistent that instead of physical 'public' space it was the discursive elements interacting within the space which deemed it public. Such space of appearance required the rebirth of the rational civic- minded individual who was capable of speech, persuasion and collective action. These actions differentiated public space from private spaces. 'Wherever people gather together' Arendt writes, '[the public sphere] is potentially there, but only potentially, not necessarily and not forever' (1958, p.199) As D'Entreves further explains, the existence of the public sphere is realized 'whenever actors gather together for the purpose of discussing and deliberating about matters of public concern, and it disappears the moment these activities cease' (1992, p.147).

## **An Arena for articulation of variable Citizenships**

Whilst citizenship is most commonly conceptualised in terms of the relationship between citizen and state that is embedded in set of formal rights and obligations, urban theorists have shown growing interest in the city as a social and political space in which citizenship is enacted (Sassen 2000). Cities, argue Isin and Wood (1999: 7), are 'places where the very meaning, content and extent of citizenship are being made and remade'. Jantar Mantar has catalysed the articulations of citizenships and has played an important role in the expansions of the arena citizenship in the context of India. The Indian context is a complex interplay of multiplicities of identities and citizenship rights. Here the Public sphere are not only arenas for formation of discursive opinion; in addition they are arenas for the formation and enactment of social identities. Drawing on the notion of citizenship as an array of practices through which individuals and groups claim new rights and/or defend existing ones, these and other authors (Isin F. , 2000, Fraser, 1993, Sassen, 2000) have conceptualised city spaces such as the urban neighbourhood as places where citizenship is performed. Indian context is characterized by competing claims for rights, recognition and social justice by a range of minority groups (including the homeless, gay men and lesbians, disabled people, minority ethnic groups etc.). In India and its several regions we are witnessing a general trend towards the proliferation of identities which articulates very different patterns of inclusion, rights, obligations and social struggles depending on its historical, social and political trajectories. we observe strange multiplicities and events: in some parts of India, as even basic civil or political, rights are trampled upon by authorities(with AFSPA<sup>3</sup> in effect)thus forcing people from these regions to claim basic civil and political rights, new rights, for example sexual or technological rights, are also being claimed. In the last two decades of the twentieth century, post modernization and globalization have challenged the nation state as the sole source of authority of citizenship and democracy (Isin F. , 2000). This has also broadened the way in which citizenship is understood and debated. Rather than merely focusing on citizenship as legal rights, there is now agreement that citizenship must also be defined as a social process through which individuals and social groups engage in claiming, expanding or losing rights(in the case of secessionist movements). There is no doubt that the debates and struggles over citizenship rights and obligations will intensify not only at the level of the state where, as we have seen, many of these rights are defined, enacted and allocated, but also at other levels. On the global or international level, there is already a lively debate and struggle over cosmopolitan citizenship and democracy (Held, 1995). India is also home different categories of Global Ex-patriates and people in exile. Tibetan Refugees, Burmese refugees, Somalis, Afghan besides a large number of Nepalese and Bangladeshi refugees, which poise newer dilemmas

---

<sup>3</sup> Armed Forces Special Power Act, 1955

and contentions for citizenship. At sub-national levels, the renewed emphasis on citizenship not only as legal rights and obligations but also as social practices through which citizens can have the full right to practice their cultural or religious codes. There have been many demonstration on these categories of citizenship as some wanted they should be included as some tribe, like the Adivasis in Assam, tribes wanted the inclusion of the tribal religious code, which is hitherto unrecognized. Global cities are spaces where the very meaning, content and extent of citizenship are being made and transformed. Being at the interstices of global networks of flows of commodities, services, capital, labour, images and ideas, the global city, both as a milieu and object of struggles for recognition, engenders new political groups that claim either new types of rights or seek to expand modern civil, political and social rights (Turner, 1992). In an evocative phrase, Sassen (1996) describes global cities as places where 'the work of globalization gets done'. We can extend her phrasing and describe cities as places where the work of post-modernization also gets done. Many social groups have effectively demonstrated that modern civil, political and social rights do not adequately address their needs and so claim new rights on the basis of such identities as gender, ethnicity, ecology and sexuality. Their struggles for recognition and social justice revolve around new claims to citizenship, inclusion and engagement with the polity to which they seek membership in a qualitatively different way. Globalization has resulted in reduced real wages and social benefits, limited job retraining opportunities, lack of affordable housing, discriminatory housing and employment practices, environmental hazards, inaccessible and unaccountable political processes, unhealthy work conditions and restricted educational opportunities, which are all confronted and contested in cities. Throughout the history of liberal democracy, workers, women and other marginalized groups have liberal democracy, workers, women and other marginalized groups have struggled to expand the terrain of the public and in so doing, make citizenship rights more encompassing and inclusive. An adequate understanding of the issues surrounding citizenship in present day societies must go well beyond the Marshallian framework. Citizenship identities in the post-modern global city provides an overview of contending notions of citizenship. The contemporary debate on citizenship takes the Marshallian legacy a little forward and forges it to the analysis of identities, entitlements and citizenship in the modern city, as Marshallian tradition is particularly deficient as a perspective on ethnically diverse societies (Turner, 2000). This has particular relevance in India, where a multiplicity of citizenship rights form the conundrum, these rights needs to be defined, negotiated and established through such discursive spheres such as Jantar Mantar.

Citizenship confers, in addition to legal status, a particular cultural identity on individuals and groups. The notion of the 'politics of identity' indicates an important change in the nature of

contemporary politics. Whereas much of the struggles over Citizenship in the early stage of industrialization was about class membership and class struggle in the labour market, citizenship struggles in early 21st century society are more commonly about claims to cultural identity and cultural history. These identities and struggles have been about sexual identity, gay rights, gender equality, aboriginality and minority rights. Most debates about citizenship in contemporary political theory are, as a result, about the questions of contested collective identity in a context of radical pluralism. (Mouffe, 1992). When political scientists therefore refer to 'citizenship' they are not merely thinking about access to scarce economic and political resources, they are concerned ultimately with the questions about identity in civil society and civic culture. The subnationalist and ethnic articulation of issues such as Telangana, Gorkhaland are assertions of people for identity, regional autonomy and monopoly over their symbolic heritages-language, culture and religious faith. The growing struggles of people in defence of natural resources, freedom and personal liberty, lifestyle and the memories of imagined past are bursting out on the social scene of India. Various castes and communities, minorities and ethnic groups demand recognition, a just share in power, and equality and social justice.

The content of citizenship is neither fixed nor finite. Across the history of liberal democracies, the state has been charged with the codification and enforcement of quite distinct citizenship regime-a term which entails a complex and historically negotiated institutional and discursive underpinnings (that is it is institutionally created and also discursively claimed.) Any construction of citizenship assumes an amalgam of compatible political institutions, policy making practices and patterns political representations (Jenson, 1997, p. 631). The concept of citizenship then includes much more than the idea of formal membership in the national community. It is the object of ongoing political struggle and a pivotal component of a broader historical matrix of governance. In particular the content of citizenship defines the relation between the state, civil society and the individual.

### **Democratic deepening**

The exercise of political voice goes to the heart of democracy. In fact, it is difficult to imagine democracy on a national scale without the right of citizens to take part freely in politics. Through their political participation citizens seek to control who will hold public office and to influence what policymakers do when they govern. When they take part politically, citizens communicate information about their preferences and needs and generate pressure on public officials to respond. The protest politics expands the arena of democratic practices; democracy does not remain confined to the electoral system. People discuss and debate issues relevant to policy making and other

relevant components of governance. The site Jantar Mantar, provides that crucial link with the government and messages conveyed through citizen groups adds to the vibrancy of democratic governance. Beyond its instrumental function in permitting activists to communicate their politically relevant concerns, participation is a value in and of itself: conferring upon the individual the dignity that comes with being a full member of the political community.

### **The Symbolic Dimension Of Jantar Mantar**

Kieth and Pile (Keith & Pile, 1993), while discussing this post-modern condition, suggests that spatialities have always produced landscapes that are loaded with multiple meanings. Spaces are simultaneously real, imagined, symbolic) Almost invariably they are contested, In locating the symbolic dimension of a public space, we draw from Edward Soja's (Soja,1996) concept of 'thirdspace'. Drawing from Lefebvre, she developed the notion of trailectics of spatiality: which in the words of Soja is "trailectics of spatiality", of spatial thinking, of the spatial imagination that echoes from Lefebvre's interweaving incantation of three different kinds of spaces: the perceived spaces of materialized Spatial Practice; the conceived space which he defined as Representation of Space; and the lived Spaces of Representation. While the perceived space related to the routine spatial practices, the conceived was understood as the way spaces were represented in popular imaginary by the dominant groups; the lived or the spaces of representation are seen by Lefebvre as distinct from and also encompassing them. Spaces of representation embody "complex symbolism". Here there is a space which is directly lived, spaces that stretches across the images and symbols that accompany it, the space of the "inhabitants" and users"- "this is the dominated-space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects" and tend towards "more or less coherent system of verbal symbols and signs" these are spatial representation of power, combining the real and imagined, and these lived spaces of representation are thus the terrain for the generation of "counter-spaces", spaces of resistance to the dominant order arising precisely from their subordinate, peripheral or marginalized positioning. With its foregrounding of relations of dominance, subordination, and resistance; the space is simultaneously open to be contested, appropriated and remade, is what Soja defines as Third space(Soja,1996 p.67-68). As Lefebvre argues that there is dialectic in the lived world between spaces of representation and representation of spaces, it is recognition of the perpetual need to create, conserve and re-create political spaces.

Kieth and Pile (Keith & Pile, 1993), believe that all spatialities are political because they are the covert medium and disguised expressions of asymmetrical relations of power. Jantar Mantar is also

analysed from the perspective of the 'thirdspace' for the inherent symbolism of the site of protest, which from a conceived representational point of view, might have been a monument of astronomical significance but through the lived practices of the protesters have been reimagined and reproduced as a site of protest; a space of representation of the 'marginalized' and the people on periphery. Protesters have created an alternative geography through transgression; where they have come from the margins to the centre and in doing so had created a new space of resistance.

## Bibliography

Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Calhoun, C. (1992). Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere. In C. Calhoun, *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (pp. 1-48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calhoun, C. (1993). 'New Social Movements' of the Nineteenth Century. *Social Science History* 17 , 385-427.

Calhoun, C. (1989). Tiananmen, Television and the public Sphere: Internationalization of Culture and the Beijing Spring. *Public Culture* 2 , 54-71.

D'Entreves, M. (1992). Hannah Arendt and the Idea of Citizenship. In C. Mouffe, *Dimensions of Radical Democracy*. London: Verso.

Dikec, M. (2005). Space, Politics and the Political. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23 , 171-88.

Fraser, N. (1993). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. In B. Robbins, *The Phantom Public Sphere*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Garber, J. (2000). The City as a Heroic Public Sphere. In F. Isin, *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City* (pp. 257-274). New York: Routledge.

Habermas, J. ( 1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. . . Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harvey, D. (1993). Class Relations, Social Justice and the Politics of Difference. In M. Keith, & S. Pile, *Place and the Politics of Identity* (pp. 41-66). London: Routledge.

Held, D. (1996). *Models of Democracy, 2nd edn*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Held, D. (1991). *Political Theory Today*. Stanford University Press.

Hershkovitz, L. (1993). Tiananmen Square and the Politics of Place. *Political Geography* 12 , 395-420.

Innis, H. (1945[1995]). Democracy and the Free City. In D. Drache, *Staples, Markets, and Cultural Change: Selected Essays* (pp. 482-6). Montreal: Mc-Gill-Queen's University Press.



- Isin, E., & Wood, P. (1999). *Citizenship and Identity*. London: Sage.
- Isin, F. (2000). *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. New York: Routledge.
- Keith, M., & Pile, S. (1993). *Place and the politics of identity*. London: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Oxford, Cambridge-UK: MA: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. (2003). *The Urban Revolution*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). *Writing on the Cities*. In trans. Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Marshall, T. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Massey, D. (1993). Politics and Space/Time. In M. Keith, & S. Pile, *Place and the Politics of Identity* (pp. 141-161). London: Routledge.
- Mitchell, D. (1995). The End of Public space? People's Park, Definitions of Public, and Democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85 , 108-133.
- Mitchell, D. (2003). *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the fight for Public Space*. New York: The Guilford Press .
- Mouffe, C. (1993). *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.
- Oommen, T. (2005). *Crisis and Contention in Indian Society*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: The New Press.
- Sassen, S. (2000). The Global City: Strategic Site/New Frontier. In F. Isin, *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City* (pp. 48-61). New York: Routledge.
- Singh, R. (2001). *Social Movements, Old and New: A Post-Modernist Critique*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Smith, N., & Katz, C. (1993). Grounding Metaphor: Towards a Spatialized Politics. In M. Keith, & S. Pile, *Place and the Politics of Identity* (pp. 67-83). London: Routledge.
- Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace-Journey to Los Angeles and other Real and Imagined Places*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Soja, E. (1989). *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.
- Soja, E. (1980). The Socio-spatial Dialectic. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70 , 207-25.
- Tonkiss, F. (2006). *Space, the city and social theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Turner, B. (2000). Cosmopolitan Virtue. In E. F. Isin, *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. London: Routledge.

Turner, B. (1992). Outline of a Theory of Citizenship. In Mouffe, *Dimensions of Radical Democracy*. London: Verso.

Young, I. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zukin, S. (1995). *The Cultures Of Cities*. Cambridge: M.A.: Blackwell.