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ABSTRACT
Countries in the developing regions or transitional economies are now experiencing an unprecedented pace of urbanization. This phenomenal event involves far more complex system dynamics of human security and livelihoods than any times before. This paper is aimed to highlight these issues from human dimensions where peoples’ choices and values are properly addressed and can value in sociopolitical arena. The philosophical inputs have been taken from the remarkable works of Nobel Laureate Economist Amartya Sen. This paper explores how Sen’s ideas on freedom of choice and capability approach can improve the urban governance in cities like Dhaka, which is an example of hyper urbanization in low income developing regions and experiencing severe poverty and exclusion.
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1. Introduction

Urbanization, undoubtedly an irreversible phenomenon in course of human history, confronts man with numerous unpredictable challenges. How is he to master its growth, regulate its organization and norms, and successfully accomplish its animation for the good of all? Sometimes new proletariats are born as the result of unprecedented growth. They install themselves in the heart of the cities, often abandoned by the rich. They dwell on the outskirts—which become a belt of misery besieging in a still silent protest the luxury which blatantly cries out from centers of consumption and waste. Instead of favoring fraternal encounter and mutual aid, frequently the city fosters discrimination and also indifference. It lends itself to new forms of exploitation and of domination whereby some people in speculating on the needs of others derive inadmissible profits. Behind the facades much misery is hidden, unsuspected even by the closest neighbors; other forms of misery spread where human dignity founders: delinquency, criminality, abuse of drugs and eroticism (idea connection, 2010a).

Cities are extremely complex networks of human activities. Running a city can often be as complicated as running an entire country. Now more than half of the world’s population is living in large cities. In success or failure of cities to serve their populations can have a critical impact on billions of people worldwide. Catastrophic recent episodes in different parts of the world, both natural and man-made, have brought the terms urban shocks or urban vulnerabilities to the front of public attentions as well as public policy. In most of the cases, these shocks take place in or near to urban areas, which have frequently a range of socioeconomic, political and environmental consequences.

However, the analysis of such urban phenomenon through the philosophical inputs on capability approach and freedom of choices by Nobel Laureate Economist Amartya Sen can be instrumental of developing the conceptual frameworks for the study of urban resiliency and sustainability in context of low income developing countries. Recently many parts of the world are experiencing different types of innovative ‘governance’ mechanisms and also being adopted as potentially significant terrains for fostering inclusive development process and planning. It is now widely accepted that in context of low income countries, ‘development’ is something similar to increase the state’s capacity in response to different types of risks or vulnerabilities. It is quite practical to presume that Sen’s thoughts on urban issues, where the citizens should be the agents of change, could be new policy instruments in public policy domain considering human freedoms to choose their future.

This paper will first describe different types of vulnerabilities that Dhaka is now facing or might face in near future followed by exploring the present scenario of political participation. The second part will address the issue of transformative governance and how Sen’s capability approach could be instrumental in achieving those political participation in pursuits of an inclusive society. The final section will presents some synergistic relationships among capability approach, political participation and urban resiliency.
2. World Urbanization and Dhaka City

The world is now experiencing an unprecedented rate of urbanization, which is even faster than originally predicted by the Club of Rome in its Malthusian 1972 report Limits to Growth (Davis, 2006a). In 1950 there were 86 cities in the world with a population of more than one million, today there are 400 and it is now being predicted that by 2015, the number will rise up to 500 (UNDESA, 2002). Cities have absorbed almost two-thirds of the global population explosion since 1950, and last some years growing by one million babies and migrants each week (Population Information Program, 2002). However, the scale and velocity of urbanization in low income developing countries and in the countries of transitional economies completely dwarfs that of Victorian Europe.

Table 1: World Megacities¹

| Urban agglomeration                  | Population (in millions) | Average annual rate of change (percentage) 1975-2007 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
|                                      | 1975 | 2007 | 2025        |                                             |
| 1. Tokyo, Japan                      | 26.6 | 35.7 | 36.4        | 0.9                                         |
| 2. New York-Newark, USA              | 15.9 | 19.0 | 20.6        | 0.5                                         |
| 3. Mexico City, Mexico               | 10.7 | 19.0 | 21.0        | 1.8                                         |
| 4. Mumbai, India                     | 7.1  | 19.0 | 26.4        | 3.1                                         |
| 5. Sao Paolo, Brazil                 | 9.6  | 18.8 | 21.4        | 2.1                                         |
| 6. New Delhi, India                  | 4.4  | 15.9 | 22.5        | 4.0                                         |
| 7. Shanghai, China                   | 7.3  | 15.0 | 19.4        | 2.2                                         |
| 8. Kolkata, India                    | 7.9  | 14.8 | 20.6        | 1.9                                         |
| 9. Dhaka, Bangladesh                 | 2.2  | 13.5 | 22.0        | 5.6                                         |
| 10. Buenos Aires, Argentina           | 8.7  | 12.8 | 13.8        | 1.2                                         |
| 11. Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, USA | 8.9  | 12.5 | 13.7        | 1.1                                         |
| 12. Karachi, Pakistan                | 4.0  | 12.1 | 19.1        | 3.5                                         |
| 13. Cairo, Egypt                     | 6.4  | 11.9 | 15.6        | 1.9                                         |
| 14. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil           | 7.6  | 11.7 | 13.4        | 1.4                                         |
| 15. Osaka-Kobe, Japan                | 9.8  | 11.3 | 11.4        | 0.0                                         |
| 16. Beijing, China                   | 6.0  | 11.1 | 14.5        | 1.9                                         |
| 17. Manila, Philippines              | 5.0  | 11.1 | 14.8        | 2.5                                         |
| 18. Moscow, Russian Federation       | 7.6  | 10.5 | 10.5        | 1.0                                         |
| 19. Istanbul, Turkey                 | 3.6  | 10.1 | 12.1        | 3.2                                         |

Source: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs / Population Division World Urbanization Prospects: The 2007 Revision.
London in 1910 was seven times larger than it had been in 1800. On the contrary, cities like Dhaka, Kinshasa or Lagos are today approximately forty times larger than they were in the 1950s (Davis, 2006b). It is now apparently evident that in many parts of the developing world, urban populations are growing even faster than the capacities of the cities to support their citizens.

At the recent decade, Dhaka has emerged as one of the fastest growing megacities. It had a manageable population of 2.2 million in 1975 and that became 12.3 million in 2000. The growth rate of this urbanizing population during 1974-2000 was 6.9% (UN, 1998). There are very few other cities in the world, which has ever had the experiences of having such a high growth rate in population during this period. Apparently the growth rate of urbanizing people in Dhaka City will also continue to remain high even in the coming years. At 2000-2015 the expected growth rate is 3.6% and will reach a total population of 21.1 million in 2015 (UN, 1999).

**Map 1: Dhaka City**

*Source: Banglapedia (2010)*
Recent population report of the United Nations also highlights the same issue by mentioning Dhaka as one of the top ten cities of the world in terms of population (World Urban Population, 2010). There might be very few cities in the world history which have experienced the phenomenal increase of this order of magnitude. Dhaka has led to a degree of urbanization, which relatively to the level of development was excessive and unprecedented in laissez faire style and many citizens who have experienced this in the first hand use to mention this as ‘Hyperurbanization’ or ‘Overurbanization’. Right now Dhaka is the home of 13 million people and everyday approximately 2600 people come to Dhaka to reside permanently (Ittefaq, 2010).

2. Consequences of Hyper Urbanization

By the year 2000, over half of the world’s populations have crowded into 3% of the earth’s land area. But this trend towards urbanization is dispersed unequally with 17 out of the 20 largest cities in the world being located in low income developing countries or in the countries of transitional economies (idea connection, 2010b).

At the same time, it is also true that the continued expansion of large urban agglomerations creates risks of physical, economic and social breakdowns with the most serious political consequences. Over the decades in both developing and developed countries, urban growth has been accompanied by severe social and economic problems, some of which appear likely to worsen as overall population growth is accompanied by the trend toward greater urban growth (idea connection, 2010c).

In developed countries, problems of environmental deterioration (especially air and water pollution), traffic congestion, and other disamenities are experienced in response to hyperurbanization. But in the developing countries, very often it is almost an impossible task to provide the minimum social services in the rapidly growing urban areas, or to absorb an ever expanding labor force into struggling urban economies. Most cities in the low income countries or in the countries of transitional economy are built organically with least regularized planning interventions in a laissez faire character, which confuses the identity of city communities, creates chaos in the pattern of land uses, travel behavior, wastes resources and prohibits coherent patterns of any kind (idea connection, 2010d).

One of the striking reasons for problems in the megacities of the developing countries is due to the fact that they have materialized ahead of any systematic-regularized movements towards modernization. Many of these cities formed transmission points from which raw materials and food were sent to the metropolises of Europe or North America, and to which manufactured goods returned (idea connection, 2010e). In addition to these, there was tremendous shortage or absence of human and technical resources to deal with the full range of urban development needs. In the 90s, rapid population growth in many Asian and African cities has increased the tendency to outgrow the resources of the economies they are supposed to nourish and support.

Scenario is not very different in Dhaka. Human activities without proper institutional and infrastructural supports are impacting drastically on the quality of
land, air and water. By virtue of its geography, governance, population and urban form, Dhaka suffers extensively urban shocks or vulnerabilities traumas that threaten lives, damage buildings and infrastructures. So megacity Dhaka in one sense is the sign and symbol of a development process that could break down completely in anytime in near future.

Therefore, a clear understanding on different types of urban shocks or vulnerabilities should to be addressed in different phases of planning and implementation, if we need to plan and manage the urban resiliency and sustainability process. For Dhaka, the perceived vulnerabilities are as follows:

(a) Unplanned urbanization: Unplanned urbanization puts tremendous pressure on infrastructure and the performance of basic services delivery to the citizens. Water logging, spread of diseases, depleting or contaminated ground water are some of the public health risks in Dhaka due to laissez faire urban development with little or no planning interventions.

Table 2: The Area and Population Growth of Megacity Dhaka (1951-2001)

| Year | Area in Sq Km | Population |
|------|---------------|------------|
| 1951 | 85.45         | 411,279    |
| 1961 | 124.45        | 718,766    |
| 1974 | 335.79        | 2,068,353  |
| 1981 | 509.62        | 3,440,147  |
| 1991 | 1352.87       | 6,487,459  |
| 2001 | 1530          | 9,912,908  |

Source: Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics Population Census (2001)

During the last 50 years Dhaka has not experienced the same level of planned neighborhoods in comparison to its’ increasing population.
Map 2: Clusters of planned neighborhoods in the evolutionary stages of Dhaka city

Source: Khan and Nilufar (2009)

Therefore the pressure was huge on city governance and infrastructures and overall quality of life. The Livability Index 2010, published by The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), recently highlights the abject situation of urban living in Dhaka, which has ultimately impacts on workforce performance, economy and social sustainability.

(b) Rural-urban migrations: Rural-urban migration is a regular phenomenon for most of the big cities in Global South. In Bangladesh, government has virtually failed to promote country-wide decentralized development. Since Dhaka was the provincial capital of Pakistan (1947-1971), it was the center of all political, economical and social attention. But it experienced a massive level of human in-migration right after its birth as the capital of a sovereign country in December 1971. It was
the popular destination for the low income people, migrated mostly from rural areas and small-medium sized towns. Very few of them could manage basic employments in informal or formal sectors and in most cases, their perceived opportunities and developments remained mostly unattained.

(c) Political Chaos: Dhaka was always the center of politics and most of the political chaos. The totally unstable and unpredictable nature of national politics put always Dhaka to the front of rigorous political demonstrations breakdowns, which impact through huge economic and social loss. According to the Kaufmann et al. (2008), political stability in Bangladesh is worse than in several other South Asian countries.

| Country    | Percentile Rank | Governance Score | Standard Error |
|------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
|            | (0-100)         | (-2.5 to +2.5)   |                |
| Afghanistan| 1               | -2.64            | 0.27           |
| Bangladesh | 9.6             | -1.54            | 0.21           |
| Bhutan     | 77.5            | 0.89             | 0.3            |
| India      | 16.7            | -0.99            | 0.2            |
| Maldives   | 39.2            | -0.1             | 0.3            |
| Nepal      | 7.7             | -1.69            | 0.24           |
| Pakistan   | 1.4             | -2.61            | 0.21           |
| Sri Lanka  | 2.9             | -2.04            | 0.21           |

Source: Kaufmann D., A. Kraay, and M. Mastruzzi (2009)

It is quite apparent that Dhaka is home of huge political unrestness and chaos. Therefore, even though the city is the home of millions of poor and low income families, all these unstabilities and unrestness push the people to more intense urban uncertainty, e.g., loss of employment, social unrestness, severe food or health insecurity.

(d) Natural disasters and impacts through extreme climate events: Dhaka or many other cities in the developing world are exposed to two different types of natural disasters: i) disasters with forecasting, when minimal preparedness can avail and ii) disasters without forecasting, when there is almost no chance of getting minimal preparedness. However during urban floods which are almost a yearly phenomenon for Dhaka, people can have some forecasting and preparedness. Nevertheless urban floods make negative impacts on urban lives and economy. Apart from all perceived economic losses, people experience a tremendous impact on human lives combining social, environmental and political stresses. On the other side, where people get no forecasting, the chances for damage are more than perceivable limit. At the recent times, several scientific findings highlights that
geologically Dhaka is located in an earthquake prone location. The Great Bengal Earthquake attacked almost a hundred years ago. At the recent time, seismologists could identify several indications for upcoming earthquakes. If earthquake hits Dhaka, the amount of damage would be simply huge due to unplanned development and lack of preparedness. The recent earthquake of Haiti and Chile could be an evidence of showing perceived human damage and economic loss. In addition to these, Dhaka is also very much prone to different climatic impacts; preliminarily in two different ways: firstly, by increasing the floods and by heat stress. Waterlogging and drainage congestion due to river floods and excessive rainfall during the monsoon costs huge urban economic and public health damage. In addition to this, at the recent years urban heat shocks during the mid-summer are becoming a regular phenomena, which have also and this has also negative impacts on public health and urban livelihoods (Alam and Rabbani, 2007).

(e) Commodity price increase and inflation: Increasing commodity price is one of the regular phenomena in Dhaka. It has drastic impacts on urban livelihoods and food security particularly among the low-income and poor families. Hyper inflation could be an integral part of this entire phenomenon. In the 90s, the world had experienced the structural shocks by massive inflation in Buenos Aires and afterwards massive social turmoil as consequence.

In addition to all these urban shocks and vulnerabilities, the social costs of concentration in over-populated metropolises huge, particularly in the areas of transport, labor, workspace, public security and social services, with the indirect costs including travel to work time, pollution, crime and social congestion (Idea connection, 2010e).

4. Scenario of Post Colonial Urban Governance in Dhaka

Governance issue in Dhaka is quite complex and interdependent with different socioeconomic and political factors and histories. Primarily present patterns of urban governance are heavily influenced by colonial heritage.

The purpose of colonial administration was its own preservation, and the preservation of its status of distinctness and aloofness from the people they ruled. In usual cases, the functions of the colonial administration were to maintain law and order, and to ensure a minimum level of infrastructure services in urban areas (where their functionaries usually located)-e.g. water, electricity, railways to connect urban centers. These functions were to be maintained so that the objective of surplus extraction would continue smoothly without any obstacles (Mehrotra, 2008a).

The post colonial state was superimposed on the structure of the colonial state (Mehrotra, 2008b). The colonial bureaucrats had relatively little reason to be a rent seeker at the personal level. Their primary objective was to facilitate surplus extraction for their Kingdom. But very soon after the independence, comparisons were being made among the post-colonial citizenry between the morally uprightness of the colonial...
administrators and their post colonial successors. The colonial administrators could afford to be morally upright at an individual level, even in the absence of democracy, let alone deep democratic decentralization and accountability to the people (Mehrotra, 2008c).

Decades between 60s and 80s, ‘development’ mostly initiated by the state within a regulative planning framework and within this framework, the concept of governance was embedded in strengthening the public administration for the implementation of state initiated development (Fukuda Parr, 2002). Afterwards in developing countries multilateral development organizations like World Bank and United Nations Development Programme became more visible with their policy agenda on economic liberalization. In a consequence ‘governance’ concept became one of the core concepts of international development manifestations. In the 90s, developing countries experienced another transition towards ‘good governance’ agenda in pursuits of creating efficient local institutions, which was again advocated by the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (Kala, 2007a).

However, presently (urban) local governance in Bangladesh shows mostly all the vices and shortcomings of national politics and its weaknesses is rooted mainly in institutional weakness and national political culture (Siddiqui, 2000; Rahman and Rahman, 2005a; World Bank, 2007a; Osman, 2009a).

Dhaka City Corporation (DCC) is the most visible local authority in Dhaka city. It is headed by a democratically elected mayor. DCC is comprised with 10 zones and 90 wards and each headed by a democratically elected ward commissioner. Wards constitute the most localized level of urban municipal governance. As the closest representatives to urban residents, ward commissioners play a critical and role in urban governance. Unfortunately due to the absence of defined-jurisdictional framework of duties and responsibilities ward commissioners are left to perform their responsibilities just by their own initiatives and commitments to their people (Banks, 2008a). Significant variations in efficiency responding to the needs of mass population end up with poor quality of living.

Although ward commissioners are responsible for managing the development works and day-to-day running of the wards, ward commissioners are provided with little in the way of resources and power and have only three staff members: a security guard, a secretary and an errand boy (Banks, 2008b). The ward commissioners themselves select their ward’s development priorities, mainly service and infrastructural developments such as roads, sewage and drainage maintenance, and improvements in electricity and then submit proposals to the relevant authority/ies, such as DCC or Dhaka Water and Sewage Authority (DWSA). However, financial budgets are controlled and channeled through DCC. DCC itself struggles to get the necessary funds from its tax base revenue and central government transfer and therefore that impact on ward level development financing. In addition to these, 10-20% development funds are lost due to corruption in different levels of public administration (Banks, 2008c).

In addition to these, the World Bank points also the overlapping responsibilities and legal authorities of different line ministries and government’s agencies to provide urban services to the poor (World Bank, 2007b). This polarization of power and responsibilities between center and periphery is a typical trait of postcolonial states. At the end, there is corruption, what is pervasive and involves public officials’ unaccountability both to their superiors and to the public scrutiny (Ullah, 2005a).
5. Present Capacity of Political participation in Dhaka

Political participation is about taking part in politics for shaping the dimensions of public policy domains. The general level of participation in a society is the extent to which the people as a whole are active in politics, e.g., the number of active people multiplied by the amount of their actions, to put it arithmetically.

In Bangladesh except the voting citizens have little power to exert political pressure to ruling class and local decision-makers (Rahman and Rahman, 2005b). A formal democratic order is not enough to produce a democratic system where citizens control public policies and force the leadership to take responsibility for their actions, i.e. accountable governance. Effective accountability depends majorly on having systems and processes in place that are understood, accepted and respected by everyone concerned, with effective sanctions applied when transgressions occur (Kamal, 2000a). Present status of urban governance in Dhaka seems to lack these requirements. The main reasons for people’s lack to influence and participate in decision-making are related to dysfunctional institutions, misconduct of the administrative personnel, lack of information, articulation of local bodies and politics of patronage (Kamal, 2000b).

Table 4: Governance Indicators in Bangladesh

| Governance Indicator (2008)         | Percentile Rank (0-100) | Governance Score (-2.5 to +2.5) | Standard Error |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Voice and Accountability          | 30.8                    | -0.61                           | 0.12           |
| Government Effectiveness          | 22.7                    | -0.77                           | 0.16           |

Source: Kaufmann D., A. Kraay, and M. Mastruzzi (2009)

In addition to this, the Economists Intelligence Unit (EIU) also provided Democracy Index for different countries. Indicators particularly concerning on ‘Participation’ are sub categorized under the Index Political Participation (i.e. to the degree of participation in political life), Electoral Process and Pluralism (i.e. to the effective share of pluralism in the different electoral processes) and Political Culture (i.e. to the political culture of citizens). Each of the sub-categories is expressed along a scale ranging from 0 to 10 (0 is the lowest score and 10 is the highest score). For each of these indexes, the following formula was applied:

\[
\text{Index} = \frac{\text{Country Score}}{10}
\]
Table 5: Participation Index

| Political Participation | 4.44 |
|-------------------------|------|
| Index                   | .444 |
| Electoral Process and Pluralism | 7.00 |
| Index                   | .700 |
| Political Culture       | 3.75 |
| Index                   | .375 |

**Source:** Economic Intelligence Unit (2008)

In Bangladesh, although democratic elections have increased representation and participation at the recent years, questions might arise on the depth and effectiveness of this participation. Frequently there occurs external pressures as ‘vote buying’, as the practice of payments in exchange for votes or payments to facilitate presence at protests or demonstrations indicates monetary obligations can become the major facilitators behind this political participation, thus undermining independent political representation (Banks, 2008d).

Inclusive development or the planning for urban resiliency largely depends on the quality and extent of political participation. Bangladeshis are experienced in mobilizing through either conventional forms of political participation (in the last election voter turnout was approximately 80%) or unconventional ones (strikes, protests in the streets, etc.). However, these elements provide a bias picture of reality without a contextualization. In truth, the quality of political participation seems not so positive considering scholars’ claims that describes Bangladesh’s political regime as unconsolidated or illiberal democracy, and essentially based on patronage and neo-patrimonialism system (Kamal, 2000b; Islam, 2006b; Khan, 2007a; Rahaman, 2007a; Quadir, 2007). Political phenomena are often described with two concepts: criminalization of politics and politicization of crime² (Khan, 2007b).

To analyze political participation in Bangladesh, it is important to consider the “gatekeeper” role of political parties between citizens and the state. After independence declaration’s, Bangladesh has expressed a polarized pluralist party system (nowadays there are over one hundred parties), dominated by two parties: the Awami League (AL) and Bangladesh National Party (BNP). These two parties collect the majority of voters’ preference and have been at the top of government alliance since 1991. Political competition between the major parties is extremely confrontational and violent (Devine 2008). Regardless of the ruling coalition, the opposition and the government accuse each other of not respecting the democratic rules (Islam, 2006; Rahaman, 2007b).

Although, the two major parties by their political discourse tend to differ from each other, fragmentation and political conflict in Bangladesh is not rooted in social cleavages. Political parties in Bangladesh do not fulfill either classical functions or educating citizens to democracy. Parties are more like instruments of power based on patronage relation and on a neo-patrimonial system (Islam, 2006; Rahaman, 2007c).
The leadership of parties is not selected by a democratic process where members indicate who should lead them but follows dynastical lines (Rahaman, 2007d). Therefore this is clearly evident that in Bangladesh political freedoms are not fully effective rights. Political participation is biased by inequalities in socio-economic status and is strongly constrained by the party system and dysfunctional political culture. The biggest cost is paid by unprivileged social classes and citizens, who can exert limited powers in setting the political agenda.

World is experiencing at the recent year an increasing public and policy attention for greater democratization of decision-making processes. UNDP (2002) perceives democratic governance as a set of principles and core values that allow poor people to gain power through participation while protecting them from arbitrary, unaccountable actions in their lives by governments, multinational corporations and other forces. In fact, the need for democratic governance lies in the conviction that the issue of development is strictly linked to the extent of political participation and implementation of a substantial democracy. There is a need, therefore, to expand the range of solutions to the problem of human sufferings and to search afresh for ways to achieve a situation where continuous improvements to the goals of human development and the resiliencies to the vulnerabilities can become policy for the urban settlements (Berwari and Mutter, 2005c).

6. Capability Approach in expanding Human Choices

Capability Approach suggests the overriding objective of development, which is the expansion of human capabilities rather than mono-centric economic growth. Growth is necessary for development, but it is not always sufficient (Clark, 2005b). Frediani (2007a) also highlights the core characteristic of the capability approach, which is to de-emphasize an exclusive preoccupation with the income-led evaluation methods, and to focus more generally on the ability, people have to achieve the things they value. Therefore it is possible to interpret that Sen believes the well-being can be measured by assessing the levels of peoples’ freedoms and choices rather than calculating their income or consumption.

However, Sen’s approach for assessing the well-being consists two specific aspects: a) capabilities and b) functionings. As it has been already mentioned that ‘Capabilities’ are the freedoms people have to achieve the kinds of lives they reason to value. Simultaneously those states of doing or being which people value Sen termed as ‘Funditioning’ (Frediani, 2007b). Defining these issues, Sen was actually inspired by the Aristotelian norms, when ‘development’ was conceptualized as the process of expansion of peoples’ freedom to be and do what they might value (Sen, 1996).

Therefore in that context for many low income countries poverty alleviation policies and action plans should be implemented in expanding peoples’ opportunities to pursue the goals they value. Poor income in that sense just one aspect of poverty and according to Sen that is neither the sole content not the leading cause of it. It is quite possible to synergize this aspect with the urban development challenges in relatively poor regions, particularly in the low income developing countries like Bangladesh.
Sen’s ideology on ‘development’ offers an opportunity for the policy makers to break with the dualistic tradition by moving towards a more integrated understanding of the relationship between different interrelated issues. However, Sen does not propose an operational guideline to measure capabilities, rather he emphasizes the needs for democratic processes to identify the list of valued capabilities, which are context and culturally sensitive (Robeyns, 2003). Sen believes, in his words, “the people have to be seen, in this (development as freedom) perspective, as being actively involved-given the opportunity-in shaping their own destiny, and not just as passive recipients of the fruits of cunning development programs” (Sen, 1999: 53). Sen presents three arguments in supporting his positions: (a) the direct importance of democratic political freedoms and civil rights for basic capabilities, including that of political and social participation; (b) their instrumental role in enhancing the hearing the people get, including their claim to economic needs; and (c) and their constructive role for conceptualizing needs (Mehrotra, 2008d).

7. Public Policy Transitions towards Transformative Governance

Urban agglomerations have seen always as the benchmarks of the greatness of human civilizations. The settlement planning and governance of Mohenjo-daro, Babylon, Alexandria, Rome, Pompeii and Naples are some of the mentionable demonstration of human innovation and engineering works. Some of these great historical cities were completely destroyed due to different natural and man-made disasters, while many others survived from catastrophes. The resilience of cities in the modern ages has been demonstrated time and again, as cities as engines of economic growth have bounced back to life, but often at huge costs and miseries. This could be avoided if the cities are better planned to mitigate the hazards of nature and the vulnerabilities of socioeconomic and environmental conditions that confront them (IDMC 2, 2009). Therefore planning for shock resilient cities is at the center of contemporary urban development initiative and public policy domain.

The systematic analysis of resilient cities is relatively new in public policy domain. A resilient city is capable of withstanding severe shocks without either immediate chaos or permanent deformations or ruptures. Designed in advance to anticipate and recover from the impacts of shocks, resilient cities are based on principles derived from past experience with disasters in urban areas. While they may bend from hazard forces, they do not break. Composed of networked social communities, lifeline systems and the capacities of local institutions, resilient cities are able to adapt and rebound to new levels of sustainability (Godschalk, 2003). A city without resiliency planning could be extremely vulnerable to different types of disasters or shocks, particularly when we are experiencing the increasing concentration of people, infrastructure and human activities in the urban spatial boundary.

What do all types of urban shocks, disasters, vulnerabilities or political instability have in common? They all reflect threats and challenges, which have impacts on
human security. Therefore the need to establish the transformative practices is at the core of human survivability and sustainable planning practice. Different types of transformative practices are needed to cope with the continuing and unabated pace of change driven by the (structural) developments challenges. So a shift is needed from a more regulative, bureaucratic approach towards a more strategic, synergistic, peoples’ centered, implementation and development-led approach for tackling the urban challenge in developing world. People around the world seem to have lost confidence in the effectiveness of their governments-and often seem to be losing fair in democracy (UNDP, 2002).

Almost all dimensions of urban development challenges are closely interlinked with the status and quality of governance. While good governance contributes to human development and prosperity, poor governance can shatter the lives of those who are most vulnerable and need it most; the urban poor.

Good governance is an effective public policy instrument in bringing government closer to the people and building trust, transparency and accountability. The same study concludes from a 12 country survey that there is weak evidence that decentralization automatically empowers more people, reduces poverty or mitigates spatial inequality, but rather decentralization works and empowers people only when structures are open to participatory practices (UNDP, 2001a). Sen perceived the need for re-evaluating the framework of development governance to encompass a much wider concept that centers on development and freedom of choices rather than a scientific debate on poverty versus prosperity (Removing Freedoms, 2007).

The urban transformation is characterized by a growth in scale and complexity of the economic, social and political networks in which actors take place (Dijst and Schenkel, 2002). At the recent years in several low income and transitional developing countries transformative nature of Governance has appeared to be a rational choice for dealing the urbanization challenges. Sen’s theory on capability approach is at the center of this change dynamics. This newly developed governance framework can offer the state and its people more openness, participation, legitimacy, accountability, effectiveness, equity, coherence and efficiency through the capability development in different levels of public policy domain. In addition to this, Transformative Governance involving capability approach and freedoms of choices philosophy can play an instrumental role for integrating economic, social and political considerations with equal importance. Sen (1999a) perceives the Transformative Governance, which is the core of popularly researched ‘deliberate democracy’, as the people have to be seen as being actively involved-given the opportunity-in shaping their own destiny, and not just as passive recipients of the fruits of cunning development programs. Sen also argues that humanistic dimensions of development should be measured in terms of increasing capabilities within five broad areas, which he mentions as five freedoms: political freedoms, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency (guarantees of openness and rights to information) and protective security (Bamberger, 2006a). Sen views development not only based on the standard economic framework, but also focusing on poverty, inequality and human development. Since his Tanner Lecture on “Equality of What” at the Stanford University in 1979, he has refined and defended the framework, which directly concerned with human capability and freedom (Clark, 2005a).
8. Transformative Urban Governance in Global South

Urban planning and development is often reviewed from the perspectives of different philosophical, ideological and methodological approaches by planners, architects and social scientists (Levent and Nijkamp, 2009). Conventionally the policy experts decide how to promote and plan for development. This entails a limited set of values and ethics, which are selected and prescribed by powerful nations or international development agencies. In case of urban planning, this actually reflects a tradition of classic urban development models, either of planned cities (e.g. 19th century Paris) or the garden cities developed by chocolate manufacturers and steel barons (Bamberger, 2006b). However, both of the approaches ignore the spontaneous and unplanned “middle city” of Global South, which is the home of millions of people, restricting the ability of its inhabitants to lead the lives they value for their lives and living. Despite the huge investments in urban development, the number of people has grown dramatically in urban region. Now it is almost a fatalistic acceptance that cities and their problems will continue to grow in the coming years.

Urbanization is no longer just a response to employment creations for the people; it is also driven by other factors like empowerment, entitlement and sense of belongingness. Policy makers will continue to make the mistakes if the primary focus continues to be economic issues, employment creation or physical improvement of the city (Bamberger, 2006c). A 30 year panel study in the Favelas (hillside slums) of Rio de Janeiro shows that even though physical conditions have improved significantly, Favelas continue to suffer from social poverty as residents still fight for communication space in the media and violence continues to be a major determinant of deprivations (Perlman, 2002). A successful urban development strategy must consider the process of ensuring increasing freedoms and capabilities for individuals and communities (Bamberger, 2006d).

During the cold war era, there were always debates between the competing socialist and capitalist models of development for the control and use of the factors of production. However, none of them paid proper attention to the role of the individual as agent rather than patient. The nature of the debate has now changed, because of the discrediting of the socialist model and the growing importance of nongovernmental organizations, media and civil societies. Policy objectives have widened, and social investment is now a crucial component of development (Bamberger, 2006e).

Latin America experienced always creative transformation of the urban governance models developed in the North (Irazabal, 2004). Several researchers and development practitioners mentioned this process. A resilient urban development planning requires a greater understanding by giving priority to inductive, community defined priorities and approaches and development evaluations must place greater reliance on individual and household level indicators and use more participatory, community led approaches with less emphasis on top down data collection and analysis (Bamberger, 2006f).

This is now widely accepted that the key to urban development policy making is the involvement of the political representation of the people and communities at the local level-primarily through local government, municipal and service authorities (Berwari and Mutter, 2005a).
9. Concluding Remarks

Sen perceives individual freedoms as the main trigger of meaningful and sustaining development. Capabilities Approach shows us, the development and resilience of a society has not to be intended as the level of income per capita and GDP growth. They rather are to be considered a process of expanding substantive freedoms (capabilities), that empowers individuals’ ability to choose what to be or what to do following their values, attitudes and sensibilities in pursuits of resiliency (Sen, 1999b: 78). Economic and social security depends strictly on political freedoms and democracy. It happens because the political freedoms produce the political incentives that encourage good governance. In democratic regimes, governments in order to maintain consensus and power have to meet social needs and to work for the people. In other words, deep democratic decentralizations endow citizens the weapons of protest, voice and loyalty, what can be instrumental of punishing or rewarding governments.

In many countries, Innovative attempts to implement reforms have been doomed because the failures of cities to develop their civic capacities—the capacity to build and maintain a broad social and political multisectoral coalition in pursuit of common goals. In Dhaka context, if the government needs to develop a framework for shock resilient urban management, there is almost no ways without developing an inclusive and capability approach oriented development strategies, where people can enjoy their belongingness and freedom of choice in different phases of planning, development and management. Actually where the functional performances of democracy and freedoms of choices are good, information spreads more quickly and public criticisms come more easily, making a quick response by the government to the extreme events essentials and therefore resiliency becomes not any longer a theoretical or paper concept, it works rather in reality.

Sen believes “Development” is a participatory and pleasant working process and people can make it even more pleasant and inclusive by allowing everyone to take active part by sharing their voices and arguments. The key is to let people make decisions about their own lives so they can choose the kind of life they value. If we observe the present increasing trend of urban exclusion or poverty, we can also realize the importance of freedoms of choices and capability development of the people and their political participation, where deep democratic decentralization will play the pivotal role. In a megacity like Dhaka and having a population more than 15 millions, if it is not possible to introduce Transformative Governance ensuring freedom of choice, probably Dhaka will be no other choices without being entrapped with poverty as well as tyranny, poor economic opportunities along with systematic social deprivation, neglect of public facilities as well as intolerance or over-activity of repressive states and virtually all urban vulnerabilities and shocks will turn into disasters costing impassable human loss.
Notes:

1. Urban agglomerations are ordered according to their population size in 2007.
2. Criminalization of the politics happens when a political force accuses its political rivals of being criminal; instead, politicalization of crime occurs pursuing political ends by illegal means.
3. UNDP (2002) reports that in a global survey when 500000 people in 60 countries were asked “Would you say that your country is governed by the will of the people”. Nearly 70% said “no”. The same survey also asked, “Does the government respond to the will of the people?”. Only 10% said “yes”.
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