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Introduction

Charlotte Lemanski and Colin Marx

This book sets out to explore the reasons why a city-spatial analysis is crucial to contemporary interpretations of, and policy responses to, urban poverty. In recent decades, there has been widespread recognition, within both academic and policy arenas, that the scale of the city is of utmost importance in understanding contemporary social, political, economic and cultural life. This perspective is typically justified by the oft-repeated incantation that more than half of the world’s population now live in urban areas (often overlooked in this justification is that urbanisation is not restricted to cities). At the same time, traditional interpretations of poverty as largely rural have lost traction, as aid agencies and scholars alike increasingly recognise the dominance of urban poverty, particularly in the rapidly urbanising Global South. However, whilst the dominance of these two agendas (the city and urban poverty) is now well established, what is striking is the absence of connections between research addressing the spatiality of the city (typically located in geographical approaches) and research exploring the dimensions of urban poverty (situated within poverty studies and development studies).

Essentially, while geographers have critically debated the ways in which the spaces of the city play a role in the formation of urban culture/politics/economics, and poverty scholars have scrutinised the spatial distribution of poverty, very little addresses the ways in which the spaces of the cities themselves are active agents in creating and sustaining unequal distributions. A noteworthy exception is Lakshman Yapa’s work that implicates Geography (as a discipline) in the perpetuation of poverty in the Global South. He locates the problem in the basic geographical argument that ‘the spatial variation of a problem such as poverty can reveal the intensity of what causes that problem. Presumably
areas where the problem is the most experienced must contain a high level of the causative elements’ (Yapa, 2002: 44).

The title of this book, *The City in Urban Poverty*, is perhaps a confusing start, and indeed could potentially be criticised as oxymoronic. After all, surely the point of urban poverty is that it exists in cities (and towns)? However, the starting premise of this book is our belief that a rather simplistic approach to urban poverty has historically been taken, one that embraces urban poverty as a process that exists in the spaces of the city. Instead, we seek to turn things on their head; arguing that the city itself is also in urban poverty, that is to say that the spaces of the city play a crucial role not merely in containing urban poverty (as typically assumed), but also in re-producing and perpetuating processes of exploitation and inequality. So the city is both in and of urban poverty (and vice versa).

Consequently, this book seeks to explicitly address what are currently implicit spatial aspects of urban poverty, and in doing so, promote the spatial analytical framework that lies at the core of ways of understanding urban poverty. Specifically, it highlights the dynamics of interactions between urban spaces and processes of exploitation, rather than merely embracing space (urban or rural) as a static container for poverty. In so doing, the book makes a claim for a new spatial politics of urban poverty and thereby intends to broaden the range of strategies for poverty reduction available to scholars and policy makers. In addition, the book also brings into visibility the ways in which the spaces of cities – particularly in the Global South – are contributing new insights into the dynamics of urban poverty more generally.

This introductory chapter outlines the primary argument upon which the book is grounded (i.e., that attending to the spatiality of urban poverty highlights the dynamics and processes of poverty as well as identifying the location of these processes), as well as providing a brief summary of the chapters that follow. The substantive chapters address a variety of empirical contexts and thematic foci, drawn together by a common recognition of the importance of incorporating the spatiality of the city into analyses of urban poverty. Finally, a summary of the book’s cross-cutting arguments as well as lessons for future urban poverty research and policy-based agendas are provided in the conclusion.

**What is ‘urban’ poverty?**

In recent decades there have been notable attempts to understand the emergence and perpetuation of urban poverty in cities in the Global
South, countering the long (and ongoing) assumption that poverty in the South is primarily rural. Surprisingly, given the diversity of cities, experiences of poverty, and scholars and policy makers engaged in defining and measuring poverty, there is remarkable consensus on what ‘urban’ poverty is. Urban poverty is poverty that occurs in urban areas. The characteristics that make up the definitions of urban poverty, then, are the characteristics of urban areas and cities. What is far more contentious is which characteristics are appropriate to draw upon in defining and measuring poverty. In this section, we summarise the characteristics of the city that are commonly identified as defining urban poverty, and then move on to the consequences of this definition.

The attempts to define urban poverty – specifically in cities in the Global South – are few and far between. However, before considering definitions of urban poverty it is helpful to remind ourselves of what made it necessary to start defining urban poverty in cities in the Global South. In our view, there were four factors in the late 1980s and early 1990s that made it imperative to begin understanding urban poverty in these cities more clearly. The first was the evidence that general economic growth was not leading to poverty reduction in cities. The second was that the structural adjustment policies imposed on countries in the Global South were having differential impacts on urban and rural populations. The third was the evidence of growing poverty in cities and it was not clear whether this was due to poor people moving to cities and/or cities (further) impoverishing people. The fourth were the initial signs that many countries in the Global South were starting to experience urbanisation at a rapid scale and pace.

In this milieu, Ellen Wratten’s (1995) seminal contribution identified four characteristics that have been repeatedly picked up and developed by others (see Table I.1).

Wratten’s (1995) contribution has stood the test of time because few would argue with the characteristics that she draws attention to. People come together in cities as environments that are characterised by greater proximities to different land uses, social groups and densities of the built environment. Government is typically more proximate, and it is much more difficult to engage in livelihoods that are not mediated by money. Consequently, individually and in combination, the different characteristics cause, and are symptoms of, various forms of impoverishment in cities. Reflective of the period in which a debate about whether the urban or rural were more important in addressing poverty (see, for example, Lipton’s 1977 *urban bias*), the notion of urban poverty has rural poverty as its primary referent (even as Wratten is at pains to side-step such distinctions).
In the lineage we are tracing, we identify David Satterthwaite’s (2001) contribution as the next seminal attempt to develop an understanding of urban poverty. Synthesising a wide range of literature with his own unique vantage point, he expands on Wratten to identify eight different characteristics of cities that define urban poverty (see Table I.2).

Although the debate about the relative importance of rural versus urban poverty is still ongoing, and the eight aspects have been adapted from a rural poverty frame (drawing on Baulch, 1996), Satterthwaite is more concerned with broadening the understanding of urban poverty per se than whether there are any specific distinctions between urban and rural poverty. Overwhelmingly, the definition of urban poverty that is elaborated builds on the recognition that life in urban areas is mediated by money, and that cities are recognised centres of economic growth and political power, the focus of overlapping state institutions of different kinds and levels, NGOs and international aid organisations. That urban life is mediated by money necessitates access to regular income through employment and/or a secure asset to save or generate

### Table I.1 Wratten’s four characteristics of urban poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban environmental and health risks</td>
<td>Urban poor face environmental health risks relating to their spatial proximity of their residence to harmful industrial processes in relation to competition for land and dense and overcrowded living conditions that are poorly serviced. In short, the externalities of urban industrial production are borne disproportionately by the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability arising from commercial exchange</td>
<td>Commercial exchange mediates access to more necessities, commodities and services in urban areas, making people more dependent on access to cash through various forms of employment or control of assets and resources which are irregular, infrequent and/or poorly paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social diversity, fragmentation and crime</td>
<td>Less coherent social bonds, households that are split and/or headed by more vulnerable people, and alienation leading to crime appear more common in urban areas and impoverish people further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability arising from the intervention of the state and police</td>
<td>For many urban poor people, their contact with the state is in negative ways – corruption, confiscation, poor policing and difficulties accessing justice increase poverty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2  Satterthwaite’s eight aspects of urban poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate income</td>
<td>Inadequate income (because it is low, irregular, informal and/or infrequent) leads to inadequate consumption of necessities including food and, often, safe and sufficient water; often problems of indebtedness, with debt repayments significantly reducing income available for necessities or for dealing with fluctuating prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate, unstable or risky asset base</td>
<td>Non-material and material assets including educational attainment and housing for individuals, households or communities cannot be converted or are of low value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate shelter</td>
<td>Typically poor quality, overcrowded and insecure, which imposes unnecessary expenses and fails to provide a sustainable platform for developing enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate provision of ‘public’ infrastructure</td>
<td>Piped water, sanitation, drainage, roads, footpaths, etc. which increases health burden and often work burden, impoverishing households and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate provision for basic services</td>
<td>Such as day-care/schools/vocational training, health care, emergency services, public transport, communications, and law enforcement impoverishes because these have to be sought privately or because of unnecessary exposure to risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited or no safety net</td>
<td>Basic consumption cannot be maintained when income falls; also access to shelter and health care can no longer be paid for imposing additional costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate protection of poor groups’ rights through the operation of law</td>
<td>Exclusion from laws and regulations regarding civil and political rights, occupational health and safety, pollution control, environmental health, protection from violence and other crimes, protection from discrimination and exploitation impoverishes by exposing poor people to unnecessary burdensome costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorer groups’ voicelessness and powerlessness</td>
<td>Within political systems and bureaucratic structures, leading to little or no possibility of: receiving entitlements; organising; making demands; and getting a fair response. No means of ensuring accountability from aid agencies, NGOs, public agencies and private utilities to address priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Column 1 reproduced from Satterthwaite (2001: 146).
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most recent contribution to the story we are tracing here, Mitlin and Satterthwaite (2013) develop these themes in-depth with great insight. In Mitlin and Satterthwaite (2013), a further aspect is added to the eight aspects already listed (see Table I.3). The nine aspects are further elaborated in terms of determinants (op. cit.: 278–280) and associated with particular institutional forms and organisational arrangements in the companion volume of Satterthwaite and Mitlin (2014).

Before considering some of the consequences of this lineage of debate about urban poverty definitions, it is worth briefly turning to other contributions. One example is that of Philip Amis’ (1995) contribution. It is useful to consider because, while it cites Wratten, it highlights other factors and draws attention to other strands in the debates about definitions of urban poverty that we are sketching here. It therefore illustrates other issues that we have chosen not to elaborate, but which are important for a broader picture.

For Amis (1995) the discussions of urban poverty miss the point by focusing on urbanisation. For him, the process of proletarianisation or the extent to which people’s livelihoods depend on a cash wage determines urban poverty. That is, the problem is not so much specifically ‘urban’ as related to capitalism (and consequently this type of poverty could potentially exist in cash-based rural economies). Amis identifies nine characteristics of poverty in urban areas – many of which are in common with the dominant lineage traced above. For example, his definitions share a focus on the more commoditised aspects of urban life, insecure and low-value assets, exposure to industrial pollution, little access to alternative ‘common’ goods when private goods are exhausted, and uneconomical (and hence relatively more expensive) purchasing of commodities, goods and services necessitated by irregular/low incomes.

What is distinctive is his proletarianisation argument that urban poverty is primarily defined by the positions of people in labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I.3  Additional aspects of urban poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High prices paid for many necessities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is often because of inadequate or no public provision, which means that, for example, water has to be purchased from vendors or kiosks, access to toilets has to be paid for and fees must be paid in order for children to go to school, and these are costs that other wealthier groups do not incur because they are either provided with the service on a different basis or the necessities are purchased in more economical units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Reproduced from Mitlin and Satterthwaite (2013: 89–90).*
markets, which in turn are shaped by the nature of labour markets, market segmentation and levels of casual labour in cities in the Global South. These positions in the labour market are kept in place by rigidities that are determined by education, forms of social discrimination and the location of residential neighbourhoods in relation to employment opportunities. Additional elaborations such as this highlight a broader debate but also serve to underscore the importance of income as a defining element of urban poverty.

Returning to the historicity of urban poverty definitions, rather than synthesising this ongoing and finely nuanced debate, we instead embrace existing definitions (with their complexities and contradictions), in order to concentrate on analysing the purpose of these definitions. In our view, definitions of urban poverty have emerged in response to two of the issues presciently identified by Amis and Rakodi (1994) and a third directly related to the spatial themes of this book. The first is that urban poverty cannot only be defined by income and must include other characteristics. The density of multiple and overlapping aspects of urban life means that there are more chances of processes of impoverishment acting cumulatively and thus requiring action through multiple and simultaneous policies and strategies. The second is that the diversity of life, livelihoods, and aspirations of cities and towns means that it is much more difficult (if it ever were possible?) for experts to define which aspects of poverty to address first and thus, again, it is critical to simultaneously address urban poverty on multiple fronts.

The third overarching goal of urban poverty definitions has been to identify who and where poor people are in cities and towns. Notwithstanding Mitlin’s (1995) and Mitlin and Satterthwaite’s (2013) evidence that urban poverty continues to be misrepresented and underestimated, what current definitions of poverty are extremely good at is identifying where urban poverty exists within cities and who the people are that live or work in such areas. In this way, the definitions of urban poverty help us with an important aspect of the spatiality of urban poverty by primarily identifying the distribution and location and then the quantification of women and men, boys and girls, in cities and towns who can be defined as poor, as well as the qualification of this poverty.

The policy consequence of current views of the spatiality of urban poverty

The ability to identify the spatial distribution and location of urban poverty and then quantify and qualify its multiple characteristics is
fundamental to poverty reduction or eradication. Consequently, we have a rich spatial vocabulary for analysing urban poverty – notwithstanding distinctions between ‘deserving’ and ‘non-deserving poor’ that prefigure any calculations (Dean, 1991). There are the obvious distinctions such as ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ poverty that are often drawn upon and sometimes countered (for example, Satterthwaite and Tacoli, 2002). Other spatial referents also yield important insights into urban poverty. For example, notions of ‘spatial poverty traps’, ‘poverty barriers’, and ‘the urbanisation of poverty’ have been operationalised to describe, analyse and respond to poverty and injustice in many cities. In resource-strapped cities of the Global South, indicators for poverty distribution and location are vital tools for policy makers adjudicating the allocation of scarce resources.

The political consequences that follow existing spatial definitions of poverty are important to consider because they provide the basis for the argument of this book. Current views of the spatiality of urban poverty set up a politics of redistribution that affects both those with the ability to redistribute and those seeking to gain from such redistributions. Once a form of deprivation is located within and across a city, quantified and qualified, it becomes possible for both policy makers and those stigmatised as poor to argue for the redistribution of resources to eliminate the deprivation.

We are clear that redistribution is fundamental to addressing the multiple aspects of urban poverty. Indeed, if resources, opportunities, services, assets, and incomes were more evenly distributed across cities it is arguable whether urban poverty would exist. Without forms of redistribution there is little hope of reducing poverty. But let us return to the politics of redistribution which sets up groups who claim and counter-claim the distribution of urban resources. There are two issues that this politics raises. The first is that, while perhaps successfully addressing the deprivations of a current generation of poor women, men, girls and boys, the politics that come with this view of the spatiality of poverty condemn policy makers to repeat the political struggle for the next generation because any politics surrounding the causes of this poverty are not addressed.

The second, following Lakshman Yapa (1998: 99), is that the belief that ‘a study of the poor will reveal why they are poor’ is to severely limit the politics of addressing urban poverty. What the current spatiality of urban poverty is extremely good at is identifying across and within a city who and how many people, for example, do not have adequate housing. The outcome of this process is that poverty is explained by the
incidence of the lack of adequate housing. That is, the cause of poverty is inadequate housing and is located in the identified areas inhabited by the poor. Such a view is not only rather weak at identifying the dynamics of urban poverty, but also results in policies that address only the short-term outcomes of poverty (e.g., insecure housing) rather than the long-term inter-generational causes of poverty.

Moreover, this specific spatial interpretation of urban poverty essentially interprets poverty as in cities. In contrast, we argue in this book that poverty is of cities: that is to say that the space of the city itself is dynamic in contributing towards poverty causality and is not merely a static container for poverty (so the city is in urban poverty just as much as urban poverty is in the city). This notion of (urban) space as dynamic is well established in the geographical literature. Indeed, geographers have long understood space as socially produced (e.g., Unwin, 2000; Massey, 1992; Soja, 1989), and ‘the urban’ is increasingly understood as the ‘co-presence of multiple spaces, multiple times and multiple webs of relations’ (Amin and Graham, 1997: 417), meaning that spaces are active in shaping social relations. Consequently, urban geographers conceptualise the city not as a physical space per se, but as a relationship between the urban environment (space) and human behaviour (social relations). In other words, whilst the dynamics of urban space are a product of social interactions (between people, institutions, organisations, etc.), these social relations also create distinct urban spaces.

The reciprocal relationship between urban space and social mechanisms is a fundamental foundation of urban geography, as acknowledged by David Harvey’s understanding of spatiality as both a consequence and cause of social relations (1973: 10), and Neil Smith’s apt recognition that ‘society no longer accepts space [solely] as a container, but [also] produces it’ (1984: 85). Consequently it is surprising that such a well-established geographical understanding of the spaces of the city as dynamic agents has received so little attention within work on urban poverty, which has instead largely addressed the social and human perspectives of urban life. More recently, geographers have embraced the idea of the city as a site of networks and flows, including infrastructural as well as social elements, exemplified by the ideas of ‘splintering urbanism’ (Graham and Marvin, 2001), ‘urban metabolisms’ (Gandy, 2004) and ‘urban political ecology’ (e.g., Heynen et al., 2006). Although these analytical frameworks are starting to develop a critical Southern perspective amongst geographers (e.g., Lawhon et al., 2014), it is rare to encounter these spatial approaches within analyses of urban poverty.
The aim of the book

We argue that further analyses of the spatialities of urban poverty have the potential to add to the politics of addressing urban poverty and ways of reducing it. The three spatialities that we identify below have all been identified before – sometimes only implicitly – but so far, they have not been adequately analysed and developed.

The first is that the spaces, and space, of cities make a difference to the emergence and perpetuation of urban poverty. Whilst axiomatic that urban poverty is located in cities (in addition to large towns and peri-urban areas), the roles played by the spaces of the city in the emergence and perpetuation of urban poverty go largely overlooked. Whilst the specifically urban characteristics of poverty have been documented and classified (see above), many of which have spatial elements, a conceptualisation of space as having some agency is largely glossed over (with the two notable exceptions of Gotham, 2003, albeit focused on the spatial agency of the poor rather than the spatial agency of the city; and Mabogunje, 2005, who uses space implicitly in interpreting the economic disjuncture between rural and urban areas as a primary (spatial) cause of poverty).

The second is that urban poverty is multi-sited as well as being multi-dimensional. Although this argument is not new (see, for example, Yapa, 1998; Bradshaw, 2002; Chant, 2007), it has yet to gain wider purchase. This perspective highlights how people can experience deprivation and impoverishment in many different spaces of their lives – from the workplace (in terms of low-paying insecure jobs, for example), from the dwelling (in relation to tenure or location or access to services), in educational spaces (in relation to an inability to access quality education), and so on. It is clear that poverty can be compounded across multiple sites. A poor location of residence is likely to mean poor access to educational resources, quality health care and transportation. It could also be that urban space is itself impoverishing.

We identify two possible explanations for why the multi-sitedness of poverty has gained so little traction: firstly, because of the household and settlement focus of typical poverty surveys and analyses; and secondly, because of the sectoral-based nature of research (e.g., housing/health/education), with few studies considering poverty across a broad range of scales and sectors. As some of the contributions in this volume indicate, there is a clear need to start to develop analyses of poverty that take its multi-sited nature into account.

The third is that the spatial positionality of poverty researchers (and potentially organisations representing the urban poor) matters. Ellen
Wratten (1995) drew attention to this early on in the debates noting that it is rarely questioned ‘how, and by whom poverty has been defined and measured’. Satterthwaite and Mitlin (2013) also examine how the location of interventions is important. As we write this chapter, two scholars situated in the relative privilege of the ivory towers of the United Kingdom (albeit one of us originally hailing from the Global South), we are intently aware of the implications of our positionalities in seeking to write about a form of urban poverty that neither of us, like the vast majority of poverty scholars, experience in our daily lives. At the same time, the (spatial and other) positionalities of poverty analysts is a virtually unspoken topic, with current urban poverty analyses seemingly written from nowhere and everywhere. Indeed, it is a refreshing contrast that the editors of *The Routledge Handbook on Cities of the Global South* opened the handbook with reference to their spatial location in Cape Town, arguing that ‘where one lives and works is crucial’ (Parnell and Oldfield, 2014: xx). We certainly do not wish to suggest that only certain types of people living in certain types of spaces are entitled to comment on urban poverty; however, we do argue that the (urban) spaces from which urban poverties are viewed, categorised, calibrated and theorised matter to the understanding of urban poverties that are generated. Consequently, the spaces of the city(ies) from which scholars’ perspectives stem, as well as the (urban) spaces in which ideas are debated and distilled, cannot be ignored.

**Conclusion**

Poverty is an inherently spatial concept, with associated spatial practices. Indeed, this is well recognised in categories such as ‘urban’ and ‘rural’, and the politics of (re)distribution that are consequently invoked. Yet, the way in which the space of the city is represented in analyses of urban poverty is surprisingly one-dimensional, overwhelmingly addressing the outcomes of poverty (i.e. distribution), rather than the causes of poverty. Consequently, we argue in this book that the role of space in urban poverty needs more critical debate, and that ultimately, approaching the ‘spaces of poverty’ from multiple perspectives can aid in the production of more effective and just poverty-reduction policies.

While the urban poverty debates in the Global South have been caught in a partial spatial politics that focuses on the distribution and location of poverty, the rapidly urbanising cities and towns of the Global South are yielding new insights that this book builds on. To summarise, the book’s central argument remains that the ways in which we think about
space in relation to urban poverty in the Global South must be critiqued in order to broaden the everyday politics of urban poverty and scope for effective poverty-reduction policies.

Summary of chapters

Susan Parnell’s chapter highlights the ways in which existing urban poverty research has failed to adequately address the city scale, instead favouring the household and neighbourhood scale. She argues that there is a pressing need, particularly in the Global South, to better understand the role of the material built form and infrastructure of the city (in addition to the existing focus on human agency and communal activity) in the emergence and perpetuation of urban poverty. In essence, Parnell’s chapter shifts attention from the current focus on poverty in the city, to a consideration of poverty and the city.

Sylvia Chant and Kerwin Datu provide a comprehensive overview of issues related to gender and urbanisation, particularly highlighting the need to consider both poverty and prosperity within a multi-dimensional and multi-sited analysis. This latter perspective is relatively new, highlighting the ways in which women experience poverty in divergent but related ways across different spaces of the city (e.g. home, work, neighbourhood). This chapter reveals how a multi-sited approach can explore the ways in which diverse intra-urban spaces influence women’s relationships to poverty, while also affecting how women contribute to, and benefit from, urban prosperity.

Alexandre Apsan Frediani considers how to integrate spatiality into Amartya Sen’s capabilities approach when developing a framework for urban poverty. While Sen’s theories have played a significant role in understanding urban poverty, the role of space is often overlooked. Through an empirical analysis of case studies addressing informal settlement upgrading, Frediani’s chapter develops a theoretical approach that demonstrates the ways in which space not only creates the context for capabilities, but also the means for addressing urban poverty.

Melanie Lombard explores the socio-spatial role (or ‘place’) of informal settlements as a method for better understanding the everyday realities of life for the urban poor. By exploring how spatial and social processes interact, her chapter focuses on the construction of urban informal settlements as places. She develops the idea of ‘place-making’ as an analytical tool that acknowledges the dynamic roles played by both social and spatial processes in creating and perpetuating urban informality and poverty.
Isa Baud explores the ways in which ‘mapping’ urban poverty can contribute towards more holistic measures of poverty within cities, as well as improved governance processes. Her chapter uses the Indian example to highlight how the spatialisation of knowledge on urban poverty can be used to develop a multiple approach to urban poverty that goes beyond income. Further, she highlights the ways in which the spatial mapping of urban deprivation can play a key role in strengthening claim-making processes in urban governance.

Romola Sanyal's chapter takes a historical perspective, exploring the urban poverty experiences of refugees as an example of a demographic group frequently overlooked in urban poverty analyses. By analysing the position of refugees in late-twentieth-century Calcutta, she develops a critical perspective on the poverty and displacement of refugees as an example that demonstrates the role of the state in producing poverty. This account challenges scholars to develop a broader understanding of urban poverty.

Caren Levy provides an in-depth account of Community-led Infrastructure Finance Facility’s (CLIFF) contribution to socio-spatial justice in Mumbai, India. She uses this example to argue that in order for urban planning to address urban poverty (and socio-spatial justice) it must simultaneously prioritise three approaches: material redistribution, inclusive recognition and party political participation. In her chapter, Levy develops the concept of ‘room for manoeuvre’ as an action space for transformative planning that offers the multiple spaces necessary to achieve the triangulation of redistribution, recognition and parity that underpin socio-spatially just urban development.

Amlanjyoti Goswami explores the relationship between the law and the space of the city in India. He does this by providing a detailed analysis at the scale of the street in Delhi, focusing on the legality and spatiality of street vendors as an example of those marginalised by a contemporary focus on regulation and on a rigid interpretation of (il)legality.

Gareth Jones and Dennis Rodgers develop a critical argument around the limited ways in which the city is represented in studies of violence and security. Their chapter highlights the ways in which research on violence and security, especially in relation to development, either ignores the city or assumes it is a necessarily violent place. Using empirical examples from Latin America that explore security governance on the one hand, and gang violence on the other, Jones and Rodgers challenge existing approaches, demonstrating the very spatial nature of violence in cities.
Note

1. It is important to point out that, although not the focus of this book, a similar argument for attending to the spatiality of rural poverty could be made (see, for example, King, 2010).
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