Seesaw of Spatial Metamorphosis in Aravind Adiga's *Last Man in Tower*

Sadaf Mehmood

Teaching/Research Associate, Department of English, International Islamic University, Islamabad & PhD Scholar, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi

Abstract

Urban space is inherently uneven. Economic pursuits and commercial integrity translate urban space into categorization of *haves* and *have-nots.*Neo-Marxists theorize spatial disequilibrium through the dynamics of capital accumulation.Analysis of *Last Man in Tower* by Aravind Adiga helps to explorecity space as a commodified place that serves the interests of capital accumulation by converting it as a space of differences, struggles and negotiations. While examining spatial alienation, I probe the making of urban other who experiences, evictions, and displacements followed by the development projects of capital accumulation in the theoretical frame of David Harvey's accumulation by dispossession. The urban space expands and grows not for the urban other but for the elitist consumption. This directs the argument to inspect the creation of a critical spatial consciousness to assert the urban other's right to the city. By retaliating to their evictions and dispossessions they devise strategies for remaking their space through their lived daily experiences. This has been supported by the theoretical lens of Henri Lefebvre's "The right to the city". The selected fiction defines uneven city space whereby the spatial metamorphosis dispossesses and displaces the urban other andraises critical spatial consciousness to obstruct subsequent displacements.

Keywords: *Dispossession, Displacement, Right to the City, Resistance.*

Aravind Adiga's*Last Man in Tower*(2012) is the novel that uncoils the helix of capitalism in spatial specificity whereby the capitalists manipulate and exploit the urban other while producing allegories of dispossessions and displacements. Adiga portays the urban other who is engaged in giving meaning to the propagated interests of capitalists and negotiating his socio-economic stability through ephemeral substitutes. The mirage of ameliorated lifestyling kindles oppressed desires of individuals to claim their space in growing spatial metamorphosis. The novel is plotted over the grand offer of Dharman Shah, the capitalist, to the residents of Vishram Society who are the

urban other, to evacuate the tower for the construction of *Shanghai*; a modern gothic style building. This offer has thrilled the residents except Yogesh Anantha Murthy; an old teacher known as Masterji who resists Shah's offer against his dispossession and dislocation. Masterji reclaims his right to the city by his constant refusal to give up his old home in exchange of a big amount proposed by Mr. Shah.Drawing over Neo-Marxist argumentation of spatial subject, the present study has structured its theoretical framework over David Harvey's *Accumulation by Dispossession* through which I have argued that the dynamics of urban space are deeply connected with the growth of capitalism. Neo-Marxists contend thatthe capitalists' intrusions for accumulation are making cities spaces of socio-economic differences. Eventually, the urban space becomes a commodity to be used by the capitalists that interpellateunevenness as natural thus normal.   The   individuals experience mayhem of capital accumulation through segregations, evictions, displacements and dispossessions. These differences produce two classes in urban confines: the urban elite; the class that owns means of production of space, and the urban other; a class that is dispossessed and dislocated when capitalism derives for acceleration of accumulation (Mehmood, 2018). This research study probes the making of urban other and how the everyday experiences of inequalities and evictions cast remaking of urban other through asserting their right over the city.David Harvey accentuates capital growth and expansion through its mechanism of "accumulation by dispossession" (2003, p. 137), which makes the rich richer and poor poorer. He characterizes capital accumulation as dual in its nature by juxtaposing "expanded reproduction" and "accumulation by dispossession". Capital reproduction and accumulation accelerate politico-economic logics of power that promote uneven geographical conditioning. For Harvey the geographical "asymmetries" are the product of spatial exchange relations that are expressed through "unfair and unequal exchange, spatially articulated monopoly powers, extortionate practices attached to restricted capital flows" (Harvey, 2003, p. 32). The novel extrapolates dynamics of capital class that presents its self interest under the rubric of common interests to inseminate the common sense understandings of society. This is where, I argue, an individual is imprisoned by capitalist ideology and thus adheres to the desires of capitalists' accumulation. Based upon this theoretical underpinning, I investigate a) how spatial matamorphosis is shaping spatial relations and ideologies, b) how the spatial transformations are producing allegories of displacement and dispossession, c) and how these transformations raise critical spatial consciousness of urban other to obstruct subsequent displacements.

Last Man in Tower is set in one of the most populated urban spheres of India, Mumbai. The density in Mumbai indicates its commercial pivot where India grows day and night. India earns 40% of its gross income from this city by the sea; therefore, it is known as 'commercial capital of India' (Risbund,

2003, p. 3). In chapter '13 May' Adiga begins questioning: 'What is Bombay? From the thirteenth floor, a window answers: banyan, maidan, stone, tile, tower, dome, sea, halk, *amaltas* in bloom, smog on the horizon, Gothic phantasmagoria (Victoria Terminus and the Municipal Building) emerging from the smog' (Adiga, 2012, p. 67). Adiga's definition conceives Mumbai through lexicon of construction materials and the steady buildings that divulge Mumbai as engaged in incessant struggles of development in socio-economic spheres through urban restructuring. Adiga's elaboration of Mumbai juxtaposes natural world with the constructed world where nature seems kneeling down before emerging edifice. By calling Mumbai *Bombay* Adiga construes the creative destruction of past and present that is traversing from the post independence incarnations of the city towards the production of modern lifestyling. This palimpsest of modern and oldbuilt structure in Mumbai has become nucleus of capital dynamics by operationalizing the processes of evictions and exclusions. David Harvey finds creative destruction of urban space as a strategy of burgeoning intensity that has displaced and dispossessed the poor urban class (Harvey, 2001, p. 97). Guha (2010) examines the contemporary practices of capitalism in the present with specific focus on Mumbai. She inculcates that this creative destruction has turned the urban structures of India into a collage of old and new infrastructure. Attuned to the needs of capital escalation towards creative destruction, the cityspace becomes more vulnerable to the socio-economic divisions. "With rescaling of the 'global' and recasting of the 'urban'", the cities are rising as embodiment of the current "imperatives of capitalist production achieved through flexibilisation and disaggregation" (Guha, 2010, p. 202).

Dharman Shah as a capitalist has cited Vakola an area that is "boiling with money" (Adiga, 2012, p. 72). The building of Vishram Society is located in Vakola nearby the airport that displays many "polyps" on the map of Mumbai. These polyps turn out to be slums that surrounds Vishram Society. In the ambience of the slum habitation Vishram Society appears to be the important building that is an attractive site for the capitalists to get hold on Vakola. Banerjee Guha (2010) opines that the restructuring of Mumbai is geared to cast it a world city under the overarching stretches of neoliberalism. According to her, in the heart of Mumbai a triangle of empty spaces is identified for reshaping city as the commercial center "(a) sprawling mill lands, now converted into upper class commercial–residential areas, (b) Dharavi, the huge slum that is being made ready for gentrification, and (c) Bandra–Kurla commercial complex built on evacuated slum land" (Guha, 2010, p. 214). The ambience of this triangle is a golden line for the capitalists to accelerate the accumulation processes with an engagement in growing competition.

The demolition of Vishram Society would path new ways for associating Vakola with Mr. Shah's construction company name; the Confidence Group whose building projects "Fountainhead and Excelsior" are already under-construction. The construction of Shanghai in the place of Vishram Society would escalate accumulation process with the planning of displacing its residents who are the the urban other in the novel: "Vishram is an old society. But it is the most famous building in the area. We'll take it and we'll break it—and everyone will know. Vakola is ours" (Adiga, 2012, p. 146). The building projects that Shah has initiated in Vakola reveal his desire to label Vakola with the Confidence Group. Adiga displays Shah's obsession and competitive tendency through the brochure of the Ultimax Group that he keeps in his pocket. "The Very Best" the motto of the Ultimax Group ignites his desire to produce the perfect and to be known the best that does not allow him to leave Mumbai. As Harvey defines it: "The coercive laws of competition force them to reinvest because if one does not reinvest then another surely will. To remain a capitalist, some surplus must be reinvested to make even more surplus" (2010, p. 19).Adiga through his insights to Shah's character defines the capitalist competition as more domineering that kindles accumulation greed. Adigaposits that it is only the wave of competition through which every individual in Mumbai has been engaged to shape restructuring. The battle of *haves* and *have-nots* makes the dreams of Shah and many other capitalists like him possible. David Harvey argues that the subsequent animosity between these hierarchical extremes particularly exists between the developed and underdeveloped sections of the urban affinity. He accentuates that the logic of capital propagates asymmetrical patterns for urban expansion that ultimately strengthens ground for expanded reproduction and accumulation (Harvey, 2001, p. 79).

Last Man in Tower begins with descriptive details of Vishram Society; from the infrasturcture of building to its residents settled in six floors of the building. Built in 1959, the Vishram Society is occupied by the middle class housing cooperative that is "anchored like a dreadnought of middle-class respectability, ready to fire on anyone who might impugn the pucca quality of its inhabitants" (Adiga, 2012, p. 11). The interior and exterior structure of Vishram Society insinuates its *pucca* middle class residents who are "incapable of either extremity",who have schedualed their everyday lives according to the water supply and their presence in the community only matters to "pay taxes, support charities and vote in local and general elections" (Adiga, 2012, p. 11). People of Vishram society who apparently seem to be contented in their lives have several unfulfilled dreamsthat this offer ignites; the forgetful and repressed. All of the residents are imprisoned in the cocoons of their dreams as Kudwa who buys a new motorcycle of Honda to pretend rich and thus happy, Kothari the lover of flamingoes, Ajwani the real estate broker who does not use

money inside his drawer just to make himself happy with, Mrs. Puri who wants to dine at Taj Hotel and even Mr. Pinto who loves dollars and gold.

The making of *Shanghai* would not give them space in a highly developed urban region but it would surely give them an improved urban lifestyling. The model of Shanghai indicates the dream of the Indian capitalists in making Mumbai like Shanghai. Adigain the novel castigates the unplanned gentrification and redevelopment projects on the name of "Vision Mumbai" that have legalized evictions of the urban other from their spaces in the city.Adiga highlights how urban other is at first being prepared for the displacement and then further framed to leave the place for elitist consumption. The redevelopment projects are not merely displacing the urban other but shifting them to a spatial specificity where the relations are made between the equal hierarchies of the society. Adiga desolately notes the redevelopment of spatial structures where the urban other is considered as a threat to urban opulence. Therefore, the redevelopment of spatial structures is labeled with exorbitant costs that the urban other cannot even imagine to live in (Adiga, 2012, p. 151).

The individuals living in Bombay are enthralled by the approaching horrors of displacements and dispossessions from their belongings when the city is cited by the capitalists as lucrative place for further accumulation and thus dispossessions. All the capitalist engaged in the generous task of redeveloping the city and making the city global and modern are the well-wishers of the nation-state, therefore, the state facilitates the smooth functioning of accumulation. The discourse of making Mumbai a world class city for the stimulation of urban economic growth has made the city horrifying for the urban other. With reference to Indian city Calcutta, Chatterjee (2004) discusses the urban poor within the "population groups" are not regarded as "proper" citizens. The *proper citizens*are "rights-bearing citizens", who can assert their right to urban infrastructure and amenities. The urban poor are othered from proper citizenship because of "very livelihood or habitation involve violation of the law" (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 40). This othered urban class thus becomes "illegal" and "informal" owing to their involvement in commercial and non-commercial pursuits that are not supported by government institutes and "contrary to good civic behavior", however, apart from their informal and illegal existence in urban-space they claim their habitation and livelihood as right, that according to Chatterjee "would only invite further violation of public property and civic laws" (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 40). To avoid possible belligerence, the process of legalization of these illegal slum dwellers is initiated through negotiations done at state level.

While examining the slum dwelling in Mumbai, Bjorkman (2014) delineates that the history of Mumbai apart from all possible policy negotiations is the history of slum clearance. In Mumbai the slum policy of 1995 has given a chance to capitalist growth by offering alternative and free housing to slums on one hand and on the other they offer free spaces to capital accumulation. Bjorkmen critically examines the disjuncture of "legal and illegal, planned and unplanned" that has made urban air uncertain for the slum dwellers (Bjorkman, 2014, p. 234). In the process of "world class city making"the slums of Mumbai experience "dispossessions and violences" (Bjorkman, 2014, p. 225) that signify their ultimate exclusion from the city. She closes her argument by specifying exclusion and dispossession as the final destiny of the slums because their presence has always been seen as a hurdle on the paths of making Mumbai a world class city. Roy (2011) also details the brutal evictions of the urban other under the agenda of "Vision Mumbai"; these "displacements were only the precursor to what is now a vast urban renewal scheme meant to reclaim the city center through the redevelopment of the Dharavi slum" (Roy,2011, p. 161). She proceeds to investigate how through the formation and operationalization of Special Economic Zones, Indian state has provided land to capitalist investors followed by 'forced expropriation and expulsion" for "accumulation by dispossession" and displacement (Roy, 2011, p. 162). The surrounded slums in Vakola begin their day with expectations of slum clearance summons and their day ends with new fears for the next day this is how their days are passing:

> New financial buildings were opening every month in the BKC— American Express, ICICI Bank, HSBC, Citybank, you name it—and the lucre in their vaults, like butter on a hot plate, was melting and trickling into the slums, enriching some and scorching others among the slum-dwellers. A few lucky hut-owners were becoming millionaires.... Others were being crushed—bulldozers were being leveled, slum clearance projects were going ahead (Roy, 2011, p. 49).

Mary, the sweeper in Vishram Society, has therefore, run numerous times on the summons of *slum clearance* and gets relaxed when finds everything intact in the hut. Mary and other slum inhabitants live in constant peril of displacement.

Adiga shows that how the government officials at first make the slums legal at the time of elections and after becoming the electedgovernment officials they become threats of evictions for the slums (Adiga, 2012, p. 244). He concedes that each saving day from displacements is a miracle in Mumbai. Mary's fears of livelihood and her son's school are connected to her spatial settlement. Every morning when Mary reaches to her workplace she keeps on

thinking about her meager hut that is her sole belonging in the world. Her approaching eviction with unpromised resettlement makes her fearful about her everyday livelihood and her subsequent resettlement. For Mary happiness of the residents of Vishram Society is incomprehensible. The standing towers of Vishram Society delay her fear of uncertainty but the excitement of residents for their relocation horrifies Mary for the triviality of her existence and her only belonging; the hut. Her right over her own hut cannot stand before the restructuring of Mumbai as world-class city. Guha (2010) argues that these redevelopment projects are strategically imbuing polarization in the society as he puts it:

> In the contemporary situation of 'neoliberal crackdown', the spatial 'see-saw' of valorisation and devalorisation of city-spaces and the associated urban restructuring are leading to an increasing legitimization of the dispossession of the poor, segregation of the city-space and regulatory access to resources that are getting directly linked to the basic question of the 'right to the city' and the right to eke out a livelihood according to the choice of the individuals (Guha, 2010, p. 221).

While bringing one class to the center of the city that owns material prosperity, redevelopment is relocating the urban other to the margins of the city, towards the undeveloped sector of the city. Mary knows about the history of slum clearance that makes her fearful about her approaching displacement.

Roy (2011) examines the unevenness in Indian urbanity within its traditional vs. modern contradiction. The ideological conflict for claiming right over city by both the capitalists and the urban other becomes a seesaw that reshapes their geo-political existence. Roy opines that while India is traversing to development, it experiences two different attitudes the one is to agglomerate for smooth processing of modernity and development in India, however, the other demands to make India traditional. This difference of attitudes overarches the novel where one group needs to be modern and the other wants to be traditional. If Shah's offer has brought glad tidings to the residents, it also has caused tears to a few, especially Masterji. Shah fuels capitalist ideology while converting common interest into self-interest by offering an amount that cannot be ignored (Adiga, 2012, p. 144). Although Masterji demands *nothing* in the city, his home resists his offer. Adiga draws comparison between a spider and a man that symbolically refers to the difference between Shah and Masterji:

> A spider's mind is outside him; every new thought shoots off at once in a strand of silk. A man's mind is inside. You never know what he's

> thinking. Another difference. A spider can live without family, all alone in the web he makes (Adiga, 2012, p. 140).

Mr. Shah, who is obsessed with constructing his building projects, calls Masterji a weak man: 'we are dealing with the most dangerous thing on earth, Giri. A weak man. A weak man who has found a place where he feels strong. He won't leave Vishram' (Adiga, 2012, p. 381). During the course of the narrative, Adiga manifests that Masterji's economic instability could not disregard the true strength of his character. He is not a weak man in his immediate morals and self-build. His patience against the boycott and his uncompromising resistance does not insinuate his weakness.

Masterji's attempts to claim his space in the developing cityspace can be theorized in Lefebvre's "right to the city". For him the right to the city enables the participation of all individuals to the use and production of urban space; this participation in the production of urban space entails participation in socio-spatial relations. "For users, the city is a creative and collective human project, one that thrives on interaction, cooperation, and effective relations", hence by claiming a right to the city is "claiming a right to inhabit well" (Purcell, 2008, p. 94). Capitalists own urban space as a site for accumulation whereas the urban class owns it to have a reasonable access to comfortable everyday life. For Lefebvre, the problem begins when capitalists perceive urban space as exchange value that potentially abolishes the urban life and its associated institution. Thereby, through claiming the right to the city Lefebvre is not concerned with the provisions of basic needs—he demands something different that has never been addressed in the slogans of struggles—the right of urban quality—the right to access all resources of the city to all sectors of population:

> The Right to the City manifests itself as a superior form of rights; right to freedom, to individualization in socialization, to habitat and to inhabit. The right to the oeuvre, to participation and appropriation (clearly distinct from the right to property), are implied in the right to the city (Lefebvre, 1996, p.174).

The right to the city is essentially the right to appropriation. Appropriation is defined by Lefebvre as "de-alienation" from capitalist productive forces. He contends that the urban other resists to alter hegemonic significations and distributions of space stemming from spatial oppression and segregation, results in the creation of what is referred to the reconfiguration of identities on account of the development of what Soja terms as "critical spatial consciousness" (Soja, 2010, p. 2). This critical spatial consciousness motivates the urban subjects to reclaim their right to the city including "the fair and

equitable distribution in space of socially valued resources and the opportunities to use them" (Soja, 2010, p. 2). This struggle of resistance for territorial justice can be highly challenging and disturbing for the city. It can possibly trigger political, social and economic upheaval of the city or give birth to even bigger social problems – like in the case of Indian metropolitan cities, it leads to violence.

Masterji fights against the dispossession of his past memories, the cupboard filled with his wife's outfits and her daughter's drawings ofVishram Society. He resists the eyes of Mrs. Pinto who can walk alone with her blind eyes in the Vishram society, he resists for the future of Ronak who can exercise his freedom in the free city. Masterji is a man who is living beyond the ideological sphere construed by the capitalism where individuals associate their comforts with material stability. He appears to be a dangerous man, a great obstacle for the capitalists and also for those who are engaged in the scrimmage of haves and have-nots (Adiga, 2012, p. 381). For Masterji, his son's insistence upon his displacement is quiet astonishing, when he expresses diligently his critical spatial consciousness: "I am thinking of Ronak. This man Mr. Shah threatened the Pintos. In daylight. Would you want Ronak to grow up in a city where he can be bullied or threatened in daylight?" (Adiga, 2012, p. 394).

The protagonist who is the *last man in the tower* has not taken any action against his neighbourhood who has made his life miserable after his refusal to the offer. He has not considered the residents as his enemies who have applied excrement on his door, called vagrants to threaten him. He directly fights with the man Shah who has produced the whole trouble in his *home of thirty years.* Masterji files complaint against Mr. Shah for threatening him (Adiga, 2012, p. 323). His frivolous visits to police station have not given him expected response therefore he seeks reporting to the newspaper as effective and influential step to retrieve his right to the city, to his home: '*Dear Editor, it being said that we live in a republic, the question arises whether a man in his own home can be threatened, and that too on the eve of Independence Day....*' (Adiga, 2012, p. 326). The latter exposes Masterji's innocuous complaints to the state apparatuses that give him illusions about his everyday existence in the city as an independent and rightful citizen. When Masterji could not resolve matters through press or police, he directs towards law. His legal inquisition propels him to seek alternatives that state laws provide him for claiming his right over city but the incomprehensible abbreviated legal jargon horrifies Masterji (Adiga, 2012, p. 337). Adiga cynically displays the ambiguity of Indian legal structure on urban issues that even its practitioners are not fully aware of its ambivalence (Adiga, 2012, p. 376). As MCS Act (Maharshtra Co-operative Societies Act) gives Masterji a ray of hope for his protection in the

urban space but also summons his eviction when the fellow residents move towards the Legal possibilities: '*Maharshtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960, section 51 through 56 of the Model bylaws, a member may be expelled from his Society',* the conditions of expulsion do not fit on Masterji's character, nonetheless, his neighbourhood tries to fit him within these prescriptions: 'Didn't he say he would sign the form and change his mind? Isn't that deceiving his Society? Hasn't he invited the police into our gates?' (Adiga, 2012, p. 356). In the meeting of the Society the residents collectively decide to expel Masterji from his only residence and even from his life: "he lay in the dark; feeling the weight of two floors of people above and three below who had expelled him from his home of thirty-two years" (Adiga, 2012, p. 364).

Masterji is not the only resident who acquires the critical spatial consciousness to claim his space in the city against his dispossession and displacement, Mrs. Rego, the social activist is also fully aware of the astute policies by claiming that "this is our home and no one can ask us to leave it' (Adiga, 2012, p. 141). She is the first one who calls the capitalists 'liars and criminals' (Adiga, 2012, p. 141). However, besides her resistance she surrenders before Shah's *special* offer. In a single meeting at restaurant with Mr. Shah she plans to *trump* her sister Catherine's lifestyling when all three Mrs. Rego with her two children say *Bandra* as their new place of settlement. Ramesh Ajwani who has been making every possible and violent effort to persuade Masterji for signing the agreement also develops this critical spatial consciousness when he confesses that he is *trapped* (Adiga, 2012, p. 503). Though he is also associated with a small scale business of the real estate but he fails to decipher Shah's attempt to displace people of Vishram society. Masterji's resistance to claim his place in the city becomes an epitome for Mrs. Rego and Ajwani for calling the city their own from where they cannot be displaced. They address the young boys of the slum to become future Masterjis who would own Mumbai as their city where "*Nothing can stop a living thing that wants to be free*" (Adiga, 2012, p. 555). They are hopeful for the future when they meet the fortunate man in the slum who got 91 lakhs for giving up his hut because he knows the bargaining tactics with those who dominate the socio-economic and thus spatial sphere.

> "Why should I be unhappy?" the fortunate man laughed. "My children have never had a real home. Four daughters I have. Fate is good to many people these days. There's a man here in Juhu, living in a slum, who has been offered sixty-three lakhs by a real-estate developer to move out. He's a connection of a connection of mine, and I came to talk to him. About how to deal with these builders." (Adiga, 2012, p. 553)

While examining diversity in urban process, Ghertner (2011) contends that though "utopian image" of the "world-class city" is part of the "practice of government", it is equally endorsed and redefined by the urban other (p. 301).

Ghertner argues that in Indian cities the urban other employs "the image of the world-class city, by making "sensible" a world-class aesthetic, and by advancing a myth of private property and the'*good life*' associated with it" (Ghertner, 2011, p. 300). The urban other "tune[s] their aspirational strategies" to the hegemonic "image of the world-class city", and in so doing they also endorse "the promise that such a city will provide them with a world-class lifestyle – be it quality education for their children, secure employment and private property" although, it ends up with the demolition of their homes without any provision of substitutes (Ghertner, 2011, p. 301). However, it is due to this acceptance that their "expectations of improvement can crystallize into new demands and points of politics, threatening to turn the promise of the world-class city into a political demand for world-class citizenship" (Ghertner, 2011, p. 301). This directs to a new aspect of claiming the city by subverting as well as by participating in the consumption. The strategic subversion against urban growth is significant to claim right over city, however, while following "heart's desire" to become a consumer and contribute in the production of space the urban other reclaims his right to the city.

Adiga provides similar suggestion to survive in redeveloping urban space of India where the capitalists would use the ideological and coercive tools to squeeze their desired objective for making the world-class city. Therefore, standing adamant like Masterji is not possible for the whole urban other. Negotiating and bargaining would be the strategy that could provide space to the capitalist, the state and the urban other in the developed state. This bargaining might instigate equilibrium in urban specificity, not *compromise* or *tears* to one and *gold* to the other. Initially, Masterji's death makes Ajwani reluctant for accepting the remaining amount from the builder but he accepts it later because he has "a family. Two sons. A wife" (Adiga, 2012, p. 553). Ajwani displays middle class décor by showing incapability of belonging to any extremes. His refusal to the offer and then acceptance makes him conscience of his right to the city. He cannot give up his only belonging to Mr. Shah. He receives the price of his displacement that is not meant to influence his *soulpassageway*(Adiga, 2012, p. 555).

This study concludes that spatial transformation has shaped antagonistic spatial relations. Before Shah's offer, the residents of Vishram society have been spending their everyday lives through collective symbiosis devoid of any socio-economic differences. The meetings in Vishram society, free tuition given by Masterji, Ramu an abnormalchild cared by all, blind Mrs.

Pinto has helping hands to protect her from falling down and the compromise on water shortage, all residents have been negotiating their differences very peacefully, but they encounter the trouble of the offer. It has been debated throughout this study that the offer gradually converted Vishram Society into a place of threat, violence, and murder.In the examination of Masterji's character, the argument has been developed that he perceives the absurdity of ongoing development projects in an area that is already experiencing water crisis. The depth and uniqueness of his resistance is regarded as an insane incredulousness of a developing city. Adiga reveals the strength of Masterji's character through his remarkable patience against all evils that have been inflicted on him by his neighbourhood. This study has also found the failure of media, police and legal structures of Indian society to provide justice to Masterji for claiming his right over the city. It is finally argued that the process of redevelopment cannot be regarded as the innocent desire of making Indian cities as world class cities so as to make the capitalist interventions of this dream true. For Adiga, it requires a promise for all Indians to have a shared developing state.

References:

Adiga, A. (2012). *Last man in tower.* New York: Vintage Books.

Arrighi, G. (2005). Hegemony unraveling-I. *New Left Review* , 23-80.

Arrighi, Giovanni, N. A. (2010). Accumulation by dispossession and its limits: The Southern Africa paradigm revisited. *Studies in Comparative International Development* , 45 (4), 410-438.

Anant Maringanti, A. B. (2011). Urban concerns: An introduction. *Economic & Political Weekly, 46* (31), 39-40.

Bhan, G. (2009). This is no longer the city I once knew: Evictions, the urban poor and the right to the city in millennial Delhi. *Environment & Urbanisation*, 21 (1), 127-142.

Baviskar, A. (2003). Between violence and desire: Space, power and identity in the making of metropolitan Delhi. *International Social Science Journal, 175* (55), 89-98.

Elden, S. (2004). *Understanding Henri Lefebvre: Theory and the possible.* New York: Continuum.

Ghertner, D. A. (2011). World-Class city making in Delhi. In A. O. Roy (Ed.), *Worlding cities: Asian experiments and the art of being global* (pp. 279-306). Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gooptu, N. (2011). Economic liberalization, urban politics and the poor. In S. R. al. (Ed.), *Understanding India's new political economy: A great transformation* (pp. 35-48). New York: Routledge.

Guha, S. B. (2010). *Accumulation by dispossession: Tranformative cities in the new global order.* New Delhi: SAGE publications.

Harvey, D. (1975). *Social justice and the city.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1982). Marxist geography and mode of production. In D. G. al, *The Dictionary of Human Geography.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *Spaces of neoliberalization: Towards a theory of uneven geographical development.* Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Harvey, D. (2006). *The limits to capital.* London and New York: Verso.

Harvey, D. (2010). *The enigma of capital and the crisis of capitalism.* London: Profile Books.

Harvey, D. (2010a). The right to the city: From capital surplus to accumulation by dispossession. In S. B. Guha (Ed.), *Accumulation by dispossession:Transformative cities in the new global order.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution.* London & New York: Verso.

Harvey, D. (Mar. 2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* , 22-44.

Jessop, B. (2006). Spatial fixes, temporal fixes and spatio-temporal fixes. In N. C. Gregory (Ed.), *David Harvey a Critical Reader* (pp. 142-166). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (1976). *The survival of capitalism: Reproduction of the relations of production.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1988). Towards a leftist cultural politics: Remarks occasioned by the centenary Of Marx's death. In N. C. L (Ed.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 75-88). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space.* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.) Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, H. (1996). *Writing on cities.* (E. K. Lebas, Trans.) Oxford: Blackwell publishing.

Lefebvre, H. (2003). *The urban revolution.* Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. (2009). Space and the state. In B. N. S. (Ed.), *State, space, world: Selected essays/Henri Lefebvre* (pp. 223-253). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Marcuse, P. (2012). Whose right(s) to what city? In P. M. Neil Brenner (Ed.), *Cities for people, not for profit: Critical urban theory and the right to the city* (pp. 24-41). London & New York: Routledge.

Mehmood, S. (2018). Half-baked cities for half-baked men: The urban other in The White Tiger by Aravind Adiga. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 21 (1), 97-108.

Piyush Tiwari, R. N. (2015). *India's reluctant urbanization: Thinking beyond.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Purcell, M. (2008). *Recapturing democracy: Neoliberalization and the struggle for alternative.* New York: Routledge.

Purcell, M. (2014). Possible worlds: Henri Lefebvre and the right to the city. *Journal of Urban Affairs, 36* (1), 141-154.

Risbund, N. (2003). The case of Mumbai, India. *Case Studies for the Global Report on Human Settlements*, UN-Habitat, 1-20.

Roy, A. (2011). The blockade of the world-class city: Dialectical images of Indian urbanism. In A. R. Ong (Ed.), *Global, Worlding cities: Asian experiments and the art of being* (pp. 259-278). Oxford: Willey Blackwell.

Shatkin, G. &. (2014). Introduction. In G. Shatkin (Ed.), *Contesting the Indian city: Global visions and the politics of the local* (pp. 1-38). Malden and Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Walker, R. A. (1978). Two sources of uneven development under advanced capitalism: Spatial differentiation and capital mobility. *Review of Radical Political Economics, 10* (3), 28-37