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ABSTRACT
Development policy has evolved significantly over the past sixty years - from Keynesian principles to trickle down process to Washington consensuses to more recent pro-poor growth. From the inception of independent India, she has opted to build herself on the economic principles of socialism. In spite of following the pro-poor and extremely pro-poor development policy, large section of Indian citizen continue to live under extreme poverty (68.72% people earn below USD2/day, World Bank 2010). In the past two decades India has witnessed opening up its economy in 1991 and the Constitutional amendment of 1992. While economic liberalization has shifted her economic principles from socialist to more free market; the Constitutional amendments has delegated administrative, fiscal and political power to the local rural and urban institutions (municipality). In spite of these progressive policies, India continues to reel under the abysmal socio-economic situation. Now the country with 1.2 billion population hope to transform its fortune by adopting Inclusive growth as the mainstay of its policy planning. The research would highlight the underneath meaning of Inclusive growth; its implication in urban planning, uniqueness compare to earlier policies, evolution of India’s urban policy (from pro-poor to Inclusive approach), and finally identify the prospects of inclusive urban growth.
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INTRODUCTION
A job in public domain starts with a strategy or understanding of the social and economic situation. A public domain can be anything which affects the public at large. In the republic system of the modern era public works is undertaken by the governments either in democratic or socialist format. The government undertakes
many roles for the public and the wellbeing of their cause – law maker, regulator, business entrepreneur, and policy maker are four crucial aspect of governance work. Public policy coupled with regulations and law is the fundamental factor of sector wise governance. “Public policies focus on public and its problems” (Dewey 1927). Public policies are concerned with (Jans 2007);
   i. How are the problems and issues defined and constructed?
   ii. How are they placed on political and policy agenda?
   iii. How policy option emerged?
   iv. How and why Governments act or do not act?
   v. What are the effects of Government policy?

“No single discipline, integrates what seems useful for understanding” (Jans, 2007). “The study of how, why and to what effect governments pursue particular courses of action and inaction” (Arnold J. Heidenheimer 1990) . Urban policy is one such domain which is under control of the government. Policies are the single most influencing factor in spatial analysis.

Urban policies are the government’s response in understanding the urban problems, approach to the remedies, visualize the urban future and development of the society; and its assessment can reveal many related concerns related to this specific field. Considering the urban policies in relation to economic growth, poverty and inequality from the 1950s, to the present days in 2010, we can focus on some key aspects and models in the research process. A significant portion of development policy is concentrated around the discussion of growth, poverty and inequality.

In the 1950s the dominant approach to economic growth was influenced by the monetary theories by John Maynard Keynes or Keynesianism. Later, the discussion of poverty-inequality drew heavily upon Kuznets (1955) and Solow (1956) models. Interestingly, Lewis model or dual sector model first published during this time but became popular much later during the 1980s. In the 1970s monetarism and neoclassical economics began to be popular in policy making. During this time the poverty-inequality context had shifted towards trickle down process. In the 1980s, Dual sector model became the central theme of discussion, as its inventor Sir William Arthur Lewis, honored with Nobel memorial prize in Economics in 1979. In the late 1980s, a radical policy prescription came into effect in the name of Washington consensus (WC). Pro-poor growth approach came into feature at this very time. WC can be considered as the crucial step in establishing globalization and an enhanced international capital flow. Till today many of WCs’ suggestion had been modified as the post Washington consensus and been practiced by many countries to attain economic growth. In the 2000s, fight against poverty-inequality got an encouragement when Department for International Development (DFID) – UK initiated a concept
called pro-poor growth. UN had also announced MDG in 2000 with multi prone objectives and sustainable development. In the mid 2000, inclusive growth began to be viewed as an alternative growth model. Although it was not clear about the exact origin of inclusive growth. But many international institutions (The World Bank, United Nations, OECD, Asian Development Bank etc.) initiated discussion on inclusive growth.

**INCLUSIVE GROWTH FROM PRO-POOR GROWTH**

According to the chronological order, inclusive growth evolves in the first decade of twenty first century. The evolution immediately preceded by pro-poor growth. Therefore, it would be interesting to identify the specific differences between these two growth policies and its influence on the society as a whole.

From the nomenclature, pro-poor growth can be defined as growth in favor of poor. In literature pro-poor growth is always equated with growth which reduces poverty (both absolute poverty and relative poverty). Many scholars are also highlighted the issues of pace and pattern of poverty reduction or pro-poor growth. The pace of poverty reduction not only dependent on the rate of economic growth but also depend on a whole other supportive economic-social policy approach including the distribution of growth benefit. Incidentally, pro-poor growth has also become a tool in political economy, particularly for the developing country with democratic set up. When large section of the population is poor, it is always easier to reach out to them with the manifestation of pro-poor growth policy. The growth is equally important for pro-poor growth. Economic growth generates more revenue for the government, more jobs for the people and hence provides the necessary tools for poverty reduction.

Thus, the challenge for policy makers is to combine growth-promoting policies with policies to assure participation of the poor. Full participation by the poor in the opportunities unleashed due to the growth process can augment their contribution in growth process. If a country gets the combination of policies right then both growth and poverty reduction can be rapid (Ravallion, Pro-Poor Growth: A Primer, 2007). Pro-poor growth is thus associated with attacking poverty through growth and reduced income inequality. As a result, people at the lower end of the distribution are better able to meet their basic needs. Equalizing opportunities means that the benefits generated by economic growth are shared across the population including by those who are less well-off (Ali, Pro-Poor to Inclusive Growth: Asian Perspective, 2007). Ravallion (Ravallion, Pro-Poor Growth: A Primer, 2007) further cites the example of China with a closer inspection. He argues that in China, the time periods when inequality fell (notably the early 1980s and the mid 1990s) actually have the highest
growth rates. And the province where rural inequality raises the least has the highest growth rates. Irrespective of all the required qualities and a push from the international institutions towards its acceptance in the poor countries; the policy experiences a mix in outcome. It fails to be a universal success story for eradication of poverty and inequality. Given that growth is roughly distribution-neutral on average, it is not surprising that growth in the developing world as a whole has brought down the overall poverty measures. Higher growth in a number of developing countries has come with widening regional disparities and often little or no growth in lagging poor areas. For example, nonfarm economic growth in India has not occurred in the states where it would have the most impact on poverty nationally (Ravallion, Pro-Poor Growth: A Primer, 2007). For example, from 1990 to 2005, the Asian development has been characterized by rising income and expenditure inequalities and stubbornly high levels of non-income inequalities (Table 1 below).

### TABLE 1 INEQUALITY IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy</th>
<th>Initial Year</th>
<th>Final Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rising inequality has become a trend in the Asian growth stories among the developing countries in the past two decades barring few examples like Thailand, Mongolia and Indonesia. The variance in inequality largely causes due to the approach to tackle the poverty inequality conundrum. Countries with large proportion of poor people often attain this conundrum with large scale social support schemes.
Subsidized commodities, direct cash benefit, subsidized health benefits, reservations in opportunities are few such approaches of social benefits to the poor. The success in attaining the poverty-inequality dilemma depends on the approach, its implementation and the possible consequences. Otherwise, possibilities of failure by mistake or wrong intention become higher. Intentions may be noble but every intention needs to be substantiated with logical strategies. “Our intentions may be very good but, because the intelligence is limited, the action may turn out to be a mistake - a mistake, but not necessarily a sin, for sin comes out of a wrong intention” (Eli Stanley Jones, 1884–1973).

The outcome of pro-poor growth has not yield desirable outcome for most of the developing country. India for example is practicing the fundamentals of pro-poor growth and extremely pro-poor growth for more than half of a century; yet 32.7% of its population live below the international poverty line of USD 1.25 per day and 68.7% live on less than USD 2 per day (World Bank 2010). It is evident that the process of pro-poor growth has failed to lift large section of Indian people out of poverty line irrespective of a noble intension to do so. The magnitude and complexity is so profound and intense that the traditional approaches often become insufficient. It is evident that given the scale of difficulties, it needed some innovative ideas/approach to work out these problems.

The much needed fundamental approach got two thrust in the later part of the past decade. Firstly, the central focus of the 2006 World Development Report established its pursuit to attempt for equality of opportunity while avoiding extreme deprivation (World Bank, 2005). And India which has had poverty reduction as the central goal of policy over the past 60 years, has switched to a new development strategy focusing on two basic goals: raising economic growth and and making growth more inclusive (Ali, Pro-Poor to Inclusive Growth: Asian Perspective, 2007). Ever since then, inclusive growth has become a frontline policy approach particularly among the Asian and African developing nations. Lots of energy, effort, and aptitude have been put together in apprehending, explainning and establishing the attribute, approach and implementation strategy of this growth policy.

INCLUSIVE GROWTH

Dimensions of Inclusive Growth

Recently the term “inclusive” is being widely used by policy makers. There is not a clear definition of this word. It appears that it is a synonym for “equitable” – antonymous for “inequitable” – but with an emphasis on job creation and creating an enabling environment for the private sector (Stuart, 2011). The usage of the term
‘inclusive’ in the characterization of growth episodes can be traced back at least to the turn of the century, when Kakwani and Pernia (2000) employ this term to highlight the nature of what they consider to constitute pro-poor growth. Inclusive growth has two words in it – “inclusive” and “growth”: the literal meaning of “inclusive” is all-embracing/ comprehensive/ with everything included and “growth” means multiplication/ expansion/ enlargement. In socio-economic terms, growth is often considered as economic growth. Therefore, it can be justified to assume from the words that that inclusive growth embraces a connotation of all-embracing expansion of social and economy.

Since it has become the major issue of contemporary international development approach, all the major international institutions (e.g. UN, WB, IMF, ADB, and OECD), and academic researchers have tried hard to identify the norms and dimensions of inclusive growth. Define inclusive growth and outline its scope has become the primary task to verify its theme and application around the world. It can be least to say that it has not been an easy task at all. Similar to the earlier growth policies like “pro-poor growth” or “broad based growth”, inclusive growth also doesn’t have a uniform definition or definitive scope. Even among the international institutions, the definition and scope varies depending on their institutional outlook towards development. The World Bank, IMF, OECD, UN, and Asian Development Bank (ADB) have taken the leading role in the discussions of inclusive growth. The institution’s vision of inclusive growth has been listed below (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPC-IG (UN)</th>
<th>WB/IMF/OECD</th>
<th>ADB</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has both outcome and process</td>
<td>Focuses on both pace and pattern of growth</td>
<td>Has economic and non-economic dimensions</td>
<td>Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts from the premise that societies based on equality</td>
<td>Equality of opportunity to access the market, resources for businesses and individuals</td>
<td>Must benefit all stripes of society including poor, near poor, MIGs and even rich.</td>
<td>Equality (of opportunity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable share of benefits of growth among all</td>
<td>Sustained long term and broad based growth across all the sectors</td>
<td>Non discriminatory growth that grants equal access to everyone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone able to participate in decision</td>
<td>All people contribute in growth process</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The research has identified the dimensions of inclusive growth after analyzing the outlook of inclusive growth by different international institutions. The dimensions of inclusive growth are; pattern, economic well-being, equality of opportunity, participation, benefit share, and welfare and social safety. The study finds distinctive difference in approach towards growth process for inclusive growth.

**Uniqueness of Inclusive Growth: Comparison between Inclusive Growth and Earlier Growth Models**

The major difference of inclusive growth is its vision to extend non-income well-being in addition to income well-being. In this sense inclusive growth recognizes the importance of complete human well-being in place of only economic well-being. The other important difference from earlier growth approaches is its vision of equality of opportunity and participation of every citizen in growth and decision making. Inclusive growth is concerned about the opportunity extended towards every people.
Irrespective of socio-economic background, each citizen must have equal access to opportunities. The examples of equality of opportunities can be livelihood opportunity, opportunity for education and access to health service etc. Citizen participation is another key dimension of inclusive growth. Participation of every citizen both in growth and decision making process make integrity of the growth. Otherwise the growth shall become unjust and non-inclusive.

### TABLE 3  COMPARISON BETWEEN MARKET LED GROWTH, PRO-POOR GROWTH & INCLUSIVE GROWTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Led Growth</th>
<th>Pro-Poor Growth</th>
<th>Inclusive Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of resource from rapid economic growth</td>
<td>Economic growth is important for poverty reduction</td>
<td>Expansion in per capita income and <strong>non-income well-being</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor people benefit from opportunity (job) through investment from accumulated resource</td>
<td>Additional benefits to poor people through welfare programs</td>
<td>Additional benefits to poor people through welfare programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme poverty reduction Inequality is good for growth – inequality increases savings</td>
<td>Reduction of both poverty and inequality</td>
<td>Reduction of both poverty and inequality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job creation for poor through economic growth</td>
<td>Productive employment</td>
<td>Productive employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security and safety for socially vulnerable citizen</td>
<td>Social security and safety for socially vulnerable citizen</td>
<td><strong>Equality of opportunity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every citizen participate in growth and decision making</td>
<td><strong>Every citizen participate in growth and decision making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCLUSIVE GROWTH IN INDIA

**Backdrop of Introduction of Inclusive Growth in India**

India has adopted a combination of ‘pro poor growth’ and ‘extremely pro poor growth’ development policy regime over the past 60 years. But the policy regime has done very little to change India’s position in development and growth. The policy has failed to uplift millions of poor Indian out of their poverty. The intense gravity of the
problem induces some ardent steps required to be taken. In an approach to mitigate the intense hurdle, the policy makers introduce inclusive growth as the nucleus of all Indian policy planning with the inception in 11th five year plan in 2007. Now with inclusive growth, the country with 1.2 Billion populations, hopes to convey the growth benefits to all her citizen. The main features articulated in the vision of inclusive growth are,

i. Rapid growth is essential but not sufficient by itself;
ii. Achieve widely spread growth and broad based improvement in living standards of all;
iii. Ensure benefits, in terms of income and employment, are adequately shared by the poor and weaker sections of society;
iv. Growth must occur not just in our major cities but also in our villages and small towns. It must be spread across all states and not just limited to some;
v. Equality of opportunity for all; and
vi. Empowerment through education and skill development, employment opportunities.

Inclusion of Growth in Urban Planning in India

Inclusive growth is not only focuses on the outcome but also deeply concerned with the process. Following the argument, it can be commenced that urban inclusive growth also has a process and an outcome. If we consider urban planning as the process then we can assume physical and social development of city as its outcome. In earlier section, we have identified the dimensions of inclusive growth. Urban policy can find its resemblance with four of these dimensions. These are equality of opportunity, participation, benefit share, and welfare and social safety.

It is very hard to define inclusive city and inclusive city planning with a uniform definition. The identified dimension can lead towards defining inclusive growth. Following the assumptions of inclusiveness in this research we can describe inclusive city planning, as a process which promotes equal opportunity for all; endorse participation in growth and decision making for all; and extend benefits of growth to all; support socio-economically deprived people with welfare and social safety.

The dimensions of inclusive growth can verify the Indian urban planning and its inclusiveness. Prior to verification of the policy inclusiveness the lacunas of Indian cities needs to be known.

Indian cities are severely challenged with many dimensions. The research identifies the urban deficiencies. These are summarized below;

i. Poverty = Urban poverty and its extensive presence is a chronic problem in Indian cities. In 2004-05 the number of urban poor in India was about 80.8
million, which was 25.7% of the urban population (Asian Development Bank, 2008). The urban poor often live in slums and squatters with practically no civic service like water supply, sanitation, electricity.

ii. Utilities and infrastructures = Continuous lack of provision of basic amenities like safe drinking water, sewerage, waste management and sanitation facilities in urban conglomerations decrease potency of human well-being. Existence of urban utilities, while also ensuring that the urban poor have access to these facilities at affordable cost.

iii. Governance = Urban governance is a continuous challenge for Indian cities. The spatial governance structure is often overlaps with responsibilities delegated to various agencies. It raises multiplication of job and unnecessary confusion over the implementation of policies.

iv. Transportation = Transportation in urban centers is a major constraint. Currently, public transport accounts for less than a quarter of urban transport in India;

v. Healthcare = Healthcare in urban India is mostly privately operated. Insufficient public healthcare facility forces the people to access more expensive private healthcare facilities. High cost of private healthcare prevents urban poor from accessing healthcare facilities.

vi. Productive employment and job creation = Indian cities do not create enough productive jobs. Job in informal sector dominates urban economy. The informal sector jobs are often found to be exploitive. Under-employment is an equal concern as unemployment in India.

vii. Housing = Housing shortage in the cities compound the problem further for urban India. The estimated housing shortage in 11\textsuperscript{th} plan (2007-2012) is 24.71 million. Most of these shortages are belong to the economically weaker section of the society.

viii. Social safety = Contribution of informal sector is very significant for urban economy. But most of these contributors are often found themselves in slum or slum like situation.

Identification of urban insufficiency and the government’s vision can illuminate the possible aspirations of a country’s growth approach. It also endows the research with its important purpose to identify the specific indicators to analyze inclusiveness. Social, economic, political and administrative status is different for every country. As a result, policy ambition of each country is different and unique. UN-Habitat has come up with a classification of possible sectors of cities and its policy directions. According to UN-Habitat, there are seven possible areas where urban policies can attribute in urban development. These are urban land legislation and governance,
urban planning and design, urban economy, urban basic services, housing & slum up-gradation, risk reduction & rehabilitation, and research and capacity development. The table below showcases the policy sectors endorse by UN-Habitat and its presence in Indian policy sector.

TABLE 4  SECTOR WISE CLASSIFICATION OF URBAN POLICY BY UN-HABITAT AND ITS EXISTENCE IN INDIAN PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existence in Indian Urban Planning</th>
<th>Urban Land, Legislation &amp; Governance</th>
<th>Urban Planning &amp; Design</th>
<th>Urban Economy</th>
<th>Urban Basic Services</th>
<th>Housing &amp; Slum Upgrading</th>
<th>Risk Reduction &amp; Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Research &amp; Capacity Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Legislation</td>
<td>Regional &amp; Metropolitan Planning</td>
<td>Urban &amp; Municipal Finance</td>
<td>Water &amp; Sanitation</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban &amp; Community Management</td>
<td>City Extension &amp; Enlargement</td>
<td>Youth &amp; Job Creation</td>
<td>Urban Mobility</td>
<td>Slum Upgrading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagship Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Market Town &amp; Intermediate City Planning</td>
<td>Urban Waste Management</td>
<td>Shelter Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-existence in Indian Planning</td>
<td>Land &amp; GLTN</td>
<td>Urban Productivity</td>
<td>Urban Energy</td>
<td>Urban Risk Reduction</td>
<td>Global Urban Observatory</td>
<td>Climate Change Mitigation &amp; Adaptation</td>
<td>Infrastructure Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pro-poor growth remains all along up to 2007. In 2007, the government formally adopts inclusive growth as its mainstay of development policy.

**TABLE 5  INDIA'S GROWTH STRATEGY FROM 1950 TO PRESENT DAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From 1950s to 1980s</th>
<th>From 1980s to 1990s</th>
<th>1991 to mid 2000s</th>
<th>2007 to present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-poor and extremely pro poor growth</td>
<td>Economic reform coupled with pro-poor growth</td>
<td>From socialist ideologies to open market economy</td>
<td>Inclusive growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist political-economic principles</td>
<td>High public spending on capital investment</td>
<td>Structured economic liberalisation</td>
<td>Creation of opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we need to see whether urban policy planning follows the similar trend to the overall development policy or not. In order to identify the policy consequences we have undertaken policy analysis for past three decades (Figure 1).

**FIGURE 1  EVOLUTION OF INDIAN URBAN POLICY OVER THE PAST THREE DECADES**
Prior to 1991 economic liberalization, an urban infrastructure program and poverty alleviation program is initiated by the central government and major funding flows from the centre. Other initiatives and effort come from the individual state governments. In 1992 the decentralization act is enacted but it takes almost a decade to realization of the act in all the states. Housing has always remained a major hindrance in Indian urban sector. In 1997 National Urban Housing and Habitat Policy is introduced. The policy embraces habitat along with housing to inculcate the habitation and built environment from only facilitating people with housing. Livelihood generation program aims at alleviating poverty is renewed on the same year with modified objectives and enhanced funding arrangements. In 2000s, many programs are initiated and in many sectors of urban areas. It includes housing for slums (Valmiki Ambedkar Awas Yojana and Integrated Housing & Slum Development Program) and tax free municipal bonds for Urban Local Bodies. The first major constructive policy is introduced in 2005 with the introduction of urban renewal mission in 2005 (Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission and Urban Infrastructure Development Scheme for Small & Medium Towns). In 2007 India introduces inclusive growth as the fundamental policy program for the country. In the same year revised National Urban Housing and Habitat Policy is introduced. For urban institutions, policy seeking capital infusion in urban area by the local government named Pooled Finance Development Fund and capacity development initiative of e-governance is introduced. In recent years Affordable Housing in Partnership for urban poor and Rajiv Awas Yojana for slum and urban poor are introduced. Rajiv Awas Yojana is an ambitious program by the central government which aims at slum free city in India. The program also subsumes all housing program for slum and urban poor. Therefore the program is the only housing program aims at urban poor and slum people.

Discussion on Urban Policy and Inclusive Growth

It can be observed from the evolutionary diagram that only one program comes into after the introduction of inclusive growth. All the other programs have been modified or introduced considering the theme itself. But a close look at the programs reveals that the programs are targeted mostly towards meeting the direct benefit of the people. The moral obligation of inclusive growth in equality of opportunity, participation, benefit share, and welfare and social safety is often ignored. In this framework, the deprived people are provided with additional welfare and social safety programs. But none of the programs are concerned about the capability of the people to either maintain or improve of their existing infrastructure. In this manner the people will remain dependent on the government support for ever. The approach needs lots of
revenue to continuously support the people. India is a big and poor country for that much revenue requirement.

If the present method continues the growth shall never be inclusive in accordance to the true dimensions of inclusive growth. The present method is just an advanced adaptation of pro-poor growth. It may be insufficient to resolve India’s problem in this approach.

CONCLUSION

The research identifies significant dissimilarity between the true dimension of inclusive growth and its adaptation in Indian urban system. It is commendable that Indian policy makers are constantly invigorate inclusive growth theme in public domain. Public discussion always leads to more effective approach. But the policy makers need to realize the true dimension of inclusive growth. At the same time it is very hypothetical to conclude that if applied inclusive growth can alleviate India’s problem. As a theoretical comparison inclusive growth appears to be far more effective approach than pro-poor growth. But the theory needs to be comprehended in practice. India has a golden opportunity to apply the true dimensions of inclusive growth and benefitted from the application. It needs modification of the existing approach to implement the true dimensions of inclusive growth.
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