

S
by Y Z

Submission date: 12-Nov-2020 03:46AM (UTC-0800)

Submission ID: 1443808417

File name: part_2_1.docx (12.83K)

Word count: 184

Character count: 987

Part 2

Withers (2015), argues that gentrification should have limits concerning compensation. According to the Indian Constitution, the state has the responsibility to maintain the wellbeing of the people. When gentrification is done, this aspect is not followed as most slum dwellers are not legal occupants. Instead of being given long term residence, they reside on highway sides where little space is found. In the end, low-income people suffer so that the property tax base is increased.

Withers (2015) insists that should not be the case, and instead, people should be displaced and provided with long term residence. If the buyers cannot do so, then the process should be avoided. Also, the capitalists should be banned from persuading the residents to accept little cash, so to move. There need to be limitations on how much they should be given to be replaced. It is the case as low-income people would readily accept little cash due to challenges and end up suffering more, which the government needs to control.

Reference

Withers, J. (2015). David Harvey: Limits to Growth, Limits to Gentrification. (9th Dec 2015).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4JQPnbN6ALo>

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off