



WORKING PAPER

94

ELITE PERCEPTIONS OF POVERTY : THE CASE OF KARNATAKA

Anand Inbanathan

ISBN 81-7791-050-7

© 2001, Copyright Reserved

The Institute for Social and Economic Change,
Bangalore

Institute for Social and Economic Change (ISEC) is engaged in interdisciplinary research in analytical and applied areas of the social sciences, encompassing diverse aspects of development. ISEC works with central, state and local governments as well as international agencies by undertaking systematic studies of resource potentials, identifying factors influencing growth and examining measures for reducing poverty. The thrust areas of research include state and local economic policies, issues relating to sociological and demographic transition, environmental issues and fiscal, administrative and political decentralization and governance. It pursues fruitful contact with other institutions and scholars devoted to social science research through collaborative research programmes, seminars, etc.

The Working Paper Series provides an opportunity for ISEC faculty, visiting fellows and PhD scholars to discuss their ideas and research work before publication and to get feedback from their peer group. Papers selected for publication in the series present empirical analyses and generally deal with wider issues of public policy at a sectoral, regional or national level. These working papers undergo review but typically do not present final research results, and constitute work

ELITE PERCEPTIONS OF POVERTY: THE CASE OF KARNATAKA

Anand Inbanathan*

Abstract

The present study uses the concept of 'social consciousness' to address the problem whether elites possess attitudes and beliefs which are essentially 'pro-poor'. Though poverty is often manifested in their own neighbourhood, their direct interaction with the poor is limited. There is little feeling among most that they are responsible for the poor, or that they use up a disproportionately high part of society's resources. Only a few thought they should exert themselves to improve the condition of the poor. Although they were important in their own sphere of life, they felt their personal resources and power were too weak to make any impact on the problem of poverty, which is of enormous dimensions.

Introduction

Poverty is a condition that has existed for years. And, in whatever manner it is defined, there has always been a substantial part of Indian society that fell into the category of 'poor'.¹ Although the condition of being poor meant deprivation of one kind or the other, there is nothing to suggest that poverty has always been seen as a social problem. Thus, anti-poverty programmes, initiated and carried out by the government or any other agency, are also a very recent phenomenon.

After Indian Independence (1947), while it was recognized that levels of poverty in India were very high, the means to reduce poverty rested on a choice between two distinct paradigms of development. One was the Gandhian model (representing traditionalism) which aimed at the improvement of the quality of life at the local level, eventually leading to overall development. The second model was the Nehruvian model (representing modernity) which sought to define development in a particular way and was to be achieved through economic growth. The building of 'temples of progress' (involving large industry, dams, etc.) was stressed as a necessary precondition for the economy to take-off

* Associate Professor, Sociology, at Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore. Email address: dr.anand@vsnl.com

This is one study among several taken up in different countries, to provide a comparative picture of the elite perceptions of poverty.

Srividya G D, H Y Gowamma and Suma Rao assisted in, and carried out, several of the interviews that form the basis of this paper. Observations and suggestions from V. Vijayalakshmi are greatly appreciated.

into high growth. Nehru was deeply influenced by the Soviet model. The ultimate result was expected to be the reduction and probable elimination of poverty among large sections of the Indian population. The rate of growth of the Indian economy was higher after Independence than before, and on several indicators improvements were certainly made (Basu 2001). But such improvements were not sufficient to drastically reduce the number of poor in the country, which makes poverty as relevant and significant an issue as it was at the time of Independence.

It is in the context of the large number of poor people in the country and Karnataka, that the present study seeks to enquire into the views of the elites who are found in this state. It is assumed that when poverty has not been brought down to a sufficiently low number/proportion of the population, something more needs to be done. In this, it is also presumed that if the elites in society were found to have attitudes that were more conducive to furthering anti-poverty efforts, these may be brought to bear on fresh initiatives to reduce the incidence of poverty.

Various measures were undertaken, including planning for development (Dev and Ranade 1997), and controlling the growth of the economy, as well as distribution of resources, with the view to bring down the incidence of poverty. It is agreed that there has been a substantial number of poor people who have now come above the 'poverty line,' though the proportion of people who are poor still remains a significantly large part of the Indian population². In Karnataka, the estimated number of persons below the poverty line was 29.88 per cent in the rural areas, and 40.14 per cent in the urban areas. And, the total number of persons below the poverty line was 189.61 lakhs (i.e. 18.96 million) in 1993-94. Compared to the poverty levels in 1973-74 when rural poverty was 55 %, and urban poverty was 53 %, the levels of poverty in rural and urban areas have fallen considerably (Human Development in Karnataka 1999). Further, compared to many other states of the country, Karnataka does not have a very wide disparity in wealth between people of the state, any great inequality in land ownership, or frequent caste and class conflicts (see Manor 1989; also Deshpande and Raju 2001)³. As the gini coefficient⁴ also indicates, the figures of 0.27 for rural and 0.32 for urban Karnataka, the state has a relatively low level of inequality (compared to some of the other states of India).

Social Consciousness

The concept of 'social consciousness' was instrumental in directing questions and enabled analysis of the perception of the elites. This was defined in terms of three characteristics: that elites possessed social consciousness to the degree that:

1. They are aware of the interdependence among social groups in the society, and of the external effects of poverty on them, which may be perceived as either threatening or promising opportunities.

2. They realised that as members of the elite they bear some responsibility for the conditions of the poor.
3. They believe that feasible and efficacious means of improving the lot of the poor exist or might be created.

Poverty

Two indicators of poverty are usually observed in the literature on the subject, one of which is absolute poverty and the other is relative deprivation. The first depends on some standard, or a poverty line (Lanjouw n.d), and all those below this line are considered as poor (Srinivasan 1977). In this sense, 'Absolute poverty is defined as the inability to attain a minimal standard of living'. This standard varies from country to country. The second measure of poverty is '...a measure of income distribution and inequality than a measure of absolute deprivation'(Quibria 1991: 93). Absolute poverty may be eradicated at some time, or at least reduced to a considerable extent, but relative deprivation will always persist, inasmuch as there is always the likelihood of there being inequalities in society (see Alcock 1993).

Government measures to reduce the levels of poverty, and also provide for immediate aid to the poor, has taken two directions. One is a 'direct approach' where the government intervention is through specific programmes aimed at people who are identified as poor. The second is an 'indirect approach' where overall economic growth is enhanced through appropriate policies, which would benefit the poor. In the latter approach, the strategy is not an expectation of any 'trickle down' of benefits (which Bhagwati claimed is more likely to be benign neglect), but a 'pull-up' effort, meant to actively enable the poor to exit from their state of poverty (Bhagwati 1988: 541).

Who are the Elites?

Most societies have some form of social hierarchy, with predominant number of people in the lower rungs, while the pyramidal structures have a much smaller number of people at the highest rungs. It is those at the highest rungs who have power and control over the functioning of society (see Nash 2000:13-16). However, there is no uniformity in the manner in which elites function in societies. In less complex societies, one group of elites may perform a large number of functions, while the more complex societies have different sections and segments with elites in each group. To consider one of the better known descriptions of what constitutes 'elite,' we have Vilfredo Pareto's description, where he stated that we can classify elites as those who, in terms of capability and capacity, are outstanding individuals in whatever area of human activity they were engaged. He suggested a scale of 0 to 10, and those who can be given a score of 10 are those who belong to the elite (Bottomore 1993:1).

In complex societies, 'strategic elites' is a term which could be used to refer to those who have or are assigned responsibilities. They also have influence over their society as a whole, in contrast with segmental elites, which have major responsibilities in sub domains of the society (Keller 1972:26).

Indian society is considered as a segmented society, with a wide diversity in its composition. The society is divided on the basis of castes among Hindus, but other religious groups too have some form of divisions, some of them even caste-like (see Caplan 1989). Castes not only divide society, but they are also seen in an hierarchical order, for instance, among Hindus with the Brahmins as the highest caste and groups of the former 'untouchables' at the lower end. These latter, now comprise the 'Scheduled Castes' (the list of castes which the Government of India and state governments have prepared, to provide benefits to help them in various ways) (see Srinivas 1987;1996a;1996b).

In the context of the segmental elites which we have in India, a wide variety exists in terms of the sub domains or segments, the mode of recruitment, the form of authority and power which they possess, and the exclusiveness that they display. Obviously, it would be inappropriate to suggest that they (elites) from different domains, can be equated or seen as identical. And further, the kind of impact that they have on policy or on poverty also differs from one domain to another.

Most of those who occupy the highest positions in various occupational hierarchies, such as civil services, and professionals, are from the middle class, and generally from the upper castes. Through English education, and employment in British agencies several groups were able to achieve a higher status, based not just on their ascriptive position but more on their achievement (Subramaniam 1994). And this class has people from different caste and religious groups. Recruitment to most occupations is based on education and technical skills rather than the fact of belonging to specific groups (except that in the case of the Scheduled Castes, and in some institutions also for Backward Classes, where, through affirmative action seats are reserved for them). The civil services are dominated by the middle class, and this is also related to the much higher representation of the middle class in school and university (Ibid: 19-29, 31-33). This is of some significance since there are considerable similarities in the socio-economic background of the elites. Members of the educated professional elite and IAS officers (Indian Administrative Service) are predominantly from higher income groups, from families where the father had a relatively high status, and higher income occupation (Navlakha 1989:78, 80-83). The education of nearly 60 per cent of them was through 'better class schools,' and where English was either the medium of instruction (51.8%) or an important paper (13%) together comprising 64.8 per cent. Engineers, particularly in the Indian Institutes of Technology, were mainly of middle and upper classes

and English schools (Rajagopalan and Singh 1968:565-70). Allopathic medical doctors were mostly from families of middle and upper income (see Oommen 1978; Jayaram 1977) and among the more prosperous of the professionals (see Dubey 1975). Others, who figure among the elites such as the heads of religious sects, or caste leaders, have not come up the route which we have described above. Business families and the very rich may exhibit some of the characteristics of the elites from the professionals and civil services, essentially because their educational qualifications may be similar. However, their standing in society does not depend on working their way up any occupational hierarchy, but because they stand above such hierarchies.

Members of the elite who are from the Scheduled Castes may now share some of the characteristics of the other elites, but a particular point that is to be noted here is that many of them were recruited into the services through reservations of seats (in addition to their education and skills). While they occupy positions of considerable prestige and influence, their background was not always comparable to other elites. They had to overcome several handicaps, and their background had relatively more disadvantages than the other elites (see also Mendelsohn and Vicziany 1998).

Context of the Study

In the present study we have several activities which have been listed as being important in the state. Those who are prominent in these areas are those we have identified as the elite, and whom we interviewed. The elites in our study were not a 'national' elite but functioned in a more local context, i.e. the state of Karnataka, and hence may be called local elites. Even those who may have held positions of an all-India character at some time did not have this characteristic when this study was conducted.⁵ The farmers who are in our sample have only a local presence--they are village elites, and on their own have very little impact on policy even at the state level--though as a group, farmers have a strong presence and are able to influence policy at various levels.⁶

The elites included in the study comprise 1 a) politicians in power; b) politicians in opposition; 2) media-editors/senior journalists; 3) academicians and teachers; 4) union leaders; 5) corporate heads; 6) leaders of voluntary agencies; 7) civil servants; 8) military officers; 9) farmers; 10) religious leaders; 11) professionals. It is not always easy or possible to state very clearly that an individual can be placed at the highest or even a high position near the top in his sphere of activity. In a clearly established structure such as the government bureaucracy which has a well ordered hierarchy of positions, one can easily place anyone in the hierarchy, and see who is at the top most position or near it. It is less easy to place a freelance journalist or members of voluntary agencies, or

even farmers (though some rough indication of their position is possible with size of land ownership being a crucial criterion of placing them)⁷. We were not always successful in meeting persons of high status who were still 'in service'. In such cases, we have had to interview superannuated officials, or politicians out of power. For our purpose it was considered as an essential adjustment to the conditions of research, and a better alternative to not having anyone from that particular group at all. Eight of those we interviewed are women. Generalization is not really an issue when the number of persons in each category is small, and we have not described or analysed the field material in terms of separate categories of elites. This is also due to the fact that views expressed by the elites did not directly and always correspond to the group in which they were located, i.e., their views could not be identified as peculiar or unique to that particular group.

The majority of our respondents are based in Bangalore, and even those who are in occupations which may see them transferred from place to place, are at least for the time being, located in this city. The farmers have been selected from villages located some 40 km from Bangalore city, in Bangalore Rural district. The head of a religious institution, the *Swamiji* of a Lingayat *mutt* was met in Tumkur city since he rarely visited Bangalore.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents

Activity	Number
Politicians (in tenure)	3
Politician (out of office)	1
Media persons (editors; senior journalists)	4
Academics	5
Union leader	1
Corporate leaders/heads	2
Voluntary associations	6
Civil servants	8
Military officers	3
Farmers (land, 10+ acres)	10
Professionals	3
Religious leaders	6
Total	52

Elite Perceptions of Poverty

On 'who' are the poor: We started by trying to establish 'who' in the views of the elite can be classified as 'poor'. Poverty was described by virtually all the persons with whom we talked as a severe deprivation of

food, shelter and clothing, in that order. The clear indication was that the lack of food takes precedence over all other forms of deprivation because it affects health, earning capacity, and possibly life itself. People can survive without education or even, to some extent, a health support system, but without proper food, the cumulative impact on the person is substantial enough, to greatly affect the person and his/her future. About a third of the Indian population could, thus, be among the poor. In the context of the sections of the population which were in poverty, there was even the perception (among a few of the elite) that poverty was related to whether the person had a government job or not.

Having asked for a more elaborate review of not only absolute poverty, the views of poverty went into what may be seen as relative deprivation of a more general kind. Answers of most persons suggested that if we consider deprivation only in terms of the meeting of 'basic needs', then 20-50 per cent of the population are seen to be among the poor. There is also the distinction that we can make between deprivation in an objective sense and the subjective perception of the people themselves----which could differ markedly⁸. When we move away from these 'basic needs,' we realise that more can be included in the idea of deprivation, most people are in one manner or the other, 'deprived.' However, as a former official (who is also an economist) remarked, the debate over the actual number of poor people (whether 29% or 37%) is immaterial, because the fact is that the poor constitute a sizeable segment of the population. The presence of a large number of poor people retards the rate of growth of the economy. A higher growth rate of the economy (compared to the earlier 3 per cent) will result in the generation of employment and a reduction in the number of poor people. But the poor are not able to take advantage of the opportunities because of the lack of education. This further increases income disparities in the population, necessitating the intervention of the state. The state's main role becomes the redistribution of resources in society.

There were two opposing views about poverty or relative deprivation being more, or less, acute in the rural areas⁹ as compared to the urban. Most of the respondents who were from urban areas clearly had the idea that it was possible for rural people to manage, for a while at least, without any money or income---which was not possible in urban areas. With the idea that in rural areas family and relatives can provide a basic minimum (food, for example) to those who cannot manage for themselves, the impact of poverty is less severe. Moreover, people in rural areas can manage with much less, than in the urban areas. The understanding here is that rural people have less 'needs' than urban people. Thus, it is only in urban areas that we really see poverty. In this view, the urban poor need to pay for whatever they need, and since money is always in short supply, they cannot get enough of any of the basic necessities.

Another view (of a minority) was that poverty is more of a rural problem since the majority of Indian people lives in villages. When a substantial number of them do not get enough to eat, have poor shelter and clothing, and even less in terms of education and economic opportunities, then poverty can be seen as essentially a rural phenomenon. In an urban area many facilities are available even for the less affluent. Schools and medical facilities are available, but less so in rural areas. The rural interviewees (farmers) indicated that in an agricultural context, possessing no land was one of the aspects of poverty, since owning land provided several opportunities to earn a living and support themselves. But a crucial attribute which follows from being landless is that these people become 'wage labourers'. Being a wage labourer is what confirms the person as poor. Certain groups were represented in higher proportions among the poor than others. Several references were made to the 'poor' comprising mainly those from Scheduled Castes, and Muslims. For reasons which are not very similar, many in these two groups have not been able to find their way out of poverty, though small numbers from within them have indeed succeeded. Caste as such may be instrumental in keeping some persons of the SCs in the same situation when their lower self-esteem and poor opportunities reduce their ability to get any education, keep them in unskilled jobs and poor wages, and not motivate them to even aspire for anything higher.

There was also a view (expressed by a few persons) that overall, poverty in Karnataka has been reduced to a considerable extent, and is not on a scale, as for example, in states such as Bihar and Orissa.

Some ambiguity is visible in the reactions of the elite on whether to consider the poor as either 'deserving' or 'undeserving'. Almost everyone considered this distinction as inappropriate. Views of the elite indicated that all the poor are deserving of support and help, regardless of how they found themselves in the category of 'poor.' No one chooses to be poor, and they are in this situation due to their circumstances. However, as an official said, the distinction between 'deserving' and 'undeserving' is a value judgement imposed by those outside the category of poor. It is easy to label someone as belonging to the group of 'undeserving poor' because the person is thought to be too lazy to work and earn an income. But a closer examination of the person's life situation often reveals that other factors may be responsible for the person's unemployment. Lack of requisite skills, employment opportunities only far away from home, and many other compulsions forcing persons to refrain from taking up employment. Some may even prefer begging to gainful employment. Age becomes a crucial factor while talking of 'deserving poor'. Children, who are forced to eke out a living and live in poverty rather than attend school, deserve special consideration for their education. Should women be dependent on men, or should they attempt to manage the dual burden of work outside the home and housework? This fails to resolve the debate

over referring to women as deserving or undeserving poor. But such a rigid classification is unnecessary, for the aim of poverty alleviation programmes must be to provide every deprived person with the necessities of life.

But having said this, there were also strong views expressed by a majority to suggest that quite a few of the poor were lazy and did not take up opportunities when they were available¹⁰. Further, 'self inflicted' problems included habits such as drinking, smoking, and gambling, which wasted their already weak resources and increased their health problems. Education was one of the first casualties when weak resources were apportioned for different family expenses. So upward mobility was also difficult when education was not taken up by the family members. A hypothetical case was cited by an official of Scheduled Caste background to illustrate a point of view that caste may be a factor in the attitudes that are present among the poor. Thus, if a non-Brahmin family (or of Scheduled Caste background) of poor people was earning roughly 9-10 thousand rupees a month through the work of several family members, a minimum amount will be spent on basic necessities and the rest would be spent on non-productive items such as liquor, cigarettes, etc. Even a smaller amount, if it were in the hands of a Brahmin family, would have been spent judiciously, on good food, and on education. This would have resulted in the economic well being and better status/income occupations for the family members. While this was one person's view (i.e., the hypothetical case), there was a general agreement that though the conditions of life for the poor are difficult, it was not impossible for them to improve their social-economic situation, through even the limited opportunities that were available. What was required was the inclination towards hard work-something, the elite emphasised, that is lacking among many of the poor. However, even if we considered the poor as deserving of help, one should be discerning in the kind of support that was given to them. With limited resources, if one gave away something to a person who hardly did any work, then someone who was more likely to be a hard worker was deprived of such help. Further, appropriate support meant that, for example, one did not give a computer to a poorly educated person, but rather helped set up a petty shop so that he/she could earn a living.

An extreme view was also articulated by one person that when the government provides so many opportunities, the poor can, with not too much effort, make their way out of poverty. The reason why they do not get out of poverty is their own complete lack of effort and motivation. Thus, no one among the poor is really 'deserving'.

In whichever manner 'poverty' is defined, the number of people who are poor is undoubtedly large. A factor which exacerbated the problems faced by the poor was their usually large family size. In the opinion of the majority of the elite, 'family planning' was neither successful,

nor was it implemented vigorously by the government agencies. Does this large number affect the rest of society, i.e. those who are not poor? Views on this question suggested that the major effect was on the economy, i.e. economic growth. Large amounts had to be set aside as subsidies, which had little value in creating and increasing the country's wealth. Also mentioned was that resources had to be made available to cater to a growing population, and therefore, institutions providing support for health and education were stretched to the maximum. The resources were spread too thin, and the benefits reaching the people were also of a relatively low quality.

Reasons for Poverty: With over 50 years since India's Independence, the fact that there is still a large number of poor is clearly indicative that official anti-poverty policies have not met with overwhelming success. The elite were quite aware of the wide gap between expectations and reality related to poverty. In varying forms they indicated that the government was to blame for the less than successful overall effect of anti-poverty programmes. The main reason identified was that only the government commands resources on a scale to make a significant impact on the incidence of poverty and it did not utilize the resources for maximum effectiveness. Secondly, it was suggested that even the designs of the anti-poverty programmes were faulty, mainly because they were programmes designed only by government officials, without any involvement of the poor. Thus, there was always a discrepancy between what is appropriate and useful, and what is actually given--leading to a relatively less than successful outcome.

Corruption as a major factor in the failure of anti-poverty programmes was frequently mentioned. While development funds are siphoned off, anti-poverty programmes too suffer. Programmes after programmes have been initiated and run for several years, with poverty still being a major issue in public life. The greater blame was on lower rank bureaucrats, rather than those in higher positions. The understanding was that implementation of programmes is managed by these bureaucrats, and when things go wrong it is they who should be held responsible. There was even the suggestion that special training should be imparted to get officials to rise above personal gains, and to think about the public good, or that of the poor, on whose behalf they were working. Officials were not the only ones involved in corruption according to the elites. Representatives who functioned as 'middlemen' and received a percentage of the loans were also seen as being involved in corrupt practices. This was so since the beneficiaries got less money than the sanctioned loans.¹¹

Agriculturists were of the view that land distribution was not very successful, and that is why we find so many rural poor. Even when land was distributed, many of the poor sold their land, used up the money, and then reverted to their earlier poverty and style of life. A farmer stated

that while 50-60 bags of grain per acre may be produced in some countries, his perception of production in his area was a production of just 5-6 bags. While the figures he mentioned may sound an exaggeration to emphasize his view, there is little doubt that low productivity is an important fact of agricultural production in many parts of India¹². Further, improving the conditions of the poor and reducing the incidence of poverty depend on several factors, including education and employment.

The role of government in poverty control : By and large there is a common thread which runs through the entire study, and that is the feeling that 'I' cannot do anything significant about poverty. Thus, the usual observation was that it was only the government which has the resources to control and reduce poverty in the country. And, individuals are relatively powerless to make any dent on poverty. In fact, a member of the state legislative assembly stated that since he was in the opposition (a member of the Congress-I party)¹³ he could not do anything for the poor. There was also the perception that voluntary work is not as acceptable as it may have been assumed- reaction to community/neighbourhood activities suggested that not everyone has adjusted to the possibility that individuals other than government functionaries can or should be involved. However, a few did say that if they helped in their own small way, something may be achieved. The question here is one of whether the elites, in whatever occupation that they belong, have the opportunity to carry out activities that are beneficial to the poor. On a large scale, over the whole country, or over the state, programmes designed to reduce poverty can be carried out only by the government. And in this context, it is government bureaucrats who have considerable scope to influence them. Members of the ruling party in government too may have some influence over these policies and programmes. The rest of the people may need to think of relatively small scale efforts which can be called charitable activities, to help those who are poor.

While the elites still believe that the government, as the single largest agency to be involved in the anti-poverty efforts, should continue with its programmes, the perception is also visible that the problem is too much even for the government.

Non government organizations (NGOs) and the control of poverty: It is clearly agreed that the government on its own has not been able to control poverty. That other agencies, including NGOs would be a relevant and useful addition in the anti-poverty efforts of the government is also a view held by most of the elites. There is no illusion that NGOs can handle the problem either, or over a wide area. It is recognised that NGOs are dependent, to a large extent, on resources and funds from outside sources (i.e. not generated by the NGOs from within, or through their own activities). This fact, of having to support their

activities through funds from outside sources (whether within the country or other countries) makes NGOs be a suspect in the eyes of several of the elite. The possible involvement of NGOs in anti-poverty efforts brought forth some strong reactions, both of positive and negative nature. For most of the elite, who had something positive to say about NGOs, these agencies had local contacts, and specific skills which could be used to develop poor areas, and people under the poverty line. Education and health facilities could be provided through NGOs, wherever the government has been less than successful in getting educational institutions started. A farmer was of the view that immunization programmes could be more effectively implemented by NGOs than government agencies. Others said that even if NGOs are financed by foreign agencies, there is no special problem in that, but strict accountability should be maintained. After all even the government gets foreign funds from time to time. Disaster relief in many cases are provided through NGOs, sometimes even sooner than government agencies.

The negative statements (from a few) on the NGOs reflect certain perceptions which have been current for sometime, as regards the activities of NGOs. On those sponsored by Christian agencies, they are seen as agencies whose sole motivation is to propagate or spread Christianity through conversions. The small NGOs which have sprung up in many places are seen as essentially started by those who were unable to get any other employment. There were even statements that there was no need for NGOs when there are sufficient government agencies working for the uplift of the poor, and that NGOs were unreliable entities. Alternatively, charitable activities can be carried out by religious trusts. 'Self help groups' which have been started in several areas can be encouraged to be the nodal point for people to organize and pool their efforts towards improving their economic situation. Another view was that NGOs too, like government agencies, are afflicted with the disease of corruption. Siphoning off of funds is quite common among NGOs, and therefore, it is better to do whatever needs be done for the poor by oneself. This last point was made by someone who has substantial means as well as the inclination to carry out work for the poor. So she was instrumental in setting up a foundation to manage activities and resources for the benefit of the poor, in different states of the country.

An interesting, but perhaps not typical case is of a lady who grew up in a particular environment and was imbued with the idea that each person should help others who are not in a comfortable situation in life, such as the poor. In her early years, she could not do much, through lack of resources, though she helped poor people in the neighbourhood in various ways. However, now that she is both an executive in a company which is quite wealthy and also has substantial control over large volumes of funds, she can do much more for the poor. The foundation which she directs has taken up development activities in four states and several

villages. She favours developing peoples' entrepreneurial skills and giving a part of a start up cost for petty business. She does not favour giving the entire cost as a grant because this may result in the person not working hard to make the enterprise succeed and also makes the person dependent on someone else.

The Buddhist monk in this study felt that government agencies are not very successful in carrying out anti-poverty programmes. He thought religious organisations, related to churches, Lingayat mutts, Jain organisations, etc., were doing far better in reaching benefits to the poor.¹⁴

Localised and personal efforts: A few of the elites were involved in small scale efforts to improve the situation of the poor. For example a doctor said he treated several patients free of cost when he found that they were relatively poor. A member of the Rotary Club said that the club was involved in poverty alleviation efforts. A Christian clergyman said that his church was involved in development activities in local slums. In all these the motivating factor appears to be a personal 'need' to do something for the poor, in whatever limited manner. There was no grand scheme in view, to reduce the overall number of poor, or to do something to avoid any rebellions, uprisings or riots which may occur if the disparities in income and wealth increased to a very great extent. The clergyman suggested that the Christian religion itself has a service orientation among its precepts, and hence doing something for the poor was part of his religious commitment. Among the agriculturists, it was considered everyone's duty to look after those who worked for them. In one case, the agriculturist hired 10-15 labourers regularly. One of them was seriously injured and the agriculturist financially supported the worker so that he could send his son to school and later even found the boy a government job. Essentially a part of patron-client relations, the feeling of obligation towards their subordinates is strongly ingrained among many of the large landowners who regularly hire labourers to carry out agricultural operations. A Muslim agriculturist said he gave money, food and clothes to many people at the time of Muslim festivals, and with the belief that if he were to do this, he too would be benefited with divine grace.

Elites appeared to show little interest in helping only members of their own community, or religious group. For example, the swamiji of the Tumkur mutt, indicated that the support provided by the mutt extended to all groups, including those of Scheduled Castes, and not confined to the community which is associated with the mutt, i.e. Lingayats. Likewise the individual acts of charity or help to the poor were not confined to members of their own caste or religious groups.

High ranking government officials said that while it was often part of their official functions to implement anti-poverty programmes and schemes, their own empathy and understanding of the situation of the

poor would undoubtedly make them more sensitive in their implementation of the programmes. For instance, an official stated that under various circumstances, his family had lost its property and resources, and for a while was in a state of poverty. He is, therefore, more aware of the circumstances of the poor than many others in similar occupations and positions as he. This makes it possible for him to carry out his official duties in a manner more sympathetic to the poor. Whether this may actually occur in all cases has been disputed by another official who stated that elites can be manipulated, and biased, towards certain ways of looking at the poor. Often we find that people who have a background in poverty do not choose to remember the times in which they lived. Thus, they may not be the best people for effective anti-poverty efforts. In fact they may even believe that when they could get out of their poverty situation, others too can do the same with sustained hard work. (This is borne out by one of the elites in our sample, from a Scheduled Caste and poor background, who explicitly stated that it is possible to come out of poverty through hard work, but most people are lazy and also have wasteful habits, and hence remain poor). A less than sympathetic attitude may be found in these people who were poor and now are not. On the other hand, even people who grew up in relatively affluent circumstances may be more effective in carrying out anti-poverty programmes after they get over their initial shock of seeing the conditions of the poor. This official called it the 'Gautama Siddharth effect'.

An official of the Indian Administrative Service stated that intentions behind anti-poverty programmes were good and they were indeed designed to help the poor. But it was not only the government machinery which had problems, or was at fault. Indian society is so large that to handle any problem this size is bound to be less than entirely successful. Further, corruption at various levels made matters worse. Another view related to the functioning of the officials was that there is a definite possibility that age and the position of the person is related to perceptions of poverty. For instance, among the officers of the Indian Administrative Service, when they were younger they may be more idealistic and motivated to do something for the poor, while they may have a reduced inclination to take up anti-poverty initiatives when they are older, and may even be more cynical about the possibility of successful anti-poverty efforts.

In principle, bureaucrats should be expected to function under the supervision of elected representatives. However, a member of the legislative assembly (MLA) stated that the majority of politicians functioned under the supervision or even control of bureaucrats. In one sense, this may be construed as passing the blame onto the 'appropriate' persons. That the bureaucrats are more in control is not an isolated view of the politicians. A senior journalist too felt that at present, policies are not framed by people's representatives, but by officials.¹⁵

Government policies and poverty: In the context of the present efforts at liberalisation in the economy, there was no consensus that these efforts would have any beneficial effect on the poor, or whether any effect would be noticed at all. There were views that even earlier (i.e. prior to the liberalization process being set in motion around 1991,) improvements in the economy did not necessarily reach the poor. It was usually the rich who benefited then, and is the same even now. The major problem was in the distribution of resources and not whether the economy grew or increased. Rural poor were the ones who were least benefited from the growth of the economy. However, an economist suggested that liberalisation was not accepted as a complete ideology, but only in a few areas such as trade policy. The increasing inequality in society would have set in even if liberalisation had not been undertaken. Liberalisation has both a positive and negative impact. On the positive side, it opens up the rural economy, increases variation and breaks down traditional bondage. But a bad year in agriculture can result in severe losses. There was even the view that if the rate of economic growth increased due to the liberalisation efforts of the government, there was every likelihood that this would also increase the level of corruption. The poor, in this case, would not, in any way, benefit from the economic growth.

There was almost complete agreement among the elites that increasing taxes is not a viable means of reducing poverty. Increases in taxation may, in principle, help in the re-distribution process, but even that is not certain. In any event, the rates of taxes were high enough, and what needs to be improved is their collection. The number of tax payers should be increased, and then funds should be properly used. At the most, if taxes were to be increased it should only affect the rich. Or, taxes should not be increased on basic requirements, but only on luxury items. Whatever be the case, even if resources were increased through higher taxes, the chances are that much of it would be used up by politicians and bureaucrats, and very little would reach the poor. A point in this context is that there was no mention at all that agricultural income should be taxed. As of now, one can become rich through agricultural activities, but still pay no income tax. Moreover, even with the existing resources, the government can do a lot to alleviate poverty. Rather than handing out funds as subsidies or largess, the government must encourage productive activities that can stimulate economic growth. Poverty alleviation programmes such as Jawahar Rozgar Yojana must not be reduced to relief programmes, but should add to the productive capacity of the population. Anti-poverty programmes must aim at providing jobs in the area of infrastructure development, such as building of roads and irrigation facilities. This can help provide labour-intensive employment while also building the infrastructure required for higher economic growth. Others indicated that the government should manage the economy more efficiently rather than increase taxes, which in a sense may imply that the rich were being penalized. This may also have a negative impact on

economic growth. Being rich should be seen as a sign of success, and the rich should be perceived as assets to the country because of their enterprise, achievements and success. The fact that there are many poor people does not mean that the rich are to be blamed or be held responsible for the plight of the poor.

Poverty and other social issues: When a list of issues were ranked according to their importance in the context of poverty, most of the elites accorded the highest ranks to health and primary education¹⁶, and then other issues followed in different sequences (higher education, security, social welfare, the environment, corruption). In this context, a former official stated that when money is allocated and budgeted for various items, education and health were the 'soft targets,' and even when money was already allocated, it could be diverted to other, more 'urgent' matters. Expenditure on police, security, etc. were more essential and sought after by the elite, and the upper class. As the increase in the number of large apartment buildings indicates, and also the fact that these buildings have their own security, paid for by the residents, there is the distinct impression that more and more people---not necessarily only the very rich, but even those who are just about upper middle class, feel insecure enough to support such private security---even if they do not feel so threatened that they would hire body guards¹⁷. There was no perception that there was any great increase in crime thanks to the expansion of the economy, or rising disparity between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots.' It was not usually the poor who indulged in large scale violence or uprisings, but they were involved in relatively small acts such as burglary and theft. An interesting statement was that one cannot really blame the poor for thefts, etc. Modern, materialistic lifestyles of the rich flaunt material items in front of those who do not have them, and cannot even hope to get them at any time. However, even this type of crime is now more and more carried out by young people from better off families who want to get rich quick, and not only those of the poor. The anger generated by the wide disparities in society has been confined to the middle class. The poor have not been affected for they cannot even aspire for the benefits which the rich garner. The tensions generated in society have failed to become aggregated. The generalized anger is diverted in caste, class or religious hatred. Though the source of these tensions is economic disparity, while society is splintered there has been no organized rebellion over the entire country or even a large part of it. Further, the people who can be classified as poor are a smaller proportion of the population as compared to the rest. If the poor were a majority, or even something like 80 per cent of the population, considerable unrest could be expected. As of now widespread unrest is extremely unlikely.

Another view (expressed by a few) on the relation between poverty and crime is that the older generation among the poor is frustrated and adopts a fatalistic attitude about their condition, and normally would

not take to crime. The younger generation, on the other hand, has fewer inhibitions in the methods they use to gain material goods. Thus, force and violent attempts to wrest material goods from the elite may be seen more often. The elite feels threatened and in an attempt to provide security for themselves, they influence the state to allocate more resources for law and order, through strengthening the police and other forces. In this sense, the state's priorities are influenced by the elite, who are keen on protecting their own interests. Consequently, priority is not given to minimum needs programmes, and allocations for health and education sectors are reduced. Hence, the needs of the poor are given less importance than they deserve.

Further, even when it comes to a more organised sort of rebellion, and not just the individual acts of burglary, there is no immediate indication that it is the poor who are involved. It is more than likely that we would find that educated unemployed are exercised about their situation, and the inclination to take matters into their own hands could have been influenced by the reading of specific kinds of literature. As of now, however, Karnataka is not likely to have activities such as that of the People's War Group (in Andhra Pradesh).

A matter which caused some anxiety to the elites was the impact that the poor would have on health and environment, causing or being in some way purveyors of epidemics. A majority were of the view that when there were health problems in the neighbourhood, it was usually the poor who were afflicted first, and since often, poor neighbourhoods were immediately adjacent to neighbourhoods where the affluent lived, there was always the possibility of the spread of disease. This was not accepted by all. Others thought that with improvements in medical facilities, even the poor were in a better position to receive medical help. Hence, they were not really a threat to others. Even if people from poor neighbourhoods (slums) were hired to work as domestic help in the households of the middle/upper class, they were hired after at least a cursory inspection into whether they were neat and clean. But, if the poor spread disease, so we were told by a few, you cannot really blame them. They live in an environment that lacks sanitation and hygienic conditions. If you were to provide water to them, may be they will also bathe regularly.

There was only one among our respondents who talked about the family upbringing which inculcated certain ideas about people's responsibility towards others, and the need to render assistance to those who are in a disadvantageous situation. The principle of 'caring' if we were to so describe it, is part of her life and has been so from an early age. As she herself says, she was moved by the teachings of Basavanna¹⁸ who had indicated that to be kind is the root of all religions and emphasized its presence in all human beings. 'I had never asked god that I should be

born in such and such a family, be in such and such company.....and neither did the poor. So it does not mean that I should forget my responsibility towards other fellow creatures around me who are deprived of the opportunities that I enjoy.' Her lifestyle and concerns reflect the philosophy that possessing wealth does not mean ostentatious or even a lavish existence. Only what her family needs for a reasonably comfortable existence is met by the wealth they possess (which is very large indeed), and they propose to give away the rest for the public good. The large amounts that the family has already given directly and through the company (they are part owners) for various causes are on public record. The time and effort that she spends on the various programmes that she and the company have taken up are clear indications of her serious concern for the poor and other disadvantaged groups.

Conclusion

While India can be seen as a segmented society, there is the clear indication that in most social contexts, the elites see themselves as belonging to a particular occupation and class. Their associates and social interaction are mostly between people of their class, rather than only of their caste or religion. Even the interaction within caste and religious groups is by and large with the people of the same class. When they talked about poverty, they did not see themselves as belonging to any particular caste or religious group, as against the poor of specific castes/religious groups. For the most part, the poor were seen as one large group, essentially of one class, rather than being of any particular caste or religion.¹⁹

The question of who is of the elite and what they can do, keeping in view their power and authority, as against the issue of the overwhelming poverty that exists in the country, cannot be easily answered in terms of whether they are motivated to do anything about poverty or the poor. People who were among our sample were certainly among the very influential in their own field of life. But, by their own accounts this did not give them the kind of power to do anything about poverty as such. For example, an admiral, who was earlier the chief of the Indian navy did not see his position as having any bearing on the issue of poverty. As a professional who was involved in a particular activity, poverty did not figure in his professional duties in any real sense. Even to suggest that recruitment policies could be framed to support poor people, does not result in reducing eligibility requirements.

No one had stated in so many words that the poor are in that condition because of their (the poor) 'fault' or caused entirely by themselves. It is accepted that for the most part the poor came into that situation because of factors beyond their control. What is not generally acceptable is that the poor should remain so, even when opportunities

are available to get out of poverty. The elites are clearly of the view that even though the poor face serious handicaps, ultimately it is their own purposeful hard work which would enable economic and social advancement. Thus, the feeling that the elite are 'responsible' either for the poor being there, or to rehabilitate them or improve their condition is not particularly strong.

One should also emphasize that the elites are clearly under the impression that they cannot do much on their own. In India, it should be recalled that most of the elites are recruited from the middle class, and often remain in the middle class even if their official position entitles them to be classified among the elite. Their rise up the ranks of whichever professional/occupational category they belong to is long and arduous and they reach the levels of the 'elite' only in the later stages of their career. By and large, it appears that the factor which influences or persuades the elites to take up efforts to help the poor is essentially their occupational status. While this is not to take a cynical view that only those who have some compulsion (official duty) to take up measures for the poor, actually do so, there seems to be a strong relation between their control or influence over resources and their practical activities/measures for the poor. For example, government bureaucrats talked about the work they did for the poor, through official policies, and also the kind of empathy they brought into their work and the implementation of anti-poverty programmes. Outside these official functions there did not appear to be any anti-poverty work that they did. Those with a religious occupation (Christian clergymen) said they were engaged in anti-poverty work and slum development programmes through their involvement in church-related work. Beside these programmes, they had very little to do with anti-poverty efforts. The heads of religious institutions other than Christians, also stated that they were engaged in anti-poverty efforts through the programmes sponsored and supported by their own institutions. We did not find much (there was some limited sign that it exists) to support any proposition that the elite have a social consciousness which predisposes them to undertake or support anti-poverty efforts, unrelated to their occupation or formal status. Even the suggestions which we heard about the practical forms of contribution that the elite may provide in anti-poverty efforts were of a kind that involved only a small part of their time and energy, in NGO efforts for example.

The elites from the Scheduled Castes (in our study) took a keen interest in activities that were beneficial to the Scheduled Castes. But, for serving police officers (as in our sample), the time available to them to take up anti-poverty efforts independent of their official duties is limited. Their activities for the Scheduled Castes, through their involvement in organisations that help SCs, and their influence in the functioning of these organisations are undoubtedly helped by the fact that they are high ranking police officers. However, the number of Scheduled Castes

who are helped through these organizations is not large. This applies also to the politicians whose impact on SCs in general has to be acknowledged as modest²⁰. While we say that the benefits that SCs had derived from the efforts of the politicians or the officials has not been considerable, we are referring also to the enormity of the problem, where the number of SCs who are poor is a very large number indeed.

The bulk of those who comprise the elite are not in an economic position to directly help the poor through their own philanthropic efforts. Or if it is to be through their occupation and work, then only the highest government officials are in a policy making position while it is the officials lower in the bureaucracy who are mainly involved in implementing these policies. And in the official line of work, it is also the political leadership that influences the framing of anti-poverty policies. In either of the situations, the democratic system which prevails in the country would move the politicians and bureaucrats to initiate programmes which are to the benefit of the poor. Does this mean that we should give up any idea of involving the elite in anti-poverty efforts, or consider that the attitude of the elites cannot be changed or influenced to be more oriented towards a personal involvement in activities against poverty? Such pessimism may be premature, inasmuch as the elite were not entirely devoid of any sympathy or recognition of the situation of the poor, in their living conditions, poor health, low education, and so on, all of which contribute to their low standard of living, and the likelihood of their remaining in poverty. It is this sympathy which could be encouraged, to involve them in more practical efforts to remove some of the conditions in which the poor live.

Notes

1. There is a point of view that mass poverty has been the condition of most of humanity for much of human history, until the onset of the Industrial Revolution. The economies of earlier societies were for the most part linked to the productivity of land. With limited changes in technology over long periods of time, which implied that there was no drastic increase in productivity, the usual condition of life was that except for a few, the bulk of a society's population was at a subsistence level of living (Lal and Myint 1996: 33-34)
2. World Bank estimates indicate that the number of poor in the country was 164 million in 1951 and 312 million (35% of population) in 1993-94. The World Bank also estimated (1997) that 80% of India's poverty is in rural areas (cited in Herring 1999).
3. Karnataka is usually seen as comprising five recognisable regions: Coastal, Old Mysore, Bombay Karnataka, Hyderabad Karnataka, and Malnad. Districts of Bombay and Hyderabad Karnataka, which are found in northern Karnataka, have higher average landholdings than Old Mysore or Coastal Karnataka, but those landholdings are also mostly dry land (rainfed), which are in general less productive. Over a period of time from 1970-71 to 1995-96 average landholdings have been reduced considerably across the state (Deshpande and Raju 2001).
4. Based on the July 93-Jun 94 round of the National Sample Survey Organization.
5. Officials of the IAS (as also other all-India services such as IPS-Indian Police Service, etc.,) are based in the state for a period of time, but also serve at the central government from time to time.
6. In Karnataka, the Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha has a noticeable presence. See, Kripa:140-1.
7. Land holdings are only one of the possible indicators of wealth in rural areas, and political activity and status, business, are other indicators that add to a person's overall position in rural society. However, for our purpose, we have focused more on land holdings than other indicators. We had indicated 10 acres as a point above which the land owners may be considered as large landowners. These 10 acres also included a substantial part which was irrigated land.
8. For instance, a study in West Bengal (Beck 1994) shows that even when the incomes of the poorest households increased, these villagers themselves thought that they had become poorer. This was because of the perception that the rich had enjoyed larger income increases than the poor did over the same time. (Cited in Jayaraman and Lanjouw 1999:25),
9. An interesting point highlighted in the Human Development in Karnataka 1999:91-92 is that rural poverty declined much more sharply, from 55% to 30%, than in urban areas, which was from 53% to 40% in the twenty years between 1973-74 and 1993-94. The explanation offered in this report is that employment opportunities increased in rural areas even if labour productivity was low.

10. As a view on tribals (not in Karnataka) was narrated, this classification of deserving and undeserving poor may not be appropriate in India. For instance, the tribals of Bolangir, Koraput, and Kalahandi are referred to as the deserving poor. But this may be inaccurate insofar as they do not fully utilize the facilities and opportunities offered by the Jawahar Rozghar Yojana. Tribals of these areas work just enough to meet the immediate needs of food and drink. They do not take up sustained employment which may enable them to rise over the poverty line. Another reason for the tribals remaining poor may be the educational system which is too rigid. It disrupts the tribal way of life and hence they have rejected it.
11. 'Middlemen' or 'fixers' also served a useful function, in the context of illiterate people, who needed someone to help them in writing applications for loans, and also to meet the appropriate requirements which were entailed in loan applications. In this sense middlemen and fixers may not be involved in corruption as such, but were being paid for a service that was required, and which they were able to provide. (See Inbanathan, forthcoming; also Manor 2000).
12. With the scarcity of land, land reforms and distribution have not had the kind of success that may have been hoped for. A redistribution which results in reasonably viable farm holdings may make for higher productivity, but fragmentation of land into very small pieces, would only result in more and more people being pushed into poverty. Increasing the productivity of land may be another means of reducing poverty (Ahluwalia, 1990:115-6).
13. Which was in the opposition at the time when the interview was conducted.
14. The influence of heads of religious groups (seers) should not be underestimated. Even if they do not directly make pronouncements on public policy, their followers may include high ranking officials, political leaders and others in influential positions. Such religious leaders can influence their followers, who may then choose to act in a certain manner.

Organizations which have a religious background, and involved in voluntary effort for the poor include the Chinmaya Mission, Ramakrishna Mission, Sri Sathya Sai Baba Organization, which carry out large programmes for the poor, have also set up hospitals, educational institutions etc., where people of any background can avail the facilities offered by these institutions.

A few retired officials who had held very high ranks now spend considerable time in social service activities, and with organizations such as the Sri Sathya Sai Baba organization.

15. Designing anti-poverty programmes has always been done at the highest levels of government, either the central government or the state governments. They were not done at the local level. Even the introduction and functioning of the institutions of local governance (the panchayats) has not to any great extent brought in local control of development programmes. Much of the funds given for development and anti-poverty efforts are from the central government with their own guidelines for implementation and use. Local discretion is very limited. The sense of insecurity and lack of confidence is seen more often at the lower levels of governance, due to the lack of education and experience (political and administrative) of many elected representatives. But, more than

that, politicians do not remain in power all the time, while the bureaucracy has a stable presence over an extended period of time. Hence, politicians, even when in power depend on officials to carry out their functions as representatives and ministers.

16. That basic education has been given comparatively less importance than higher education has been emphasized by Amartya Sen, and he went on to argue that this is because of 'inequalities of economic and social powers of different groups in India,' (Sen, 1994:14) and this situation has not changed to any great degree in the past 25 years because of insufficient 'public effort to overcome the legacy of those social inequalities,' (ibid, footnote, p.14).
17. In our sample there was no one who hired body guards for their personal security, but by all accounts, some of the very rich in the state do.
18. A 12th century social reformer who fought for equality of all castes. Later, a sect of Veerashaivites came into existence, which took on the aspects of a caste.
19. This was despite the fact that a few respondents indicated that the majority of the poor were from the Scheduled Castes, with Muslims being the second largest group after them.
20. Also Mendelsohn (1986:508) where he states'....untouchable politicians are not economically sufficiently comfortable for them to play the strong and independent political role which might more effectively promote their community's interests'.

References

- Ahluwalia, Montek S., 1990. 'Policies for Poverty Alleviation,' *Asian Development Review*, vol. 8, no.1.
- Alcock, Pete, 1993. *Understanding Poverty*, Macmillan, London.
- Basu, Kaushik, 2001 'India and the Global Economy: Role of Culture, Norms and Beliefs', *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. XXXVI, no. 40.
- Beck, Tony, 1994. *The Experience of Poverty. Fighting for Respect and Resources in Village India*, Intermediate Technology Publications, London.
- Bhagwati, Jagdish N., 1988. 'Poverty and Public Policy,' *World Development*, vol. 16, no.5.
- Bottomore, Tom, 1993. *Elites and Society*, edn. 2, Routledge, London.
- Caplan, Lionel, 1989. *Religion and Power: Essays on the Christian Community in Madras*, Christian Literature Society, Madras.
- De Swaan, Abram, James Manor, Else Oyen and Elisa P. Reis, 2000. 'Elite Perceptions of the Poor: Reflections for a Comparative Research Project.' *Current Sociology*, January 2000, vol. 48(1): 43-56.
- Deshpande, R.S. and K.V. Raju, 2001. *Karnataka: Rural Policy for Growth and Poverty Reduction*, ADRT Unit, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore.

- Dev, S. Mahendra and Ajit Ranade, 1997. 'Poverty and Public Policy: A Mixed Record,' in *India Development Report*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
- Dubey, S.M., 1975. *Social Mobility Among the Professions: A Study of the Professions in a Transitional City*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay.
- Field, G. Lowell and John Highley, 1980. *Elitism*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Herring, Ronald J., 1999. 'Persistent Poverty and Path Dependency', *IDS Bulletin* vol. 30, no.2.
- Hossain, Naomi, 1999. 'How do Bangladeshi Elites Understand Poverty', IDS Working Paper 83, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex, England.
- Human Development in Karnataka 1999*, Planning Department, Government of Karnataka, Bangalore. Source of information: Government of India (Press Information Bureau), Estimate of Poverty (March 1997).
- Inbanathan, Anand, 'Political Fixers in Karnataka: a view from the village' (forthcoming).
- Jayaram, N., 1977. 'Social Implications of Medical Education in India,' *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 3, no.2.
- Jayaraman, Rajshri and Peter Lanjouw, 1999. 'The Evolution of Poverty and Inequality in Indian Villages,' *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol.14, no.1.
- Keller, Suzanne, 1972. 'Elites', in David L. Sills, ed., *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Macmillan, London.
- Kripa, A.P., 1995. 'Raitha Sangha's Political Dilemma', *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. xxx, no.3.
- Lal, Deepak and H.Myint, 1996. *The Political Economy of Poverty, Equity, and Growth: A Comparative Study*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Lanjouw, Jean Olson, n.d. 'Demystifying Poverty Lines,' Institute of Development Studies, U.K. Website.
- Manor, James, 1989. 'Karnataka: Caste, Class, Dominance and Politics in a Cohesive Society', in Francine R. Frankel and M.S.A. Rao, eds., *Dominance and State Power in Modern India: Decline of a Social Order*, Vol.I., Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Manor, James, 2000. 'Small-time political fixers in India's states: 'towel over armpit,' *Asian Survey*, 40:5.
- Mendelsohn, Oliver, 1986. 'A' Harijan Elite'? The Lives of Some Untouchable Politicians,' *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. XXI, no. 12.
- Mendelsohn, Oliver and Marika Vicziany, 1998. *The Untouchables: Subordination, poverty and the state in modern India*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Nash, Kate, 2000. *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics and Power*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Navlakha, Suren, 1989. *Elite and Social Change: A Study of Elite Formation in India*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.

- Oommen, T.K., 1978. *Doctors and Nurses: A Study on Occupational Role Structures*, - Macmillan, Delhi.
- Oommen, T.K., 1983. 'The Legal Profession in India: Some Sociological Perspectives', *Indian Bar Review*, vol. x. no.1.
- Paul, M. Thomas, 2001. 'Economic Reforms and effects on various sections, including the poor in India-a review,' Participatory Research and Voluntary Action, Research Report, mimeograph, Institute for Social & Economic Change, Bangalore.
- Quibria, M.G., 1991. 'Understanding Poverty: An Introduction to Conceptual and Measurement Issues', *Asian Development Review*, vol. 9, no.1, 1991.
- Rajagopalan, C. and J. Singh, 1968. 'The Indian Institutes of Technology: Do they Contribute to Social Mobility,' *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 3, no. 14.
- Sen, Amartya, 1994. 'Beyond Liberalization: Social Opportunity and Human Capability,' Lakdawala Memorial Lecture, Institute of Social Sciences, New Delhi.
- Srinivas, M.N., 1987. *The Dominant Caste and Other Essays*. Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Srinivas, M.N., 1996a. *Village, Caste, Gender and Method: Essays in Anthropology*. Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Srinivas, M.N., 1996b (ed.) *Caste: its Twentieth Century Avatar*. Viking, Delhi.
- Srinivasan, T.N. 1977. 'Poverty: Some Measurement Problems', World Bank Reprint Series: no. 77, from conference proceedings of the 41st session of the International Statistical Institute, New Delhi.
- Subramaniam, V., 1994. *Classes and Elites in Afro Asia: The Colonial Legacy*, Ajanta Publications, Delhi.

Recent Working Papers

54. **ALLEN ROY, PRAVAKAR SAHOO AND B KAMAIAH**
A Causal Test of Fiscal Synchronisation Hypothesis in India
55. **ALLEN ROY, B KAMAIAH AND M GOVINDA RAO**
Educational Expenditure Needs of Large Indian States : A Normative View
56. **G K KARANTH**
Does Replication Mean Consensus
57. **H G HANUMAPPA**
State Policy Initiatives and Agricultural Development: A Case Study of Karnataka Province, India
58. **G THIMMAIAH**
Federalism and Economic Development: Indian Experience
59. **T KANNAN**
Caste Violence and Dalit Consciousness: A Critical Interpretation of Dominance
60. **K V RAJU AND JEFFREY D BREWER**
Conjunctive Water Management in Bihar
61. **MADHUSHREE SEKHER**
Local Organisations and Participatory CPR Management: Some Reflections
62. **PRATAP CHANDRA BISWAL AND B KAMAIAH**
Stock Market Development in India: Is There Any Trend Break?
63. **SANGHAMITRA SAHU AND B KAMAIAH**
Some Aspects of Monetary Targeting in India
64. **AMALENDU JYOTISHI**
Swidden Cultivation: A Review of Concepts and Issues
65. **K V RAJU**
Participatory Irrigation Management in Andhra Pradesh: Promise, Practice and a Way Forward
66. **D RAJASEKHAR**
Non-Governmental Organisations in India: Opportunities and Challenges
67. **S JYOTHIS**
Willingness to Participate in Biodiversity Conservation in Periyar Tiger Reserve: A Contingent Valuation
68. **ANAND INBANATHAN**
Power, Patronage and Accountability in the Panchayats of Karnataka
69. **PRATAP CHANDRA BISWAL AND B KAMAIAH**
On Stock Market Development, Banks and Economic Growth in India
70. **N R BHANUMURTHY**
Testing Long-Run Monetarists' Propositions in Some Industrialized Countries
71. **PRABIR KUMAR MOHANTY AND B KAMAIAH**
Does Seasonal Pattern in Indian Stock Returns Contain a Unit Root?
72. **V VIJAYALAKSHMI AND B K CHANDRASHEKAR**
Gender Inequality, Differences, and Identities: Women and Local Governance in Karnataka
73. **DEBASHIS AND B KAMAIAH**
Simple Sum Versus Divisia Monetary Aggregates: An Empirical Evaluation
74. **T S JEENA**
Wetland Conversion: The Case of Backwater Reclamation in Kerala
75. **P H RAYAPPA, T V SEKHER, M RAMAKRISHNA REDDY**
Population Policy for Karnataka: A Suggested Framework
76. **D RAJASEKHAR & P SHOBANA**
Economic Programmes and Poverty Reduction: NGO Experiences from Tamil Nadu

77. **PRAVAKAR SAHOO, GEETHANJALI NATARAJ, B KAMAIAH**
Savings and Economic Growth in India:
The Long-Run Nexus
78. **KAUSHIK BASU**
A Note on Multiple General
Equilibria with Child Labour
79. **A S SEETHARAMU**
Literacy, Employment and
Social Security: A Review
80. **T V SEKHER**
Empowerment of Grassroots
Leadership in Health and Population:
A Training Experiment in Karnataka
81. **N R BHANUMURTHY, M RAMACHANDRAN AND PURNA CHANDRA PADHAN**
Is the QTM Controversy Settled?
82. **KAUSHIK BASU, AMBAR NARAYAN AND MARTIN RAVALLION**
Is Knowledge Shared within
Households? Theory and
Evidence for Bangladesh
83. **M THOMAS PAUL, N R BHANUMURTHY AND NISHANT BAPAT**
A Re-Examination of the Long-Run
Relationship between Money Supply
and Inflation in India
84. **GEETHANJALI NATARAJ, PRAVAKAR SAHOO AND B KAMAIAH**
Export-Led Growth in India:
What do the VARS Reveal?
85. **K N NINAN AND JYOTHIS S**
Social Forestry in Karnataka:
Cost-Benefit Appraisal of a Project
86. **M D USHADEVI**
External Supervision Support for
Enhancing Quality in Primary Education
87. **M JAYA KRISHNA**
Private Foreign Investment in
Post-Reform India: A Search for
Proximate Determinants
88. **V VIJAYALAKSHMI**
Politics of Inclusion: Scheduled
Tribe Women in Local Governance
89. **T V SEKHER, K N M RAJU AND M N SIVAKUMAR**
Fertility Transition in Karnataka:
Levels, Trends and Implications
90. **A S SHRINIDHI AND SHARACHCHANDRA LELE**
Forest Tenure Regimes in the Karnataka
Western Ghats: A Compendium
91. **VEERASHEKHARAPPA**
Community Participation in Rural
Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation:
A Case Study of Karnataka
92. **M JOHNSON SAMUEL**
Communication and Linguistic Situation
in Karnataka: Demographic Perspectives
93. **K V RAJU AND H K AMAR NATH**
Irrigation Subsidies in Karnataka:
A Growing Constraint For Reforms

ISBN 81-7791-050-7

Price: Rs.30-00



INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHANGE

Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao Road, Nagarbhavi, Bangalore - 560 072, India
Phone : 0091-80 - 3215468, 3215519, 3215592 ; Fax: 0091-80 - 3217008

Grams: ECOSOCI, Bangalore - 560 040

E-mail: kvraju@isec.kar.nic.in