

Fighting Neoliberalism: Does West Bengal Show the Way?

Dipankar Basu

Mindless economic growth through unfettered operations of the `free' market, that is often portrayed in the mainstream media as a panacea for all of India's economic problems, has now been shown to be seriously flawed as a sensible strategy for economic development. Active, pro-people state intervention through sound policies is essential for making any meaningful dent on the problems facing our country today; and this includes, if historical experience is anything to go by, even the achievement of sustainable, broad-based economic growth. In every known case of successful industrialization and economic development, be it England or Continental Europe or USA or Japan or the East Asian tigers, the State has played a pro-active role in directing investments, mobilizing resources to finance that investment, protecting fledgling industries from undue competition from abroad, and so on; it is, therefore, inconceivable that any state, or the country for that matter, can make that transition without State intervention through effective policies for agriculture and industry. State governments subscribing to this viewpoint would claim to have put this political philosophy into practice, especially the one in West Bengal.

Thus, analysts sympathetic to the CPI(M)-led Left Front Government would have us believe that the state government has indeed played, and continues to play, such a pro-active and beneficial role. As proof of this claim they point to the putative "spurt in economic growth" that West Bengal has seen over the last two decades of the 20th century. For instance, in an article in the website Pragoti¹, Jayati Ghosh (JG henceforth) claims that "over the 1990s West Bengal was one of the fastest growing states in India" if this growth is measured in terms of State Domestic Product. "This tendency was even more marked in per capita terms," claims JG, "because West Bengal has been successful in controlling fertility to a greater extent than many other states." This spurt in economic growth, moreover, comes in the backdrop of the fact that for the past three decades "West Bengal has been among the middle ranking states of India, in terms of both per capita income and human development indicators."

Before we look at the evidence to evaluate these claims, let me briefly point to the interesting history of this article by JG. On May 20, 2008 this article was (for the first time presumably) posted on Pragoti² and was also published in the Hindu Business Line³, the first one authored by JG and the one in the Business Line by C P Chandrasekhar (CPC) and Jayati Ghosh (JG). Exactly three weeks later, on June 10, 2008, essentially the same article was published again simultaneously in the Hindu Business Line⁴ and in Pragoti⁵. Two days later, the same article was posted on Macroscan⁶.

What was the need to recycle this article after three weeks? Let us hazard a guess. Polling in the Panchayat elections in West Bengal finished on May 17, and counting started on

¹ <http://www.pragoti.org/>

² <http://www.pragoti.org/node/1286>

³ <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/2008/05/20/stories/2008052050050900.htm>

⁴ <http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/2008/06/10/stories/2008061050760900.htm>

⁵ <http://www.pragoti.org/node/1441>

⁶ http://www.macroscan.com/fet/may08/fet120508West_Bengal.htm

May 20; the first showing of the article, therefore, seems to have been pre-emptive in purpose. No matter what the election results, supporters could find solace in the “spurt of growth” in West Bengal that JG had detected in the data. The second time round, it seems to have been more of a damage control exercise; hence the frantic recycling, and even in the same website and newspaper to boot! Probably supporters and sympathizers of the Left Front Government needed to be reassured that despite Singur, despite Nandigram, despite the verdict in the Panchayat elections, all was well with the social democratic left; after all the magic of growth was on it’s side, or so JG would have us believe.

Before we turn to the evidence, let us remind ourselves about JG's claims: first, she claims that West Bengal has seen relatively higher growth rates in per capita income; second, she claims that West Bengal has been a middle ranking state with regard to per capita income for the last three decades; third, she claims that West Bengal has also been a middle ranking state with regard to indicators of human development. The first claim, of course, is related to the other two. If West Bengal has seen relatively higher growth rates, then its relative position must have improved, both with respect to per capita income and human development indicators; the first simply by the logic growth rates, and the second because of higher growth rates coupled with a supposedly “pro-people” government. In what follows, we will evaluate each of the three claims, taking them one at a time.

Comparative Growth Rates of Per Capita Income

JG claims that West Bengal has been one of the fastest growing states in India over the 1990s if we look at the growth of State Domestic Product⁷ (SDP); the growth in per capita SDP is even more pronounced because, according to JG, West Bengal has managed to reduce its population growth rates much better than many other states. She mentions a fact which has been repeated very often: West Bengal has had the highest growth in SDP in the 1990s among major Indian states, second only to Karnataka. For instance, this fact was mentioned in an article in August 2004 by Manas Chakravarty⁸; it was later used by Mohan Guruswamy⁹ to take V S Naipaul rightly to task; now JG has repeated that fact: “...it is not generally known that over the 1990s West Bengal was one of the fastest growing states in India, and actually showed the second highest rate of aggregate State Domestic Product growth among major states, after Karnataka.”

But this should hardly be celebrated. From the perspective of economic growth, it makes little sense to look at the growth rate of SDP *per se*; what is important is to see how that growth rate has moved in comparison to the growth rate of the population. Since this should be an obvious proposition, it is not clear why the growth rate of the SDP is used so often by economists and analysts. Even JG realizes this. For, in the very next sentence she moves to the per capita SDP: “This tendency [for growth] was even more marked in per capita terms, because West Bengal has been successful in controlling fertility to a greater extent than many other states.”

⁷ The State Domestic Product (SDP) measures, roughly, the market value of all the final goods and services produced during any year in the state under consideration; to get the per capita SDP we divide the SDP by the population in that year.

⁸<http://www.rediff.com/money/2004/aug/05spec.htm>

⁹<http://www.hindu.com/2005/03/19/stories/2005031901061000.htm>

Since it clearly makes more sense to study the evolution of the per capita GDP, we will not waste any space talking about the growth rate of the GDP; we will only look at the per capita GDP. In Table 1.1, we present the average annual compound growth rates of the per capita GDP (at current prices) for all the states in India for various periods starting in 1990; the starting point of 1990 is chosen because JG's claim about growth rates relates specifically to the 1990s.

What does the evidence on comparative growth rates tell us? That West Bengal was *not* one of the fastest growing states (among the major states) in India during the 1990s. All entries highlighted in blue in Table 1.1 are growth rates of per capita GDP which are higher than that recorded by West Bengal. In the period 1993 to 2003, there were five states which grew faster than West Bengal: Chandigarh, Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala and Tripura¹⁰. Between 1993 and 2000, there were again five states that grew faster than West Bengal: Goa, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Pondicherry and Tripura. If, on the other hand, we look at the decade of the 1990s, the period to which JG's claim specifically relates, we see that eleven states grew at a faster rate than West Bengal between 1990 and 2000: Andaman & Nicobar, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Mizoram, Nagaland, Pondicherry, Tamil Nadu and Tripura. So, what should we make of JG's claim that "over the 1990s West Bengal was one of the fastest growing states in India"? We will leave this task to the readers¹¹, but JG should take some consolation from the fact that two of the faster growing states, Kerala and Tripura, have been ruled off and on by CPI(M)-led governments.

Before moving on, let us note in passing that JG's claim about West Bengal's fertility transition is at best partially valid; there were many states that managed to control aggregate fertility better than West Bengal. In Table 1.2, we give the average annual growth rates of the populations of the Indian states for each decade since 1951. If we restrict ourselves to the decade of the 1980s and 1990s, we see two things: one, West Bengal had lower rates of population growth than the Indian average; two, there were several major states that outperformed West Bengal in this regard: Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Orissa, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Goa¹².

Comparative Levels of Per Capita Income

After comparing the growth rates of the per capita GDP, let us now turn to the levels. If, as JG claims, West Bengal has witnessed one of the fastest growth rates among major Indian states over the 1990s, then the position of West Bengal relative to other states must have

¹⁰ The figures in Table 1.1 are the growth rates of the per capita GDP evaluated at *current prices*, i.e. the GDP figures have not been adjusted for inflation; that is why the growth rates are so high. If we assume that the average inflation rate was about 5 percent, then to get the growth rate of real per capita GDP we will have to deduct 5 from each entry in Table 1.1.

¹¹ The basic data presented in Table 4 might have some issues with regard to comparability both across states and across time; I still use them because they, nonetheless, provide a good first approximation.

¹² Many analysts, including leftwing economists, have pointed out that West Bengal data might be fudged; this is especially true about data relating to agricultural production and yield. An inflated agricultural production data also inflates figures on overall economic growth. I will not go into this issue here and instead assume that the data has not been manipulated; for reference on this issue see the article by Devadeep Purohit in *The Telegraph* on May 29, 2003.

improved remarkably. To evaluate this claim, we will again turn to the evidence. In Table 2, we present the relative rankings of the Indian states in *decreasing order* for the period 1993-94 to 2004-05; this particular period has been chosen because the latest Economic Survey, i.e., 2007-08, provides consistent data for this particular period. For each year, states have been ranked by the level of the per capita GDP for that year; states which appear higher in any column have higher values of per capita GDP than all the states appearing below them. What story does Table 2 tell?

West Bengal began the period with rank 21 among 32 states; in the next five years it climbed to a rank of 16 and then slipped back to a rank of 18 at the end of the period. This hardly corroborates the picture painted by JG of steady growth and outpacing of other Indian states. Over the period under consideration, West Bengal moved up by merely 3 positions. Was this the best performance among all the Indian states during this period? Look once again at Table 2: Andhra Pradesh moved up 3 positions; Karnataka moved up 4 positions; Himachal Pradesh moved up 8 positions; Tripura moved up 13 positions.

But the interesting part of the story is that, like all social democratic pronouncements, even this partially favorable picture is only a half truth. Let us go back a decade and see how West Bengal has fared compared to the other states in terms of economic growth over roughly the period of the Left Front government's tenure in office. Table 3 gives analogous rankings of Indian states for the period 1980 to 2004-05. For comparability with later periods, we have left out the newly created states (Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, and Uttaranchal) as well as Chandigarh (for lack of data) from this comparison.

Why does it make sense to go back a decade and start at 1980? This is simply because of the fact that the Left Front Government came to power in 1977 and "made West Bengal the most active state in respect of land reform, leading the rest of the country not only in recording and legal recognition of the rights of sharecroppers but also in enforcing land ceilings and distributing surplus and vested land". According to JG, this contributed to breaking the "agrarian impasse" and lifting the growth rate of the state. Recall, at this point, that several commentators sympathetic to the Left Front Government have, time and again, claimed that the 1980s was a period of massive growth - led by agricultural growth - for West Bengal; going by these pronouncements, West Bengal outpaced most other states during this period of "pro-people" governance. Hence, it makes sense to compare this period with the growth experience of other states which was not fortunate enough to have had the benefit of the "pro-people" government.

So, what story does Table 3 tell us? The evidence flies in the face of all such claims made by the sympathizers of the Left Front Government. West Bengal started the period in 1980-81 with a rank of 10 among 28 states, a good rank by all means; at the end of the decade, it had slipped down four rungs to end up with a rank of 14 among 28 states. Thus, during the decade of the 1980s it fell from being a relatively high income state to a position roughly in the middle. In the next five years, it slipped down even further to a rank of 18. At the end of the period in 2004-05, it has ended with a rank of 17, way below where it started in 1980-81. From a relatively high income state, West Bengal has become a relatively low income state during the last three decades. So what shall we make of JG's claim that for the past three decades "West Bengal has been among the middle ranking

states of India, in terms of both per capita income and human development indicators.” The reader, as before, must draw the appropriate conclusion.

Human Development Indicators

Let us now turn to some of the commonly used indicators of social well-being, what JG calls human development indicators, and see how West Bengal has fared in comparison to the other states in India. We will look at the following indicators: life expectancy at birth, the infant mortality rate (per 1000 live births), the literacy rates and access to safe drinking water; the first two give an indication of the health status of the population, the next looks at the educational status while the last gives an indication of the availability of a very basic infrastructure necessary for a decent living.

Life expectancy at birth is a measure of the average life span of the population under question. The infant mortality rate (IMR) is the number of newborn babies that die within a year of birth per 1000 live births; both, it is obvious, give some indication of the health status of the population. Table 6 gives the life expectancy at birth and the IMR for the major Indian states. The life expectancy figures are for the period 2001-05 and the IMR figures are roughly for the period 2006.

The average life span of an average person residing in West Bengal around the beginning of this century was marginally higher than an average citizen of India. For the total population, the average life expectancy at birth was 63.2 for India while it was 64.6 for West Bengal. Among the 15 major Indian states listed in Table 6, six had a higher life expectancy at birth than West Bengal.

The probability of a child dying during the first year of its life was substantially lower in West Bengal than for the country as a whole, as shown in Table 6. The IMR for the total population in India was 57 (per 1000 live births) while it was only 38 (per live birth) in West Bengal. Only three states, Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra, among the 15 major states listed in Table 6 had better scores than West Bengal in this regard. But this relatively superior performance with regard to infant mortality hides some deep problems. To see this look at the more detailed data on IMR presented in Table 7.

Table 7 presents data on the IMR for all the Indian states for two points in time, 1961 and 2001, to compare its evolution through the decades. These time points were chosen because data for these were available in the latest Economic Survey of India (2007-08). The last three columns give an idea of the improvement of the IMR over this four decade period; it is the percentage *decrease* in the IMR between 1961 and 2001. For the country as a whole the IMR decreased by around 102 percent, while the corresponding figure for West Bengal was 150 percent. But this overall high performance hides the abysmal performance with respect to the IMR of female children. For female children, whereas the country improved the IMR score by about 83 percent, West Bengal improved it only by about half of that: 42.5 percent. In this respect, West Bengal was the *worst performer among all the Indian states barring one!* Is this indicating a hidden male preference in West Bengal?

In government statistics - which is what we are using - access to safe water is defined simply as the availability of a tap or a hand-pump or a tube-well for a household; by all reckoning, this is a very basic and essential infrastructure for modern-day living. Table 8 gives the proportion of households in a state that have access to safe drinking water, along with the growth rate of that proportion over the last two decades. Whereas for India, only 78 percent of households had access to safe drinking water in 2001, about 89 percent of West Bengal households had that access; but this is largely the result of starting at a higher level. In 1981, only 38 percent of Indian households had access to safe drinking water while the corresponding figure for West Bengal was 70 percent. Thus, in terms of *increasing* the reach of safe drinking water to excluded households, West Bengal has fared much worse than the country as a whole.

But how has it performed in comparison to other states with regard to providing access to safe drinking water to the general population? Table 8 provides information to answer that question. In Table 9, we have ranked the Indian states in *decreasing order* according to the proportion of households (in the state) with access to safe drinking water (as defined above); a state which appears higher up in the list had a higher proportion of its households with access to safe drinking water. Among the 28 states listed in Table 8, West Bengal had a rank of 5 in 1981, a high rank by all means; in 1991, the rank remained unchanged, and in 2001, West Bengal's rank declined to 6. Thus, compared to other Indian states, West Bengal's performance with regard to providing access to safe drinking water to households was that of a laggard.

Last but certainly not the least, we turn to a measure of the educational attainment of the population: the literacy rate. The literacy rate is, roughly, the proportion of the population with basic reading and writing skills; it would be part of what nowadays is called 'human capital' by mainstream economists. Table 10 gives state-wise figures for the literacy rate from 1951 to 2001; the entries refer to the proportion of the population considered literate. It can be seen from Table 10, that West Bengal's literacy rate in 2001 was nearly equal to the country's average; in this respect West Bengal has been a middling state. But if we look at the growth rate of literacy we see that West Bengal has been a laggard. While for the country as a whole, the literacy rate increased by 49 percent between 1981 and 2001, for West Bengal it increased by only 41 percent during the corresponding period. Compared to other states, West Bengal's rank fell, as can be seen from Table 11.

Concluding Remarks

In summary, we should note the following: West Bengal was not one of the fastest growing states once we consider per capita SDP instead of SDP; over the period from the 1980s onwards, West Bengal's relative ranking in terms of per capita SDP has fallen significantly; in terms of several human development indicators, West Bengal has been losing ground in comparison to other states as well. Broadly, it seems to be the case that whereas West Bengal started the decade of the 1980s as a relatively high income Indian state, it has fallen to the rank of a lower-middle income state over the next two decades, precisely when it was being steered by the CPI(M)-led Left Front Government. So, it seems that JG's claim about the "spurt in economic growth" in West Bengal is really a figment of her imagination with very tenuous links to reality. But more problematic than the parading of

these half-truths is the accompanying blindness of the likes of JG to the increasingly pronounced anti-people character of the CPI(M)-led Left Front Government in West Bengal.

What they fail, or are unwilling, to see is, in fact that whatever land reforms and progressive legislation was enacted in West Bengal, though beneficial, was extremely limited in scope¹³. It left the bottom rung of rural society – the landless laborers and the poor peasants – completely untouched and replaced the landlords with the rich and middle peasants as the new ruling class. Since the growth of the ‘internal market’ was thereby rather limited, the boost to economic growth was equally feeble. Neither did the state government take much pro-active steps to channelize the economic surplus into productive investments or take the land reforms to the next step of collective, cooperative farming. Though it made some efforts at state action on the input side of agricultural production, it completely failed to make any inroads on the output side; the result was the continued domination of monopolies and, as a result, wastage of a considerable part of the economic surplus. In fact, come the 1990s, just like any other state in the grip of neoliberal ideology, it has gradually whittled down public investment in rural infrastructure, let the public distribution system go to the dogs, let the public irrigation system lose its efficacy, let rural moneylenders make an ignominious comeback; instead of working out and implementing pro-people policies, the party behind the State, has spent most of its efforts in ensuring, by hook *and* by crook, continuance in office. The result, in comparison to other states in India, is there for all to see. Holding up the performance of such a government as a shining example of *fighting neoliberalism in practice* is, therefore, digging one's own political grave.

(I would like to thank Alita, Debarshi and Kuntala for helpful comments.)

¹³ For instance see, Basu, D. “The Political Economy of Middleness: Behind Violence in Rural West Bengal,” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. XXXVi, No. 16. April 21, 2001.

Table 1.1: Average Annual Compound Growth Rates of PCSDP (%)

	1990-01 to 2000-01	1993-94 to 2000-01	1993-94 to 2003-04
Andhra Pradesh	13.94	12.30	11.51
Arunachal	10.54	7.72	8.48
Assam	9.61	9.40	10.62
Bihar	6.85	7.87	8.57
Jharkhand		5.80	8.18
Goa	18.90	17.00	12.67
Gujarat	11.78	9.03	10.67
Haryana	11.95	11.15	11.02
Himachal	15.04	14.19	13.67
J&K	12.85	10.04	10.36
Karnataka	14.50	12.45	10.10
Kerala	16.95	14.11	12.38
Madhya Pradesh	10.28	7.29	8.07
Chattisgarh		6.14	9.43
Maharashtra	11.40	8.73	9.35
Manipur	10.78	9.54	9.68
Meghalaya	12.83	11.35	11.64
Mizoram	15.25	12.09	10.20
Nagaland	13.45	9.86	8.59
Orissa	11.63	9.51	11.28
Punjab	11.27	9.64	9.39
Rajasthan	11.56	10.60	10.45
Sikkim	12.02	10.12	9.84
Tamil Nadu	15.11	12.44	10.41
Tripura	16.30	15.59	14.34
Uttar	9.82	8.83	8.31
Uttaranchal		9.31	11.52
West Bengal	13.20	13.25	11.91
Andaman	15.89	7.01	8.12
Chandigarh		12.30	12.90
Delhi	14.42	12.91	10.62
Pondicherry	18.07	20.07	17.38

Source: author's calculations from data available in Table 4 below.

Table 1.2: Average Annual Growth Rates of Population (%)

	1951-61	1961-71	1971-81	1981-91	1991-01
Uttar Pradesh	1.53	1.8	2.29	2.31	2.33
Maharashtra	2.14	2.46	2.22	2.32	2.07
Bihar	1.82	1.92	2.19	2.12	2.55
West Bengal	2.88	2.41	2.11	2.23	1.65
Andhra Pradesh	1.46	1.92	2.1	2.19	1.37
Tamil Nadu	1.13	2.03	1.63	1.44	1.11
Madhya Pradesh	2.23	2.6	2.43	2.44	2.2
Rajasthan	2.35	2.49	2.89	2.53	2.53
Karnataka	1.97	2.19	2.4	1.93	1.63
Gujarat	2.41	2.61	2.47	1.94	2.06
Orissa	1.82	2.26	1.85	1.85	1.52
Kerala	2.24	2.36	1.78	1.35	0.9
Jharkhand	1.81	2.06	2.16	2.18	2.12
Assam	3.04	3.04	2.12	2.19	1.75
Punjab	1.97	1.98	2.17	1.91	1.85
Haryana	2.95	2.83	2.56	2.45	2.53
Chhatisgarh	2.07	2.43	1.87	2.32	1.69
Delhi	4.31	4.34	4.34	4.24	3.93
Jammu & Kashmir	0.91	2.63	2.63	2.73	2.61
Uttarakhand	2.06	2.21	2.45	2.1	1.87
Himachal Pradesh	1.66	2.1	2.15	1.91	1.63
Tripura	5.98	3.14	2.81	2.99	1.5
Meghalaya	2.41	2.78	2.82	2.88	2.71
Manipur	3.04	3.24	2.85	2.6	2.25
Nagaland	5.65	3.41	4.15	4.56	5.1
Goa	0.76	3.03	2.4	1.5	1.43
Arunachal Pradesh		3.34	3.05	3.19	2.41
Pondicherry	1.53	2.49	2.5	2.95	1.89
Chandigarh	17.46	7.91	5.81	3.57	3.45
Mizoram	3.1	2.24	4.05	3.4	2.57
Sikkim	1.62	2.63	4.17	2.54	2.91
Andaman & Nicobar Island	7.52	6.04	5.09	4.05	2.39
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	3.28	2.47	3.46	2.87	4.77
Daman & Diu	-2.77	5.47	2.29	2.59	4.47
Lakshadweep	1.34	2.92	2.26	2.66	1.61
INDIA	1.98	2.24	2.23	2.16	1.97

Source: Economic Survey of India, 2007-08 (Table 9.7).

Table 2: Relative Rankings of Indian States by Per Capita SDP at Current Prices (1993-2005)

1993 -94	1995 -96	1996 -97	1997 -98	1998 -99	1999 -00	2000 -01	2001 -02	2002 -03	2003 -04	2004 -05
CH	CH	CH	CH	GA	GA	GA	GA	GA	CH	CH
DI	DI	GA	GA	CH	CH	CH	CH	CH	GA	GA
GA	GA	DI	DI	DI	DI	DI	DI	DI	DI	DI
AN	AN	AN	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY	PY
PB	MA	PY	AN	PB	MA	AN	AN	AN	AN	HA
MA	PB	MA	MA	AN	PB	PB	PB	MA	HA	MA
HA	HA	PB	PB	MA	AN	HA	HA	HA	PB	PB
GT	GT	HA	HA	HA	HA	MA	MA	PB	MA	HP
PY	PY	GT	GT	GT	GT	TN	HP	HP	HP	AN
ND	TN	KR	TN	TN	TN	KR	TN	KR	GT	GT
TN	KR	TN	KR	KR	HP	HP	KR	GT	KR	KR
AL	ND	MZ	HP	HP	KR	MZ	GT	MZ	TN	TN
SM	AL	HP	ND	KA	KA	GT	MZ	TN	AP	KA
MZ	MZ	ND	KA	SM	AP	KA	ND	ND	MZ	SM
KR	HP	KA	SM	AP	MZ	ND	KA	SM	SM	AP
HP	SM	SM	MZ	WB	WB	AP	AP	KA	TR	TR
KA	KA	AP	WB	MZ	SM	SM	SM	AP	ND	AL
AP	AP	AL	AP	AL	AL	WB	WB	TR	WB	WB
UC	WB	RN	AL	ND	TR	TR	TR	WB	MG	MZ
MG	UC	WB	RN	RN	MG	AL	MG	AL	UC	UC
WB	MG	UC	MG	MG	RN	MG	AL	MG	KA	MG
MP	RN	MG	UC	JK	ND	UC	RN	UC	AL	ND
JK	MP	MP	TR	TR	JK	JK	UC	JK	JK	JK
CG	JK	JK	JH	UC	MP	RN	JK	MR	RN	MR
RN	CG	CG	JK	JH	UC	MR	MR	RN	CG	CG
JH	AS	TR	MP	MP	MR	MP	MP	CG	AS	JH
MR	OR	MR	CG	CG	CG	AS	CG	AS	MR	AS
AS	JH	UP	MR	MR	JH	CG	AS	MP	MP	RN
TR	MR	AS	OR	AS	AS	OR	JH	JH	OR	OR
UP	TR	JH	AS	OR	OR	UP	OR	OR	JH	MP
OR	UP	OR	UP	UP	UP	JH	UP	UP	UP	UP
BH	BH	BH	BH	BH	BH	BH	BH	BH	BH	BH

Source: author's calculations from data in Table 4. Refer to Table 5 for state codes.

Table 3: Relative Rankings of Indian States by Per Capita SDP at Current Prices (1980-2005)

1980-81	1985-86	1990-91	1995-96	2000-01	2004-05
DI	DI	DI	DI	GA	GA
GA	GA	GA	GA	DI	DI
PY	PB	PB	AN	PY	PY
PB	PY	HA	MA	PB	HA
AN	HA	MA	PB	AN	MA
MA	AN	PY	HA	HA	PB
HA	MA	GT	GT	MA	HP
GT	AP	AN	PY	HP	AN
JK	GT	AP	TN	TN	GT
WB	SM	SM	KR	KR	KR
HP	WB	ND	ND	GT	TN
AP	JK	TN	AP	MZ	KA
SM	MZ	HP	MZ	KA	SM
KA	HP	WB	HP	AP	AP
KR	TN	KA	SM	ND	TR
TN	AS	AP	KA	WB	AP
MN	ND	MZ	AP	MG	WB
AP	KA	MG	WB	SM	MZ
MG	KR	AS	MG	TR	MG
ND	MN	KR	RN	AP	ND
MP	AP	RN	MP	J&K	J&K
OR	MG	MP	J&K	RN	MN
TR	OR	MN	AS	AS	AS
MZ	MP	JK	OR	MN	RN
AS	TR	UP	MN	MP	OR
UP	UP	TR	TR	OR	MP
RN	RN	OR	UP	UP	UP
BH	BH	BH	BH	BH	BH

Source: for data see Table 4; for state codes see Table 5.

Table 4: Per Capita SDP at Current Prices (Rupees)

	1980-81	1985-86	1990-91	1993-94	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05
Andhra Pradesh	1380	2258	4531	7416	9999	11202	11650	13965	15049	16708	17932	19087	22041	23729
Arunachal	1571	3403	5398	8733	10956	10816	11642	12955	13669	14699	15577	16916	19707	22542
Assam	1284	2612	4281	5715	7001	7394	7966	8826	10080	10718	11423	12247	15687	16825
Bihar	917	1601	2660	3037	3041	4001	4014	4495	4794	5161	5004	5606	6913	7467
Jharkhand				5897	6904	7235	9581	10715	10362	8749	10129	11139	12941	17493
Goa	3145	4660	8797	16558	22207	26418	32647	40248	44349	49693	51073	60787	54577	66135
Gujarat	1940	3221	5891	9796	13665	16153	16585	19001	18831	17938	19713	22624	26992	29468
Haryana	2370	4004	7508	11079	14213	16611	17530	19340	21105	23214	24883	26818	31509	35044
Himachal Pradesh	1704	2649	4910	7870	10607	11960	13488	16144	18160	19925	21570	22902	28333	31140
J&K	1776	2874	3816	6543	7783	8667	9491	11591	12373	12781	13444	14507	17528	18630
Karnataka	1520	2495	4598	7838	10217	11670	12832	15396	16345	17816	18091	19576	20515	24199
Kerala	1508	2398	4200	7983	11626	13280	14523	16370	18117	20107	20287	22776	25645	27864
Madhya Pradesh	1358	2085	4049	6584	7809	8819	9440	10678	11764	10777	12209	11500	14306	14534
Chattisgarh				6539	7479	8353	9218	10056	10405	9922	12032	12369	16098	18068
Maharashtra	2435	3826	7439	12183	16152	17844	19016	20143	22978	21891	24044	26858	29770	32979
Manipur	1419	2322	3976	5846	6901	7920	8813	9742	11070	11066	12683	12878	14728	18386
Meghalaya	1361	2250	4375	6893	8641	9243	10270	11914	13088	14632	15813	16803	20729	21915
Mizoram	1289	2658	4474	8319	10953	12210	12393	13479	14909	18491	19704	22207	21963	22417
Nagaland	1361	2576	4990	9129	11057	11805	13052	12408	12594	17629	18911	20746	20821	20998
Orissa	1314	2175	3077	4896	6985	6548	7973	8766	9507	9245	9879	10164	14252	16306
Punjab	2674	4578	8318	12710	15471	17353	18764	21194	22745	24206	25868	26395	31192	32945
Rajasthan	1222	1978	4191	6182	8467	10102	10997	12360	12765	12514	13621	12641	16704	16800
Sikkim	1571	3023	5302	8402	10239	11332	12665	14270	14761	16503	17644	20013	21476	23791
Tamil Nadu	1498	2620	4983	8955	11819	13269	15388	17383	18337	20346	20326	21740	24106	27137
Tripura	1307	2025	3370	5534	6828	8109	9658	11012	13195	15253	17383	18550	21138	22836
Uttar Pradesh	1278	1999	3590	5066	6331	7476	7826	8470	8970	9162	9320	9963	11250	11941

Uttaranchal				6896	8746	9334	9961	10848	11443	12863	13466	14947	20519	22093
West Bengal	1773	2893	4673	6756	9041	9857	11682	13641	14817	16146	17499	18494	20806	22522
Andaman	2613	3985	5590	15192	18604	21017	22855	20504	22262	24418	25999	28340	33150	31004
Chandigarh				19761	26734	31158	34583	39112	42942	44516	47734	53886	66512	75181
Delhi	4030	6545	11057	18166	22542	25952	30736	34332	37065	42509	44286	45579	49825	55215
Pondicherry	2794	4475	6683	9781	12202	18631	25720	28768	29383	35190	37926	45431	48547	44908

Source: Data for 1980-81, 1985-86, 1990-91 is from the Economic Survey 1999-00; data for 1995-96 is from the Economic Survey 2006-07; and data for the other years are from the Economic Survey 2007-08. The data for the per capita SDP appears in Table 1.8 in all the Economic Surveys; all these are available online at: <http://indiabudget.nic.in/>

Table 5: State Codes

State	Code	State	Code	State	Code
Andaman	AN	HP Pradesh	HP	Orissa	OR
Andhra Pradesh	AP	Jammu & Kashmir	JK	Pondicherry	PY
Arunachal	AL	Jharkhand	JH	Punjab	PB
Assam	AS	Karnataka	KA	Rajasthan	RN
Bihar	BH	Kerala	KR	Sikkim	SM
Chandigarh	CH	Madhya Pradesh	MP	Tamil Nadu	TN
Chattisgarh	CG	Maharashtra	MA	Tripura	TR
Delhi	DI	Manipur	MR	Uttar Pradesh	UP
Goa	GA	Meghalaya	MG	Uttaranchal	UC
Gujarat	GT	Mizoram	MZ	West Bengal	WB
Haryana	HA	Nagaland	ND		

Table 6: Health Indicators for Major Indian States

	Life Expectancy at Birth (2001-05)			Infant Mortality Rate (per 1000 live births) (2006)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Andhra Pradesh	62.7	65.2	64.1	55	58	56
Assam	58.3	59	58.7	67	68	67
Bihar	62	60.1	61.4	58	63	60
Gujarat	62.8	65	63.9	52	54	53
Haryana	65.6	66	65.9	57	58	57
Karnataka	63.4	66.9	65.1	46	50	48
Kerala	71.3	76.3	73.9	14	16	15
Madhya Pradesh	57.8	57.5	57.7	72	77	74
Maharashtra	65.8	68.1	66.9	35	36	35
Orissa	59.2	59.2	59.2	73	74	73
Punjab	68.1	70.1	69.2	39	50	44
Rajasthan	61.2	62.2	61.7	65	69	67
Tamil Nadu	64.8	67.1	66	36	37	37
Uttar Pradesh	60.1	59.3	59.8	70	73	71
West Bengal	63.9	65.5	64.6	37	40	38
India	62.3	63.9	63.2	56	59	57

Source: Economic Survey of India, 2007-08 (Table 9.1).

Table 7: Infant Mortality Rates for Indian States

	1961			2006			Improvement (%)		
	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person	Male	Female	Person
Kerala	55	48	52	14	16	15	292.86	200	246.67
Puducherry	77	68	73	20	36	28	285	88.89	160.71
Mizoram	73	65	69	24	25	25	204.17	160	176
Manipur	31	33	32	10	13	11	210	153.85	190.91
Andaman & Nicobar	78	66	77	27	36	31	188.89	83.33	148.39
Lakshadweep	124	88	118	29	21	25	327.59	319.05	372
Chandigarh	53	53	53	20	27	23	165	96.3	130.43
Goa	60	56	57	16	14	15	275	300	280
Arunachal Pradesh	141	111	126	38	43	40	271.05	158.14	215
Jammu & Kashmir	78	78	78	51	53	52	52.94	47.17	50
Maharashtra	96	89	92	35	36	35	174.29	147.22	162.86
Tripura	106	116	111	31	41	36	241.94	182.93	208.33
Delhi	66	70	67	36	39	37	83.33	79.49	81.08
Meghalaya	81	76	79	53	52	53	52.83	46.15	49.06
Sikkim	105	87	96	26	40	33	303.85	117.5	190.91
Tamil Nadu	89	82	86	36	37	37	147.22	121.62	132.43
West Bengal	103	57	95	37	40	38	178.38	42.5	150
Punjab	74	79	77	39	50	44	89.74	58	75
Karnataka	87	74	81	46	50	48	89.13	48	68.75
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	102	93	98	28	44	35	264.29	111.36	180
Gujarat	81	84	84	52	54	53	55.77	55.56	58.49
Himachal Pradesh	101	89	92	45	55	50	124.44	61.82	84
Andhra Pradesh	100	82	91	55	58	56	81.82	41.38	62.5
Bihar	95	94	94	58	63	60	63.79	49.21	56.67
Haryana	87	119	94	57	58	57	52.63	105.17	64.91
Assam				67	68	67			
Rajasthan	114	114	114	65	69	67	75.38	65.22	70.15
Uttar Pradesh	131	128	130	70	73	71	87.14	75.34	83.1
Madhya Pradesh	158	140	150	72	77	74	119.44	81.82	102.7
Orissa	119	111	115	73	74	73	63.01	50	57.53
Nagaland	76	58	68	17	23	20	347.06	152.17	240
Daman & Diu	60	56	57	28	28	28	114.29	100	103.57
Chhatisgarh				59	62	61			
Jharkhand				46	52	49			
Uttarakhand				42	44	43			
India	122	108	115	56	59	57	117.86	83.05	101.75

Source: Economic Survey of India, 2007-08 (Table 9.5).

Table 8: Access to Safe Drinking Water for Indian States (% of hhlds)

	1981			2001			Growth (%)		
	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban
Jammu & Kashmir	40.3	28	86.7	65.2	54.9	95.7	61.79	96.07	10.38
Himachal Pradesh	44.5	39.6	89.6	88.6	87.5	97	99.1	120.96	8.26
Punjab	84.6	81.8	91.1	97.6	96.9	98.9	15.37	18.46	8.56
Chandigarh	99.1	94.4	99.4	99.8	99.9	99.8	0.71	5.83	0.4
Uttarakhand				86.7	83	97.8			
Haryana	55.1	42.9	90.7	86.1	81.1	97.3	56.26	89.04	7.28
Delhi	93	62.3	94.9	97.2	90.1	97.7	4.52	44.62	2.95
Rajasthan	27.1	13	78.7	68.2	60.4	93.5	151.66	364.62	18.81
Uttar Pradesh	33.8	25.3	73.2	87.8	85.5	97.2	159.76	237.94	32.79
Bihar	37.6	33.8	65.4	86.6	86.1	91.2	130.32	154.73	39.45
Sikkim	30.3	21.7	71.9	70.7	67	97.1	133.33	208.76	35.05
Arunachal Pradesh	43.9	40.2	87.9	77.5	73.7	90.7	76.54	83.33	3.19
Nagaland	45.6	43.4	57.2	46.5	47.5	42.3	1.97	9.45	-26.05
Manipur	19.5	12.9	38.7	37	29.3	59.4	89.74	127.13	53.49
Mizoram	4.9	3.6	8.8	36	23.8	47.8	634.69	561.11	443.18
Tripura	27.3	22.2	67.9	52.5	45	85.8	92.31	102.7	26.36
Meghalaya	25.1	14.3	74.4	39	29.5	73.5	55.38	106.29	-1.21
Assam				58.8	56.8	70.4			
West Bengal	69.7	65.8	79.8	88.5	87	92.3	26.97	32.22	15.66
Jharkhand				42.6	35.5	68.2			
Orissa	14.6	9.5	51.3	64.2	62.9	72.3	339.73	562.11	40.94
Chhattisgarh				70.5	66.2	88.8			
Madhya Pradesh	20.2	8.1	66.7	68.4	61.5	88.6	238.61	659.26	32.83
Gujarat	52.4	36.2	86.8	84.1	76.9	95.4	60.5	112.43	9.91
Daman & Diu	54.5	46.4	67	96.3	94.9	98.9	76.7	104.53	47.61
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	19.4	16.8	54.3	77	70.5	96.1	296.91	319.64	76.98
Maharashtra	42.3	18.3	85.6	79.8	68.4	95.4	88.65	273.77	11.45
Andhra Pradesh	25.9	15.1	63.3	80.1	76.9	90.2	209.27	409.27	42.5
Karnataka	33.9	17.6	74.4	84.6	80.5	92.1	149.56	357.39	23.79
Goa	22.5	8.6	52.3	70.1	58.3	82.1	211.56	577.91	56.98
Lakshadweep	2.2	1	3.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	109.09	360	24.32
Kerala	12.2	6.3	39.7	23.4	16.9	42.8	91.8	168.25	7.81
Tamil Nadu	43.1	31	69.4	85.6	85.3	85.9	98.61	175.16	23.78
Puducherry	80.6	76.9	84.2	95.9	96.6	95.5	18.98	25.62	13.42
Andaman & Nicobar	51.6	36.3	92	76.7	66.8	97.8	48.64	84.02	6.3
INDIA	38.2	26.5	75.1	77.9	73.2	90	103.93	176.23	19.84

Source: Economic Survey of India, 2007-08 (Table 9.6).

Table 9: Relative Rankings in Access to safe Drinking Water

1981	1991	2001
Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Chandigarh
Delhi	Delhi	Punjab
Punjab	Punjab	Delhi
Puducherry	Puducherry	Daman & Diu
West Bengal	West Bengal	Puducherry
Haryana	Himachal Pradesh	Himachal Pradesh
Daman & Diu	Haryana	West Bengal
Gujarat	Sikkim	Uttar Pradesh
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	Karnataka	Bihar
Nagaland	Daman & Diu	Haryana
Himachal Pradesh	Arunachal Pradesh	Tamil Nadu
Arunachal Pradesh	Gujarat	Karnataka
Tamil Nadu	Maharashtra	Gujarat
Maharashtra	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	Andhra Pradesh
Bihar	Tamil Nadu	Maharashtra
Karnataka	Uttar Pradesh	Arunachal Pradesh
Uttar Pradesh	Rajasthan	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
Sikkim	Bihar	Andaman & Nicobar Islands
Tripura	Andhra Pradesh	Sikkim
Rajasthan	Nagaland	Goa
Andhra Pradesh	Madhya Pradesh	Madhya Pradesh
Meghalaya	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Rajasthan
Goa	Goa	Orissa
Madhya Pradesh	Orissa	Tripura
Manipur	Manipur	Nagaland
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Tripura	Meghalaya
Orissa	Meghalaya	Manipur
Kerala	Kerala	Mizoram
Mizoram	Mizoram	Kerala
Lakshadweep	Lakshadweep	Lakshadweep

Source: ranks calculated from data in Table 9.6 of the Economic Survey of India, 2007-08.

Table 10: Literacy Rates for Indian States (%)

	Level						Growth
	1951	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001	1981-2001
Jammu & Kashmir		12.95	21.71	30.64		55.52	81.2
Himachal Pradesh					63.86	76.48	39.52
Punjab			34.12	43.37	58.51	69.65	60.59
Chandigarh			70.43	74.8	77.81	81.94	9.55
Uttarakhand	18.93	18.05	33.26	46.06	57.75	71.62	55.49
Haryana			25.71	37.13	55.85	67.91	82.9
Delhi		61.95	65.08	71.94	75.29	81.67	13.53
Rajasthan	8.5	18.12	22.57	30.11	38.55	60.41	100.63
Uttar Pradesh	12.02	20.87	23.99	32.65	40.71	56.27	72.34
Bihar	13.49	21.95	23.17	32.32	37.49	47	45.42
Sikkim			17.74	34.05	56.94	68.81	102.09
Arunachal Pradesh		7.13	11.29	25.55	41.59	54.34	112.68
Nagaland	10.52	21.95	33.78	50.28	61.65	66.59	32.44
Manipur	12.57	36.04	38.47	49.66	59.89	70.53	42.03
Mizoram	31.14	44.01	53.8	59.88	82.26	88.8	48.3
Tripura		20.24	30.98	50.1	60.44	73.19	46.09
Meghalaya		26.92	29.49	42.05	49.1	62.56	48.78
Assam	18.53	32.95	33.94		52.89	63.25	39.18
West Bengal	24.61	34.46	38.86	48.65	57.7	68.64	41.09
Jharkhand	12.93	21.14	23.87	35.03	41.39	53.56	52.9
Orissa	15.8	21.66	26.18	33.62	49.09	63.08	87.63
Chhattisgarh	9.41	18.14	24.08	32.63	42.91	64.66	98.16
Madhya Pradesh	13.16	21.41	27.27	38.63	44.67	63.74	65
Gujarat	21.82	31.47	36.95	44.92	61.29	69.14	53.92
Daman & Diu					71.2	78.18	19.61
Dadra & Nagar Haveli			18.13	32.9	40.71	57.63	75.17
Maharashtra	27.91	35.08	45.77	57.24	64.87	76.88	34.31
Andhra Pradesh		21.19	24.57	35.66	44.08	60.47	69.57
Karnataka		29.8	36.83	46.21	56.04	66.64	44.21
Goa	23.48	35.41	51.96	65.71	75.51	82.01	24.81
Lakshadweep	15.23	27.15	51.76	68.42	81.78	86.66	26.66
Kerala	47.18	55.08	69.75	78.85	89.81	90.86	15.23
Tamil Nadu		36.39	45.4	54.39	62.66	73.45	35.04
Pondicherry		43.65	53.38	65.14	74.74	81.24	24.72
Andaman & Nicobar	30.3	40.07	51.15	63.19	73.02	81.3	28.66
INDIA	18.33	28.3	34.45	43.57	52.21	64.84	48.82

Source: Economic Survey of India, 2007-08 (Table 9.4)

Table 11: Rankings According to Literacy Rates

1981	1991	2001
Kerala	Kerala	Kerala
Chandigarh	Mizoram	Mizoram
Delhi	Lakshadweep	Lakshadweep
Lakshadweep	Chandigarh	Goa
Goa	Goa	Chandigarh
Pondicherry	Delhi	Delhi
Andaman & Nicobar	Pondicherry	Andaman & Nicobar
Mizoram	Andaman & Nicobar	Pondicherry
Maharashtra	Maharashtra	Maharashtra
Tamil Nadu	Tamil Nadu	Tamil Nadu
Nagaland	Nagaland	Tripura
Tripura	Gujarat	Uttarakhand
Manipur	Tripura	Manipur
West Bengal	Manipur	Punjab
Karnataka	Punjab	Gujarat
Uttarakhand	Uttarakhand	Sikkim
Gujarat	West Bengal	West Bengal
Punjab	Sikkim	Haryana
Meghalaya	Karnataka	Karnataka
Madhya Pradesh	Haryana	Nagaland
Haryana	Meghalaya	Chhattisgarh
Andhra Pradesh	Orissa	Madhya Pradesh
Jharkhand	Madhya Pradesh	Orissa
Sikkim	Andhra Pradesh	Meghalaya
Orissa	Chhattisgarh	Andhra Pradesh
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Arunachal Pradesh	Rajasthan
Uttar Pradesh	Jharkhand	Dadra & Nagar Haveli
Chhattisgarh	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Uttar Pradesh
Bihar	Uttar Pradesh	Arunachal Pradesh
Rajasthan	Rajasthan	Jharkhand
Arunachal Pradesh	Bihar	Bihar

Source: ranks calculated from data in Table 10.