

Labour Principles and Community Strategy in Karnataka State Since 1981 to 2009

Dr. Mallikarjunappa. N.L.

Associate professor, Indian Academy School of management studies, Bangalore.

ABSTRACT: “The significant improvements in the living wage standards of labourers over the past three decades in villages in the Karnataka state, a active centre of apparel production in states. The improvements have been connected with state programmes and policies linking to education, subsidized food, transport and communications, and the growth of rural industrialization centered on oven and knitwear production for export and domestic markets. There are still very few opportunities for the majority to move into employment other than low skilled manual labour however. This raises questions about the strategy based on ‘cheap labour’ that the Indian state has been pursuing in the recent period. Alternative strategies would almost certainly serve the interests of labour better than this.”

Keywords— *Apparel production, labour standards, rural industrialization, social policy, Karnataka.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The situation of employment has mutual with strong state social policy to improve the position of labour in an industrializing region of South India. Social policy is defined broadly here to include social welfare as well as education, health, and employment generation policies. It has come onto the agenda for developing countries with the rise of neo-liberalism, and its ‘freeing up of labour markets’, encouragement of ‘flexible labour markets’, et al. India was one of a number of countries that expanded its social policy initiatives as part of its neo-liberal project in the 1990s and early 2000s.

1 The expansion of social policy could be seen as necessary to contain resistance to neo-liberal policies. Social policy could also be seen as transferring some of the responsibility for the provision for the reproduction of labour from capital to the state.

2 This was a project that some fractions of capital would support. At the same time however, social policy strengthened the bargaining position of labour vis a vis capital. This made it a project that labour would support as well.

In India there is clear evidence of expanded social policy initiatives at the state and national level strengthening the position and bargaining power of labour in the 1990s and 2000s. Improved terms and conditions of employment and expanded state social policy had combined to produce very substantially improved standards of living for the labourer population between 1981/2 and 2008/9. It is only in comparison with what were very poor standards in 1981/2 that this looks impressive though.

Overall, policy was supporting an economy continuing to rely on large quantities of relatively unskilled labour. The context is one driven by dynamic industrial growth linked to the global market, part of the neo-liberal project in which India has been involved over the past 3 decades or so. The case in question is the expansion of the production of redeemed garments for export, in a relatively decentralized and labour-intensive industry dominated by small-scale production unit’s centre. The strong social policies that accompanied the expansion of the industry pre-dated the introduction of neo-liberal policies, originating as they did in the 1960s. They were strengthened in the 1980s, and strengthened further after that as well. These strong social policies were driven by the populist politics for which the state of Karnataka has long been well known.

II. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT, SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WELFARE: 1981, 1982, 1996, AND 2008-2009

Erms and Conditions Of Employment In 1981/1982

In 1981/2, most of the working population in the villages was employed in agriculture, or in trade and services derivative of agriculture. There were different types of agricultural employees: bonded labourers, employed on an annual basis; casual labourers employed on a daily basis; and sugar cane crushers working on contract outside the villages as well as within for 6-10 months in the year, staying away for months at a time. Casual labourers were male and female and from all caste groups. Sugar cane crushers were all men, relatively

small number of people were employed outside agriculture in 1981/2, most of them in trade and services, a few in larger scale manufacturing units outside the villages.

Farmers used large numbers of casual labourers for particular operations. Small farmers employed smaller numbers likewise. The standard hours for casual labourers were 9-6 in 1981/2. Some worked from 6-9 in the early morning as well. They got food at work if their employer did not want them to go off in the middle of the day. There was employment more or less round the year. Seasonal unemployment was not a major issue at the time. Moreover there were Dalits who had moved to these villages when a house became available because they knew that these were villages in which it was always possible to get work.

There were problems in years of severe drought however. Then people went considerable distances to seek work to tide them over until employment in the villages became available again. There were families for whom droughts had been occasions to migrate permanently too. Sugar cane crushing was done by groups on a contract basis. It involved working long hours in poor conditions, staying on the farm where the sugar was being crushed. Much of what was earned was spent on the job however. Sugar cane crushers' wives complained about how little money they brought home. Sugar cane crushers responded that the work was so hard that they had to drink much of what they had earned to be able to continue to do the job.

III. SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WELFARE IN 1981/2

Social policy is defined here to include state interventions which protect those in employment and others in the population as a whole. It includes social welfare interventions such as the provision of subsidized food and other essential commodities; the provision of housing and amenities associated with housing; the provision of health care; and pensions, maternity, accident and disability benefits. Support for education was an important component of social policy rather than social welfare. Employment generation schemes and schemes to support self-employment fall under social policy here too. There was only a limited amount of recognizable social welfare reaching the villages in 1981/2.

Not much of it was reaching Dalit labourers and their families. This was one of the reasons that labourers were so dependent on employers at the time. Most of the strong social welfare interventions for which Karnataka is known only reached the villages in the later 1980s and subsequently. In 1981/2 there were intermittent food for work programmes on which manual labourers but rarely Dalits were employed. There were also the beginnings of what were to become major Dalit housing developments. New Dalit colonies were in the process of being set up in 2 of the 4 hamlets in the study villages in which there were substantial Dalit communities in 1981/2. The initiatives for these new Dalit colonies came from thottam farmers who were able to mobilize state support. This was partly a strategy on their part to capture and immobilise Dalit labour. Apart from housing, social protection was still very much a matter for non-Dalits in 1981/2.

IV. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT IN 1996

In 1996 there were nearly as many paid employees in non-agricultural employment as in agricultural. There were relatively few Dalits among the non-agricultural employees though. The increase in non-agricultural employment was the result of the integration of the villages into the wider local economy and the growing industrial development that had taken place since 1981/2. The non-agricultural employment was primarily in textile mills and engineering workshops as well as knitwear. There was relatively little paid employment in trade and services. There were relatively few government employees in the sample too.

The majority of employees in the industrial sector were in relatively unskilled jobs, many though not all of these jobs providing more regular employment than agriculture. Hours were longer however, and commuting added to what was already a long working day. For the majority industrial employment was not significantly better than agricultural. The generally lower social status associated agricultural labour did not appear to be a major factor here. casual labour remained the dominant form of employment in agriculture; contract labour was now being used for tasks other than sugar cane crushing; and more people from the villages were now involved in sugar cane crushing too. There was less child labour in 1996 than there had been in 1981/2.

Irrigation had become more expensive and was producing less water than it had in 1981/2. Increased labour costs were also a problem for those employing labour, but these had not resulted in much mechanization, at least as far as field operations were concerned. They were moving into the wider industrial economy, many still retaining their homes in the villages, others moving out. They were educating their sons to enable them to move into the wider economy as well.

Terms and conditions of casual labour had also improved. Hours were shorter. And pay had nearly tripled. The wages of casual labour had increased much more substantially. Contract labour was now being used for many tasks, not just for sugar cane crushing. Many men preferred contract to casual labour because they could earn more working for fewer hours that way. There was also more sugar cane crushing work in 1996, most of it outside the villages, and women were involved as well as men. This could be attributed at least in part to the integration of the village economy into what was a dynamic local economy driven by the expansion of

knitwear production for export that had been so striking in and around Karnataka. It could also be attributed to the expansion of social policy. It was not just improvements in employment conditions that improved the position of labour. Social policy was also contributing very significantly, both directly and indirectly, in 1996.

V. SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WELFARE IN 1996

A substantial number of new social policy and social welfare programmes were in place in 1996. Earlier programmes had also been expanded. Some of the more important social welfare programmes as far as labourers in the villages were concerned were the PDS (Public Distribution System); the ICDS (Integrated Child Development Services); free school meals, school uniforms and books; pensions, and maternity, accident, and disability benefits; and housing developments. There had also been a significant expansion of education and some improvement in health coverage though there was still no health centre in the villages. The IRDP (Integrated Rural Development Programme) had been continuing as had intermittent employment generation schemes. Programmes to support production were not expanding though.

The PDS was a flagship programme providing subsidized food and essential commodities including rice, sugar, some wheat products, and kerosene, and an annual distribution of saris and dhotis. Whereas in 1981/2 the PDS had had a very low profile, having only relatively recently been extended to the rural areas, in 1996 it was playing a significant role. Not all households were able to access it successfully. Dalits had more difficulties than others in doing so. There were problems with the reliability, and the quality, of supplies. But it was reaching large numbers in 1996.²² The ICDS supplemented the PDS, providing food for pregnant women and young children. It also provided child care for small numbers of pre-school children, primarily Dalit, whose mothers went out to work. Free school meals, uniforms and books, introduced in 1984, were generally regarded as having had a significant impact on participation in education in Karnataka. Participation in education had increased very substantially in the villages between 1981/2 and 1996.²⁴ There had been a substantial reduction in child labour in Dalit households between 1981/2 and 1996 too. Pensions and maternity, accident and disability benefits were only reaching some of their intended beneficiaries in the villages in 1996, but the fact that they were available was significant nevertheless.

Dalit housing had improved enormously between 1981/2 and 1996 in two of the four study villages in which there were Dalit communities. The colonies being established in 1981/2 were up and running, doubling the number of house sites and houses and providing more public space as well. Similar extensions were being planned for the other two Dalit communities. Dalits were spending more on buying house sites, and building and extending houses with or without contributions from the state. This had led to increases in indebtedness, to moneylenders, to employers, and to the state. There were a number of credit programmes providing loans for small-scale self-employment in the 1980s and first half of 1990s.²⁶ The majority of investments financed by such programmes in these villages were livestock investments, mainly but not exclusively non-Dalit.

There were also employment generation schemes, but these were not very visible in the study villages in 1996. Overall, this amounted to a significant expansion in state social policy reaching low-income households, reducing their dependence on employers and the village elite. This reinforced the impact of integration into the rapidly growing industrial economy that was also playing a role in reducing dependency in the villages. Dominant caste employers complained that social welfare developments were undermining their position. They attributed Dalit labourers' unwillingness to work as much, or as hard, or for as long, to the 'pampering' they were getting from the government. Employers also attributed the increased assertiveness of Labourers, both Dalit and non-Dalit, also felt that the fact that there were now alternatives available to them in the knitwear industry and related sectors meant that they could resist pressure from employers in agriculture much more strongly than they had been able to before. The balance had clearly shifted in favor of labourers for other reasons too. These included changing attitudes on the part of state officials particularly where Dalits were concerned.

VI. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT IN 2008/9

Paid employment outside agriculture had overtaken that in agriculture for the villages as a whole by 2008/9. Also striking was that, unlike in 1996, manufacturing employment was now dominated by employment in the apparel industry. There had been an increase in employment in miscellaneous trade and services as well, much of it associated with transport and other activities related to the industry. The majority of people resident in the villages who were employed in the industry were in relatively unskilled jobs. These included tailors who had learned the job by working as 'helpers' for a year or more. This was not strictly speaking 'unskilled' employment. It was however employment that was easily accessible to manual labourers of all caste groups if they started young enough. People from the study villages were employed in knitwear production for the domestic market as much as for export, and this was more regular than export production. But although much of this employment was more regular than agricultural labour, hours were long and pay was not very different. Most of the people who worked in the knitwear industry were young, male and female,

They were attracted by what they regarded as relatively 'light' work, and work that was relatively social. They also liked getting out of the villages. There were few prospects of advance for these employees though. They were likely to continue in relatively unskilled low-paid positions for as long as they continued to work in the industry. There had been only a small decrease in the overall numbers of agricultural labourers in the villages in 2008/9. There was no more child labour in agriculture either. Contract labour was now the dominant form of male agricultural employment. Women also did contract labour, but not as much as men. People employed on contract worked outside the villages as well as within. None of them was doing sugar cane crushing work though. Sugarcane was now being processed in mills. Contract labour was organized informally. Non-Dalits were not involved because they were not prepared to join Dalit groups and there were too few of them to make up groups consisting of non-Dalits alone. Contract labour was organized by someone hearing about the work who would get a group together.

Pay was better if the work was further away. If far away the employer would send a truck to pick the labourers up, and they would often stay for several days to complete the work. Employers in the villages complained that men were rarely willing to do casual labour in 2008/9. Daily wages for male casual labourers varied between Rs.100/- and Rs.150/- for a 6-hour day. If they worked on contract they could get up to Rs.200/- or Rs.250/- per day in the villages, and more if they worked further away. Women were also doing contract labour in the villages but they did more casual than contract labour.

VII. SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL WELFARE IN 2008/9

Further developments in social policy included a substantial expansion of the PDS. School meals had also improved and their uptake had increased. There were more pensions, and maternity, accident and disability benefits reaching Dalit households. There had been significant further improvements in Dalit housing. Education had improved too, as had health care – there was now a health centre in one of the study villages. There was less support for small scale self-employment and what there was now channeled through SHGs (Self Help Groups). Earlier employment generation schemes had been replaced by the NREGS. This was a new initiative with major long term implications that was getting off the ground in the villages in 2008/9.

The price of PDS rice was reduced in 2006, from Rs.3/50 to Rs.2/50, and then Rs.2/00, and finally, in September 2008, Rs.1/00 per kg., by the government which was elected in 2006. These moves took the price way below the Central issue price, substantially increasing the subsidy born by the state. The food subsidies were particularly important in 2008/9 when food price inflation was high. Rs.1/- per kg rice when the open market price was Rs.14/- per kg or so for the poorest quality was a real boon to the poor.

There had been further improvements in housing by 2008/9. The new colonies being planned in 1996 were up and running, Efforts were being made to get more house sites on another piece of land there too. There still seemed to be an insatiable demand for house sites. Some of this was a demand for the future for children. Most was simply to get away from multiple occupancy and crowding, still quite widespread in 2008/9. Participation in education had continued to increase. Children under 15 were in school in 2008/9.36 There was very little child labour in the villages any more. This reflected a major change in attitudes to children and children's education. Children were now the focus of attention, and seen as investments in the future, in labourer as well as other households. This was a far cry from 1981/2, and even 1996. In 2008/9 all state provided credit was being channeled through SHGs, as in many other parts of India. The SHGs in the study villages had not proved at all effective though. here was a spurt of activity in 2000/01 when the first were set up, but this soon petered

More support would be needed if SHGs were to generate finance for self-employment et al. A limited amount of employment was being provided by the NREGS in 2008/9. This was an initiative on an altogether different scale from the employment generation schemes of the 1980s and the 1990s. The NREGS guaranteed up to 100 days of work per rural household per year in theory, for all who claimed it. The NREGS was started in selected districts in 2006, and extended to all rural areas in the country, including the study villages, in 2008/9. The scheme was only attractive to women in the study villages. Men's wages for agricultural and other manual labour were much higher than those of women, and much higher than those being paid by the NREGS. There was little demand for NREGS work in the villages at first. But the demand gradually picked up.

While the wage of Rs.80/-per day was on a par with what they were paying women for agricultural labour prior to 2010, when the wage went up on 1 January 2010 to Rs.100/-, they raised what they were paying to Rs.100/- too. Industrial employers also complained about the NREGS. Agricultural employers were putting some pressure on NREGS supervisors to try to get them to organize less NREGS work particularly in peak seasons. Pressure may also have been exerted at higher levels. This was not something that this research inquired into though. Thus there had been a significant further expansion of state social policy low income households, strengthening their overall position, by 2008/9. It had reinforced the impact of further integration into a fast-growing local industrial economy too. Employers complained more than ever about the difficulty of getting people to work in agriculture, now talking about not having to work as much, or as hard, because of the

PDS et al. The NREGS was an added bonus as far as labourers was concerned, increasing the wages of female agricultural labourers particularly. The combination of social policy with the continuing expansion of the industrial sector was continuing to shift the balance in favor of labour.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Focused on the evolution of employment, and of terms and conditions of employment in agriculture, and the evolution of social policy, over the period from 1981/2 to 1996, and 1996 to 2008/9. The combination of increased employment opportunities in the growing industrial economy, and the expansion of social welfare programmes et al., led both to an increase in the wellbeing of labourers and their families, and to a strengthening of the bargaining position of labour vis a vis employers. It was the association of strong, decentralized and labour-intensive industrial growth in the local economy with the expansion of social policy and social welfare that produced these results. We consider a number of issues that arise from these findings: first, issues relating to the tightening of the labour market; second, issues relating to the division of responsibility for the wellbeing of labour between employers on the one hand, and the state on the other.

THE TIGHTENING OF THE LABOUR MARKET

One of the more striking features of the period under review was the tightening of the labour market. This was a regional phenomenon as far as the villages were concerned. Thus though there was no longer enough work in agriculture in the villages themselves, agriculturalists had difficulty attracting sufficient labour because there was enough work in the region as a whole, and this was work to which labourers in the villages also had access. The corollary of this was that to get enough labour agriculturalists had to treat labour well. The shortage of labour in agriculture was connected with the shortage of labour outside agriculture.

Textiles, particularly spinning and weaving, engineering, and metalworking contributed too. The growth of employment in the knitwear industry centre on outweighed all of these others though It has been drawing increasingly on labour from other states recently as well. This may in part be in order to get more docile labour. It was discussed primarily however in terms of an increasing shortage of labour from nearer by. While the shortage of labour in the region was driven primarily by demand, reductions in supply made their contribution to the tightening of the labour market as well. The labour supply had been affected by such things as the longer-term effects of fertility decline on the growth of the labour force, increasing participation in education reducing the number of young people in the labour force³ and increases in wages and earnings making it less necessary for members of labourer households to put in as much work as before. This latter was countered only to some extent by increasing aspirations providing incentives to put in more.

Social policy and the expansion of social welfare made a strong contribution to the decrease in the labour supply. The PDS, the ICDS, school meals, maternity benefits, accident benefits, pensions, et al. made it possible for people to meet their consumption needs with less labour. Increased aspirations, reflected in increased spending on housing, and increased spending on children, in labourer households have not been strong enough to outweigh the incentives to supply less labour. There was a striking change between 1981/2 when very little was spent on children, and children brought in earnings from an early age, on the one hand, and 1996 and 2008/9 when households were having to do without children's contributions to earnings and were involved in substantial additional expenditure associated with the improved standing of children within the household as well, on the other. Significant reductions in the supply of the labour of children, and of women looking after children, were being offset only to some extent by increased incentives to put in more labour to support new demands on household budgets.

There were contradictory tendencies here. The net effect was to reduce the supply of labour over time, however. This could be seen in the reduction in numbers of young people in the labour force, the reduction in numbers of women in the labour force, even with their participation in the NREGS, and the reduction in numbers of days of paid work that men were putting in too. It should also be noted here that social welfare interventions dampened the increase in wages and earnings, by keeping the costs of living down, and by providing some of the things like pensions, maternity benefits, housing, et al. that one would normally expect employers to provide.

THE DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND THE STATE

Focused on the interplay between terms and conditions of employment on the one hand, and social policy on the other. This leads to questions concerning the division of responsibility for providing for labour between employers and the state. One can focus on employer responsibilities – not wanting to let employers off the hook. An alternative is to focus on what the state can do. The policy emphasis in India in the recent period and in neo-liberal regimes generally, has been on reducing the responsibility of employers for providing fully for labour. Policies reducing the restrictions on employers, and reducing the obligations of employers, with respect to labour, have been accompanied by an expansion of state social policy, increasing the responsibility of the state.

One of the questions that arise in connection with the state taking on more responsibility for providing for labour is its capacity to do so. There are many states in India that are poorly equipped to intervene effectively here. Not all states have the capacity to deliver on the scale that the Karnataka state has done. There is also the question of the financing of state provision. The state may take responsibility for some of the provision for labour and finance it from taxes on employers – effectively making employers pay through another route. An alternative is to finance it through things like VAT, taxes on alcohol etc.

Also paying a large part of the cost. This brings us to the bargaining power of labour. Trade unions which were powerful in the region in the 1960s and 1970s declined as industry became more fragmented and relied more on casual and migrant labour. Agricultural labour was never unionized in this area. Collective bargaining was generally rather weak in the industries that were important in the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s. There is also the question of the bargaining power of labour vis a vis the state – the ability of labour to mobilize around state benefits et al. Party politics has played an important role in getting social policies introduced, and implemented. Populist politics in Karnataka are usually regarded as responsible for the fact that Karnataka was the first to introduce many social welfare policies that have now been adopted at the national level in India. Organized labour has not played a strong role here. There may be more to be gained by mobilizing outside the workplace to put pressure on the state to deliver better on its social welfare policy though. This is an area in which labour mobilization outside the workplace could play a role, through political parties, social movements.

IX. CONCLUSION

The paper has shown how terms and conditions of employment changed between 1981/2 and 1996, and between 1996 and 2008/9, as the rural areas became more closely integrated into the growing industrial economy. Terms and conditions of employment in agriculture were harsh and oppressive in 1981/2 when a large majority of the population in the villages was working in agriculture. By 1996, the proportion working in agriculture had fallen, and terms and conditions of employment in agriculture had improved. The majority of labourers working outside agriculture were working on terms and conditions that were not very different from those in agriculture too. In 2008/9, there had been a further decrease in numbers working in agriculture, though much smaller than between 1981/2 and 1996. Terms and conditions of employment in agriculture had improved again, on a par with those in non-agricultural employment. The paper has also shown how state social welfare policy developed over this period from playing a very limited role in 1981/2, to a significant role in 1996, and a very much expanded role in 2008/9.

By 2008/9 it was clear that it was making a major contribution to labourers' standards of living, something that it had not been doing either in 1996, or in 1981/2. Improved terms and conditions of employment and expanded state social welfare policy had combined to produce very substantially improved standards of living for the labourer population between 1981/2 and 2008/9. It is only in comparison with what were very poor standards in 1981/2 that this looks impressive though. Labourers were still working hard for long hours for low pay in 2008/9. There were still very few opportunities to move into employment other than low skilled manual labour. State social policies may have improved the conditions of manual labourers, but they were not equipping many to move out of manual labour.

These were policies supporting an economy relying on large quantities of relatively unskilled labour still. This raises questions about the strategy based on 'cheap labour' that the Indian state has been pursuing in the recent period, a strategy in which the responsibility for capitalist enterprises to provide fully for labour is reduced, and the state takes on more of this responsibility, the state pursuing a strategy of increasingly unequal development while providing safety nets to cater for the poor. An alternative is for the state to focus on increasing the skills and productivity of labour as a basis for enabling capitalist enterprises to compete in the world economy. If the state moved towards getting employers to pay the full cost of providing for labour, employers would have greater incentives to contribute to increasing the productivity of labour too. Increasing the skills and productivity of labour would enable employers to take responsibility for providing fully for labour and still remain competitive. It would enable labour to earn higher incomes as well. A strategy of the state promoting development that takes care of inequality in this way has much more to recommend it in the longer term than the strategy that is being pursued in India now.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Barrientos, A. and Hulme, D Social Protection for the Poor and the Poorest: Concepts, Policies and Politics. London: Palgrave. (2008)
- [2]. Breman, J. The Poverty Regime in Village India: Half a Century of Work and Life at the Bottom of the Rural Economy in South Gujarat. New Delhi: Oxford University Press. 2007
- [3]. Cederlof, G. Bonds Lost: Subordination, Conflict and Mobilization in Rural South India c. 1900-1970. New Delhi: 1997
- [4]. Chari, S. Fraternal Capital, Peasant-Workers, Self-Made Men, and Globalization in Provincial India. New Delhi: Permanent Black. 2004
- [5]. De Neve, G. ““There You are Like a Bird in a Cage!””, Indian Garment Workers 2010
- [6]. Critiquing Fordism and CSR’, paper presented at the conference: Working for Export Markets: Labour and Livelihoods in Global Production Networks, Sussex University, July 1-2 (under review). 2001
- [7]. Government of India National Rural Employment Guarantee Act website. Available at: nrega.nic.in (accessed 17 July 2010).
- [8]. Heyer, J. ‘Embedding Global Production Networks: Impacts on Labour and Rural Hinterlands of Integration Into the Global Economy’, revised version of paper presented at the conference: Working for Export Markets: Labour and Livelihoods in Global Production Networks, Sussex University, 1-2 July (under review). 2010
- [9]. Jeyaranjan, J. ‘Women and Pro-poor Policies in Rural Karnataka: An Examination of Practices and Responses’, Economic and Political Weekly 41(43): 64-74. 2011
- [10]. Kalpana, K. ‘Subverting Policy, Surviving Poverty: Women and the SGSY in Rural Karnataka’, Economic and Political Weekly 46(43): 50-57. 2011
- [11]. Swaminathan, M. ‘Village Level Implementation of IRDP: A Comparison of West Bengal and Tamil Nadu’, Economic and Political Weekly 25(13): A17-27. 1990
- [12]. Swaminathan, M. Weakening Welfare: The Public Distribution of Food in India. New Delhi: Leftward. 2000
- [13]. Vijayabaskar, M. (2011) ‘Global Crises, Welfare Provision, and Coping Strategies of Labour in Tiruppur’, Economic and Political Weekly 46(22): 38-45.2011