Journal of Economic Cooperation **23**, 1 (2002) 1-16

POVERTY ALLEVIATION: TOO MUCH OPTIMISM, TOO LITTLE ATTENTION

Fikret Şenses[*]

This paper provides an overview of poverty in the world in light of various poverty indicators for a selected group of countries. It then examines the shortcomings of the current poverty alleviation approach of the international community as dominated by the World Bank, and concludes with a brief outline of the main ingredients of an alternative strategy that poverty research should focus on for a significant dent in poverty in the years ahead.

1. INTRODUCTION

The past decade has witnessed the re-emergence of poverty as a major issue on the development agenda. Although the high incidence and severity of poverty in some developing countries have engendered a certain degree of domestic interest, it has been the international institutions, most notably the World Bank, rather than national governments which have been in the forefront of this revival of interest.

The period of increased attention that the subject of poverty has attracted has paradoxically corresponded with a period of slow progress in poverty alleviation, leading to the charge that a lot of the international effort in this direction has been rhetorical in nature rather than representing a concerted effort to come to grips with the problem. This charge can be justified on several counts.[1] First, the interest of the international community headed by the World Bank in this respect has not been continuous with a long gap of roughly ten years in the 1980s when there was a deep preoccupation with structural adjustment, with poverty relegated very much to the background. Second, with much of the effort concentrated on the level of living at a particular point in time as measured by simple indicators such as current income or

[*] Department of Economics, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

consumption expenditure, there has been a serious lack of analysis of the dynamic and mutually reinforcing forces that lead to poverty. Third, there has been little recognition that mass poverty is an old problem, the origins of which can be traced back to at least the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. Although this, together with the fact that poverty is a problem that industrialised countries still confront, points to the systemic nature of the poverty problem, such considerations have been ignored in much of the current discussion. Finally, as a result of the lack of effort to capture the diversity of the poverty problem vis-à-vis its causes and profile in different countries and in different time periods, there is a tendency to view the poor as a homogeneous group and suggest a common approach to alleviate their poverty. For instance, the two-tier poverty alleviation strategy advocated by the World Bank comprising labour-intensive growth and emphasis on social sector expenditure in health and education is expected to be applicable everywhere and under all circumstances, often without any reference to the nature and extent of poverty in different contexts.[2]

It is this latter issue which provides the subject matter of the present paper which aims at critically reviewing the current approach to poverty alleviation which is in vogue in international financial circles and pointing to the inadequacy of this approach in coming to grips with the intricacies of the poverty problem in different parts of the world. It is further argued that this approach oversimplifies the issues at stake and generates undue optimism, which, in the final analysis, diverts attention from the need to develop a far-reaching strategy.

The plan of the paper is as follows: In the second section after this introduction, the extent of poverty in the world is briefly reviewed in light of various poverty indicators for a selected group of countries. Without probing into the possible reasons behind it, attention is drawn to the relatively low poverty rates in some Islamic countries. In the third section, the shortcomings of the current poverty alleviation approach of the international community as dominated by the World Bank are examined. In the fifth section, we conclude by briefly outlining the main ingredients of an alternative strategy that poverty research should focus on for a significant dent on poverty in the years ahead.

2. MAIN TRENDS IN POVERTY

According to the World Bank, over one billion of the world's population live under the $1 a day international poverty line. The distribution of the poor by main regions of the world is presented in Table 1. The Table indicates that the biggest concentration of poverty is in South Asia which accounted for 43.5% of the world's poor in 1998. This is no doubt related to the fact that heavily populated low income countries like India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are located in this region. Another area in which poverty is concentrated is Sub-Saharan Africa which accounted for about a quarter of the world's poor population in the same year. This is also reflected in the fact that these two regions are characterised by high poverty incidence, with poverty rates in 1998 reaching 46.3% and 40.0% in Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, respectively.

Table 1: Income Poverty by Region, 1987, 1998

Region	No. of Poor People[a]		Poverty Rate[b]	
	1987	1998[c]	1987	1998[c]
East Asia & Pacific	417.5	278.3	26.6	15.3
Excluding China	114.1	65.1	23.9	11.3
Europe/Central Asia	1.1	24.0	0.2	5.1
L.America/Caribb.	63.7	78.2	15.3	15.6
M.East/ N.Africa	9.3	5.5	4.3	1.9
South Asia	474.4	522.0	44.9	40.0
S.Saharan Africa	217.2	290.9	46.6	46.3
Total	1,183.2	1,198.9	28.3	24.0
Excluding China	879.8	985.7	28.5	26.2

[a]Number of People living on less than $ 1 a day (million).
[b]Share of population living on less than $1 a day (per cent).
[c] Preliminary.
Source: *World Bank* (2000: Table 1.1, p. 23).

Two remarkable features of this data is the sharp rise in poverty incidence in the so-called transition economies comprising the former socialist countries in Eastern Europe during the last ten years and the very low poverty incidence in the Middle East and North Africa region (comprising predominantly Islamic countries) with a poverty rate of

1.9% as opposed to the average poverty rate of 24.0 % for the world as a whole. It is all the more remarkable that in this latter region both the poverty rate and the (absolute) number of poor persons declined during the 1987-98 period.

These highly aggregated data conceal the considerable intercountry variations within these broad country groups. Poverty rates based on population living on the less than one dollar a day criterion of the World Bank are given for selected developing countries in Table 2. For example, Sri Lanka and Tunisia stand out as countries with poverty rates considerably lower than the average rate for their respective regions. Although rural poverty rates are generally higher than urban poverty rates, the latter have also reached very high proportions, especially in countries like India and Pakistan (World Bank, 2000: 280-81).

Table 2: Poverty Rates in Selected Countries Using International Poverty Lines

Country	Survey Year	$1 a day (%)	$2 a day (%)
Algeria	1995	**	15.1
Bangladesh	1996	29.1	77.8
Brazil	1997	5.1	17.4
Chile	1994	4.2	20.3
China	1998	18.5	53.7
Egypt	1995	3.1	52.7
India	1997	44.2	86.2
Indonesia	1999	15.2	66.1
Jordan	1997	**	7.4
Kenya	1994	26.5	62.3
S. Korea	1993	**	**
Morocco	1990-91	*	7.5
Pakistan	1996	31.0	84.7
Portugal	1994	**	**
Russian Fed.	1998	7.1	25.1
Sri Lanka	1995	6.6	45.4
Tunisia	1990	**	11.6
Turkey	1994	2.4	18.0

* less than 0.5%
** less than 2.0%
Source: *World Bank* (2001: Table 4, pp.280-81).

Among the Islamic countries, there is a sharp distinction between those in Asia with high poverty incidence and those in the Middle East and North Africa with very low rates. The fact that there is generally a sharp rise in poverty rates when the poverty line is increased to two dollars per day reflects the heavy concentration of poverty in this interval. On the basis of this higher poverty line, also, Islamic countries in the Middle East and North Africa, in general, preserve their position with relatively low poverty rates. However, even within this group of countries, there is a variety of experiences with Jordan and Morocco, for example, lying at the lower end and Egypt at the higher end.

Table 3: Various Welfare Indicators in Selected Countries

Country	Prevalence Of Child Malnutrition *	Child Mortality Rate+	Life Expectancy at Birth	Literacy Rate (%)++	Enrolment Ratio** (%)	Human Development Index
	1992-98	1998	1999	1999	1999	1999
Australia	0	6	78.8	...	116	0.936
Algeria	13	40	69.3	66.6	72	0.693
Bangladesh	56	96	58.9	40.8	37	0.470
Brazil	6	40	67.5	84.9	80	0.750
Chile	1	12	75.2	95.6	78	0.825
China	16	36	70.2	83.5	73	0.718
Egypt	12	59	66.9	54.6	76	0.635
Ghana	27	96	56.6	70.3	42	0.542
India	...	83	62.9	56.5	56	0.571
Indonesia	34	52	65.8	86.3	65	0.667
Jordan	5	31	70.1	89.2	55	0.714
Kenya	23	124	51.3	81.5	51	0.514
S. Korea	...	11	74.7	97.6	90	0.875
Malaysia	20	12	72.2	87.0	66	0.774
Morocco	10	61	67.2	48.0	52	0.596
Pakistan	38	120	59.6	45.0	40	0.498
Sri Lanka	38	18	71.9	91.4	70	0.735
Tanzania	31	136	51.1	74.7	32	0.436
Tunisia	9	32	69.9	69.9	74	0.714
Turkey	10	42	69.5	84.6	62	0.735
Zambia	24	192	41	77.2	49	0.427

*Percentage of children under five.
+Under five mortality rate per 1,000.
++ Persons 15 years and older
**Combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio.
Source: *World Bank* (2000: Table 2, pp.276-77) for Cols.1-2 and UNDP (2001: Table 1, pp.141-44) for Cols. 3-6.

Several welfare indicators, including those making up the Human Development Index of the UNDP, for selected countries are given in Table 3. This table also confirms the sharp differences among individual countries, ranging from 0.427 in Zambia and 0.436 in Tanzania to 0.825 in Chile and 0.875 in South Korea. A similar picture emerges from individual indicators like child malnutrition, child mortality, life expectancy, literacy and school enrolment. For example, life expectancy ranges from 41 years in Zambia and 51.3 years in Kenya to 74.7 years in South Korea and 75.2 years in Chile. Literacy rates range from 40.8 % in Bangladesh and 45.0 % in Pakistan to 91.4 % in Sri Lanka and 95.6% in Chile. The fact that the countries with high poverty rates are generally characterised by poor performance in these social welfare indicators introduces a new and, perhaps, more difficult dimension to their ill-being.

3. THE INADEQUACY OF THE CURRENT POVERTY ALLEVIATION STRATEGY

The current approach to poverty alleviation as championed by the World Bank does not provide a sufficient basis to cope with the magnitude of poverty that exists in the world. The shortcomings of this approach can be examined under several headings, each one of which representing its essential elements.

3.1. Labour-intensive growth

Research on individual countries has shown that rapid growth *per se* is not a panacea for a significant reduction in the number of poor people. Rather it is the pattern of growth together with its pace that matters. In particular, it is the pattern of income distribution at the beginning of the growth process and what happens to it during that process which plays a major role. The success of South Korea and the Taiwan Province of China in dealing with poverty is usually attributed to the land reform and expansion of education that took place in these countries before the start of accelerated growth in the 1960s.

The crucial test in this context pertains to the degree to which the benefits of growth reach the poor. The “trickle down” hypothesis popularised in the post-war development literature, that the benefits of growth will reach the poor, is, in fact, a very old one. Its origins can be traced back to John Locke and later to Adam Smith. As the experience of today's developed countries during the Industrial Revolution has amply demonstrated, growth can be associated with mass poverty. The depth of poverty faced by a major section of the population in major urban centres of the new industrial powers was documented in 19th century literary works, especially by British authors, long before the first empirical studies on poverty were conducted at the turn of the twentieth century.[3]

Given the technological dependence of the developing countries on imported technologies from the industrialised countries reflecting a strong bias towards capital intensity, the options for labour-intensive growth may not be as readily forthcoming as propagated by the international financial institutions. A recent report published by an international organisation has pointed out that technological developments, especially those in the sphere of biotechnology, have favoured products used primarily by the higher income groups, with little impact on the poor population.[4]

Similarly, it is doubtful whether small and medium-sized enterprises which are expected to be at the centre of the labour-intensive pattern of development can play a leading role in the growth process as they have done in the Taiwan Province of China and develop productive networks with larger enterprises as they have done in Japan.

3.2. The Emphasis on Market-based Solutions

Another aspect of the current approach to poverty alleviation has been the gradual move away from generalised subsidies on basic goods and services and towards "cost effective" market-based provision through user charges and targeted allocations to the poor. The main justification for this move has been to cut down the cost of general subsidy programmes and prevent leakages of their benefits to the non-poor sections of the population. Although plausible at first sight, the new policy may have the drawback of leaving the poor out. Country studies have shown that this risk may be considerably high. One econometric study on Jamaica, for example, has shown that while 26% of total transfers involved in general subsidies leaked to the top quintile of income distribution, targeted subsidies, while reducing the proportion leaking out to this group to 8%, left out half of the poor.[5] The policy of user charges may also be self-defeating as the imposition of fees for education and health services may result in the poor shying away from using these services altogether. One study on Asian countries has estimated, for example, that following a 100% increase in fees charged for each visit to the local clinic, the fall in the number of visits for the bottom and top quarters of the income distribution would be 2% and 96%, respectively.[6]

3.3. Poverty Alleviation Programmes

A large number of programmes have been introduced in various countries implementing structural adjustment policies under the auspices of the World Bank. These programmes have created a strong impression that they were aimed foremost at providing no more than a "safety net" for people adversely affected by the structural adjustment policies and, by preventing policy reversals, ensuring the continuity of the reform process towards the integration of these countries to the international economy through market-based policies. The fact that these poverty alleviation programmes lacked sufficient resources to come to grips with the gravity of the poverty problem and were further bedevilled by political patronage preventing the little resources allocated for this purpose from reaching the poor confirms this point. The resources allocated to one such programme implemented in Mexico, for instance, reached a maximum of 0.75% of GNP during the 1981-89 period, representing merely 14 cents per poor person. Although this programme provided employment for 42,000 and training for 125,000 persons, these fell drastically short of the needs of the 9 million unemployed during that period.[7] A similar programme in Bolivia, during its most successful phase, created employment for around only 20,000-30,000 persons, as opposed to 23,000 workers laid off during the privatisation of the state mining enterprise, alone.[8] A similar programme in force in Turkey since 1986 has been characterised by vulnerability to political pressure and interference and weak and unstable financial structure.[9]

3.4. Efforts to Substitute the NGOs for the State

The poverty alleviation approach of international financial institutions constitutes an integral part of their neoliberal stabilisation and structural adjustment programmes, a chief objective of which is the reduction of the role of the State in economic life. In the sphere of poverty alleviation, this has translated itself into a reduced role of the State in social policy with the vacuum left behind by the State to be filled by non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Although these organisations may have certain advantages, such as their close contact with the poor at the community level, to justify their new role, some of their characteristics warn against complacency in this regard.[10] First, experience has shown that the relations between these organisations and government organisations active in the same sphere have not been altogether harmonious. Second, corruption and the lack of transparency and accountability, which form essential aspects of the neoliberal critique of State involvement in economic life, may also bedevil the activities of these organisations. Third, the concentration of the activities of these organisations at the local level, which is usually presented as their main advantage, may in the final analysis prove to be their chief disadvantage as it limits their overall impact, especially in key areas like health and education. Finally, participatory democracy and organisation at grassroots level are concepts which are yet to penetrate the bulk of the developing world. Even in India, which has made relatively more progress on this count, NGOs are estimated to cover between only one fifth and one quarter of the country.[11] The fact that these organisations have often resorted to direct government assistance and have not had a major impact in this sphere even in the USA indicates that they cannot be a substitute for State action. Given their weak showing so far, one cannot expect these organisations to play a major role in poverty alleviation, especially in the near future.

3.5. Poor Foreign Aid Record of Major Donors

Information on foreign aid from official sources disproves that poverty eradication has been high on the agenda of the international community. The record of foreign aid of major donors during 1990-99, a period overlapping with the so-called re-emergence of poverty as a major international issue, is assessed in Table 4 on the basis of several interrelated criteria. As can be observed from the table, the performance of major donors on the basis of criteria such as foreign aid/GNP ratio, foreign aid per capita, the share of foreign aid given to the least developed countries, and the trends in these indicators during the said period, has on the whole been negative. While foreign aid/GNP ratio of major donors declined further from a low level of 0.34% in 1990 to

0.24% in 1999, there was a fall in foreign aid per capita from 77 dollars to 66 dollars. Similarly, the share of the least developed countries in total foreign aid fell from 26% to 19% during the same period (UNDP, 2001: 19). The fact that the major recipients of foreign aid were the “geopolitically important” countries, by and large, explains the neglect of the poverty alleviation objective in the disbursement of aid.[12]

Table 4: Foreign Aid Record of Most Important[*] Donors

Country	Amt. of Foreign Aid 1999 million $	Foreign Aid/GNP 1999 (%)	Foreign Aid/GNP 1990-99+	Foreign Aid per Capita 1999($)	Foreign Aid per Capita 1990-99+	Share of Least Developed Countries 1990 (%)	Share of Least Developed Countries 1990-99+
Norway	1,370	+++	—	+++	+	++	—
Canada	1,699	+	—	—	—	—	—
Sweden	1,630	++	—	++	—	+	— —
USA	9,145	— —	— —	— —	— —	—	—
Holland	3,134	++	—	++	+	+	— —
Japan	15,323	+	+	+	+	—	—
France	5,637	+	—	+	—	—	— —
UK	3,401	—	—	—	+	+	—
Denmark	1,733	+++	+	+++	++	++	—
Germany	5,515	—	—	+	— —	+	—
Italy	1,806	— —	— —	— —	— —	+	— —
Spain	1,363	—	+	— —	+	—	—
OECD**	$56,378	% 0.24	—	$66	—	% 19	—

*Countries whose total foreign aid (net official development assistance disbursed) in 1999 exceeded 1 billion dollars.
** Total aid provided by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD.
+ Indicates the direction and magnitude of changes during the 1990-99 period.
Source: Our own calculations based on data given in UNDP (2001: Table 14, p. 190).

4. CONCLUSION

Even the data given by the World Bank, which according to some represent only a conservative estimate of the extent of poverty in the world[13], indicate that poverty is widespread and presents a major challenge for development practitioners throughout the world. One of the main objectives laid down in the Millennium Declaration of the United Nations was to halve the proportion of the world's people living on less than one dollar a day by the year 2015.[14]

A recent report published by an agency of the United Nations has stated that it is already clear that this target will not be reached, especially in view of the fact that achievements vis-à-vis rural poverty reduction, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, have been drastically below targets. The same agency has also drawn attention to the fact that during the past decade, there was a marked reduction in international efforts to alleviate poverty and that progress made in this sphere during the past ten years compared unfavourably to that of the twenty years before that.[15]

This paper has argued that the current approach to poverty alleviation, which is dominated by the neoliberal outlook of the international financial institutions, most notably the World Bank, is surrounded by a number of shortcomings and major weaknesses, paying only lip service to crucial issues like the structure of taxation, the pattern of credit allocation and, most notably, to the pattern of ownership of productive assets as major determinants of poverty. Given the poor past record of this approach and the insufficiency of international efforts, the main steps to alleviate poverty will have to focus on national efforts.

The debate on policy proposals for poverty alleviation is conducted generally in terms of either the direct approach comprising public action or the indirect approach relying basically on economic growth.[16] Given the gravity of the poverty problem, an all-out effort is needed. The first step in this direction should be the elevation of the poverty problem on national agendas and the recognition of the fact that there are no simple solutions to the problem. As one commentator has noted, an effective progress in poverty alleviation inevitably involves the whole economic and social policy framework.[17] It is therefore necessary to consider the direct and indirect approaches together.

Not only the rate but also the pattern of growth and, in particular, its impact on employment creation in both the urban and rural sectors and on income distribution should be emphasised. At a time of heavy preoccupation with structural adjustment, industrialisation seems to have been a forgotten objective in much of the developing world. Even a cursory examination of the structure of production would, however, show the strong link between low poverty incidence and the level of industrialisation which should, by itself, justify a revival of interest in the industrialisation objective. A major factor with a direct bearing on poverty incidence is the low level of agricultural productivity in many developing countries. For example, during the 1996-98 period, agricultural labour productivity in the USA reached 141 times the level attained in Bangladesh and 171 times the level attained in Kenya.[18] In view of the fact that a major section of the poor live in rural areas, due attention should be paid to investment in agricultural infrastructure and technology to raise agricultural productivity.

These measures should be supplemented by direct measures. Poverty indices based on income and consumption expenditure at a particular point in time should not divert attention away from the pressing need to improve social welfare indicators in a number of key spheres. In particular, public expenditure on social sectors like health and education should be increased with emphasis on the quality and relevance of these services for the poor. Structure of taxation should be redesigned with the objective of redistribution to the poor. In particular, there should be a redirection away from regressive indirect taxation towards direct taxation.

On the institutional side, too, there should be a concerted effort to bring together the resources and the administrative capacity of the State to the centre of the anti-poverty strategy and supplement them by the activities of the NGOs. Likewise, efforts of pro-poor elements in developed countries and in the broader international community such as NGOs, political parties, trade unions, various international organisations, particularly those within the United Nations, should also be utilised in the creation of conditions more conducive to poverty alleviation.

The alleviation of poverty is in many senses an uphill task, full of formidable obstacles, domestically as well as internationally. Problems of identifying the poor and determining their profile are only the tip of the iceberg. There are likely to be trade-offs between direct and indirect measures with future growth, for example, being thwarted by resources devoted to direct measures in the short term. The creation of a pro-poor constituency is likely to meet with strong political opposition. The existence of such obstacles, however, should be a reason to have a concerted all-out attack on poverty and not an excuse for delaying such action by a lot of words, rich in rhetoric but, as shown in this paper, weak in deed.

NOTES

1. See Şenses (2001) for details.

2. This strategy was outlined in World Bank (1990). World Bank's "new" strategy for poverty alleviation as outlined in World Bank (2000) embraces a broad range of concepts like opportunity, empowerment, and security. In view of the controversy within the Bank during the preparation and publication stages of this report, which led to the resignation of the director of the team (R. Kanbur) preparing the report, it is too early to say whether this represents a radical shift away from the Bank's previous stance on poverty alleviation. For a detailed account of this controversy, see Kanbur (2001) and Wade (2001).

3. Rowntree's (1901) study on poverty in an English town (York) is often referred to as the first systematic study on the subject.

4. Report published by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and referred to in *The Economist,* 6-12 January 2001.

5. See Squire (1993: 380).

6. See Gibbon (1992: 214).

7. See Laurell (1996: 132) for details.

8. See (Jenkins, 1994: 509).

9. See Şenses (1999a) for details.

10. See Şenses (2001).

11. See Friedmann (1996:168).

12. See Şenses (1999b) on details on the self-interest of donors as a major determinant of aid flows in light of the Turkish foreign aid experience.

13. As one observer has rightly pointed out, according to this approach, a family of four, with the father working fifty hours a week in a factory and earning 1300 dollars per annum (50 cents an hour) and the mother working as a housemaid and earning 600 dollars per annum would not be considered poor just because their per capita income is just above the 360 dollars poverty line. See Burkett (1990: 23).

14. See UNDP (2001: 21) and IFAD report referred to in *The Economist*, 6-12 January 2001.

15. IFAD report, *The Economist*, 6-12 January 2001.

16. See Bhagwati (1988).

17. See Bardhan (1996:1344).

18. Figures calculated from World Bank (2000: 288-89).

REFERENCES

Bardhan, P: (1996), Efficiency, Equity and Poverty Alleviation: Policy Issues in Less Developed Countries, *Economic Journal*, 106, September, 1344-1356.

Bhagwati, J. N.(1988), Poverty and Public Policy, *World Development*, 16, (5), 539-55.

Burkett, P.(1990), Poverty Crisis in the Third World: The Contradictions of World Bank Policy, *Monthly Review*, December, 20-32.(280)

Friedmann, J. (1996), “Rethinking Poverty: Empowerment and Citizen Rights”, *International Social Science Journal*, 148, 161-72.

Jenkins, R. (1994), S. Jorgensen, Bolivia's Answer to Poverty, Economic-Crisis and Adjustment-The Emergency Social Fund, *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 26, May, 508-509 (Book Review).

Kanbur, R. (2001), Economic Policy, Distribution and Poverty: The Nature of Disagreements, *World Development*, 29, (6), 1083-94.

Laurell, A.C. (1996), Social Welfare and Social Work - The Meaning of Poverty Programs in Latin-America, *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare*, 5 (3), 130-34.

Rowntree, B.S. (1901), *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*, London, Macmillan.

Şenses, F. (2001), *Poverty: The Other Face of Globalization- Concepts, Explanations, Policies and Main Trends* (in Turkish), İletişim, İstanbul.

--------. (1999a),The Fight Against Poverty and the Encouragement of the Social Assistance and Solidarity Fund (in Turkish), *METU Studies in Development*, 26 (3-4), 427-51.

--------. (1999b), Main Phases and Salient Features of Turkish Foreign Aid Experience, in K.L.GUPTA, *Foreign Aid New Perspectives*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London pp: 233-54.

Squire, L. (1993), Economic Development: Recent Lessons: Fighting Poverty, *American economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, May, 83. (2), 377-82.

Undp (2001), *Human Development Report 2001 Making New Technologies Work for Human Development*, Oxford University Press, UNDP: Geneva.

Wade, R.H. (2001), Making the World Development Report 2000: Attacking Poverty, *World Development,* 29, (8), 1435-41.

World Bank (2000), *World Development Report, 2000/2001, Attacking Poverty*, World Bank: Washington, DC.

-------- (1990) *World Development Report, 1990,* World Bank: Washington, DC.