CHAPTER 2
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS-
AN OVERVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Human development has a strong conceptual foundation, with a rich legacy, unique features and well-formulated theories. The concept of human rights occupies a justifiable place in any discourse on human development (Uvin 2005: 192). Although human right is usually regarded as the concern of philosophy, political science and law, the concept is not alien to economics. The disinterest in rights arising from the utilitarian tradition and the neglect of ethical dimensions, led to the impoverishment of economics (Sen 1987: 49-57). The convergence of human development and human rights is an offspring of the recent academic acceptance of the relation between the two.

This chapter presents a review of the concept and measures of human development and of the relation between human development and human rights. In the process certain changes needed in the approach towards human development, and the need for an analytical approach that establishes the relation between human development and human rights are also discussed.

2.2. The Conceptual Tendencies

The use of the term human development was pioneered by doctors serving particular communities in rural America in the 19th century (Government of Madhya Pradesh 1995). Later, many anthropologists have used the term in their studies in Africa. In the late 1970s it expanded to the intellectual frontiers of development economics. Gradually, from a mere ideological reference, the concept of human development has grown to a definite form of approach and practice, making it the most holistic development model (Haq 1995). The evolution of human development from an ideological level to that of a development model may be reviewed in terms of four conceptual tendencies.
2.2.1 A latent ideal

Though not specifically mentioned, the rudimentary ideas of human development can be observed in early economic literature. Development was then perceived to be the furtherance of human welfare through pursuits of good life.

Aristotle’s conception of wealth not as the ultimate aim, but as a mere means to seek a virtuous life (Aristotle 1980) pointed to the significance of non-income aspects. Plato visualized the rule of law under philosopher kings. Aristotle considered a state which did not enable its citizens to lead virtuous and useful lives, as an evil. He regarded poverty as the parent of revolution and crime.

The assertion of the medieval Roman thinkers that man’s personality develops only in society, offered early lessons on a basic requirement of human development. Society was conceived of as a social organism composed of many members, each having different but complementary functions fused in an overall harmony. Saint Thomas Aquinas stood for participation of citizens in their governments. He perceived justice as the steady and lasting willingness to give to others what they are entitled to (Finnis 1998).

William Petty, who was regarded by Sen (1998:10) as the father of development economics put forth ideas of utilizing the potentiality of the poor by engaging them in socially useful tasks. Similar tones echoed in the belief of Viet Ludwing Von Seckendorff that well nourished people formed the greatest treasure of a country (Prasad 1981: 20).

Beneath the commonly exposed growth prescriptions of Adam Smith, lay the normative analysis of human behavior. This was done in terms of the sentiments of sympathy which binds human beings in their ethical relations (Smith 1759 [1976]). Smith argued for the fostering of nobler or benevolent sentiments of human beings for development. “Baser” sentiments restrain material progress too (ibid 111.1: 98-99). Smith’s suggestion of superior reason and self command as ways to overcome the predicament of riches, pointed to the need for responsible human agency. He saw education as a method of overcoming inequalities and of learning self command (Smith 1776 [1976]).
The pessimistic prediction of Malthus was a note on the challenges created by population explosion to development. J. S Mill’s philosophy (Mill 1852) that political economy should facilitate the formulation of welfare – oriented and intelligent policies, echoes in the human development goals of this age too. He stated that passive citizens fostered tyranny even in democracies. The governments must be evaluated in term of their capacities to enable each person to exercise and develop the capability for higher forms of happiness, in their own way. Mill believed in the effectiveness of a properly educated electorate.

The Marxian interpretation of true freedom as the development of human powers (Marx 1981) has eternal relevance in the understanding of human development. Marx emphasized mutual recognition and exchange of relations like love and trust as the greatest wealth (Marx 1975: 326). The free development of each individual was regarded as the condition for the free development of all.

Alfred Marshall’s emphasis on knowledge as the most powerful engine of growth, anticipated the role of human capital. He regarded the growth of mankind in health and strength, knowledge and skills, and richness of character, as the end of all studies (Marshall 1890 [1961]). Poverty was regarded as morally degrading and destructive. His ideas on responsible individual behaviour and humane business men, reflected the human development principles.

Pigou (1932) argued that poverty was not due to the fault of the poor, but was rather related to bad environment. His conception of good life through active partnership of the poor who were not to be degraded as passive beneficiaries is a theme of human development as well.

Although J.M Keynes stood for an expansion of the functions of government, he was hostile to the economic fallacies of authoritarian regimes. He was also for a state planning that would not crush individual initiatives (Keynes 1982). The Keynesian belief that a rise in the birth rate in any country could cause a welfare loss to the whole world (Toye 2000:65-66) was an unintentional view on a crucial element of human development.
None of these thoughts had human development as the main focus. But the idea was not alien. Human development, even in its terminological absence and restricted domain of those times, did exist as an ideal. No academic enquiry in economics could ignore the ultimate aim of betterment of human conditions.

2.2.2 A submerged need

Driven by the compulsions of post war reconstruction and the post colonial dilemmas of development, development economics remained tied in its initial stages under growth economics (Dreze and Sen 1995). Human development, though known to be a need remained submerged under growth-driven goals. The theoretical approaches\(^1\) which constrained the goals of development to increasing opulence and counteracting global income inequalities focused on capital accumulation, internal supply dynamics and industrialization. Wider concerns of development were neglected by the optimism on the growth - enhancing power of income inequality (Kuznets 1955)\(^2\), and the neoliberal agenda. Economic efficiency interpreted\(^3\) in narrow terms of consumption and production accelerated value - neutral approaches.

The over justification of the market and the underrating of the state made academic concerns on human development submissive. Competitive market behaviour was justified as a way for eliminating the unfit (Weisskopf 1997). Human development, which requires a faith in the synergy between state and market suffered by the extreme positions of both state exclusion and market exclusion (Dreze and Sen 2002). Kingsbury (2004:103) saw a similar defeat caused by the ‘hyper globalists’ and ‘sceptics’ with extreme positions on globalization.

Thus, on the one hand, pure economic dimensions dominated over human development and on the other hand, an overenthusiastic zeal for human development routed it to extremely non sustainable ways that made it easy for critics to label the concept as anti – developmental, and for policy makers to dismiss it as unrealistic. The net effect was the loss of the deserved place for human development in policy prescriptions.
2.2.3. A fused idea

The presence of human development as a fused idea can be noted in several approaches of development evolved over the years. In evaluating development on the basis of conceptions of good life references to human development appeared invariably. Such references are discussed in the ensuing sections.

2.2.3.1 Utilitarianism

Although the projection of the sole criterion of utility maximization was against the wide concerns of human development, development economics got insight from the utilitarian moral philosophy (Sen 1999a: 16). Human development was not a concern of either the classical or the modern utilitarianism. However the evaluation of outcome suggested the importance of assessing mental attitudes. Utilitarianism failed to reflect a person’s real deprivations (ibid. 14-15). It neglected the physical condition. The ungrumbling acceptance of a harmful development outcome was wrongly regarded as well being.

2.2.3.2 Social and human centred development

The expression of social development was established by the creation of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) in 1963. Its interpretation of development as growth plus social, cultural and economic changes reflected in the proposals for Action of the first United Nations Development Decade, 1961 – 70. The Declaration of Cocyoc in 1974 stated that the goal of development was not to develop things, but to develop man through satisfying basic needs, expanding freedom, and self reliance. Human centred development was suggested by the Dag Hammarskjold Foundation in 1975.

2.2.3.3 Redistribution with growth

Chenery et. al (1974) considered the problems of income - deprived groups. They advocated a combination of the strategies of redistribution and growth. However redistribution strategies failed in identifying the multiple causes of deprivations (Streiten 2009).
2.2.3.4 Primary Goods

Rawls (1971; 1982) used the notion of primary goods to address the conception of good life in a society. The twin principles of social justice formulated by Rawls carried ideas of human development:

(i) Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for all.
(ii) Priority should be given to maximize the advantage of the worst-off person.

The indifference principle formulated by Rawls emphasized that inequalities in life are justifiable only if we can relate them with benefits for the worst-off individuals. Rawls talked about primary goods which would be desired by all individuals if they were free to choose (Rawls 1996:181). These extensions of development to social justice and quality of life implied human development. However Rawls believed that a person had to take responsibility for his or her own preferences. Despite having the same basket of primary goods as another, if a person ends up being less happy than the other, no injustice is involved. Sen (2009) viewed the Rawlsian conception as ineffective in reflecting the actual ability of people to convert primary goods into achievements. Human development requires an enquiry into this ability.

2.2.3.5 Basic needs

The basic needs approach had several indications to human development. ILO (1976) underscored the need to satisfy minimum consumption requirements, access to public services, employment opportunities, and participatory decision making. Morris and Liser (1977) measured the Physical Quality of Life using indicators of infant mortality, life expectancy and literacy. Streeten et. al (1981) regarded economic growth as the performance test and not as an end. They advocated basic needs as a strategy to increase productivity without incurring extra financial resources. Streeten (2009) saw the concept of needs as a way to provide all human beings with opportunities for full lives.
However the basic needs approach was criticized by Sen (1984; 2009) as commodity centred. It was blind to individual differences in the perceptions of needs. The attention on minimum needs did not permit ways to increase additional capabilities. Heller (1993) saw the basic needs approach as a tool of domination. The policies based on the approach are rhetoric and paternalistic, carrying the elitist disregard for the perceptions and knowledge of the poor.

2.2.3.6 Entitlements

Sen (1981) put forth the entitlements approach. Entitlements refer to the set of alternative commodity bundles that a person can command in a society using the totality of rights and opportunities. An entitlement failure leads to development failure. The approach focused on the ability of a person to acquire food and other commodities within the prevailing economic, social and legal arrangements. It was not a direct explanation of human development. Besides, it left out the social, cultural and institutional impediments.

2.2.3.7 Human capital

The belief of Marshall (1890) in the increasing returns of knowledge was rediscovered in the studies on productivity increases created by human capital. Romer (1990) attributed the increasing returns in production function to the endogenous factors of expanding stock of capital and productivity. The human capital theory puts forth human capital as a means to an end. Mehrota (2005) viewed the approach as nothing more than a neo – classical repetition of means to growth.

2.2.3.8. Institutionalism

Economic development, associated with the institutional environment of a society included human development as an underlying idea. Each concern on norms, codes of conduct, incentive structures, progressiveness, adaptive vigor and reforms of institutions expanded the dimensions of development (Williamson 1995; Ayres 1995).
2.2.3.9 Social capital

The concept of social capital oriented development towards the economic pay-off of externalities created by social and cultural coherence, and network of reciprocal social relations and interactions. Inglehart (1997) equated social capital with the culture of trust and tolerance, both of which are essentials of human development. Putnam (2000:19) related social capital to civic virtues characterized by reciprocity.

2.2.3.10 Sustainable development

Conceptually and practically, sustainable development has been the result of the concern for intergenerational availability and use of natural resources. The World Summit on Sustainable Development held at Johannesburg in 2002 related it to all issues of human concern. Social sustainability is a new term which extends to ecology, equity, livelihood, financial stability, cultural needs and participation in decision making, all of which are crucial elements of human development also.

2.2.3.11 Culture and development

WCCD (1995:8-10) rooted development in the cultural values and needs of people. This linking held ideas relevant for human development. The impact of cultural beliefs on the development of women was brought out by Nussbaum and Glover (1995). UNRISD and UNESCO (1997:3) stated that development implied cultural growth too. What matters is not living together, but living together well (ibid: 5).

2.2.3.12 Human Poverty

The concerns on multiple dimensions of poverty are close to the concept of human development. UNDP (1990) saw poverty alleviation not as a residual of economic growth, but as an integral part of human development. Sen (1999 b) interpreted poverty as unfreedom. He argued for capability expansion to emerge out of it. Poverty studies on the basis of perception of the poor themselves (Narayan et. al. 2000a; 2000b) brought out the heartfelt needs of the poor for things they valued.
2.2.3.13 The middle paths

Human development received necessary inputs from the shifts of extreme positions on state, market and globalization to the middle. The middle paths advocated appropriate combination of state and market (Toye 1987:67; Dreze and Sen 1995; Sen 1999 b; Dreze and Sen 2002: 53-58). The academic proposals for humanisation of globalization pointed to the possibility of humane governance, inevitable in the ways of human development also (UNDP 1992; Dhumale 2000; Dutta 2002; Bhalla and Lapeyre 2004).

In this conceptual tendency, all approaches carried some ideas of human development, either as a principle or as an underlying goal. However human development was not a specifically stated idea. It was mixed up with the respective concerns in each approach. But the whole tendency directed development towards human centerdness.

2.2.4 A Distinctive Concept

A new human - centred agenda emerged for bridging the gaps between academic enquiries and development practices. Development began to be conceptualized both as process and outcome. Human beings began to be seen both as the means to and the end of development. Development economics was liberated from the general corpus of abstract models and rooted on real lives of people. Unlike the opulence centred and the utilitarian uni-dimensional conceptions of well – being, the concept of people – centred development charted out ways for expanding multiple choices and opportunities to live full human lives. The basic needs approaches and the evaluative measures of quality of life were broadened by the theoretical perspectives on capability expansion of people. Consequently, development converged to a specific reconceptualisation of development as human development.

Human development gained identity in the 1990s with the rediscovery of this term in the annual series of the HDRs. The original intention was to write a report on human conditions. But it was realized that such mere assessments would not
bring out the real agency of people. The search for such an approach led to the selection of the term human development (Kaul 2003:61-62).

It got conceptually enriched by its acceptability as a principle, and by the approaches on its process and goals. The Millennium Declaration adopted by 189 members of the UN at the Millennium Summit 2000 listed out 8 goals, 18 targets and 48 indicators, all of which pointed to the basic elements of human development. Human development now stands with immense practical implications for development policies. The concept is positioned on a strong platform open for consistent intellectual inputs which would bring out its complete distinctiveness.

2.3 Conceptual Foundations

There is at present an extensive literature on human development which explains its unique features, conceptual themes and theoretical approaches. A brief survey of these aspects is presented in this section.

2.3.1. Defining features

An error that may occur in any discussion on human development is to treat it as conceptually same as human resource development. It may be noted that the concept of human development is not equal to that of human resource development (UNDP 1990; 1996: 54-55). Human development focuses on human capability which is broader than productive capacity. It views people both as the means to and the end of development. Human resource development treats people as means. Human development considers the non productive segments of the society too.

Sen (2003) emphasized the need to view human development in a perspective broader than that of human capital. Unlike the human capital approach, human development deals with direct valuation of human abilities too (ibid: 35). World Bank (2007:28) interpreted human capital not as a means to productivity, but as a broad range of knowledge and capabilities that people need for successful life in family and community.
Naqvi (2002) viewed human development as a broad concept aiming at protecting individual liberty and fulfilling social objectives. The process of human development translates the economic freedom of the few into a freedom for all including the least privileged.

Sen (2003) stated two central aspects of human development. One is the evaluative aspect, related to how human lives can go much better. The other is the agency aspect related to how this betterment could be brought about through human agency.

Streeten (2003; 2009) wrote on two sides of human development – one, the formation of human capabilities and the other, the use, people are willing, able and permitted to make of these capabilities for purposes they desire. There are 5 constituents of human development: economic growth, human resource development, human rights and participation, peace and security, and sustainability. Each augments the other carrying the common thread of equity.

Haq (2003) regarded human development as a practical reflection of life. It is neither narrowly technocratic nor overly philosophical. All aspects ranging from cultural freedom to economic growth fall in its fold. Matin and Rakshanda (2005:115) included social development, economic growth, political and social reforms for democratic governance, protection of human rights, equity, and global policy and institutional reforms, within the human development agenda.

Human development is an integrated whole comprising different but interlinked elements. The crucial linkages were explained by Dreze and Sen (1995: 13 – 14). They considered the intrinsic and instrumental roles of education. The instrumental roles include social process, empowerment, distribution, and interpersonal. These penetrating roles link human development to economic growth.

The human development perspective is not anti-growth (Haq 1995). All economic issues including economic growth are contents of human development. But it differs from traditional growth models. Every issue is linked to the ultimate and central focus of people. This supremacy given to people does not disregard

there is no automatic link between human development and economic growth. the connection depends on the way of management of economic growth (haq 1995, op. cit). those countries who have managed economic growth to improve human conditions could experience the automatic links. the process of translation of growth into human development has been a crucial policy concern (ibid; UNDP 1990, 1991, 1996).

sen (1999 b) classified economies to show the different possibilities of links between economic growth and human development. among high growth economies, there are those with sound human development record⁸ as well as those without comparable success⁹. likewise, among the economies with great achievements in human development, there are those with high economic growth¹⁰ and those without much economic growth¹¹. the better option is higher levels of both. these are attainable either through growth mediated ways with guaranteed translation to human development, or through support-led processes which assure both (ibid: 46-49).

Anand and ravallion (1993) argued for growth mediation. ravallion (1997:634-37) asserted that sustained growth improves non income dimensions of human development. it is not low quality growth, but ‘no-growth’ that decelerates human development. too little growth of even quite normal quality is the biggest hurdle faced by the poor. This position was affirmed by escwa (2005) in a study of its member states. weak economic performance affected the sustainability of human development.

however on the other way round, human development improves economic growth. world bank (1980) reflected on the roles of education, health and nutrition in enriching human lives and improving incomes. nair (1981) found human development as a way to enable people to participate in growth process. birdsall (1993) and haq (1995) saw human development programmes as the best investment programmes to future economic growth. sustainable economic
growth needs nourishment from human development (Soubbotina 2004:8). Sen (1999 b) stated that human development improves not by growth as such, but through public expenditure on human development. Malik (2001:17) argued that economic growth would enrich human life only if it is supported by higher investment in social services. World Bank (2004:1) called for creation and expansion of the services that have the most direct links with human development.

If the links between human development and economic growth are weak, both become mutually stifling (UNDP 1996). The imbalances are the results of either rapid human development with little growth, or of fast growth with little human development. Using a time series data of India from 1980 to 1996, Mehta (2002:14) showed that the links from human development to economic growth were relatively strong. But the reverse links from economic growth to human development were weak. Ranis et. al (2009) tested the causal chains using cross country regressions for 1960-1992. They saw two virtuous chains linking human development and economic growth. One, with high levels of human development leading to high growth and another, high growth thus generated leading to further improvements in human development. Whenever either or both chains appear to be weak, lopsided or virtuous cycles appear. One – third of the nations with strong human development and weak economic growth managed to move towards virtuous cycles. But all countries with strong economic growth and weak human development reverted to vicious cycles. Hence economic growth would not be sustained if human development is not included, from the beginning of any reform programme.

Human development has roots in the liberal economic tradition. But its philosophy and economics differs from the neoliberal approaches. Jolly (2009) compared the differences. Both approaches differ in objectives, nature, focus of concern, trend, indicators, assumptions and strategies.

Human development is neither an unrealistic idealism nor a rigid approach. Every element of the approach is being implemented in several polices across the world. Haq (1995) saw it as a vision for future human advances. The approach
has all along its course of growth accommodated various intellectual engagements with similar motivations and concerns. One expression of this open-endedness is its conceptual growth itself.

### 2.3.2 Conceptual themes

The coverage and reach in each HDR shows that human development, has been “a voyage of human discovery” (UNDP 1998:106). Consistent with its multiple considerations the concept has brought within its fold expanding themes (see Box. 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Concept and measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Financing human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>International dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>People’s participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Human security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Gender and human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Economic growth and human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Poverty eradication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Globalization with a human face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Making new technologies work for human development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Deepening democracy in a fragmented world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Cultural liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>International co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Global water crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Human mobility and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HDRs published by the UNDP (1990-2009)
The national and regional HDRS have also considered a wide range of ever-relevant aspects (see Appendix 1). HDRs at further disaggregated levels have been relating issues relevant to local area development. India began an attempt in 1995 with the HDR of Madhya Pradesh, closely followed by several other states in the succeeding years (see Appendix 2). The district HDRs of Malda and Bankura in West Bengal (2007) pioneered district-level disaggregation. As the world moves towards the 20th anniversary of HDRs in 2010, the concept stands enriched with expanded reaches integrating social, cultural, political and economic issues. The consequent conceptual refinements have made the relevance of human development non-erasable.

2.3.3. Approaches

A proper conceptualization of human development is a theoretical concern too. In explaining the meaning and process of human development, two distinct approaches can be obtained—one based on functionings and capabilities and the other on freedom.

2.3.3.1 Functionings and capabilities

Human development evolved with an identity, drawing on the capability perspective. Amartya Sen’s articulation of development as the ability of persons to live full and human lives inspired the emergence of the concept. The capability approach saw human life as a set of “doings and beings” or functionings that are valuable. A functioning is an achievement of a person, what she or he manages to do or to be. Human development is the expansion of valuable functionings. These range from elementary ones such as being adequately nourished and being free from avoidable diseases, to refined ones like taking part in the life of the community and having self respect.

The alternative combinations of such functionings from which the individual can choose, defines his capability. It is the range of options a person has in deciding what kind of life to lead. The functionings vector represents actual achievements, while the capability set represents the freedom to achieve. Thus given the capability set, an individual chooses one vector of functioning, which then
becomes her or his actual achievement. This determines the ultimate development (Sen 1987, 1999a, 1999b).

Sen (1999 b: 81-84) gave a practical shape to the capability perspective by considering three approaches:

♦ Direct approach – by directly examining and comparing vectors of functionings or capabilities.
♦ Supplementary approach – supplementary information on income by adding information on capabilities.
♦ Indirect approach - by focusing on adjusted income.

Sen’s approach regarded all capabilities as valuable. However he did not categorize capabilities. Alkire (2003:12) emphasized the need for a further theory on categorization of capabilities, to put this approach into practice. Prabhu (2003) regarded the capabilities approach as underspecified. It did not explore all contours of human development.

Nussbaum (1990, 1992, 1995, 2000) categorized capabilities\(^{12}\) as:

♦ Basic capabilities
♦ Intellectual capabilities
♦ Combined capabilities

This categorization was criticized by Clark (2002) for its neglect of income and commodity command. He proposed a revision to the list of capabilities by the Augmented Theory of the Good (ATG). The categories included:

♦ Physical capabilities
♦ Mental well being and intellectual development
♦ Relating and interacting
♦ Personal autonomy and freedom

For each category, Clark listed out the essential inputs for realization. The inputs included access to income, commodities and services.

Giri (2000) criticized the capabilities approach for its neglect of self development, self organization and self command. Development is not just
collective action. It is an individual responsibility too. Human development is the realization of one’s potential. It requires the subjective preparation of an individual to be a friend to oneself and not to be an enemy to oneself. This subjective preparation creates a conducive environment where human well being is a subject of both the self and the society. Giri saw the dimension of self cultivation as more sustainable than capabilities.

2.3.3.2 Freedom

Goulet (1983: 620) saw the freedom to define, organize and transcend own needs as the most basic human need of the poor. Human development is incomplete without freedom (UNDP 1990). Sen (1999 b) interpreted development as a process of expanding the real freedom that people enjoy. All sorts of deprivations are unfreedom.

Freedom is central to the process of development for two reasons (ibid):

- Evaluative – assessing development in terms of whether the freedom that people have are enhanced.
- Effectiveness – assessing development in terms of free agency of people.

Economic unfreedom can breed social unfreedom, just as social and political unfreedom can foster economic unfreedom. This view permitted simultaneous appreciation of the vital roles of organizations, social values, mores, and norms (ibid: 8-9).

**Sen’s categorization of freedom included:**

- Political freedom
- Economic facilities
- Social opportunities
- Transparency guarantees
- Protective security.

Development analysis must include empirical linkages that tie these complementary freedoms together. Wealth is important for the substantive freedom it helps to achieve.
However Navarro (2000) saw Sen’s ideas as insufficient to explain the key relation between freedom and development. Sen explained the five freedoms without a theory relating these. The freedoms were not positioned in a framework. Power relations and the political context of development were not analyzed in the approach of development as freedom.

2.4 The Measures

The evaluative form of human development supplements its conceptual form. An evaluation of this multidimensional concept ought to cover multiple social and economic choices. It was realized that compartmentalized measures like the GNP measuring economic progress and the Physical Quality of Life Indices measuring social progress were to be substituted by other measures. This led to new measures pioneered by the HDI.

Jahan (2009:152) saw the origin of the HDI as a reaction to the real needs of the time. The basic concern was assessment of human development achievements of countries across the world in terms of enlargement of people’s choices. For this the basic choices that could be quantified on the basis of universally available data were chosen. This led to the restriction of choices to three.

- Real GDP per capita (Purchasing Power Parity US dollars), a proxy indicator for disposable income.
- Life expectancy at birth, a proxy indicator for health care and living conditions.
- Adult literacy combined with gross enrolment ratio at primary secondary and tertiary levels (see Appendix 3 shows for the method of calculation of the HDI).

The restriction was based on the objective of arriving at a simplified composite index for all nations (Haq 1995). These 3 basic capabilities were believed to lead to achievements in all other dimensions. The exclusion of other aspects was justified by the belief that people have an overall sense of wellbeing and do not split different aspects of lives (UNDP 1990).
Over the years, the HDI has been undergoing a series of methodological refinements incorporating the solutions to some criticisms (see Appendix 3). It has also added to its group, new indices reflecting deprivational and inequality aspects. In 1995, the GDI and the GEM evolved to account for gender inequality (see Appendix 3). These were followed by the HPI – 1 in 1997, to measure the multidimensionality of poverty in developing countries and the HPI – 2 in 1998 to measure poverty in industrial countries (see Appendix 3). The HDI and its additions were disaggregated in national and sub-national HDRs in terms of religious groups, states, provinces, racial groups, gender, ethnic groups, and the rural urban divide.

Some of these reports extended the HDI to other dimensions also. The HDR of China (UNDP China 2002) rated provinces on the basis of a health risk index. UNDP Argentina (2002) added new indicators to each dimension in the HDI\textsuperscript{13}. The HDR of South Africa added a service deprivation index calculated on the basis of household level data on housing, water, sanitation, electricity, heating and energy sources (UNDP South Africa 2003). Planning Commission (2001) used the method of development radars on the basis of social indicators\textsuperscript{14} for two points of time covering early 1980s and early 1990s.

The HDI has gained enormous mileage. It has inspired corrective policies. The evaluations have also served as timely warning to identify impending problems. Jahan (2009) pointed out that the disaggregated indices highlighted the human development disparities within developed nations too.

However the HDI is not a complete measure. It leaves out many components (Hopkins 1991:1471). The achievements in the HDI indicators are possible even in prisons. Basically the HDI ignores the freedom element. It fails as an indicator of comparative performance, which varies contextually. Rao (1991) felt that the HDI neglected the link between education, health and nutrition on the one hand, and democratic freedom on the other.

Such indices should be used with great caution while deriving policy recommendations (Prabhu, Sarkar and Radha 1996). Their analysis showed that
the GDI rankings of 15 Indian states differed with data on different sets of indicators. Considering the demerits of the HPI, Kishnaji (1997) argued against the need of indices. Bardhan and Klasen (1997) reflected on the narrow focus of the GEM. It neglected many important facts of female empowerment at local and institutional levels. The GDI was over dominated by the income component. Matin and Sajid (2005) regarded the absence of an indicator of freedom as a limitation. Parr (2009) raised concerns over the imprisonment of human development within HDI. Social and political freedoms are capabilities as basic as the components of the HDI. Their exclusions are non-justifiable.

HDR (1992) argued that a large and complex concept like freedom should not be measured. It is too valuable to be reduced to a number. Yet HDR (1992) went on to construct a Political Freedom Index (PFI) using 5 components – personal security, rule of law, freedom of expression, political participation and equality of opportunity. However it was dropped in 1993 for political rather than academic reasons. Efforts are still on in this direction. Desai (1994) used five clusters to define freedom – personal security, rule of law, political participation, freedom of expression, and equality before law. Each cluster was in turn related to a set of indicators for which quantitative and qualitative data could be gathered. A PFI was devised as a single average of the scores of the 5 clusters.

Besides indices, HDRs have been giving data on indicators of human development. These could be used for evaluating human development. In addition to HDRs specific dimensions like gender inequality have been measured by other reports. The Global Gender Gap Report 2006 used the Global Gender Gap Index to measure gaps among nations in the outcome variables of economic participation and opportunities, educational attainment, political empowerment, and health and survival (Hausman et al. 2006).

2.5 Desirable Directions

The unfolding of the actual ways of human development conveys the divergence between the concept and the practice. Despite its conceptual richness, human development suffers from restrictive evaluations. The paradoxes and the
perplexities in its practical courses suggest the need to look at its real patterns at micro levels. Climbing down from the competitive world of HDI rankings to the grass roots we find human beings tied together by an exchange of mutual claims and obligations. There, conceptually each one has dignity and worth. But the practice shows a mix of convergence and divergence with the concept. The concept by itself has gaps in explaining the processes behind these. Hence it needs a redesign.

The missing links could be provided by connecting human development to a concept which is totally human-centred, by its standards of procedural fairness. Such an association opens up the possibilities of directing the theoretical and empirical analysis of human development to several neglected areas in the practical ways. The thoughts in this direction located human rights as the dynamic conceptual link to human development. A proper conceptualization and evaluation of human development demands the theory and practice of connecting human development and human rights.

**2.6 Human Rights – Conceptual Course**

Human rights are the rights possessed by all persons, by virtue of their common humanity to live a life of freedom and dignity (UNDP 2000:16). These stand for those conditions of social life without which man cannot be at his best and give his best to the adequate expression and development of his personality (Jayapalan 2000:1-2). Human rights are the universal legal guarantees protecting individuals and groups against actions and omissions that interfere with freedoms, entitlements and dignity (OHCHR 2006). In essence, human rights are birth rights, the main motto of which is to ensure dignified life.

The evolutionary course of human rights suggests a cumulative historical process. In the earliest conceptions of natural rights, all human beings were believed to have equal moral status and the rights to life, liberty and equality (Locke 1689[1970]). After lying dormant for a long period human rights gained prominence in the aftermath of the Second World War when renewed searches for peace and prosperity appeared in global agenda. This revival initiated by the
UN charter resulted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) on 10 December 1948. The Declaration represents the first global expression of rights to which all human beings are entitled. It synthesized civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. Besides, it emphasized duties of all right holders to the community in a democratic society.

In early stages of the evolution of human rights, greater emphasis was placed on ‘liberty oriented’ rights which may be described as the first generation rights. Later evolved the second generation rights, which were ‘security oriented’. These rights provide for social, economic and cultural rights of individuals. The first generation rights have been projected as negative rights, obliging the state to refrain from interfering with individual liberties. The second generation rights are more positive in nature, making the state responsible to provide for and protect these rights. These divisions found an explicit expression in two separate covenants—the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), in 1966. Of more recent origin are the third generation rights which arose from the concerns of the Third World countries about the structural causes of human rights violations (Nowak 2002). These include environmental, cultural and developmental rights. They are collective rights which are concerned with the rights of groups and people rather than that of individuals.

The question of the relative importance of different categories of human rights has been a matter of controversy ever since the UDHR was adopted. Some countries held the view that civil and political rights were more important while others stressed the importance of economic, social and cultural rights. In 1981 the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights adopted by the Organisation of African Unity declared that civil and political rights could not be dissociated from economic, social and cultural rights in their conception as well as universality. The Charter also stated that it is essential to pay special attention to the right to development as a basic human right. The right to development received universal acclaim when the United Nations adopted the Declaration of the Right to Development in December 1986. The Declaration stated that the right to development is the right to a process of development where all human rights-
economic, social and cultural, and civil and political rights—are realized. The Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action adopted on 25 June 1993 at the World Conference on Human Rights further affirmed that “all human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent and interrelated”.

All along its conceptual journey human rights have been reshaping themselves in tune with the political, social and economic compulsions. Since the 1990s, it has been moving towards a renewed agenda of designing improved ways of expanding capabilities and securing lives of dignity for all\(^\text{18}\). In 1997 the Secretary General of the UN called for recognising human rights as inherent to the promotion of peace, security, economic prosperity and social equity. In 1998 the UNDP adopted a new policy of integrating human rights with sustainable development (see Appendix 4 for the milestones in the evolution of human rights).

The real meaning and dimensions of human rights brought it closer to the concept and practice of human development. This is very well manifested in HDR 2000. The Report stated the common motivations and concerns of human rights and human development. The best expression of this association is the human rights based approach to human development (Marks 2005:27). A “common understanding” of the approach was negotiated at the Stanford Inter-Agency Workshop in 2003. All agencies of the UN were required to include realisation of human rights in their programmes, by incorporating human rights principles and expanding the capabilities to claim rights and perform duties. This was incorporated into the guidelines of the Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). In 2007, the Action 2 Reform Programme of the UN agencies was formulated for pursuing the human rights based approach.

From an ethical formulation of human flourishing, the concept of human rights has moved onwards as a practical proposition, intrinsic and instrumental to human development (OHCHR 2006). The blend of philosophy and practice makes human rights a reliable ally of human development.
2.7 Human Development and Human Rights

Being two related but separate conceptual areas, the relation between human development and human rights involves both compatibility and diversity (UNDP 2000). The common features make the concepts harmonious enough to complement each other. Both are also diverse enough to enrich each other.

The compatibility arises from the basic thrust of both the approaches on guaranteeing the freedoms that people have reason to value. Human development seeks to achieve this by enhancing the capabilities of people. Human rights focus on the claims that individuals have on the design and functionings of the political, social, cultural and economic arrangements facilitating these capabilities.

All processes of human development are simultaneously rights-based and economically grounded (Uvin 2005:122). Human development does not take place in the real sense of the term if targets are fulfilled in an environment where people are deprived of their freedom. Also, the processes of fulfilment vitiated by multiple deprivations do not amount to supportive environment. Hence human development needs to be reconceived in terms of the concerns that address all unfreedoms which adversely affect capabilities. Here lies the significance of relating it with human rights. Similarly human rights are incomplete without the channelization of these into the creation of an enabling environment in which choices and capabilities expand. This is achieved when it is qualified by additions from the perspectives on human development.

Thus the enquiry into the nature of the relation between the two ultimately becomes the search for the mutually reinforcing distinctiveness of two concepts with diverse forms and complementary aims that makes integration possible. UNDP (2000) examined this in terms of additions of human rights to human development and vice versa.

2.7.1 Additions from human rights

The human rights approach links human development to the idea that individuals, collective groups, and institutions have duties to achieve and improve human
development. This extends human development beyond mere specification of goals. The human rights approach broadens the human development perspective to incorporate the accountability of all agents involved (UNDP 2000).

Another benefit of fixation of duties is the correct identification of responsibilities which left unfulfilled, lead to failures in the process of human development. The lapses may occur at individual, societal, or government levels. Human development indicators generalise the failures as unrealised outcomes of governmental inaction alone. However the human rights approach helps to fix the responsibility.

Besides, the approach makes human development sensitive to the process of bringing out outcomes (ibid: 22). Pure human development accounting might fail to expose insecurity, unfreedom and deprivations hidden behind the much publicised achievements. Human rights widen the assessment of human development with the ingrained thrusts of the former on freedom, security and justice.

### 2.7.2 Additions from human development

Human development is a precondition for protecting and promoting human rights on a sustainable basis (Kunhaman 2002). The denial of opportunities for human development means the denial of human rights. Human development analysis enables the prioritization of concerns of rights for purposes of policy choices, necessitated by scarcity of resources. Another possibility is the understanding of the real resource and institutional constraints which affect implementation of human rights (UNDP 2000). The focus of human development on institutional and operational variables aid to make feasible policy choices.

Although human rights are normatively indivisible, the concept can be made more realistic by the idea of progressive realisation of rights. Human development, with its natural emphasis on dynamic progress, is useful in assessing human rights overtime. Within each right, a prioritisation could be set, depending upon the need of the time. The progression is aided by human
development, which offers tools to understand the social, economic and political environment shaping the needs of the time (ibid).

2.7.3 Two-way relation

As the combination of the two perspectives gives us something that neither could give alone, each can be regarded as the cause and effect of the other. The recognition of human rights in human development perspectives and practices facilitates promotion of human agency (Matin and Sajid 2004:114). Human development imparts realisable structures and concreteness to the concept of human rights. Thus the relation reflects mutual causation, resulting in an integration, the best expression of which is the human rights based approach to human development.

2.8 The Human Rights Based Approach to Human Development

In its widest sense, the approach goes beyond the status as a norm for development assistance and co-operation. A review of the perspectives on its focus, principles and process is given below.

2.8.1 The focus


Cheria and Petcharamesree (2004:6-9) regarded the human rights based approach as a corrective to the exclusively economic models that limit the social, political, civil and cultural dimensions of development. Besides, it suggests that human rights have functions beyond being conditionalities in development assistance. They saw the approach as different from the social justice approach and basic
needs approach that reinforced the dependency and powerlessness of the recipients of development projects. The rights-based approach involves not charity or simple economic development, but a process of enabling and empowering people, by adding the component of human dignity to development. Thus, it is a “development-plus approach” (ibid: 98). A formal definition was given to the approach by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights: [A] rights based approach to development is a conceptual frame work for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights. Essentially, a rights-based approach integrates the norms, standards and principles of the international human rights system into the plans, policies and processes of development. The norms and standards are those contained in the wealth of international treaties and declarations-[OHCHR (2004)].

Marks (2005:24-50) presented the human rights based approach as one of the seven approaches to link human rights and development. The seven approaches included:

- The Holistic approach of assigning equal importance to all human rights in the process of development.
- The Human rights-based approach of viewing development by integrating human rights norms that combine the already accepted concepts in development theory, like accountability and transparency in the context of good governance, with the application of these concepts to specify obligations of different agents.
- The Social justice approach with emphasis on the moral necessity of eliminating social inequality through fulfilment of rights that secure social justice.
- The Capabilities approach that links development concerns towards widening free choices and capabilities, which are crucial in realizing rights too.
- The Right to Development approach which considers development itself as a human right.
- The Responsibilities approach with focus on obligations of duty-holders to respect, protect, promote and fulfil human rights.
- The Human Rights Education approach of enhancing people’s capabilities through participatory decision making and community-based works related to development.

All these approaches have overlapping elements. The division just brings out different perspectives on the link between human development and human rights, which could be labelled together as rights-based perspectives. Mikkelsen (2005:204) asserted that the human rights based approach could be singled out as the definite approach.

2.8.2 The uniqueness

The approach is distinctive in its vision and processes. Uvin (2005:129) reflected on two unique aspects of the approach. First, it presents a new vision to understand and analyze human development, different from the earlier charity based and needs based approaches. Secondly the means and processes employed in it are different from other approaches to human development.

2.8.2.1 The vision

A human rights based approach looks at human development through a different perspective. It exposes the realities behind non-realisation of human development. Besides, it challenges the conditions that lead to under-achievements in human development, by making it clear that deprivations are not inevitable and that these should not be tolerated (CESCR 1998).

Another novelty emerges from the vision imparted by the constituents in the normative framework of the approach. These are also the principles of the approach, holding implications on the concept and practice of human development. Mikkelesen (2005) listed out equality, participation, accountability, and rule of law as the constituents. Osmani (2005) saw the uniqueness of the approach in the principles of empowerment, non discrimination, participation and accountability. OHCHR (2006) highlighted the approach for its holistic frame
incorporating the rights of the marginalised, participation, transparency and accountability.

The approach centres on the needs and aspirations of the deprived sections in the society. DIFD (2000) emphasised the pro-poor orientation of the approach. Kallen (2004) appreciated the approach for its focus on human unity. Unlike the traditional approaches of development which treated the deprived sections as “others”, the rights based approach treats no human being as the “other”. It closes the boundaries of “otherness”.

With its multifaceted considerations, the approach brings out the multiple dimension of human development. Mikkelsen lifts the sectoral compartmentalisations, and gives integrated responses to multilayered problems of human development (OHCHR 2006).

The approach throws light on how people’s claims are processed by different agents involved in the process of human development (HRCA 2001). This brings in a vision on the duties in the process in which people are treated as active subjects. Suchinmayee (2005) saw the merit in the recognition of entitlements of people, sought to be ensured through the capacity building of active participants.

In addition to the conceptual uniqueness, the approach holds a realistic vision on its realisation. It allows enough space for prioritisation of targets based on contextual necessities. However it is also based on the principle of non-retrogression which states that the prioritisation of some rights should not be at the expense of the realisation of other rights. The other rights should maintain at least their initial levels of realisation (Mikkelesen 2005:208). Another practical vision is the recognition of the importance of economic growth in sustaining human development (Osmani 2005; OHCHR 2006). Grugel and Piper (2009) noted the shifts in the approach to actual levels of human experiences. It points to extremely positive advocacy movements for human development. On the whole the approach projects a vision of what human development should be.
2.8.2.2 The process

The real value of the approach lies in its transformative potential (Weerelt 2001). UNDP (2005) saw it as a process in which both human development and human rights are realised by mutual conversion. The principles offer a framework for adoption in human development programming.

Accountability is the core of the process (HRCA 2001; UNDP 2001; Uvin 2005). Weerelt (2001) explained the process in terms of the empowerment of people to decide the course of development. It adds missing elements to the existing developmental process by expanding the enabling environment for empowerment. The process also brings in legal tools and institutions as means to secure human development. UNDP (1999) and Sen (1999 b) stated good governance with human rights standards, as a process step of the approach. The process aspect of participation was highlighted by Osmani (2005). Participation itself is a right (Cheria et al 2004; Andrea and Ferguson 2008). The approach recognises the role of economic growth in accelerating and sustaining human development. However it stands for rights based economic growth (UNDP 2000: Sengupta 2002). Osmani (2005) saw the working out in a progressive stage. Human development could be realised by a progressive realisation of human rights. Some rights could be deferred by the State on the ground of resource constraints. However the State should take immediate action to fulfil all rights that are not much dependent on resources availability. Resources could be diverted from relatively non-essential uses to those uses that are essential for the fulfilment of rights. Even in the deferred cases the approach calls for the preparation of a set of intermediate as well as final targets based on appropriate indicators. The approach also insists on human rights norms in policy formulation. Special consideration is given to the deprived groups. The State must identify the core obligations and set targets, without leaving these to progressive realisations. In its process side the approach follows the conceptual feature of indivisibility of rights. No right is inferior. So are the components of human development (ibid).
Monitoring and evaluation too are essential process aspects (OHCHR 2006). The approach stands for participatory accountability procedures involving state and non-state actors at local, national and global levels. It projects not only universal rights but also universal obligations which have full implications on development.

The definite identity of the approach revealed by its vision and process justifies the extension to the empirical field.

2.9 Empirical Studies

The human rights based approach to human development is characterised more by works on conceptualisation than by empirical studies. There are studies on micro aspects of the approach.

Acharya (2001) used a case study of Nepal to examine the relationship between property rights and empowerment of women. It was found that women who had access to property and income excelled in decision making and entrepreneurial activities. A similar approach was evident in the study on Fiji by Prasad and Kumar (2005). The deprivation of property rights reduced capabilities.

Panda (2003) applied the approach in analysing domestic violence, which is a human rights abuse. A household survey was conducted in three rural and three urban areas in Thiruvananthapuram to examine the association between human rights and prevention of domestic violence against women. The rights to property and housing were found to be strongly associated with prevention of domestic violence.

Hellum and Derman (2004) examined the conflicting land claims in Zimbabwe through a rights based approach. Property right was linked to the right to livelihood. The human rights framework was advocated to balance individual property rights with social and economic rights.

Gauri (2004) looked into the overlapping policy consequences of the rights based and the purely economic approaches to provisions of health care and education in
developing countries. However health care and education are instrumental in economic approaches, and are morally compelling in human rights based approaches.

Based on an in-depth study of the rights of indigenous people, Gupta (2005) argued for human rights based approach to human development. The particular rights based process of development realises the collective rights of indigenous people, and enhances the well being of the entire population.

Courdesse and Hemingway (2005) applied the approach to evaluate the municipal planning in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The approach was seen as a unique way of ‘doing’ development, by prioritising rights and channelizing their realisation towards vulnerable groups.

Kannan and Pillai (2005) analysed participatory development as an element of the human rights based approach. Participation becomes possible by the realisation of basic welfare rights. The authors postulated an effective political demand as the factor that actuates public action.

A rights based approach was used by Rao and Sheshasai (2005) to analyse the female foeticide in the Chittoor district of Andhra Pradesh. Foeticide was interpreted as violation of human rights. Hawkins et.al (2005) used the approach to address issues of maternal mortality. The accountability aspect was highlighted to show maternal mortality as a development failure. Safe motherhood was stated as a human right. Alston and Buta (2005) analysed the impact of the right to education on the human development of the oppressed. Filmer - Wilson (2005) used the approach to examine the right to water, with focus on community participation.

Sinha (2006) employed the approach to analyse the ICDS programme in India. The full success of the programme was related to the commitment to the rights of mother and children. Naidu (2006) saw the approach as crucial to the enhancement of capabilities of the marginalised. The Panchayati Raj institutions (PRIs) in Andhra Pradesh were studied to find out the impact on human development through fulfilment of human rights. Hunt (2006) established the use
of the approach in assessing the impact of poverty alleviation programmes. The right to health was specifically analysed to understand the multiple dimensions of the approach with focus on obligations and participation. Offenheiser and Holcombe (2006) presented five rights -right to sustainable livelihood, right to basic social services, right to life and security, right to be heard and right to an identity-to accelerate development. Participation was projected as a common element in all these. A social contract model involving the state, the economy and the civil society was specified to be applied in local contexts of development.

Hathaway (2007) attributed the practical failure of the rights based approach to inappropriate behaviour of the state. The practice deviates from the theory. Rand and Watson (2007) applied the approach contextually, in four projects. In the assessment of impact of projects, the beneficiaries rated those projects with direct application of the rights based approach as very high. The projects based on traditional human development approaches focused on immediate causes of poverty that were measurable. But the rights based approach specified the underlying causes as well. Besides, its impact was felt in the changes in power dynamics.

SADEV (2008) operationalised the approach in the development programming in agriculture, health, water supply, urban development, governance and road development. Parr and Randolph (2008) used ratio approach and achievement possibilities frontier approach for ranking countries on the basis of fulfilment of economic and social rights. However indicators were selected on the basis of availability of data. The whole analysis was based on outcome indicators.

All these attempts to apply the rights based approach point to the feasibility of studies with that perspective. However the approach is in an evolving phase. Many doubts have been raised on the conceptual issues behind the approach and on its operationalization (Seppanen 2005; Katsui 2008). Besides, the available literature does not go beyond specific issues of human development.
2.10 Need for an Analytical Approach

The academic engagements in the human rights based approach to human development have established the conceptual relation between human rights and human development. But the pursuits need to be refined by specification of the conceptual base which provides information on human development. Besides, the approach is to be analyzed as how it provides an evaluative base for assessing human development. Both could be done by evolving an analytical framework that resolves the conceptual issues and establish the mutual relation between human development and human rights. This framework could be extended to delineate the evaluative components too. The empirical application of this framework is yet another concern. From the conceptual and evaluative information, empirical validity could be analysed. Together, these could suggest the practical implications of the approach.

NOTES

1. Explanations on dual economy, surplus labour, low level equilibrium trap, balanced growth, unbalanced growth, critical minimum effort, big push, dependency and center periphery, and the steady growth models.
2. Kuznets formulated the inverted U hypothesis on the basis of time series data for England, Germany and the USA. He suggested that at low income levels, further economic growth tended to create more inequality. As income per capita continues to increase, inequality will fall.
3. The Pareto criterion and the utilitarian interpretation of efficiency.
6. Basic rights and liberties, freedom of movement, free choice of occupation, powers and prerogatives of offices and positions of responsibilities, income and wealth, and self respect.
7. Overall entitlement depends on endowments or ownership of tangible and non-tangible wealth and exchange possibilities of entitlements.

8. South Korea and Taiwan

9. Brazil

10. South Korea and Taiwan

11. Sri Lanka, Pre-reform China, Kerala

12. A full list is given in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

13. Quality of education in language and mathematics was added to literacy and enrolment.

14. Diagrammatic representations of progress of states on 8 social indicators – per capita consumption expenditure, head count poverty ratio access to safe drinking water, proportion of households with pucca houses, literacy rate in the age group of more than 7 years, intensity of formal education life, expectancy at age 1 and IMR.

15. The preamble to the UN Charter declares its aim “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small”. On the basis of the Article 52, the Economic and Social Council recommended the adoption and proclamation of the UDHR.

16. Articles 2 to 21 of UDHR specified civil and political rights. Articles 23 to 27 gave the contents of economic, social and cultural rights. Article 28 stated that everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which all these rights can be fully realised.

17. See Articles 29 and 30 of UDHR.

18. The World Conference of Human Rights in Vienna (1993); the World Conference on Women held at Beijing (1995); the Social Summit in Copenhagen (1996), and the World Food Summit held at Rome (1997), have made significant contributions in this direction.