Economic, Industrial and Business Growth in India: Some Perspectives

***Siddharth Mathur**
Research Scholar
Teerthanker Mahaveer University
NH-24, Delhi Road, Moradabad
Email id: smathur2007@gmail.com
Cell No.: +91-9557892727

****R K Mittal**
Professor, Department of Management
Indraprastha University, New Delhi
Email id: dr123mittal@yahoo.com
Cell No.: +91-9837933666

Abstract:

For the past twenty-five years, India’s economy has fully grown at a median rate of nearly 6 per cent annually. The popularly embraced argument that this growth acceleration results from the Indian state’s adoption of a pro-market strategy is insufficientfor two major reasons: the upperrate began a full decade before the liberalizing reforms in 1991; and post-1991 industrial growth has not caught pace. Instead, India’s economy has grown very fast. Reason being Indian state has prioritized growth since about 1980 and slowly embraced capital of India as its main ruling ally. This pro-business growth strategy is probably goingto possess adverse spatial arrangement and political consequences.

Keywords: economic process. Neoliberal. Indian economy. State’s economic rate

Indian economy is in booming stage. Considering that India's economy hardly grew within thefirst half of the 20th century, and following independence, grew at a sluggish rate of about 3%-4% annually, recent annual growth of more than 6% is exceptional. India's recent speedyeconomic process has been in the middle of growing inequalities, and the poor's share during this new growth is being smartly debated (see, for example, Deaton and Dreze 2002; and Sen and Himanshu 2004). Even so, the Indian economy within the recent decades has been undeniably one amongst the world's quickestgrowing economies. Moreover, not like in abundant of high growth East Asia, Indianeconomy has fully growninside the framework of a democracy. A good approach for promoting growth might notcontinuously be a well-liked or a simply rulingstrategy. Once a democratic state is narrowly committed to growth and business groups, not solelyis the quality of that democracy seems to suffer, howeverit'sadditionallyseeming tocreate spatial arrangement and political issues. The most evident ones in Indian case being: growing regional and sophistication inequalities, with political ramifications; the employment ofethnic nationalism—instead of the less volatile, interest familiarized appeals—as a tool ofpolitical mobilization; and a speedy turnover in ruling governments.

Although the cases are rare, the expertise of speedy and sustained economic process in a developing country has repeatedly aggravatedscholarly debates. The underlying questions are familiar; How did a country X or Y (say, any Asian country or China) get on the high growth path; and will the expertise of X or Yoffer a model or lessons for others? The major lines of the talkare familiar: high growth resulted from the state's embrace of a pro-market strategy, namely, a move toward restricted state intervention and an open economy; or, no, the expansion success was a product of an interventionist state, particularly of an in depth collaboration between the state and business teamsgeared toward promoting growth. In widespread discourse on development,there is a bent to treat all pro-business governments at the same time as premarket governments.

Growth-oriented organic process states pursued their commitment to high growth by developing trade and business with well-designed, consistent, and totally implemented state intervention. Specific policy measures,howevervaried, were usually aimed at easing supply-and-demand constraints faced by personal entrepreneurs.

Some of these interventions were direct and some indirect. On the availabilityfacet, for example, organic process states helped facilitate the provision of capital, labour, technology, and even entrepreneurship. therefore,provision of capital was boosted now and thenby superior aggregation and public investment, at alternative times by mistreatmentin publiccontrolled banks to direct credit to most well-likedpersonalcorporations and sectors, and yet atother times by permitting inflation to shift resources from each agriculture and concretelabour to personal industrialists. Repression was additionally a key part in sanctioning private investors to possess a preparedprovision of low cost, “flexible,” and disciplined labour.Examples of less-direct interventions on the availabilityfacetenclosed promoting technologyby investment in education and analysis and development, or by negotiation withforeign corporations to modify technology transfer.On the demand facet, too, organic process states pursued numerous policies to pushtheir growth commitment. These policies enclosedfiscaland financialpolicies, and tariffs and exchange-rate policies geared toward boosting domestic demand.When domestic demand wasn'tenough, these states promptly adopted newer policiesthat shifted incentives in favour of export promotion or, additionally, that helpedpromote production for both domestic and foreign consumption.

Politics of economic processwithin theNineteen Eighties

Table one clearly indicates theeconomic process in India accelerated perceptibly around 1980. The expansion rate of business production from 1980 onward (see Table)wasn'tspectacular, each by international standards, and compared to India’s own record within theNineteen Fifties (Wallack 2003). Even so, growth within theNineteen Fiftiesstarted from a really low purposeand therefore the performance since 1980 has been a bigimprovement over the “decade of stagnation” that preceded (Ahluwalia 1985).Moreover, Virmani (2004a, b) and Rodrik and Subramanian (2004) have established through a spread of additional formal tests that 1980 (or thereabouts) represents a prospectfrom India’s “Hindu rate.”

A slow howevercertain adoption of a brand new model of development eventually triggered theupward shift within therate of the Indian economy around 1980. Rather than thestatist and therefore the nationalist model of development of the national leader era, whichwasaccentuated in a veryadvocative direction by Indira Gandhithroughout the Nineteen Seventies, who herselfshifted India’s economy around 1980 toward a state and business alliance foreconomic growth. The 3elements of this new model of development that hasbeen pursued by subsequent governments since 1980 were: prioritization of economicgrowth as a state goal; supporting businessto attain this goal; and taming labouras a necessary side of this strategy. As befits a fancy democracy, the form of thenew model emerged slowly, howeverterriblysure enough.

Of the foremost policy reforms initiated in 1991, internal deregulating has proceededthe furthest. Worldgap has been real however slow and modest, and therefore theattempts totrim current public expenditures haven'tcreatedabundant headway. Twoalternative reformareas—privatization of public enterprises and labour reforms—were additionallymentioned atthe early stages, and aresporadically rediscussed. Anticipating serious politicalopposition, numerous governments have principally left these policy reform areas alone.

A pattern emerges. here Internal deregulatingand therefore the modest worldgap werechanges that were either demanded by Indian business teams, particularlybusiness,or one thinga big fraction of Indian business maytolerate. The dispositionor the lack to denationalize public enterprises or to tame India's organizedlabour underlines the "soft" or fragmented nature of state power in democratic *Bharat*.The politics of continuous budget deficits is partially a results of similar democraticpressures, however it additionally highlights the commitment of Indian policymakers to economicgrowth, and therefore theconnecteddisposition to use public expenditures to facilitate this outcome. In spite of the pro and antireform rhetoric regarding*Bharat* going neoliberal, both the political methodand therefore themethod of policy reform mirrora wayadditionaladvancedpattern of state intervention within the economy. whereas some easing is real, Indian state remains activist, willing to support and to figure closely with Indian business, however at identical time, state actors stay hemmed in by a spread of democratic political pressures.

Several connected observations support the purpose that the major dynamics underlying sustained growth isn'tsuch a loteasingbecause itis that the state's continued pro-business orientation. First, contrary to what one would possibly expect from any liberalization, the labour intensity of Indian businessminimizedsteadythroughout the 1990s (Chaudhuri 2002: 160). Second, the unregistered sector of Indian industry—which one presumes to be additional export-oriented and fewer capital intensive—did not attract abundant new investment within the post-reform amount (Nagaraj 2003: 3711). Thereis no clear proof that exports of labour intensive product grew sharply. Third, and very necessary, the amount of concentration in privatebusiness has doubled since 1991: for instance, capitalisation of the highesttenpersonalcorporationsdoubled from 2.2% of the gross domestic product in 1990 to 12.9% in 2004, and sales of the highesttencorporationsduring identicalamount grew from a pair of 2.3% to 9.3% of the gross domestic product. Finally, the share ofemployment generated by the producing sector has remained for the most partunmovedover the past fifteen years.

Aside from the problemof personalbusiness, public investments in *Bharat* as a proportion of total economic activity declined perceptiblythroughout the Nineties. The underlying dynamics aren'tlaboriousto know. Given the fragmented nature of state power in *Bharat*, public authorities realize it is toughto lift taxes and revenues. a spread of tax concessions to the made and middle categories have additionally cutinto the revenue pie, as has the decline on all-important import duties. The service and agriculturalsectors stayfor the most parttax-free. The pressure on the expenditure facet is uncompassionate,especially paying interest on the growing debt and defence expenditures. Faced with severe commercial enterprise pressures in 1991, alongside a loan and associatedconditions of the United Nations agency, the Indian government sought-after to trim the deficit. While thesuccessive governments have created some headway, they were unable to managecurrent expenditures. The deficit has been reduced by cutting public investments,including those in infrastructure.An additional issue that deserves attention is that the speed of growth of productivityof the commercial economy within theNinetiesfailed to improve throughout the Nineteen Eighties(Kumar 2000: 806–7). Whereas the international gap of the economy has junction rectifierto afair quantity of restructuring and consolidation of Indian business (Basant 2000), aswell as to increase in technology imports, none of this has added up to a major improvement in growthpotency.

While the Indian state recommitted itself to personal sector-led growth around 1980, *Bharat*is not anyAsian country or Taiwan. The Indian state has neither done enough to help improve the potency of the personal industrial economy, nor has it done much to enhance the life probabilities of its poor. First, India's dismal infrastructure continues to feature to the priceof privatebusinesses. Second, whereasthere'sabundantverbalizeimproving the labour state of affairs, not solelyis that the action restricted, however even the underlyingmodel of amendment is misspecified. Again, if

East Asia is to be the model, labourregimes in such speedy growers as Asian countries combined job security, coaching on thejob, continuedtalentenhancements, and strict discipline, involving substantialrepression; the “model” is neither totallyfascinating nor seemingly to be replicated in India.Third, the state has done not nearly enough to assist improve the technologicalefficiency of the country’s economy. Imports related to foreign technology have helped.However, with declining analysis and development inclined investment within thepersonal sector,and with the continued cuts within the role of the general public sector, the trend is almostreversed. Fourth, the efforts to enhance India’s human capital arecounted as lowest.Last, each of the incentives and pressures on the personal sector to spice up exports haveremained inadequate. These series of inactions—some as a results of politicalincapacities et al.attributable tothe shortage of imagination—may cumulatively facilitateIndia inunderstanding why productivity growth of industrial economy has not improvedin the post-reform era.

Conclusion:

The recent acceleration of economic process in Indiawas additionalinoperation of the pro-business tilt of the Indian state and fewer a result of thepost-1991 economic easing. To support this argument, I propose2types of evidence: initial, growth acceleration around 1980 coincided with the major, but less-noticed shift within the state’s economic role initiated by Indira Gandhi; and second, the mixtureof economic performance since easing, particularly industrial growth, failed to improve throughout the Nineteen Eighties. Proof of interstate variations inside India—a set of problems that have not beenmentioned here, however have done so elsewhere (see Kohli 2006b)—is additionally supportive: the pattern of interstate variation in economic growth within theNineties underlines that pro-business state governments are succeeding handsomely in attracting personal investment and growing pace.

With the argument currentlyin situ, what remains is to tease out some closing implications. Readers mightmarvel what the stakes are in identifying pro-business and pro-market policies? the solution is partiallyscholarly, that is, obtainingcausative connections right, and partially normative, that is, arethe continued changes truthful and just? We have a tendency tocurrentlyboard a world during which democracy and capitalist economy have emerged asthe most fascinating modes for organizing national political economies. The realdebate regarding national selections is progressivelyregarding “varieties of capitalist economy.” With advanced industrial economies providing 3 alternatives—the neoliberal model of Anglo-America, the social democratic model of Scandinavia, and therefore the statist model of Japan and South Korea—the discussion for developing countries progressively focuses on which model is best to emulate. My personal preferences are social democratic, but for currentlythat's not relevant. The neoliberal model has within the recent years been hegemonic, or close to hegemonic.

Table: Some basic growth data, 1950–2004 (All figures in percentage per annum)

	1950–1964	1965–1979	1980–1990	1991–2004	1980–2004
GDP growth	3.7	2.9	5.8	5.6	5.7
Industrial growth	7.4	3.8	6.5	5.8	6.1
Agricultural growth	3.1	2.3	3.9	3.0	3.4
Gross investment/GDP	13	18	22.8	22.3	22.5

Source: Author’s estimates based on Government of India, Economic Survey, various issues, http://indiabudget.nic.in

References

Ahluwalia IJ. Industrial growth in India: stagnation since the mid-sixties. New Delhi: Oxford UniversityPress; 1985.

Ahluwalia MS. Economic reforms in India since 1991: has gradualism worked? J Econ Perspect2002;l6(3):67–88, (Summer).

Amsden A. Asia’s next giant: South Korea and late industrialization. New York: Oxford University Press;1989.

Balakrishnan P, Pushpangadan K. Total factor-productivity growth in manufacturing industry: a fresh look.Econ PolitWkly 1994;2028–35, (July 30).

Banga R. Critical issues in India’s services-led growth, India resident mission policy brief no. 2. New Delhi: Asian Development Bank; 2006.

Bardhan P. The political economy of development in India. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell; 1984.

Basant R. Corporate response to economic reforms. Econ PolitWkly 2000;813–22, (March 4).

Basu K. The budget: a critique of its rationale. Econ PolitWkly 1983, (March 19).

Chaudhuri S. Economic reforms and industrial structure in India. Econ PolitWkly 2002;155–62, (January 12).

De Long B. India since independence: an analytic growth narrative. In: Rodrik D, editor. In search of prosperity: analytic narratives on economic growth. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 2003.

Deaton A, Dreze J. Poverty and inequality in India: a re-examination. Econ PolitWkly 2002;3729–48, (September 7).

Easterly W. The lost decades: developing countries’ stagnation in spite of policy reform 1980–98. J. Econ.Growth 2001;6:135–57.

Echeverri-Gent J. (2007). Politics of markets: political economy of reforming India’s stock markets.

Evans P. Embedded autonomy: state and industrial transformation. New Jersey: Princeton University

Press; 1995.

Frankel F. India’s political economy, 1947–2004: the gradual revolution. New Delhi: Oxford UniversityPress; 2005.

Harriss J, Corbridge S. Reinventing India: liberalization, Hindu nationalism, and popular democracy.

Oxford, UK: Polity; 2000.

Jenkins R. Democratic politics and economic reform in India. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press;1999.

Johnson C. MITI and the Japanese Miracle: the growth of industrial policy, 1925–1975. Stanford, CA:

Stanford University Press; 1982.

Kapur D. (2007). Democracy, death and diamonds: the domestic impact of international migration fromIndia.

Kochanek S. Liberalization and business lobbying in India. J Commonw Comp Polit 1996a;34(3):155–73.

Kochanek S. The transformation of interest politics in India. Pac Aff 1996b;68(4):529–50.

Kohli A. The state and poverty in India: the politics of reform. New York: Cambridge University Press;1987.

Kohli A. Politics of economic liberalization in India. World Dev 1989;17(3):305–28.

Kohli A. Democracy and discontent: India’s growing crisis of governability. New York: Cambridge

University Press; 1991.

Kohli A. State-directed development: political power and industrialization in the global periphery. NewYork: Cambridge University Press; 2004.

Kohli A. Politics of economic growth in India, 1980–2005; Part I: the 1980s. Econ PolitWkly 2006a

(April 1);1251–9.

Kohli A. Politics of economic growth in India, 1980–2005; Part II: the 1990s and beyond. Econ Polit Wkly 2006b;1361–70, (April 6).

Kumar N. Economic reforms and their macro-economic impact. Econ PolitWkly 2000;803–12, (March 4).

Milanovic B. The two faces of globalization: against globalization as we know it. World Dev 2003;31 (4):667–83.

Mohan R. Fiscal correction for economic growth: data analysis and suggestions. Econ PolitWkly 2002;2027, (June 10).

Mookherjee D. Indian economy at the crossroads. Econ PolitWkly 1992;791–801, (April 11–18).

Mukherjee P. Beyond survival: emerging dimensions of Indian economy. New Delhi: Vikas; 1984.

Nagaraj R. Indian economy since 1980: virtuous growth or polarisation. Econ PolitWkly 2000;2831–9,(August 5).

Nagaraj R. Industrial policy and performance since 1980: Which way now? Econ PolitWkly 2003;3707–15,(Aug. 30).

Nayar BR. India's mixed economy: the role of ideology and interest in its development. Bombay: PopularPrakashan; 1989.

Nayar BR. Opening up and openness of Indian economy. Econ PolitWkly 2001;3529–37, (September 15).

Nayar BR. When did the 'Hindu' rate of growth end? Econ PolitWkly 2006;1883–90, (May 13).

Nayar D. Economic development and political democracy: interaction of economics and politics in independent India. In: Jayal NG, editor. Democracy in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press; 2001. p. 362–96.

Panagariya A. India in the 1980s: weak reforms, fragile growth. Unpublished ms. College Park, MD:

University of Maryland, Department of Economics; 2004.

Paranjape HK. New statement on industrial policy. Econ PolitWkly 1980; (September 20).

Patel IG. New economic policies: a historical perspective. Econ PolitWkly 1992;41–6, (January 4–11).

Patnaik P. The performance of the Indian economy in the 1990s. SocSci 1999;27(5–6).

Pedersen JD. Explaining economic liberalization in India: state and society perspectives. World Dev 2000;28(2):265–82.

Rodrik D, Subramanian A. From 'Hindu Growth' to productivity surge: the mystery of the Indian growthtransition. unpublished ms; 2004. (March)

Sen A, Himanshu. Poverty and inequality in India. Econ PolitWkly 2004;4361–75. (in two parts,

September 18 and 25)

Sengupta A. Reforms, equity and the IMF. Delhi: Har-Anand Publications; 2001.

Srinivasan TN, Tendulkar S. Reintegrating India with the world economy. Washington, DC: Institute forInternational Economics; 2003.

Stallings B, Peres W. Growth, employment, and equity: the impact of economic reforms in Latin America and the Caribbean. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2000.

Stiglitz J. Globalization and its discontents. New York: Norton; 2002.

van deWalle N. Politics ofAfrica's permanent economic crisis. New York: Cambridge University Press; 2003.

Virmani A. India's economic growth: from socialist rate of growth to Bharataya rate of growth. WorkingPaper No. 122, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, New Delhi, India;2004a.

Virmani A. Sources of India's economic growth: trends in total factor productivity. Working Paper No.

131, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, New Delhi, India; 2004b.

Wade R. Governing the market: economic theory and the role of government in East Asian

Industrialization. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1990.

Wallack JS. Structural breaks in Indian macroeconomic data. Econ PolitWkly 2003;4312–4315, (October 11).

Williamson J. What Washington means by policy reform. In: Williamson J, editors. Latin American adjustment: how much has happened? Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics; 1990. p. 7–38.