



NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION AND INTERVENTIONS FOR EQUALITY

Dr. DINESAN VADAKKINIYIL

Assistant Professor, Department of History, Government Brennen College, Thalassery, Kerala, India.

Abstract

This article problematizes the assumptions on which NGOs chart programmes and implement plans to intervene among the marginalized to erase inequality. While arguing that NGO's approach to alleviate poverty and establish equality are based on western individualism and on a belief at the possibility of arriving at a state of equality in a particular time in future, this article asserts that a self-reflexive understanding of these assumptions is desideratum to disclose the power relation embedded in it.

Keywords: NGO, Equality, Development, egalitarianism, kudumbashree.

INTRODUCTION

Egalitarianism is not a buzzword of Non-Governmental Organizations (hereafter NGO), however, it is not unknown to them. Despite it being the case, in the contemporary discourse and practices of NGO, concepts like development, empowerment and participation recurs as interventionist objectives directed to erase inequality. Integrating the concept of development with increasing economic capital, empowerment with strengthening social capital and participation with deepening political capital, on the one hand, and by intervening to achieve them, on the other, proponents of NGO assume that poverty and inequality could be alleviated. But a close scrutiny would reveal that their notion of social and political capital are determined by economic, and their interventions are affirmed on the belief that changes in the economy will invariably bring corresponding changes in all other fields of social structure. Apparently it may look like a materialistic interpretation. But it is not exactly so. The motor of change for them is not emergent of radical social structure. Instead, it is rooted in actions of rational individual. Therefore, intervention should be to cultivate the capacity or capability of individual to act or to desire. That is, the whole is determined by the rational action of individual and not the other way. The major interventional attempt of NGO is among the people who are living in the peripheries of the world-system and among the marginalized, ethnic or gender. But their fundamental approach to alleviation of poverty and establishment of equality is based on western individualism, a belief in rational economic being capable of generating independent action, and a belief in establishing a state of equality at particular point in future, a process teleological in nature.

More interesting is the fact that these concepts, i.e., development, empowerment and participation, are not that old, rather they emerged along with the mushrooming of NGOs in the last few decades,

especially in 1980s. However, the value embedded in these concepts has been very much in circulation from the time of the very birth of NGOs, but repeated with difference in varying spatio-temporality. That is, if it is participation and empowerment in the present, earlier, in some occasions, it appeared with the garb of welfare and progress, in some other occasions as justice and right or civilize and modernize. This force us to argue that, circulation of these ideas are foundational for NGO. Or rather NGO, more than a structural entity, is an ideology/value or a legitimizing principle produced and reproduced continuously in the global capitalist milieu of accumulation of wealth and intensification of inequality. It continued from the period of colonialism to the contemporary age of post-industrialism, but manifesting different facets each time. Since it being the circulation of a value/idea the possibility of NGO becoming a state or market (or both), the two institutions in relation of difference with which these NGO is often understood and defined, is a reality. That is, there is a paradox that a process that argues for egalitarianism is itself becoming producers of inequality, not only by upholding and circulating certain specific value but also by transmogrifying itself as other institutional values and practices.

KEY ASSUMPTIONS AND ITS CRITIQUE

I begin with an analysis of some of the key ideas that emerge in and through the NGO discourses in the contemporary period, viz., development, empowerment, and participate/decentralize. I already said that they are new to NGO vocabulary. But in the process of its emergence some other words were muffled. Gopal Guru, a social scientist and Dalit activist from India. He says that "[i]n contemporary imagination one finds repeated discussions on the issues of social exclusion and marginalisation of disadvantaged groups. This discourse on marginalisation has replaced earlier terms like exploitation, domination and suppression. As a

reaction to exclusion and marginalisation, attempts are made to float counter terms like entitlement, empowerment and social inclusion.” He has also noted that this shift in terminological preference is seen in NGO discourses in India as well (Guru 2000: 111). I add that this shift is not accidental. I will discuss the concept of empowerment in a moment. But before that a brief excursion on terms that are identified appearing or disappearing in the contemporary NGO discourse is a desideratum. Concepts like social exclusion and marginalization conceives spatial positioning, and less spatial relation. Meanwhile, concepts like exploitation and suppression conceives situations of social relations within which certain values are left to dominate and thereby legitimize the on-going processes. The former could be ameliorated by restoring to the desired space, therefore advocacy for inclusion. Whereas exploitation and suppression could not be extinguished by restoring to a space of advantage, but demands change in the way human beings are understood and treated, wherever the space may be and whatever the temporality be. It is not an advocacy for settling human being at specific spatio-temporality, rather asking them to be continuously reflexive upon the exploitative and oppressive relations within which they are embedded and challenge the same. The latter is an aspect of egalitarianism of non-economic kind, which is absent in NGO discourse. Social inclusion and entitlement are intervention on behalf of individuals for achieving a settled state and a position. Contrary to it, egalitarianism, from the perception of non-economic kind must be a process attempting to continuously unsettling all such attempt to settle. No wonder in the exclusion of certain terminology and in the inclusion of some others.

As said above, in NGO discourse egalitarianism has been perceived as a state in which each individual has equal opportunity to rights and justice, access to resources, capacity/capability to aspire/desire. The individual imagined here is a western-modern-rational-individual who is free to think and act independently. Such an individual is an imagination of liberal-capitalist thinking. An individual who can alienate her labour, consume what she wants, can become philanthropic, remain as a dutiful citizen, be an upholder of rights, responsible, rational and scientific to make his own world; or in other words, a rational individual who is antithetical to society which is hierarchical. In the latter individual is not the point of generation, rather the society constitutes the individual and their personal integrity. This demands caution while analysing the interventional efforts of NGOs in states like India, where society is hierarchical and in-egalitarian, determinant of ‘quality inscribed within and generated by the individual’, and also an instrument appropriated to challenges its own egregious aspects (Kapferer).

This emphasis on the capability of individual is equally applicable to NGOs having secular nature as well as those having support from the sacred bodies like Christian Churches and Hindu religious institutions. For

example, in the Indian state of Kerala, there is an NGO having more than 50 years of history. It is an NGO with radical political orientation. Their prime intervention has been to popularise science. With this end in mind they publish books and journals, conduct surveys and produce reports, and also involve in direct political action wherever science and reason are under challenge. I am not saying that all these are irrelevant. Instead, all these are rooted in the belief that by making people scientific and rational they will create their own history. Further, they express that exploitation and oppression are the result of the prior acquisition of scientific knowledge by the dominants of the society. Or rather, it is the appropriation of scientific knowledge that made one dominant. By transforming marginalized/exploited as also rational-scientific individual, domination can be challenged and overcome. The books and reports published are thus scientific in the sense that, they are built upon quantifiable empirical-positivist method. What is quantified is what is materially available; material that individual can appropriate through his rational action. And the scientific knowledge of society thus produced would expose the exploitative condition, inequality in the society and thereupon people can act. Thus goes the assumption of the said NGO.

The other NGOs working in Kerala (they include both religious and secular who advocates for development with a leniency towards liberal thinking) also emphasise on the capacity of individual to alter the situation in which she lives. But their difference with the radicals seen above is that instead of science and reason they anchor on the capacity of individuals to work or engage in physical labour. Such NGOs begin their intervention programme with the assumption that inequality is a condition in which individuals are deprived of opportunity to appropriate resources. Therefore, by supplementing the required materials like land, seed, cattle and money, aspirations of individual to become equal with others can be accentuated. The recent phenomenon of asking people to be self-reliant by involving in micro-credit and micro enterprise programmes too valorises the potential of individual to strive for equality through material gain. Individual capacities to work, in conducive (material) condition, and accept credit, if they require any immediate social security support, are stressed as means to eradicate poverty. This is viewed as a necessary and sufficient step towards creating a society of equals. That is, while those who hang on scientific rationalism talks about resisting economic exploitation through individual action, those who believe in physical labour stands for poverty eradication through the execution of human entrepreneurial potentiality. The rational and scientific being they are objectifying is a colonial modernity (no wonder that certain NGO declaring their objective as transforming pre-capitalist society into capitalist society) constituted subject and the labourer referred to is the one who occupies a position in a class divided society. Both, but, share the idea that through assertions of individual

rational will, development and equality could be achieved.

I have already mentioned that development and empowerment are the two concepts, rather ideas, permeates through NGO discourse. First I will look upon the concept of development that has been debated in the writings concerning NGO. It is a fact that the interventions of NGOs during colonial period (especially Christian Missionaries and Social Reform organizations) were legitimized on the ground that they are involving to transform barbaric pre-colonial society into a civilized and progressive one. This 19th century idea of civilization and progress had been replaced by the idea of modernization and development by the middle of 20th century. Social action by floating these notions faced a threat in 1970s with the dissemination of theoretical insights of dependency and world system theorists. They problematized the notion of development and argued that development is not an innocent concept or political programme; rather a kind of colonial capitalist idea lurks behind it. Each development, they argued, invariably necessitates a corresponding under-development at some other social relations. Therefore, the notion of development in itself embeds the potential to produce and legitimize inequality.

Much more powerful was the criticism raised by scholars who had problematized development appropriating the concepts like governmentality, bio-power, and dispositif developed by Michel Foucault. Illustrating that development is a capillary form of power effectuating governmentality critics construed NGOs as an apparatus/dispositif of subjectification. This forced NGO to find a way out since they cannot 'throw out development with the bath water', the central key with which they survive. The strategy adopted by NGO in the context was to get involved in this discourse by appropriating some of the dimensions of post-structural criticism itself. Thus there emerged a group within NGO who are sympathetic to post-developmentalism, but also want to compromise with it. Scholars like Raymond L. Bryant and Pieter de Vries are example. They argued that third world people's desire to develop is a reality and it must be taken seriously. Their argument connotes that the third world need to and must develop to the ideal egalitarian state that the first world had already achieved. Meanwhile, to overcome the post-structural criticism and to legitimize their continuing adherence to development they appropriated two theoretical positions, one is Anthony Giddens's third way for development and the other is Jacques Lacan and Gilles Deleuze's notion of desire and virtuality.

Critiquing Foucaultian notion of governmentality and following reflexive modernist argument of Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck, Pieter De Vries labours hard to establish that there is a third-way of development between 'savage neo-liberalism' and 'dogmatic-socialism' and without succumbing to sovereign power of coercion and governmentality of consent. But much more interesting is his appropriation

of Lacanian and Deleuzian notions of desire and virtuality to defend arguments for development. He says that rather than rejecting development, an engagement with it 'provides theorists with a chance of relating with Third World people's dreams and desires'. He argues that what the Third World dreams and desires in and through the virtual world of development machine is what they realize in the actual world of development intervention. Further, in the absence of such a virtual world of desiring machine there will be banalization. He asserts, "the mundane world of actual development intervention cannot subsist without its virtual supplement: the fantastic images and promises that are evoked by a diversity of small objects that operate as objects causes of desire"(Vries 6). This is an appropriation of Gilles Deleuze's notion of virtuality and desire to defend developmentalism. It says that leaving the idea of development is equivalent to compromising with the banality. It is no matter whether you realize it or not, but 'capacity to desire' is a way for not to compromise with anti-political machine. The development desired may be virtual, but it is required to sustain the desire for equality. The new version of capacity to aspire is the argument for 'capacity to desire' (not compromising with your desire means not compromising with banalisation of development by anti-political machine). In short, the survival of NGOs without reproducing the idea of development would be a difficult task.

Yet another declared aim of NGOs is to empower 'poor and marginalized' (read this in Indian context as dalit and women). Empowerment involves both economic and social upward mobility. The programme for empowerment is eradication of poverty through economic advancement. It is the lack of economic self-reliance that made dalit and women (marginalized) disempowered. Micro-credit and micro-enterprise programmes envisage empowering women through economic assistance, economic self-reliance and economic security. The lessons of self-reliance learned through involving in micro-credit and micro-enterprises will make individual independent decision makers. This in turn will increase their social capital. Here also the basic logic of thinking is that economy will erase poverty, accumulation of wealth will make people self-reliant, and together they will add social capital to individual. Scholars have already noted the limitation of the materialistic interpretation in understanding the social-logic of reproducing exploitative social order. The continuity of caste and patriarchy has been well explained not through the spectre of capital, but through the misrecognition of culture and power in reproducing inequality. Under this circumstance recourse to economic determinism demands caution. Poverty is not something emerging out of one's position in relations of production, culture is not a mere element representing the real nature of economic base, rather both are effects of the circulation of certain encompassing values. These values, Kapferer noted, 'are never static but always being generated anew and in manifold ways, and are often

highly contested' (xxiv).

Equally important is the argument that empowering should not be 'indoctrination', but awakening through spiritual self. Michel Edward, Director of Governance and Civil Society of Ford Foundation and Gita Sen, Professor of Economics at Indian Institute of Management, in an article proposing 21st century agenda for NGO states that, for social transformation, of course for producing a society of equals, inner self of the actors should change. NGO has a role in effectuating this transformation of inner self. This change could not be achieved by simply providing **rules** and the **institutions** of governance, but only through transforming inner self of individuals through imbibing lessons of spirituality. It is worthy to see how they explain the path they visualize will bring change:

"acknowledging the fact that the absence of personal change can impede the social transformations we are searching for can be salutary in the search for a more integrated approach. Nor are we speaking of social indoctrination under duress, exemplified by the Chinese Cultural Revolution or Maoist self-criticism sessions."

Then where it lies? They add,

What kind of personal changes could energise the move towards an economic order which rebalances competitive and co-operative rationalities, a politics of dialogue rather than unrepresentative democracy, and a social policy that works against marginalisation and values the care and nurture of all human beings? The first principles for such change lie at the heart of the teachings of all the great religions – "Love thy neighbour as thyself" in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, "See God in each other" in Sanskrit. It is fascinating to recognise that the core of religious teaching concerns our feelings towards each other – a deeply social statement as much as it is profoundly personal. But to love our neighbours as ourselves, we must come to understand our own inner being - to recognise that in our deepest essence we are compassionate, capable of giving love, and worthy of receiving it.

Two aspects need to be explained here. By stating that new rules and institutions are not sufficient to transform inner-self, those who prepare 21st century agenda for NGO are proposing that creation of any new sets of institution and practices are not what one must seek to erase inequality, rather it must be the constitution of a mentality that could accept what is already available. They are suspicious of the mind as well, therefore they asserts 'human mind is a thief'. It becomes so since mind is embodied of potentialities to imagines and therefore its movement is unpredictable. The solution to control such a vibrant mind is by internalizing religious principles. Religious principles are contrasted with radical

ideologies. The former calms down any vibrant mind and advocate for pacifying and settle oneself. The latter only results in destroying inner tranquillity. If this is the 21st century agenda for NGO, will it end oppression and inequality?

STATE BECOMING NGO?

For long NGO argued that development and politics should be treated as separate domain. NGO being an intermediary between state and market, their stated ideal is not to intervene in politics, rather remain in the area of development that has been neglected by both market and state. But recently, NGO has put forward an agenda that separating politics and development as two exclusive regimes weakens the process of erasing inequality (read poverty). Modern representative state/affirmative democratic state (and not participatory state) has been identified as a failure to erase poverty and inequality. This argument of ineffectiveness of state in brining equality was shared by both liberals and the left. The liberals recommended structural adjustment along with good governance as solution. Here good governance has been projected as vital for reforming political structure, the latter's mission is to provide freedom and security. The idea of good governance followed the prescription of UN that it include, participation, consensus, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, follow the rule and the like. In India the introduction of the programme of good governance came with a declaration that, structural adjustment of economy is not sufficient to develop, political condition too must be conducive to ensure development. Good governance was aimed at bringing this. The left also shared the notion of weakness of affirmative democratic state. For example, a note of introduction to a work produced by a group of scholars who have leniency towards left political ideology states that; "this mechanism of political representation seems ineffective in accomplishing the central ideals of democratic politics: facilitating active political involvement of the citizenry, forging political consensus through dialogue, devising and implementing public policies that ground a productive economy and healthy society, and, in more radical egalitarian versions of the democratic ideal, assuring that all citizens benefit from the nation's wealth." (Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright: 3). But these scholars differ from the liberals who recommended for opening up of economic structure for the flow of private capital as the way to develop. The left alternative against privatization is deepening of democracy. Deepening of democracy could be realized through participation of mass (collective of rational individuals) into democratic process, i.e., through decentralization of power. The context of Kerala introducing people's campaign for decentralized planning had been legitimized on this ground. In literatures defending such experiments called the new process as 'empowered participatory governance'. Here, what is thus dominates in UN and NGO literature

becomes the slogans of state (whether left or right). Or in other words, NGO being a discourse of development, empowerment, and participation, also became the moving spirit of the state. We could see the UN principles of good governance appear in literature arguing for deepening democracy. For example Fung and Wright asserts, “many of these ambitious designs [i.e., representative democracy or alternative to affirmative democratic state and not participatory democracy] are not just workable, but may surpass conventional democratic institutional forms on the quite practical aims of enhancing the **responsiveness** and **effectiveness** of the state while at the same time making it more fair, **participatory**, **deliberative**, and **accountable**.” (6) What it shows, in short, is that, a development discourse generated from within the neo-liberal economic interest came through UN and disseminated through NGO has been prescribed as alternative path of development for the state. Thus by the middle of the last decade of 20th century corporate interest, NGO interest and the interest of the state became one and the same. Or rather, state became corporate-NGO state.

A live model of a state becoming NGO is Kerala. Kerala is known to the world for the unique development it had achieved in the middle of 20th century. The development discourse in 1970s narrativised it as “Kerala Model Development”. It illustrates that despite it being a state with low per-capital income, she has achieved high human development index, perhaps equal to that of any developed world. Reason for that has been ascribed to progressive state of the pre-colonial Travancore, Christian Missionaries, social reformers and revolutionary political parties. This has been read as the endeavour of the state to achieve an egalitarian society. Though criticism to such a construction had come within academics, what attracted more was the assertion that there will not be further growth to this model. Such an interpretation had been developed in 1980s indicating that there will be limits to growth due to increasing industrial stagnation, fiscal deficit, dependency on foreign remittance, and due to handicap of production sector. In a decade after floating this interpretation of limit to Kerala model development, there aroused another stream of discourse disseminating the idea of people’s planning for development. An important point to be noted is that, all the three arguments, that is, Kerala model, limits to model, and decentralized planning, were produced and circulated by a single institute named Centre for Development Studies, Thiruvananthapuram. Peoples planning/participatory planning came with all fanfare in the year 1996. Thomas Isaac, who was a professor at the Centre for Development Studies, was a key member in implementing this programme. Isaac and Patrick Heller states that it is the experience learned by NGOs that has been used to implement the peoples planning. To quote:

While the CPM’s [Communist Party of India-Marxist] return to power in 1996 provided a

critical opening, the Kerala State Planning Board formulated, designed, and drove the Campaign for Democratic Decentralization. In doing so, the Board has relied on a stock of practical knowledge, ideas, and experiences drawn from twenty-five years of local-level experiments conducted by NGOs, most notably the Kerala Sastra Sahitya Parishad (KSSP) – the People’s Science Movement. Moreover, the KSSP has played an active role within the SPB [state planning board] and at the grassroots level in implementing the Campaign. (80)

The NGO referred to is the one we have discussed above. Their experiences and experiments were confined largely with imparting rational and scientific thinking among individuals to make them capable of doing independent actions and take decisions. Rational and scientific thinking make them aware of the cause for persistence of poverty and inequality, which is nothing but economic disparity. It is this experience that has been incorporated to eradicate poverty and egalitarian society. The limitation of thinking on egalitarianism by giving primacy to economy has already been noted. But in the present discussion a factor to be noted is the open admission that it is the *experience of NGO* that has been incorporated into the programme of decentralized planning. We have already noted that there was hardly any difference in the prescription of UN, programmes of NGO and practice of the state. The open admission of one of the architects of People’s campaign for decentralized planning in Kerala that they have appropriated experiments and experience NGO underscores that People’s planning for decentralized development dovetails with the prescription of UN, programme of NGO. Much more interesting is what succeeded. Within five years of the implementation of the people’s planning the debate of Kerala Model development once again came into limelight. In the year 2001 Rene Veron published an article wherein he declared that a “new’ Kerala model” was born. He added that, it has been made possible through following participatory and sustainable development programmes suggested by UN and synergising it with the programmes of NGO and state. Veron adds that in post 1990s globalization undercut the scope of governance at national level and what is left is to prefer decentralization. It shows in another way that, decentralization is not an alternative to resist globalization and increase inequality, but a contingent and prescription during the age of globalization.

NGO-ization of the state in Kerala did not stop there. In 1998, as part of poverty eradication and to bring gender equality, the state introduced another economy centred programme called *kudumbashree*. It is a programme of setting up neighbourhood self-help groups of women under below poverty line that could function as micro-credit and micro-enterprise agents. It envisages empowering women through encouraging them to save and asking them to effectively utilise financial

advancement, on the one hand, and achieving high social capital for gender equality through forming collectives of women living in a neighbourhood. In practice, the former is the agenda and the latter is an auxiliary. Feminist critiques have already pointed out how kudumbashree would become agency for reproducing bourgeoisie patriarchy and how it would lead to effeminization. But for the present argument what is more important is the realization that *Kudumbashree* practice is nothing but the micro-credit and micro-enterprise programme of NGOs. It has been widely noted that, NGOs shift from engaging in charity work to income generating activity is foundational in this preference. Bangladesh Grameen Bank model and its clones in different parts of the world are instrumental in designing it. In 1980s NGOs began to negotiate with private and state. A scholar who reviewed some of the existing literature on NGO has noted that,

In fact, private sector business leaders, foundations and corporations has created new local-level NGOs for promoting micro-enterprise development through 'massification' applying the NGO method and philosophy on a broader scale to help increasing number of entrepreneurs and poor families (Bejar and Korten, 1987). Massification and overcoming institutional obstacles demand government and private sector collaboration. In direct contradiction with the legalists, NGOs stress that the most important role for governments is to provide the appropriate policy environment for micro-enterprise development (Otero, 1990). (Nidheesh 353).

The introduction of Kudumbashree in Kerala must be read from this background. Its introduction was not accidental. Neither was it an alternative model nor an innovative attempt to resist neoliberalism or gender inequality. The registering of *Kudumbashree* as society for the "State Poverty Eradication Mission" (SPEM), under the Travancore Kochi Literary, Scientific and Charitable Societies Act 1955 too is not accidental. It is a law under which NGOs has been registered in Kerala. Further, Kudumbashree Mission in their website admits that there were 'various forms of microfinance practices existed in Kerala from early days' and that 'when the concept of Self Help Group was introduced in Kerala in the 1980s, it was quick to gather momentum'. Though not declared openly that Kudumbashree is a successor to these microfinance and self-help groups, this acknowledging itself signifies their indebtedness to the ideology of NGOs. Perhaps for the background of J.Devika and BinithaThampi noting that, NGOs "who had formed SHGs much earlier have resisted this move [state forming kudumbashree], however, accusing the state of taking control of and restricting the growth of civil social initiatives" must be add with this identification (Devika and Thampi 40).

CONCLUSION

NGO, and state always, teaches people how to survive in the existing socio-economic order. The challenges coming against the existing socio-political order have been toned down through repeating with difference a kind of value rooted in the language of economy and the regimen of development. If this value itself is generative of inequality and oppression, what we required is an open thinking on the effects of the dissemination and reproduction of this value. In this context of thinking openly on egalitarianism one should not neither view egalitarianism as state of being, nor it be reduced to the tenets of western individualistic thinking. Both will lead only to other kinds of domination. Egalitarianism is not a space and time in which all those who constitute the social space has equal opportunity/access/resources/right/justice, but an on-going eventual-site within which one could express her ontological existence, open up things that restrict her being in the world, generate new dynamics of thinking that could challenge all hegemonic endeavours.

REFERENCES

1. Devika, J. and Binitha V. Thampi. "Between 'Empowerment' and 'Liberation' The Kudumbashree Initiative in Kerala. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*. Jan 1, 2007; pp. 33-60.
2. De Vries, Pieter. "Don't Compromise Your Desire for Development! A Lacanian/Deleuzian Rethinking of the Anti-Politics Machine". *Third World Quarterly*. Vol. 28, No. 1, 2007; pp. 25-43.
3. Edwards, Michael and Gita Sen. NGOs, "Social Change and the Transformation of Human Relationships: A 21st-Century Civic Agenda". <http://www.futurepositive.org/docs/social.pdf>
4. Fung, Archon and Erik Olin Wright. 2001. Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. *Politics and Society*, Vol. 29 No. 1, March 2001; pp. 5-41.
5. Guru, Gopal. "Dalit from Margin to Margin". *India International Centre Quarterly*. Vol. 27, No. 2, 2000; pp. 111-116.
6. Isaac, T. M. Thomas and Patrick Heller, "Democracy and Development: Decentralized Planning in Kerala," in *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*, ed. Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright. London: Verso, 2003; 77-110.
7. Kapferer, Bruce. *Legends of People and Myths of State*. New York: Berghahn. 2012[1988].
8. Nidheesh, K. B. "Study on the changing process of Kerala women through Kudumbashree in Kerala". *International NGO Journal* Vol. 4 (8), August, 2009; pp. 352-361.
9. Véron, René. The "new" Kerala model: lessons for sustainable development. *World Development*, 29 (4)2001; pp. 601-617.