

DEBATES ON SOCIAL EXCLUSION IN THE SOUTH: WHAT HAVE THEY CONTRIBUTED TO OUR UNDERSTANDING OF DEPRIVATION?

Arjan de Haan
Social Development Department
Department for International Development, UK

December 2000
Draft - please do not quote

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Definitions, and implications for policy	2
Social exclusion in France	3
Spread to the rest of Europe	4
Paradigms of social exclusion	5
2. Social exclusion in southern debates	7
Empirical studies and variety of interpretations	7
Critiques	9
3. Social exclusion from what? the multidimensional nature of deprivation	10
Resources: income and other	11
Relationships	12
Rights	13
Do dimensions of exclusion overlap and reinforce?	14
4. Poverty: causes, structures, institutions	16
Dynamic notions of poverty, vulnerability	16
Is poverty relative or absolute ?	17
Social exclusion and inclusion: whose responsibility?	17
5. Conclusion: is there a gap in the development debate?	19
References	21

INTRODUCTION

This paper is an introduction to the Uppingham seminar, which this year focuses on social exclusion. It's an introduction to the seminar, and therefore doesn't hesitate to ask as many questions as it tries to answer. For me, having tended to defend the usefulness of the concept, this is an opportunity to discuss some of the critical questions that have arisen in the various debates. This also provides an opportunity to reflect on the politics of knowledge, how and why notions are or are not taken up, and with what consequences.

One of the questions that has bothered me most is: what's new about the concept of social exclusion? Unlike the policy debates in the North, discussions about social exclusion have not been grounded in historical and philosophical traditions. It has been a case of a northern concept introduced into a field of poverty and development studies that was already filled with notions of deprivation, poverty, basic needs, etc., and heated debates about the right way of representing and measuring issues of deprivation. Not only may we have added little, but we may have also ignored Martin Evans' [1997] warning that

theoretical discussion of policy assumptions regarding paradigmatic differences between social exclusion and poverty should be strongly grounded in their policy context.

One of the reasons why I would maintain that the notion of social exclusion is an addition to this field is its emphasis on the processes and institutions that are responsible for deprivation. This can also be accused of not being new - in fact, the understanding of social exclusion as an analytical tool is central to much social (sociological) analysis - but I will maintain that in the development debate there is a gap in this respect, as there is a gap in the literature on social policy. And this gap does I think matter for the way analysis influences policy.

Another serious challenge to the relevance of the notion of social exclusion in the South is that unlike in the welfare states exclusion from basic needs, services and rights in the South is the norm rather than the exception. I will not deny that this matters, and that policy conclusions of course are very different. If the focus of the social exclusion debate is on specific deprived groups, like the work of the Social Exclusion Unit and CASE at LSE have tended to do, this may have less policy relevance for cases where, say, half of the population lives below an extreme food poverty line. However, in my opinion the extent of poverty matters less for the value of the concept if this is primarily about understanding the processes that cause this deprivation. It is thus important to remain conscious of the appropriate analytical level of the argument: my emphasis here is on the analytical framework rather than the empirical reality it describes (I will draw on work by Hilary Silver to expand on this).

The analytical framework also matters for the question of migration of the concept from North to South. It seems to remain true that many of the analytical framework in the South are informed by conceptualisations predominant in the northern part of the world with which there are close and historical contacts. Thus, I will try to show, South Asian conceptualisations of the notion remain strongly influenced by Anglo-Saxon individualist frameworks. This is not a matter of right or wrong, useful or not; the point is, emphasised in this paper, that this changes the way one looks at adoption of northern terms in the south.

The plan of the paper - which is in first-draft form - is as follows. It starts with a discussion of definitions of social exclusion, how it has evolved, and the various ways in which this has been conceptualised, mainly in Europe. Section two looks at the way in which (and why) the notion has been taken up in the field of development studies, and compares it with other more common notions. The third and fourth section then focus on the two elements that seem most relevant, as point of emphasis rather than novelty, within the definition of social exclusion: the multiple and overlapping elements of deprivation, and the social processes that cause this deprivation (including a discussion of the understanding of poverty put forward in the most recent World Bank World Development Report 2000/2001). Section five concludes, with re-emphasising the need for a broad social analysis to understand issues of deprivation, as that is what I believe the main contribution of the notion of social exclusion can be.

1. DEFINITIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY

Most definitions of social exclusion have the following characteristics in common. It is defined as the opposite of social integration, which reflects the perceived importance of being part of society, being integrated. It is a multi-dimensional concept. It refers to exclusion (deprivation) in the economic, social and political sphere (discussed in more detail in section three). It goes beyond the analysis of resource allocation mechanisms, and includes power relations, agency, culture and social identity. Social exclusion can refer to a state or situation, but it often refers to a process, to the mechanism by which people are excluded (see further section four). The focus is often on the institutions that enable and constrain human interaction.

But there is no uniformity in the way social exclusion has been defined. Social exclusion has been defined, for example, to cover both subjective and objective features of people's lives, and as a description of individual disadvantages as well as of attributes of societies. Also, there is disagreement over the way social exclusion is defined vis-a-vis poverty. For example, whereas many authors would define (relative economic) poverty as an element of social exclusion, or as an alternative concept, Jordan [1996] defined social exclusion as responsible for poverty. This section will discuss these differences, starting from the French origin of the notion.

Social exclusion in France

In the French debates, the notion of social exclusion tends to be associated with the rupture of social bonds. The invention of the term social exclusion is usually attributed to Rene Lenoir, then Secretaire d'Etat a l'Action Sociale in the Chirac Government, who published *Les Exclus: Un Francais sur dix*, in 1974 [Lenoir 1974; Donzelot 1991; Evans et al. 1995]. The *exclus* according to Lenoir, included a wide variety of people, not only the poor, but also the handicapped, suicidal people, aged, abused children, substance abusers, etc. - altogether about 10 per cent of the French population at that time.

The term gained popularity in France during the 1980s, for two reasons [Silver 1994]. First, the concept of "poverty", which originated in Britain, was never popular in France. It was discredited because of its association with Christian charity, the ancient regime, and utilitarian liberalism. French Republicans rejected both liberal individualism and socialism in favour of the idea of "solidarity". In France, the welfare state was justified as a means of furthering social integration. Correspondingly, social exclusion has been defined as a rupture of the social fabric, and attributed to a failure of the state.

Second, the 1980s was a period of economic crisis and restructuring, marked by a crisis of the welfare state, and social and political crises. The term exclusion was used to refer to various types of social disadvantage, related to the new social problems that arose: unemployment, ghettoisation, fundamental changes in family life [Cannan 1997]. Old welfare state provisions could not deal with these problems, and during the 1980s, mainly during the government of Mitterand, a new set of social policies were developed. Economic crisis, rising unemployment and a crisis of social security system thus led to redefinition of the role of the state in social policies.

In the French social policies, the idea of the state's responsibility to turn the situation of economic and social crisis around - to implement active policies for education, training and the labour market - remained strong. During Mitterand's socialist government, a new model of social policies was developed. This promoted economic development policies and enterprise values - an ideology usually associated with the political right - and a culture oriented towards both market and social ideals. New management methods were introduced in public administration, in which decentralisation, adaptation to local conditions, and strategic thinking played an important role.

In the programmes since the early 1980s, mostly under socialist administration, solidarity was a key concept, and integration of individuals, families and groups a main objective. For example, education priority areas were developed (1982), in which extra money was allocated to marginal areas. In 1988 RMI, the Revenue Minimum d'Insertion, was set up, a programme for people on long-term unemployment benefit, providing work and training; RMI applicants must enter a contract to perform a task that will help their re-integration. Delinquency prevention developed after disturbances in the early 1980s, providing local youth centres, social, cultural and educational activities. The biggest programmes became the "social development of neighbourhoods" and "urban social development". These originated in housing programmes, and moved towards community work, involving various local public and private agents and services. The approach is integrated, involving various departments and ministries, and forces cities and regions to formulate their own plans for social and economic development.

Evaluation of these programmes show a mixed picture. It has been noted that isolation of deprived neighbourhoods has been broken. Also commended has been the new way of working, with co-operation among partners, and more responsiveness to the needs of inhabitants. On the negative side, the proliferation of intermediate bodies, and variety and lack of clarity of goals have been criticised. Participation, the central goal of the programmes remains a weakness. The programmes may have addressed poverty insufficiently. The performance of these schemes is not the main area of concern here. What matters is the types of interventions that were developed in France, linked to this notion of social exclusion: according to Cannan [1997: 84], one of the more impressive social experiments of the 20th century.

Spread to the rest of Europe

The concept has gradually gained popularity in other countries, partly through EU channels [Room 1995, Silver 1998: 53 ff.]. The European Union was committed to fighting social exclusion throughout the 1990s. The Maastricht and Amsterdam Treaties and the Structural Funds included a commitment to combat social exclusion. The European Union disseminated funding for social "insertion" through the European Social Fund, the European Antipoverty Network, antipoverty programs, and research funds [Benington 1991, Commission 1989]. It induced new thinking on the nature of urban poverty and the need for integrated, participatory strategies of regeneration [Armstrong 1994, Commission 1992]. Crucial seems the change in terminology in the EU's Anti-Poverty programmes: while "poverty" was still a central concern in the 1st Programme, in the 3rd Programme this became "social

exclusion". The European Foundation [1995: 4] defined social exclusion as "the process through which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society within which they live."

More recently, social exclusion also has become central to British policies and debates. Though the notion did not find entry into policy debates during the Conservative government, it was taken up in research - with the French meaning of the term perhaps not always properly understood. In 1992 the British Economic and Social Science Research Council (ESRC) commissioned a review of research on poverty and social exclusion [Jordan 1996], which emerged as an ESRC "thematic priority" in 1995 (in reaction to debates elsewhere in Europe), and the research programme carried out by the Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) at LSE. One of the definitions proposed at the Centre is: an individual is socially excluded, if he/she is geographically resident in a society but for reasons beyond his/her control cannot participate in the normal activities of citizens in that society in which he/she would like to participate. Though acknowledging the emphasis of social exclusion as a process, emphasis tends to be on outcomes of these processes [Burchardt et al. 1999; discussed further below].

Some British literature has concentrated on the difference between British and French approaches [Silver and Wilkinson 1995 compare British and French policies]. Evans, Paugam and Prellis [1995], a group of British and French academics compared the ways the social security system were restructured in Britain and France. Obviously, the systems have always differed, and so did the reactions to the crises of the 1980s. In Britain, 'poverty' again became the central concern, and in a liberal individualist tradition, policies moved towards more means testing, restricting the number of beneficiaries, and restoring market incentives - whereas in France, social inclusion became central, and the move was towards an extension of social security.

The most recent debate has of course been strongly informed by the new Labour Government, with a much stronger emphasis on inequality and improving social services. Central for our debate here is its initiative to establish an inter-departmental Social Exclusion Unit in late 1997, which is probably more an attempt to bring issues of deprivation in the UK on the agenda of the various government departments than a new approach to poverty. The unit has produced reports on neighbourhood renewal, rough sleeping, truancy and school exclusion, an assessment of 16-18 year olds who are not in school, and teenage parenthood and ways to reduce it.

But how about the meanings of social exclusion? Has in all these cases the concept obtained the meanings? Though Silver [1998] stressed the convergence in debates within Western Europe and the increasingly common use of the concept of social exclusion, it appears that the differences remain as large as the overlaps. In the research by CASE at LSE, it seems that the social exclusion agenda has not radically altered the thematics of research. In general, the British usage of the notion remains strongly rooted in Anglo-Saxon liberal individualism - whereas the French notion as described remains based more strongly in a national solidarity paradigm. Despite British adoption of the French notion, British social policy debates suggest the strong influence of U.S. models of welfare reform.

Paradigms of social exclusion

Silver's earlier work [1994] remains extremely useful to understand the different interpretations the concept may obtain in different contexts, and different traditions of social and political thought. She distinguished three "paradigms": a solidarity paradigm, a specialisation paradigm, and a monopoly paradigm. The definitions depend in particular on the ways social integration has been conceptualised. Choosing one of the definitions therefore means "accepting the theoretical and ideological baggage associated with it."

" In the solidarity paradigm, dominant in France, exclusion is the rupture of a social bond between the individual and society that is cultural and moral. This interpretation draws on the philosophy of Rousseau. In this tradition, the poor, unemployed and ethnic minorities are defined as outsiders. National solidarity implies political rights and duties.

" The specialisation paradigm is dominant in the US, and contested in the UK. This interpretation of social exclusion is determined by individual liberalism, and draws on Hobbes. According to liberal-individualistic theories, individuals are able to move across boundaries of social differentiation and economic divisions of labour. Liberal models of citizenship emphasise the contractual exchange of rights and obligations. In this paradigm, exclusion reflects discrimination, the drawing of group distinctions that denies individuals full access to or participation in exchange or interaction. Causes of exclusion are often seen in unenforced rights and market failures.

" The monopoly paradigm is influential in Britain and many Northern European countries, and it draws heavily on Weber. It views the social order as coercive, imposed through hierarchical power relations. Exclusion is defined as a consequence of the formation of group monopolies. Powerful groups restrict the access of outsiders through social closure. Labour market segmentation draws boundaries of exclusion. Unlike in the specialisation paradigm, group distinctions and inequality overlap. Inequality is mitigated by social democratic citizenship which entails full participation in the community.

These paradigms as formulated by Silver are very useful to contextualise and understand debates about deprivation. But they are of course schematic representation of (national) traditions. In practice, these will overlap, and most analysts or policy makers will be influenced by aspects of different traditions. Also, they are concepts, ways of looking at reality rather than reality itself. "Social exclusion", in whatever interpretation, is a way of looking at reality, and as the next section shows, it is often just a different way of looking at familiar problems.

Bearing these caveats in mind, it is relevant that definitions of social exclusion vary, and that the reasons for this can often be traced to political and intellectual traditions. These differences are not only of theoretical interest: concepts of deprivation influence policies that combat deprivation. The difference between a British liberal tradition and the French tradition seems crucial. Not only are there large intellectual differences, but also political ones [Evans et al. 1995: 16-17]. In Britain during the 1980s the debate centered around reducing state intervention and creating incentives for individuals. In France the opposite was the case and the state tried to take a more active role, to integrate its citizens.

2. SOCIAL EXCLUSION IN SOUTHERN DEBATES

This section looks at the way in which the notion has been taken up in the field of development studies, and why, and compares it with other, more common notions. The concept has so far found relatively limited entry into development studies debates, less than the notion of 'social capital' that has been extensively used for example by the World Bank and DFID through its framework of Sustainable Livelihoods.

The joint project by the International Institute for Labour Studies and United Nations Development Programme, which started out as a contribution to the Social Summit of 1995 [IILS 1994], produced the first significant output of research in which the concept has been central. It produced a large number of literature reviews, and a set of country case studies which are summarised below. The International Labour Organization took up the concept in its new Strategies and Tools against social Exclusion and Poverty Programme (STEP).

Empirical studies and variety of interpretations

Empirical studies using the notion show the variety of situations to which the concept can be applied, and the variety of meanings it can obtain [de Haan 1997]. The Peruvian group in the IILS/UNDP project looked at social exclusion in Peru in a broad sense, and its relationship with inequality, using concepts of social assets and non-Walrasian markets [Figueroa et al. 1996]. They argued that social exclusion is found in economic, political and cultural processes. Seemingly based in a "specialisation paradigm", they argued that exclusion from market exchanges occurs because markets do not clear through price adjustment. Some people who are capable of participating are excluded from doing so. Full political participation is limited because of populist and clientelist politics, or legal insecurity. Cultural exclusions exist because certain individuals cannot participate in social networks. Policy implications include: developments of markets, e.g. enabling access to formal credit markets for small producers; redistribution of economic and political assets; and a cultural integration policy.

The group of Indian researchers based in Madras adopted a welfare rights perspective [Appasamy et al. 1996]. This identified factors which facilitate and constrain the ability of the state to deliver basic social rights such as education, health and social security. Although Indian elites have not neglected problems of poverty - the study described the long history of the concept of a welfare state in India, starting in 1931 - political struggles and patronage networks have limited the provision of basic needs to the majority of the population. Large sections of the Indian population continues to face multiple disadvantages. According to the authors, the efficiency and accountability of welfare programmes need attention, calling for a restructuring of the administration of programmes as well as giving beneficiaries a financial stake and involvement in the working of these institutions.

The study on Yemen partly took a similar welfare rights perspective. Social exclusion was defined in the context of a "dualistic transitional society. In relation to the traditional society, it denies membership in the social order, while in the modern economy state, it denies membership from a citizen's right to equal social participation" [Hashem 1996: 103]. The study indicated that

poverty and social exclusion are strongly associated. It described four specific excluded groups: the akhdam (an ethnic minority group), day labourers, inhabitants of remote villages, and the returnee emigrants of the Gulf War. The study analysed the newly formed political parties, and the process of modernisation and state formation, in which integration becomes an important goal, but old traditions and networks remain crucial. Social integration is hampered by the unawareness of the poor and excluded to organise and utilise political parties to represent their needs and demands.

In the Tanzanian study [Kaijage and Tibaijuka 1996], in which adjustment programmes played an important role, social exclusion is seen as a function of an interplay between economic processes, relations of power, and cultural domains. It used a "Townsendian" interpretation of relative deprivation, and looks at multiple forms of deprivation. The study focused on marginalised groups, those subject to "precarious living" as a result of inadequate earnings, unemployment, insecure jobs, or lack of access to productive resources. Occupational status and livelihoods were used as a basis for identifying groups. A recent study on health care in Tanzania [Tibandebage and Mackintosh 2000] uses this framework, emphasising the processes of marginalisation and the interrelated roles health services play in impoverishment: exclusion from health care worsens ill health, cumulating other sources of impoverishment such as work, while the abuse and neglect patients experience within the health services in itself is a core element of poverty and disempowerment.

In the Russian study, the transition to a market economy was the central theme [Tchernina 1996]. The central institution in this process is the labour market, which needed to be re-created after the socialist period that was characterised by employment guarantees. The way in which the labour market is being formed reflects a situation of surplus labour and mass poverty. The economic restructuring, the redefinition of the role of the state - as in the Indian and Tanzanian studies - is associated with the erosion of old social contacts which were the central means of social integration.

In the study of Thailand, finally, it was argued that the monopoly paradigm is the most appropriate [Phongpaichit et al. 1996]. Thai society is hierarchical, with elite groups controlling resources and excluding outsiders from access to resources and benefits from economic growth (Thai macro-data did indeed show a very rapid rise in income inequality). The political culture is "Thai, male, and Bangkok-centred". But the case studies in Thailand also showed how the excluded have tried to gain access, through protest marches, strikes and media campaigns.

Within the UK development studies community, at least two research programmes (DFID-funded) have taken up the discussion on the notion of social exclusion. Research at the University of Oxford investigates four approaches to poverty (monetary, capabilities, participatory and social exclusion), their empirical consequences and policy implications. Saith [2000] discusses social exclusion, the ways in which this can be operationalised, focusing on multi-dimensionality, relational deprivation, dynamic notions of poverty, and household/group resources; the draft paper seems to suggest that focus may be in defining social exclusion as the non-income dimensions of deprivation. Within the research programme on social policy, social exclusion is

introduced to southern research through the work with a focus on Europe by Graham Room [1998], and the empirical work by Davis [2000] focusing on Bangladesh, which describes the wide array of factors that contribute to deprivation.

Finally, Kabeer's recent theoretical discussion [2000], despite reservations, emphasises the usefulness of the concept. It captures important dimensions of the experiences of groups that are somehow 'set apart' or 'locked out' from society. The focus on institutions and process (the meso level, not anonymous) makes it an appropriate analytical basis for pro-active social policy formulation. It helps understand, for example, why in certain contexts female-headed households are poor(er), the institutional rules that are responsible for this. It helps understand group dynamics, and why some are included and others excluded (social closure). It focuses on processes of "mobilisation of institutional bias", determining gender differences for example, and "unruly practices" [see also Gore 1993], for example in services like health care.

The overview of these studies, commissioned mostly by IILS/UNDP, shows the wide variety of ways in which the concept social exclusion has been used so far. The variety of interpretations partly reflects societal complexity, the variety of goods and institutions people can be excluded from, and partly the authors' different disciplinary and theoretical backgrounds. However, the studies still share a general objective, i.e. to describe processes which exclude people from full participation in society, including not only obtaining material benefits within, but also participation in decision making.

Critiques

In the development studies debates, the notion rapidly met with a degree of (healthy) skepticism. For example, Else Oyen (Comparative Research Programme on Poverty, Bergen, Norway) noted that researchers "pick[ed] up the concept and are now running all over the place arranging seminars and conferences to find a researchable content in an umbrella concept for which there is limited theoretical underpinning" [quoted in Sen 1998: 3].

Theoretically, perhaps the main critique has been the 'one size fit all' question, and whether social exclusion does not tend to ignore the problematic sides of inclusion. Jackson [1998] questioned whether social exclusion is a useful concept to analyse gender relations. She sees social exclusion thinking as part of a movement in which 'women in development' (WID) gave way to 'gender and development' (GAD), and targeting to mainstreaming. She emphasises that women are not categorically excluded but are integrated in particular and often disadvantageous ways, through reproductive labor for example. In her view, in the social exclusion discourse "the assumption that marginality is the problem remains pervasive" - the terms of inclusion instead should be focus of attention.

I will come back to questions of targeting versus mainstreaming in the concluding section. Here it suffices to note that, on the one hand, it does not necessarily follow that social exclusion debate would focus on specific marginalised groups (for which targeted approaches would be the answer). Instead, focus could and should be the processes, institutions and rules through which people and groups. are being deprived. On the other had, this

emphasis on a dualistic interpretation of the notion, and on particular deprived groups, warns us for the strength of the pull of researchers theoretical backgrounds.

As stated earlier, and to some extent confirmed by the summary of studies above (and perhaps the absence of reference to the notion in the recent World Development Report, despite preparatory work), there is a common charge that the notion brings little new. Indeed, the notion is often interpreted in a way that is very close to more common concepts, for example when emphasising the multi-dimensionality (Saith) or relative deprivation (Bourguignon), and hence it is understandable that researchers prefer not to use. Commonalities and overlap with other notions of deprivation are discussed in the next section.

3. SOCIAL EXCLUSION FROM WHAT? THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL NATURE OF DEPRIVATION

The definition of social exclusion presented above raises two sets of questions: exclusion from what, and who or what is responsible for the exclusion. The first question is discussed in this section; section four takes up the second. This is done through a comparison with other notions of deprivation, including 'money-metric' and human development approaches. People can be, and often are excluded from many different things at the same time, e.g. livelihoods; secure, permanent employment; earnings; property; housing; a minimal consumption level; education; the welfare state; citizenship; democratic participation; public goods; family, social contacts; and/or respect. Accordingly, research on exclusion studies many different groups, such as the long-term unemployed; those employed in precarious and unskilled jobs; the low-paid and poor; the illiterate; school dropouts; mentally and physically handicapped; substance abusers; delinquents; single parents; abused children; women; foreigners; minorities; politically disenfranchised; and/or recipients of social assistance [Silver 1994; also CESIS 1997]. Arenas of exclusion can be ranked under three R-s: resources, relationships and rights.

Resources: income and other

First, not having sufficient income is of course a major element of exclusion, and debates often focus on the link between this and other dimensions of deprivation. There has been much attention and donor support as well as critique from many corners to what is slightly misleadingly termed a money-metric approach to poverty (misleading, as a common and preferred measure is consumption, not income). This focuses on people's basic needs, and define people as poor if their income is insufficient to satisfy their most basic needs (i.e. deprivation of income or consumption). Achievement of minimum food/calorie requirements (determined by WHO standards for example, and on that basis labelled 'absolute' poverty) is the most important component in determining a 'poverty line', and the most common poverty measure for countries is the number of people who 'fall below' that line: the 'poverty headcount'. The World Bank has advanced the use of a poverty line of 1 dollar a day (based on the poverty line of the poorest countries), in purchasing power parity, to enable international comparisons.

It may be relevant to reiterate that poverty is mainly an Anglo-Saxon concept. In Britain, poverty has been an important concern at least since the Poor Law of 1597, but 18th century economists Hume and Smith altered the conception of poverty. Following the technological progress in the UK, and reacting to mercantilist thoughts that saw poverty (i.e. cheap labour) as necessary for national development, economic development became conceived of as a potential remedy for poverty. The market was conceived of free individuals entering voluntarily into contracts, and poverty as an individual problem or attribute. It can be argued that a measure like a poverty headcount (or the emphasis on such a measure) is a reflection of this essentially individualistic approach.

Second, exclusion can be from a wider range of goods or services. The concept of basic needs, including the Human Development Indicator advanced by UNDP, helps to point out the various kinds of goods from which people are deprived. Like income poverty, however, it is based in an individualistic theoretical approach to society. Rowntree's *Poverty: A study of town life* published in 1901 was perhaps the first to use the concept of basic needs, seen as a minimum consumption basket: the poor are the people who cannot afford this. This concept of basic needs gained great popularity in development studies and policies (UNDP), focusing on the various human needs in terms of health, food, education, water, shelter and transport. However, the focus remains on the individual, and individual utility. As such it is similar to studies that focus on (income or consumption) poverty. In both the basic needs and the absolute poverty approach, the focus is on the individual, and not, as in the French paradigm of a social exclusion approach, on society and the individual's ties to society.

Recently, development agencies like UNDP, DFID and CARE have advanced notions of sustainable livelihoods, mostly in rural but now also in urban areas. A multi-dimensional understanding of poverty is central to this approach as well, and this is turned into 'positive' descriptions of people's assets and strategies (rather than just describing the lack of consumption or assets). It is people-centred or participatory, and emphasises macro-micro linkages. Much of the focus has been on multi-dimensionality, which has been expressed as forms of capital: natural, human, physical, social. Although the livelihoods framework [as presented in Scoones 1998 and Carney 1999] does incorporate institutions and processes - as determining access and outcomes of people's livelihood strategies - in practice attention centres around descriptions of forms of capital, as individual attributes.

Fourth, exclusion from goods and services in itself may not be the most relevant aspect of deprivation. Amartya Sen's work on capabilities and entitlements emphasises that the central determinant of deprivation is not what people possess but what it enables them to do. Sen criticises Townsend's concept of relative deprivation, and argues that this confuses lack of commodities with households or individuals' capabilities to meet social conventions, participate in social activities, and retain self-respect. A concept of relative deprivation measures relative standards, inequality, whereas capabilities are absolute requirements for full membership of society. The entitlement concept draws attention away from the mere possession of certain

goods, towards the rights on these goods, the command families have over goods, using various economic, political, and social opportunities within legal systems [Sen 1977, 1982, 1988, and his recent 1998 discussion of the notion of social exclusion].

The emphasis on entitlements brings the poverty debate much closer to a focus on the institutions that are responsible for material or basic needs' deprivation, which social exclusion focuses on. But as Gore [1993, 1995] has pointed out, there is a question whether Sen's conceptualisation is too legalistic, and ignores how legal rules work in practice. Gore believes that Sen underestimates the way in which entitlement is enabled and constrained by socially enforced moral rules. According to him a social exclusion approach goes beyond an entitlement framework by looking at processes behind entitlement failure. In a response to this Sen [1998] rightly points out that his empirical work like in *Poverty and Famines* does focus on such 'unruly social practices' - I do however believe Gore does have a point regarding the focus of an entitlement framework (and certainly an operationalisation of this like the UNDP's Human Development Index): the emphasis tends to be on individual attributes rather than the social processes that determine these.

Relationships

In French research on social exclusion the breakdown of social networks - linked to economic crises and unemployment - has been a central theme, and of course it is central to much sociological literature. In the development/poverty literature this is becoming an increasingly important theme as well. Following research by Putnam [1993] in Italy - that showed how differences between northern and southern Italy in forms of networks and civic engagement influenced long-run economic development - the concept of social capital has rapidly found entry into World Bank and others' discourses (as shown at the Bank's social capital website and a large number of Working Papers under the Social Capital Initiative).

It is commonly accepted that poor people tend to have fewer and weaker social networks to draw on, and often argued that modernisation (eg migration, urbanisation) or crises leads to an erosion of traditional forms of solidarity. Narayan and Pritchett [1997] showed quantitatively how in rural Tanzania trust and 'associational activity' had positive effects on income, education and non-farm assets. Social capital is defined as the density and nature of contacts/connections amongst individuals in a given community (e.g., horizontal-vertical, inclusive-exclusive; Narayan [1999] distinguishes within-group 'bonding' social capital and between-groups 'bridging' capital).

Also at a macro-level, in line with Barro-type of cross-country regression, social capital has been analysed in an increasing number of studies. This consists of 'government social capital' (political freedom, political violence, risk, etc.) as well as 'civil social capital' (trust, group membership, social polarisation, etc.) [Knack 1999]. These macro-studies tend to confirm the micro-studies, and suggest positive effects of social capital on growth and poverty reduction - though as Knack emphasises complex issues may hide behind such statistical relationships.

The exact nature or strength of the correlations is of less importance in the

discussion here than the conceptual issue. With the notion of social capital, social relationships have become part of the dominant discourse on development and poverty. However, the emphasis is on quantitative correlation between observable indicators (of individuals, groups, or countries). This is useful, but our understanding of how or why these correlations operate, and how policies can influence them.

Rights

Finally, there is the issue of exclusion from rights, on which we generally have much less information (particularly social and economic rights) than other forms of exclusion. In discussions of the concept of social exclusion, the question often comes up whether social exclusion is always involuntary. The answer to that question clearly needs to be in the negative. This forces us to look at issues of rights, and Sen's work of course points in the same direction. Following Cornwall and Gaventa's [2000] discussion of citizenship - noting a shift from paternalistic and consumer-focused models towards participation and concerns with citizens rights - three issues can be distinguished.

First, what is it that states provides, and for whom? Reference in social policy literature is usually to Marshall's work on the welfare state, that discussed a bundle of social rights and entitlements. Important for the discussion here is that though there may be circumstances where a state wants the entire population to be included in the delivery of services (eg public health) or goods (eg provisions that affect public safety), social rights refer to the state's obligation to guarantee rights or access. A welfare state does not force its citizens to go to hospitals when they are ill (unless the health of others is at stake), but it is responsible for making provisions available (neither does the state itself necessarily produce these).

Second, rights and citizenship are about enabling people to act as agents and their involvement in decisions that affect their lives. This includes the right of participation in decision making in political, economic, social, cultural and spheres. In the debates of development agencies at least, after a period in which the contribution of participation to efficiency was a central concern, participation as a value and right in itself is now becoming more important.

Third in Cornwall and Gaventa's distinction is the issue of accountability of service providers. This may involve increased dialogue and user consultation, for example in the form of local government or school committees. Central is the idea of enhancing participation of users in the production of these services.

How does a notion of social exclusion relate to this? As stated, a notion of rights (formal or informal) needs to be on the basis of a social exclusion analysis, so as to allow for individuals' or groups' choices not to be included. At the same time, a notion of social exclusion emphasises the cases of non-inclusion, and the processes that are responsible for this, for example the non-realisation of rights in welfare states, as well as the categorical exclusion of groups as non-citizens and non-bearers of rights and entitlements.

Do dimensions of exclusion overlap and reinforce?

The discussion in this section has noted the many possible arenas of exclusion, with reference to research and discussions that depart from other notions of

deprivation. This broad range emphasises the danger of the notion of social exclusion to become all-embracing, and the need for more precise definitions and operationalisation of the term. But at the same time, as noted by many it is exactly the emphasis on multi-dimensionality that makes the notion attractive. In this sense, an empirical test of the notion lies in the question whether dimensions of exclusion overlap: do people with fewer material resources have weaker social links and are less able to claim their rights/entitlements? The answer to this question will be context dependent, and there will be cases, for example, where groups that live in social isolation (eg traders) have substantial material wealth. This section reviews research that show the existence or absence of overlap of dimensions of deprivation.

It seems obvious that lack of income would be related to unemployment or precarious forms of employment. It may also be related to lack of proper housing, bad physical health, and/or psychological problems. For example, research by Paugam [1995] in France showed that people who lose their jobs are not only deprived of income, but are also more likely to have marital problems, less contact with family and friends, and feel socially disqualified. Research by Wilkinson [1996] in the UK showed that bad health is related to insecurity of work, and to feelings of powerlessness. The London Research Centre [1996] showed the multiple overlapping forms of deprivation - including lack income, employment, decent housing, health and safety - in different geographical areas of London. Similarly, Power [2000] emphasises how various elements of deprivation of poor urban areas in England combine, which makes it so difficult to link such marginalised area to mainstream society (for Power, social exclusion is about the inability of society to keep all groups and individuals "within reach of what we expect as a society"). Clusters of poverty consist, inter alia, of a lack of routes out, depression, low morale, lack of jobs, poor quality schooling and local government, but also lack of confidence in 'the system' illustrated for example by low turn-out for voting.

In developing countries also, there is evidence for the existence of cumulative, or 'log-jams' of disadvantages [Lipton and de Haan 1997]. Income poverty, bad education, illness, undernourishment, inadequate housing, unpleasant and insecure work, and place of living usually operate jointly. For example, in Nepal, gross primary enrolment rates in 1984-5 varied from 14 per cent for girls from poor households in the rural plains to 83 per cent for boys from non-poor households in towns in the hills. Poor girls in rural hill areas had worse enrolment chances than poor boys in the same areas, and poor Nepalese children in each location were diverting much more time than non-poor children to domestic and economic work. Family illness and under-education cause each other, and can make or keep adults or their children poor, ill-housed, immobile or undernourished. And it is hard for regions with unhealthy or illiterate populations to attract investment and innovation that reduce poverty and gender discrimination. Participatory poverty assessments, like presented in *Voices of the Poor* [Narayan et al. 2000] also suggest strongly interlined 'webs' of disadvantages, with illness a common trigger of impoverishment.

In line with this, Lipton's [1996] review of anti-poverty programmes indicates the need for policies to address this multi-dimensionality. According to Lipton,

poor people are unlikely to achieve durable progress, and may be unable to achieve lasting welfare gains, unless they can meet several requirements jointly. He calls this the principle of joint requirements: the poor need sufficient food, but also clean water and primary health care sufficient to transform nutritional intakes into decent health. They need either physical assets or job access, sufficient to turn their improved physical condition into income. In many cases, they also need access to education. Given an amount of resources, a much greater gain in child health could be achieved if those resources are divided between those two uses than if the resources were concentrated on either one of the uses.

But of course dimensions of exclusion do not necessarily overlap. Burchardt et al. [1999] investigate five dimensions of exclusion in the UK during the first half of the 1990s (using the British Household Panel Survey): minimum consumption, savings (home-owning), being engaged in an economically or socially valued activity, political activity like voting, and social interaction. While in each year over one-quarter of the sample was excluded on one dimension, and about 12 per cent in two, less than one per cent was excluded on all five. Thus, "no clear-cut multidimensional category of socially excluded people can be identified ... [and] dimensions of exclusion are best treated separately..." [p.241], thus concluding that there is no 'underclass' [see e.g. Katz 1993]. In the South, Appleton and Song use household survey data to investigate associations between income and human development indicators in Jamaica, Kenya, Nepal, Pakistan, Romania and Vietnam. They conclude that correlations exist but are modest (even bivariate) - hence many factors other than income determine health and education. The disadvantaged are typically not deprived on dimensions of income, health and education.

Thus, it remains of course an empirical question whether dimensions of exclusion overlap, and in some cases, as Burchardt et al. argue, it may be preferable - in research and policies - to focus on the various dimensions separately. Either way, so far the focus has been entirely on elements of exclusion as static realities; the next section will focus on the processes and institutions that determine exclusion.

4. POVERTY: CAUSES, STRUCTURES, INSTITUTIONS

The second question relating to the notion of exclusion is: who (or what) is doing the excluding? It follows from the description above that people or groups can be excluded by many different sorts of groups, often at the same time. Landlords may exclude people from access to land or to housing. Elite political groups may exclude others from their legal rights. Priests in India may exclude scheduled castes from access to temples. Minorities may be excluded from expressing their identity. Some trade unions exclude non-members from getting jobs. In principle, exclusion happens at each level of society: group formation is a fundamental characteristic of human society, and this is commonly accompanied by exclusion of others.

Dynamic notions of poverty, vulnerability

It has been common in poverty research in the South, often hampered by availability of data, to be limited to static notions of poverty. But there is increasing acceptance that it is important to look at the dynamics of poverty, at

the changes in households' or individuals' welfare status over time. One of the three pillars in WDR2000, enhancing security, is indeed to a great extent based on research that showed that many people move in and out of poverty [see also Yaqub 2000 for a summary of the research].

A more dynamic notion of poverty has also been introduced with the notion of vulnerability. This may be seen [cf WDR2000] as the statistical likelihood of falling into poverty, but authors like Robert Chambers [1989] argues for a more descriptive (and multi-dimensional and participatory) notion of vulnerability, implying insecurity, defencelessness, as well as exposure to risk and shocks. Lack of assets rather than income has been seen as a central element of the vulnerability of poor rural households.

An example of dynamics of poverty is provided in Paugam's research on social exclusion in France [1995], that looks at processes through which problems of individuals or households in France progressively accumulate. To analyse peoples' risk of social exclusion, he studied correlations among several indicators of precariousness, economic and social: precarious employment, marital instability, economic poverty, inadequate social and family life, inadequate support networks, and low levels of participation in social life. For example, people with stable jobs were generally in good health, lived in comfortable housing, and had professional advantages such as higher education. Also, marital breakdown was higher among those with a less stable job (especially if it was the man that had the precarious job). Instability of jobs was, unsurprisingly, related to a lower income, and marital breakdown increased financial problems. Finally, precariousness in employment was accompanied by a noticeable reduction in the intensity of social life: people with less stable jobs had on average fewer contacts with their family (men are more affected by this than women). Precariousness of employment was experienced as an expression of social disqualification.

In the definition of social exclusion, there is some suggestion that the poor are permanently excluded. The French social integration policies seem to be built on the fear that a permanent underclass may be formed. This is controversial, and the LSE research as indicated effectively contradicted this. In any case, for policies it is quite crucial to distinguish groups that are temporarily and permanently poor.

Is poverty relative or absolute ?

In the money-metric definition of poverty discussed above, the notion of an absolute poverty line was central, for example defined by minimum consumption needs. In OECD countries, the poverty line is much higher of course, and usually defined as a function of a country's wealth, for example mean income (in Europe, poverty lines are set at a level of half the average/median national income). In the example of Paugam's research, exclusion is somehow related to what society sees as normal and minimal standards of life. The notion of relative deprivation, was advanced by Peter Townsend [197] for example, who criticised the use of a basic needs concept, a minimum consumption basket, and the use of the concept of absolute deprivation.

Relative deprivation seems closer to notions of social exclusion, as it seems to

reflect more closely the ties that bind people to wider society, and the rupture of those ties. The IILS studies of Russia, Tanzania and Yemen draw upon Townsend's work [IILS 1996: 18]. Bourguignon for example, and the draft WDR2000, stressed these similarities. But this is still only part of the story, and a social exclusion analysis also looks at how such forms of deprivation - whether absolute or relative - come about.

Social exclusion and inclusion: whose responsibility?

It seems common, at least in the development literature - e.g., in the World Bank Poverty Assessments., to focus on the description of situation of poverty or deprivation (whether uni- or multi-dimensional), without paying similar attention to the causes of this. This is partly the result of a macro-type of analysis, in which causes of poverty are seen predominantly in terms of statistical associations. This is an extremely important form of analysis, but is limited in terms of understanding the 'why' of these correlations, and what can be done about them. Similarly, there is acknowledgement that in the use of the livelihoods framework (as in DFID) the understanding of the 'box' on institutions remains relatively underdeveloped.

Let me try to illustrate with an example, admittedly an extreme one but important at least in my own organisation. Cross-country regressions, using household survey data, have shown strong links between economic growth and poverty. Typically, something like half of the variation in poverty within countries is explained by differences in levels of economic growth (measured for example by GNP). This is not the place to discuss such findings itself, but two issues are important. First there is the question of cause and effect, which is very difficult to sort out. Second, in terms of formulating policies, the analysis does not provide information about the kinds of policies that may address the problem, whether, for example, one could introduce policies of redistribution without affecting growth, or the effect growth has on poverty. This is not a critique of this type of analysis, but a warning against jumping from the analysis to policy conclusion. As most authors emphasise, complex issues may hide behind such statistical relationships. It needs to be combined with an analysis that goes beyond seeing poverty as a passive phenomenon, with outcomes as indicators, and will include understanding the processes that

What would such processes include? Let's elaborate on this example, and think about what it is that produces growth? This basically consists of people, and productivity. A broad social analysis would include an understanding how the production is organised, and thus access to assets, as well as how the benefits are being redistributed. Access to assets is determined by formal and informal rules, which in turn are informed by (and produce or influence) social norms, for example about appropriate tasks for women or specific castes or ethnic groups. The distribution of what is produced - including through the labour market and wages - similarly is influenced by such rules, forms of households and power relations within, and norms about justice, be it within households or across groups and regions. There is no need to elaborate further on this: the argument put forward here is that one needs a deeper analysis that helps understand why certain (indicators of) forms of deprivation occur, and the complexities hidden behind statistical correlations, to properly inform policies.

Before concluding, I'd like to provide one more point for discussion, and illustration of how different analytical emphases may lead to different policy conclusions. During the 1990s, for example in the two-and-a-half-legged World Bank strategy, it has been common to think of social policies in terms of safety nets, or residual measures that would deal with, for example, the negative affects of adjustment. It seems that a particular form of poverty analysis may influence policy prescriptions. The dominant form of poverty analysis has focused on identifying groups or regions that suffer from elements of deprivation (be it income, human development. or otherwise).

As argued earlier, much less attention has been paid to the causes of these forms of deprivation. This is not to imply that the issue would be ignored. Even according to Locke, quoted above as one of the drivers of the Anglo-Saxon approach to deprivation, owners of capital had the duty "to provide with shelter and to refresh with food any and every man, but only when a poor man's misfortune calls for our alms and our property supplies means for charity" [cited in Lipton and Ravallion 1995: 2555, italics added]. What is relevant here is the hypothesis that the policy prescriptions that tend to go along with such a strategy has tended to focus on targeting these groups, rather than focusing on the social processes that lead to deprivation. This is not an either/or question of course, but I do believe that there is an imbalance to be redressed.

5. CONCLUSION: IS THERE A GAP IN THE DEVELOPMENT DEBATE?

Development debates and policies have moved a long way since the 1950s (though no doubt we often repetitive). Lipton and Maxwell's [1992] overview of development paradigms indicates that we moved from growth through industrialisation combined with community development as the dominant paradigm in the 1950s, via emphasis on agricultural growth and 'trickle-down' in the 1960s, to a central concern with redistribution during the 1970s. The 1980s of course was a period of waves of structural adjustment programmes, and rolling back the state - though NGOs and participatory development became more central in poverty alleviation. The 1990s brought, a new (Washington) consensus, with the above mentioned strategy of broad-based (labour-intensive) economic growth, developing human capital, and social safety nets for vulnerable groups. With the publication of the 2000 World Development Report, that stresses interlinked pillars of opportunity, security and empowerment, and embraces a multi-dimensional notion of poverty, complementarity of public policies has come squarely on the agenda.

What then can a notion of social exclusion approach contribute? We need to be open about the risks of the introduction of the term. We have seen that it tends to be used in different ways in different context, and hence can create as much confusion as it helps to clarify. As Martin Evans warned early on, one cannot ignore or escape the particular circumstances in which notions enter political and academic debates - it was thus to be expected that in the British debates, on poverty in North as well as South, the notion of social exclusion entered into the debate within a individual liberal paradigm. Jackson raised a relevant question whether the notion of social exclusion intends to replace other notion, and whether it would be an appropriate language to analyse

gender relations. Her analysis also points at the risk of dualistic interpretations of the concept. Analytical framework in the South are informed by conceptualisations predominant in the northern part of the world with which there are close and historical contacts - and thus South Asian conceptualisations of the notion tend to be strongly influenced by Anglo-Saxon individualist frameworks.

The answer to the question about the usefulness of the notion of social exclusion clearly is: it depends. This paper has argued that the notion may contribute to the field of development and poverty studies, particularly because of its emphasis on the processes and institutions that are responsible for deprivation. Indeed, this may not be new, but there is a gap in the development debate, on poverty as well as southern social policy. The notion may help to push us beyond the now widely accepted multi-dimensional notion of poverty, and bring to the heart of the analysis of deprivation an understanding of the institutions and actors that are responsible for deprivation, and thus move beyond descriptions of poverty as a passive reality.

Does this matter for policies? I believe it does, in a theoretical as well as more practical sense. Theoretically, the debates about social exclusion for me emphasise how strong historical background influence both policy making and research - which of course are not independent from each other. In a more practical sense, this paper has argued that the form of poverty analysis may influence (and again causality runs in both directions) the choices for kinds of policies. An analysis of the institutions that are responsible for deprivation thus would open up a much broader arena of social policy making.

REFERENCES

- Appasamy, P., et al. [1996], *Social Exclusion from a Welfare Rights Perspective in India*, Geneva: IILS.
- Appleton, S. and L. Song [1999], 'Income and Human Development at the Household Level: Evidence From Six Countries', Mimeo, University of Bath, September.
- Baulch, B. [1996], 'The New Poverty Agenda: A Disputed Consensus', *IDS Bulletin*, 27, 1, January, pp 1-10.
- Bhalla and Lapyere
- Burchardt, T., J. Le Grand, D. Piachaud [1999], 'Social Exclusion in Britain 1991-1995', *Social Policy and Administration*, Vol.33. No.3, pp.227-44.
- Cannan, C. [1995], 'Urban Social Development in France', *Community Development Journal*, 30, 3, pp.238-247.
- Cannan, C. [1997], 'The Struggle Against Social Exclusion. Urban Social Development in France', *IDS Bulletin*, Vol.28, No.2, pp.77-85.
- Carney, D. [1998], *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods. What Contribution Can We Make?*, London: DFID.
- CESIS, Centro de Estudos para la Intervenção Social [1997], 'Non-Monetary Indicators of Poverty and Social Exclusion', Working Paper presented at a seminar in Lisbon, March 1997.
- Collier, P., D. Dollar, N. Stern, 'Fifty Years of Development', Mimeo, World Bank, 2000.

Chambers, R. [1989], 'Vulnerability: How the Poor Cope', IDS Bulletin, April 1989.

Dollar, D., and A. Kraay, 'Growth Is Good for the Poor', World Bank, March 2000.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. 1995. Public Welfare Services and Social Exclusion: The Development of Consumer Oriented Initiatives in the European Union. Dublin.

European Union, Economic and Social Committee, Section for Employment, Social Affairs and Citizenship (SOC). Opinion on the Cost of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe. 1998. "Opinion" SOC/322. [<http://www.ces.eu.int/>].

Evans (1996),

Evans, M. [1997], 'Behind the Rhetoric: The Institutional Basis of Social Exclusion and poverty', IDS Bulletin, Vol.29, No.1, pp.42-49.

Evans, M., Paugam, S. and Prelis, J.A. [1995], Chunnel Vision: Poverty, Social Exclusion and the Debate on Social Welfare in France and Britain, London School of Economics, Welfare State Programme, Discussion Paper WSP 115.

Figueiredo, J. B., and Shaheed, Z., eds. [1995], Reducing Poverty Through Labour Market Policies. New Approaches to Poverty Analysis and Policy, Vol. 2, Geneva: ILS.

Figueiredo, J.B., and A. de Haan, eds. [1998], Social Exclusion: An ILO Perspective, Geneva: International Labour Office.

Figuroa, A., et al. [1996], Social Exclusion and Inequality in Peru, Geneva: ILS.

Gore, C. [1993] 'Entitlement Relations and "Unruly" Social Practices: A Comment on the Work of Armatya Sen', Journal of Development Studies, 29, 3, pp.429-60.

Gore, C., with contributions of Figueiredo, J. and Rodgers, G. [1995], 'Markets, Citizenship and Social Exclusion', in: Rodgers, G. Gore, C. Figueiredo, J.B eds., pp 1-40.

Gore, C., and J.B. Figueiredo. 1997. Social Exclusion and Anti-Poverty Policy: A Debate. International Institute for Labor Studies. Geneva: International Labour Office.

de Haan, A. [1997], 'Poverty and Social Exclusion: A Comparison of Debates', Poverty Research Unit Working Paper 2, University of Sussex, Brighton.

_____ [1998], 'Social Exclusion in Policy and Research: Operationalizing the Concept', in: Figueiredo and de Haan, eds.

Hashem 1996

IILS, International Institute for Labour Studies [1994], Overcoming Social Exclusion: A Contribution to the World Summit for Social Development, Geneva: IILS.

--- [1996], Social Exclusion and Anti-poverty Strategies. Research Project on the Patterns and Causes of Social Exclusion and the Design of Policies to Promote Integration: A Synthesis of Findings, Geneva: IILS.

Jackson, C. [1998], 'Social Exclusion and Gender: Does One Size Fit It All?', European Journal for Development Research.

Jordan, B. [1996], A Theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion, Oxford: Blackwell.

Kaijage, F., and A. Tibaijuka. [1996], Poverty and Social Exclusion in Tanzania, Geneva: IILS.

Katz, M.B., ed. 1993. The Underclass Debate: Views from History. Princeton,

N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Knack, S. [1999], *Social Capital, Growth and Poverty: A Survey of Cross-Country Evidence*, The World Bank, Social Capital Initiative, Working Paper No.7.

Lenoir, R. [1974], *Les Exclus: Un Francais sur Dix*, Paris: Editions de Seuil.

Lipton, M. 1996. *Successes in Anti-Poverty*, Issues in Development. ILO Discussion Paper 8. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Lipton, M. and M. Ravallion [1995], 'Poverty and Policy', in J. Behrman and T.N. Srinivasan (eds.), *Handbook of Development Economics*, vol. 3B, Amsterdam: North Holland.

Lipton, M., and Maxwell, S. [1992], *The New Poverty Agenda: An Overview*, IDS Discussion Paper No 306, Brighton: IDS.

Lipton, M. and A. de Haan [1997],

Lister, R. 1998. "From Equality to Social Inclusion: New Labor and the Welfare State." *Critical Social Policy* 18 (2): 215-5.

London Research Centre. 1996. *The Capital Divided. Mapping Poverty and Social Exclusion in London*. London.

Narayan, Deepa [1999], 'Complementarity and Substitution: Social Capital, Poverty Reduction and the State', World Bank, PREM.

Narayan, D. et al. [2000],

Narayan, D., and L. Pritchett [1997], *Cents and Sociability: Household Income and Social Capital in Rural Tanzania*, Policy Research Working Paper 1796, World Bank.

Parkinson, M. 1998. *Combating Social Exclusion. Lessons from Area-based Programs in Europe*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Phongpaichit, P., et al. [1996], *Challenging Social Exclusion: Rights and Livelihoods in Thailand*, Geneva: IILS.

Paugam, S. [1995], 'The Spiral of Precariousness: A Multidimensional Approach to the Process of Social Disqualification in France', in: Room, ed.

Powell, F. [1995], 'Citizenship and Social Exclusion', *Administration*, Vol.43, No.3, pp.23-35.

Power, A. and W.J. Wilson [2000], 'Social Exclusion and the Future of the Cities', CASE Paper 35, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE.

Putnam, R.D. [1993]. *Making democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Chichester: Princeton University Press.

Rodgers, G. (1993). 'What is Special About a Social Exclusion Approach?' in: Rodgers, G., Gore, C., and Figueiredo, J.B, eds., Part I, pp 43-55.

_____ (1995) 'The Design of Policy Against Exclusion', in Rodgers et al., pp. 253-282.

Rodgers, G., ed. (1995). *The Poverty Agenda and the ILO. Issues for Research and Action*. Geneva: ILO, 1995.

Rodgers, G., Gore, C. and Figueiredo, J.B. (1994). *Overcoming Exclusion: Livelihood and Rights in Economic and Social Development*. Geneva: IILS

Rodgers. G., C. Gore, J.B. Figueiredo, eds. [1995], *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, Geneva: International Labour Organisation.

Room, G., ed. [1995]. *Beyond the Threshold. The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Room, G. [1998], 'Social Exclusion, Solidarity, and the Challenge of Globalization', University of Bath.

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

Saith, Ruhi [2000], 'Social Exclusion: The Concepts and Its Operationalisation' Draft Paper, University of Oxford.

Scoones, I. [1998], *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis*, IDS Working Paper 72, Brighton.

Sen, A. [1977], 'Starvation and Exchange Entitlements: A general Approach and Its Implications to the Great Bengal Famine', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 1, 1.

_____ [1981], *Poverty and Famines: an Essay on Entitlement and Destitution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ [1998], 'Social Exclusion: A Critical Assessment of the Concept and Its Relevance' , Paper prepared for the Asian Development Bank, Manila, September 1998.

Shankland, A. [2000], *Analysing Policy for Sustainable Livelihoods*, IDS Research Report 49.

Silver, H. [1994], *Social Exclusion and Social Solidarity: Three Paradigms*, Geneva: IILS, Discussion Papers No 69.

---. 1997. "Poverty, Exclusion and Citizenship Rights." In Gore, C., and J.B. Figueiredo, eds. 1997. *Social Exclusion and Anti-Poverty Policy: A Debate*. International Institute for Labor Studies. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

---. 1998. "Policies to Reinforce Social Cohesion in Europe." In: J.B. Figueiredo and A. de Haan, eds. 1998. *Social Exclusion: An ILO Perspective*. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Silver, H. and F. Wilkinson [1995], *Policies to Combat Social Exclusion: A French-British Comparison*, Geneva: IILS, Discussion Papers Series No.83.

Tchernina, N. [1996], *Economic Transition and Social Exclusion in Russia*, Geneva: IILS.

Tibandebage, P., and M. Mackintosh [2000], 'Impoverishing Health Care: Charging, Access, and Exclusion in the Liberalised Tanzanian Health Care System', Paper for the Development Studies Association Annual Conference, LSE, November.

Townsend, P. [1979], *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

United Kingdom, Cabinet Office, Economic and Domestic Affairs Secretariat, Social Exclusion Unit. Social Exclusion Unit Web site [<http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/seu/>].

Wilkinson, R. [1997], *Unhealthy Societies: The Afflictions of Inequality*, Routledge.

World Bank, *World Development Reports 1990, 2000*, Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Yaqub, S. [2000], IDS