



Real crisis

NSSO jobs data negates demographic dividend

Just a day after two senior members of the National Statistical Commission (NSC) resigned, alleging that the government had withheld the release of a survey on the status of unemployment in the country, a report in *Business Standard* said that according to the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS), conducted by the National Sample Survey Office (NSSO), the unemployment rate stood at a 45-year high of 6.1 per cent in 2017-18. The joblessness rate among the youth was at a significantly high level compared to the previous years and, as the report stated, “much higher compared to that in the overall population”. For instance, the rate of joblessness among rural males in the age group of 15-29 years jumped more than three times to 17.4 per cent in 2017-18 compared to 5 per cent in 2011-12. Similarly, the unemployment rate for the female youth in rural areas was 13.6 per cent in 2017-18 compared to 4.8 per cent in 2011-12. The situation got worse in urban areas, with the unemployment rates being 18.7 per cent for males and 27.2 per cent for females. The sharp drop in the employment rate, one of the lowest in the world, shows a real crisis, and completely negates India’s demographic dividend if people are not in the labour force. This was the first time that the NSSO conducted the PLFS — an annual survey mapping unemployment. Earlier, the NSSO used to conduct quinquennial surveys, which the government decided to do away with and opted for the PLFS. This is a good move because annual surveys provide a closer trace of unemployment. Moreover, the five-yearly surveys used to come with a lag of over one or two years, thus marring timely analysis.

On Thursday, the government said it was just a draft report and further work needed to be done before release. But the point is that despite the change in duration, the concepts of unemployment used in the PLFS are the same as those in all the previous quinquennial surveys. That is why the draft report stacks the unemployment rates of the PLFS as well as all the quinquennial rounds going all the way back to 1972-73. To be sure, the unemployment rates — based on Usual Status (principal status + subsidiary status) — across rural and urban males and females have shown a sudden and spectacular spike in 2017-18. It is true that as the full report is not available, it is unclear if the methodological factors such as the sample size and sampling design have reduced comparability. For instance, the quinquennial Employment-Unemployment Survey had a single country-wide sample, involving 100,000 households. The PLFS, being an annual survey, could have been on a smaller sample. Indeed, the official website suggests that the PLFS will have two separate samples — one for rural and another for urban areas — which will be refreshed in differing time-periods.

However, none of this should take away from the broader point. The government has been stalling the publication of an NSSO survey, which, it now transpires, presents an alarming picture of joblessness in India. Given that the field work for the collection of data was done between July 2017 and June 2018, these findings are significant because they confirm anecdotal evidence that economic activity took a big hit in the wake of the demonetisation move in November 2016.

Good news or bad?

Revised estimates suggest GDP grew at 8.2% during note ban

The Union Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation has released its revised estimates of national income for 2017-18, in advance of the Union Budget due to be presented on Friday. Growth in real gross domestic product (GDP) at constant 2011-12 prices for that fiscal year is now pegged at 7.2 per cent as distinct from to 6.7 per cent in the advance estimates. Somewhat surprisingly, the second revised estimates of GDP growth at constant prices in 2016-17, the year of demonetisation, have been revised upwards by over a percentage point, from 7.1 per cent to 8.2 per cent. Relatively slow growth in 2017-18, when compared to 2016-17, is explained by the Central Statistics Office as due to a slowdown in manufacturing, communications, agriculture and mining.

Taken at face value, this data can be seen as both good news and bad news. On the one hand, it appears that growth immediately following the demonetisation exercise of November 2016 was not too badly affected. On the other hand, it appears there might have been something of a deceleration following high growth in 2016-17. Looking at the other side of the picture, gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) — a commonly used indicator of investment — as a proportion of gross domestic product went up marginally from 28.2 per cent to 28.6 per cent in the two years under consideration. However, much of this was driven by government spending, and the proportion of household investment in GFCF fell. In other words, it is not clear that private investment recovery had taken hold in 2017-18. It is also worth considering that this data suggests that the impact of demonetisation was far more staggered than previously believed. Anecdotal reports and qualitative studies suggesting that it is still having an impact on the availability of money and thus price-setting in rural areas should, therefore, be investigated with greater care.

While it may always appear good news that the economy has in the past been growing at more than 8 per cent a year, it is nevertheless necessary to examine this data carefully. The fact is that demonetisation was traumatic and all other forms of high-frequency data do not corroborate the notion that the economy was growing at 8 per cent during that financial year. Given the new and controversial back series for GDP data with 2011-12 as a base year, it is also worth considering that this second revision suggests that the economy during the year of demonetisation was growing at rates comparable to, and in cases higher than, the boom years of the 2000s. This does not completely pass the smell test. In December last year, the government announcement regarding the back series of GDP data with 2011-12 as the base year created a huge controversy. The back series, which provided the GDP growth data from 2004-05 to 2010-11, seemed to run contrary to all the other available evidence for the years in question, raising doubts on the ability of the back series to accurately reflect what happened during those years. With the latest GDP data, questions that were being asked about the credibility of official data will now become even louder and more pressing. The government must take these concerns on board.

ILLUSTRATION BY BINAY SINHA



What not to do in a corporate crisis

Putting out the right information in a crisis is not easy to do. But by being open and direct one can restore some of the lost credibility

One had assumed that corporate communications in India (world’s fastest growing economy) had advanced beyond the pleading and begging of public relations. The latter is when firms try to sell a story to the media, usually about a product or a service. There is no exchange of money involved, at least officially, and so it is necessary to be in the position of a supplicant. Every PR person has had the experience of being kept waiting outside the editor’s office.

The former, corporate communications, is more serious and aimed at creating a favourable view of the organisation in the minds of consumers and investors. The question is: Has it kept up with the pace of the economy and the size of it? I ask because it could be argued such communication is still executed by multi-billion dollar businesses in a crisis as if they were mom and pop shops.

Two examples from recent days will serve nicely to illustrate what is being discussed. On January 29, the investigative website, *Cobrapost*, published a report accusing Dewan Housing Finance Corporation’s promoters of “siphoning off ₹31,000 crore of public money.”

The sums involved are astonishing and to the ordinary person quite incomprehensible. However, our interest here is not on whether or not there was a crime but how the company responded. The allegations were made in a very detailed, extremely long report which one presumed the company would in turn rebut in detail. What it did instead was to issue to *Cobrapost* a note which was made public. Parts of it read:

“Kind attention: Team Cobrapost, We received your captioned email at 8.27 am today, with a follow up reminder one hour later, seeking answers on 64 detailed questions containing not only false but also wholly unjustified innuendos and

allegations. It is surprising as to why you have even sought explanations, considering that you had already arranged this press conference on Friday, 25th January 2019, with a pre-determined view that you are exposing a ‘financial scam’. You have already planned to defame us with many false and scurrilous allegations and even possibly to disrupt the current financial market equilibrium. Your request for explanations a few hours prior to the press conference only shows that you do not heed to any ethical journalistic practices.

It is also curious that a few weeks ago we were informed of a complaint filed with a Magistrate Court by some unknown person containing similar scurrilous allegations, which is yet pending. Copy of this complaint was sent to us precognizance, for which we immediately filed a criminal complaint. Copies of this complaint have also been circulating in the system. And now your press conference makes similar allegations. Isn’t the timing of the press conference curious? Just half an hour before the stock market closes. What is the real intent here? Expose? Or something else?

Obviously, your intentions do not appear to be in the spirit of investigative journalism. The allegations are mischievous and made with mala fide intent to damage the goodwill and reputation of DHFL, resulting in erosion of shareholder value, and to disrupt the market equilibrium, which is just about stabilising.”

The note is signed by “Nodal Officer” and ends with a paragraph about DHFL’s high rating and what I read as a mild threat to sue. Is this the sort of communication that a company accused of committing “India’s biggest financial scam” ought to have put out? It is not sophisticated and actually quite crude. The markets gave their judgement and the stock has crashed (it lost another 17 per cent on Thursday).

The second crisis communication is from the chair-



REPLY TO ALL

AAKAR PATEL

There is no Sino-American trade war

The current conflict between the United States and China is not a trade war. Although the US has a large trade deficit with China, that is not the reason why it is imposing high tariffs on imports from China and threatening to increase them further after the end of the current 90-day truce on March 1. The purpose of those tariffs is to induce China to end its policy of stealing US technology.

The Chinese government refers to the conflict as a trade war because it hopes that buying large quantities of American products will lead the US to end its tariffs. The Chinese negotiators have recently offered to buy enough US products to reduce the trade deficit to zero by 2024. Tellingly, the US negotiators have rejected that as a way to end the dispute.

The US wants China to stop requiring American firms that seek to do business in China to have a Chinese partner and to share their technology with that partner. That policy is explicitly forbidden by World Trade Organization rules, which China has been obliged to respect since they joined the WTO in 2001. The Chinese deny that they are violating that rule, arguing that US firms are not being forced to share technology: they do so voluntarily in order to have access to the Chinese market and to Chinese production opportunities. But American firms regard China’s behaviour as a form of extortion.

The US also wants China to stop using cyber

espionage to steal technology and other industrial secrets from American companies. Chinese President Xi Jinping agreed to end such digital theft of US industrial technology after he met with President Barack Obama in 2015. Unfortunately, the agreement reached at the time was very narrow, referring only to theft by both governments. Although the agreement did lead to a temporary reduction in cyber theft of industrial technology, cyber-attacks on US companies, possibly carried out by Chinese state-owned industries and other sophisticated organisations, have increased again in recent years.

The Chinese use the stolen technology to compete with US firms in China and in other parts of the world. The US Trade Representative recently estimated that this technology theft is costing the US economy \$225-600 billion per year. And the FBI has asserted that China’s cyber theft of American technology is the “most severe” threat to US national security.

Likewise, a lengthy 142-page report on the US-China conflict by the US Chamber of Commerce and the American Chamber of Commerce in China emphasised the problem of technology theft. The report made no reference at all to the trade balance.

That, no doubt, is because the authors understand the basic economic fact that the overall US global trade imbalance is the result of economic conditions in the US — the excess of investment over savings. If the Chinese bought enough US

goods to eliminate the bilateral imbalance, the US imbalance would merely shift to other countries, without reducing the overall imbalance. The US tariffs are clearly hurting the Chinese economy. The Chinese stock market is down substantially, and the Chinese economy is growing more slowly. Annual real (inflation-adjusted) GDP growth in the fourth quarter of 2018 was down to just 4 per cent. The Chinese authorities are making statements signaling their eagerness to conclude an agreement with the US in order to stop the economic slowdown and reverse the decline in the Chinese stock market. The White House also makes positive statements about the negotiation, because doing so appears to boost the US stock market. But the reality is that there is no progress yet in dealing with the fundamental problem of technology theft.

The US government has no desire to stop China’s economic growth or the growth of its high-tech industries. But stealing technology is wrong. It has gone on for too long and should not be allowed to continue.

The US is determined to stop it. If nothing is resolved by March 1, the US will raise the tariff on \$200 billion of Chinese exports from 10 per cent to 25 per cent. That will hurt the Chinese economy further and cause the Chinese authorities to take the US demands more seriously — and to negotiate accordingly.

The writer is, professor of Economics at Harvard University and President Emeritus of the National Bureau of Economic Research, chaired President Ronald Reagan’s Council of Economic Advisers from 1982 to 1984. ©2019 Project Syndicate



MARTIN FELDSTEIN

A victim’s comeback



BOOK REVIEW

MANAVI KAPUR

When I picked up Nadia Murad’s *The Last Girl*, I wondered if it would be any different from other books by refugees who fled from war-torn Iraq and Syria. It is oddly familiar yet distinct enough to make it a page-turner. Ms Murad’s prose describes atrocities that have now become part of the refugee-crisis discourse. And yet, the social and cultural history of the perpetually margin-

lenges within the context of the conflicted Yazidi community. Both the Sunni Arabs and Sunni Kurds have looked at the Yazidids with suspicion and Kocho, Ms Murad’s village, was surrounded by those who considered the Yazidids *kuffar*, or “unbelievers or worthy of killing”. Ms Murad writes that she never thought there would be a home outside Kocho and this simplicity is beguiling especially when one looks at in context of the constantly looming violence and centuries of Yazidi persecution. And though there is simplicity, there is no room for naïveté in the narrative, a consequence of the unimaginable cruelty that Ms Murad faced at the hands of her captors.

The book is divided into three parts. Ms Murad talks about her childhood and life in Kocho in the first. This section is a priceless primer of Yazidi history and the author uses her simple filial ties to explain the traditions, superstitions and oral religious stories. Her brothers and sisters are humans first and players in the geopolit-

ical drama later.

The second section is the most gruesome and heart wrenching. Ms Murad details how she and her sisters were taken by IS militants, sold from one soldier to another on the deep web as slaves, or *sabiyyas*, and were stripped of all sense of dignity, respect and belonging. The *sabiyyas*, though separated by these dehumanising circumstances, were united in their ghostly experiences. Ms Murad writes that every *sabiyya* has a story like hers. “You can’t imagine the atrocities the ISIS is capable of until you hear about them from your sisters and cousins, your neighbours and schoolmates, and you realise that it wasn’t that you were particularly unlucky...”

Ms Murad doesn’t shy from detailing her experiences. Voices like Ms Murad’s help people understand the consequence of war. But more importantly, her account gives a spine-chilling insight into the workings of IS and their disturbed desire to gain power through sexual violence.

Ms Murad’s simple and direct prose only drives this point home more strongly.

The third section is devoted to her journey to freedom and how she escaped her captors. There is no suspense here and it is a well-established fact that she escaped safely. And yet, it makes for a page-turner, especially since she did not allow the atrocities she suffered to paralyse her spirit. In the middle of the second section, she writes, “The rape was the worst part. It stripped us of our humanity and made thinking about the future — returning to Yazidi society, marrying, having children, being happy — impossible. We wished they would kill us instead.” And yet, she finds the courage to escape. She was left alone in the house of her captor with the door unlocked and with no guards only because he was sure he had broken her spirit. But, as Ms Murad says, “They thought they had me forever. They were wrong.”

The third and final section is the story of Ms Murad’s miraculous escape. She

found the determination and the hope to find a better life for herself and her family. She eventually emigrated to Germany and became a human rights activist. It is here she met her lawyer Amal Clooney and together they have fought to bring world leaders to treat IS’s crimes as genocide. Her, story, she writes, is her only weapon against terrorism. “I want to be the last girl in the world with a story like mine,” Ms Murad concludes.

The third section leaves one wanting more detail and that is the one quibble with this book. Otherwise, Ms Murad’s voice and tone never falter and every point in her life’s story is nothing short of inspirational.

**THE LAST GIRL: My story of captivity and my fight against the Islamic State**  
Nadia Murad (with Jenna Krajeski)  
Hachette India  
₹499; 306 pages