

# G.P. Manish

---

Department of Economics  
Suffolk University  
8 Ashburton Place  
Boston MA 02108  
Ph: 617 959 0311  
gpmanish@suffolk.edu  
www.gpmanish.com

## Education

- *Suffolk University*  
PhD Economics 2008-2012 (Expected)
- *Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune, India*  
M.A. Economics 2005-2007
- *Shri Ram College of Commerce, New Delhi, India*  
B.A. Economics 2002-2005

## Publications

### Refereed Journal Articles

“Central Economic Planning and India’s Economic Performance, 1951-65”  
*The Independent Review*, vol.16, no.2, Fall 2011. [Available online](#)

### Book Reviews

Review of Stevenson, L (2010), *Private Sector and Enterprise Development*,  
*Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*. Forthcoming.

### Book Chapters

“The Contributions of Austrian Economics to Development Economics” (with  
Benjamin Powell), *The Oxford Handbook in Austrian Economics*, eds. Peter  
Boettke and Christopher Coyne, Oxford University Press, 2012. *Invited*.

“Crime, Corruption and Economic Growth” (with Benjamin Powell and Malavika Nair).  
*Handbook of Crime and Economics*, eds. Bruce Benson and Paul Zimmermand.  
Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. 2010.

## **Working Papers**

- “Marginal Liberalization and Growth of Poor Quality: India in the 1980s”  
(*dissertation chapter*)
- “Indian Economic Performance in the Post-Reform Period” (*dissertation chapter*)
- “Austrian Capital Theory and Development Economics: The Contributions of Sudha Shenoy”
- “Criticisms of Bohm Bawerk’s Positive Theory of Capital: Their Influence on the Capital Theories of Hayek and Mises”
- “The Influence of John Bates Clark on Mises’ Price Theory”

## **Referee**

- The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics, June 2010
- The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics, July 2011

## **Fellowships and Awards**

- Charles. G. Koch Graduate Fellowship 2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011
- Mercatus Centre Visiting Dissertation Fellow, Fall 2011
- Award for Highest GPA 2008-09, Suffolk University
- Austrian Student Scholars’ Conference 2011 (third place winner)
- Ludwig Von Mises Institute Summer Fellowship 2010, 2011
- Douglas E. French Prize, Ludwig von Mises Institute, 2010
- Don Lavoie Graduate Student Essay Competition 2011 (One of three winners)

## Academic Presentations

- Graduate Student Paper Workshop, George Mason University, September 2011
- Association of Private Enterprise Education Conference, Nassau, Bahamas, April 2011
- Austrian Scholars Conference, Auburn, Alabama, March 2011
- Austrian Student Scholars' Conference, Grove City, Pennsylvania, February 2011
- Southern Economics Association Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, November 2010
- Association of Private Enterprise Education Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, April 2010
- Austrian Scholars Conference, Auburn, Alabama, March 2010

## Teaching

- Introduction to Microeconomics (ECON 101), Fall 2010
- Introduction to Microeconomics (ECON 101), Fall 2011

## Dissertation

**Title:** Central Planning, Market Reforms and Indian Economic Performance

**Chapter 1:** Central Economic Planning and India's Economic Performance, 1951-65

*Abstract:* The GDP growth rates recorded during the first 15 years of Indian planning are far higher than those recorded during the colonial era. The prevalent view amongst economists, therefore, is that the introduction of central economic planning caused a significant improvement in India's economic performance. This paper critiques this view. It argues that despite rather impressive GDP growth rates, the living standards of the masses stagnated during this period and thus the masses were not better off than they were under the colonial government. It also points out that, given the inherent economic irrationality of central planning, this period witnessed a massive misallocation of resources.

## **Chapter 2: Marginal Liberalization and Growth of Poor Quality: India in the 1980s**

*Abstract:* The growth spurt that the Indian economy experienced during the 1980s has led economists such as Rodrik and Subramaniam (2005) and DeLong (2001) to question the need for the pro-market reforms of the 1990s. Supporters of liberalization, most notably Panagariya (2004, 2008) and Desai (1999), have responded that the process of economic liberalization in India began in the late 1970s and continued throughout the 1980s, thus causing the growth spurt. This paper critiques both views. It argues that the economic policy changes initiated during the 1980s did not significantly weaken the state's hold on the production structure and that there was, at best, marginal liberalization. It also shows that the high per capita growth of GDP during this decade did not generate a significant improvement in the living standards of the broad masses of the nation. Thus, both sides of the debate are wrong. India remained a centrally planned economy during the 1980s, and despite the high GDP growth rates did not witness significant economic progress.

## **Chapter 3: Indian Economic Performance in the Post-Reform Period**

*Abstract:* DeLong (2001) and Rodrik and Subramaniam (2005) note that the high real per capita GDP growth rates recorded in India during the 1990s, post the market reforms, was not higher than the per capita growth rates recorded in the 1980s, when the economy was still centrally planned and was experiencing a growth spurt. Based on this evidence, they are skeptical if the market reforms of the 1990s were necessary to boost India's economic performance. Manish (2011) (*chapter 2 of dissertation*) argues that despite the high GDP growth rates, there was a stagnation in mass living standards during the 1980s. But has the high rate of economic growth in the post-reform period resulted in significant increases in the production of mass consumer goods and in the increased penetration of consumer goods that have so far been the preserve of the elite minority? This paper attempts to answer this question and therefore investigates whether the nature of economic growth is different post-liberalization as compared to the 1980s, i.e., whether the high growth rates of the post-reform period actually reflect an improvement in the living standards of the broad masses.

## References

Dr. Benjamin Powell  
Associate Professor  
Department of Economics  
Suffolk University  
8 Ashburton Place  
Boston MA 02108  
Ph: 617-573-8023  
Fax: 617-994-4216  
[bpowell@suffolk.edu](mailto:bpowell@suffolk.edu)

Dr. David G. Tuerck  
Professor and Chairperson  
Department of Economics  
Suffolk University  
8 Ashburton Place  
Boston MA 02108  
Ph: 617-573-8263  
Fax: 617-720-4272  
[dtuerck@beaconhill.org](mailto:dtuerck@beaconhill.org)

Dr. Jonathan Haughton  
Professor  
Department of Economics  
Suffolk University  
8 Ashburton Place  
Boston MA 02108  
Ph: 617-573-8127  
Fax: 617-994-4216  
[jonathan.haughton@suffolk.edu](mailto:jonathan.haughton@suffolk.edu)