AN ANALYSIS OF TEN YEARS' WORTH OF RESEARCH ON RURAL INDIA'S ECONOMIC GROWTH AND POPULATION CHANGE

Naresh Rani
Govt P.G college Hisar
sihagchhotu@gmail.com

Abstract:

This summary summarizes programs and research on population change and rural Indian economic growth. It highlights key study methods, findings, and policy implications. The goal is to illuminate the complex linkages between rural population changes and economic development, which affect India's socio-economic environment.

Over the previous several decades, rural India has seen rapid economic growth, technological advances, and demographic shifts. Researchers and policymakers must understand how these two crucial factors affect rural communities.

Population change and rural Indian economic growth have been studied quantitatively and qualitatively. These studies analyzed demographic trends, economic indicators, and development efforts utilizing government surveys, censuses, and large-scale household surveys.

Economic growth may cause population shift in rural India via many methods, according to study. When rural populations have better infrastructure, jobs, education, and healthcare, fertility rates drop, out-migration rises, and urbanization occurs. Economic growth may also attract job-seekers and improvers.

Population change does not cause economic growth. Researchers say cultural norms, social networks, government laws, and regional variables affect this link. These characteristics commonly affect rural economic development and demographic shifts.

These results underscore the need of comprehensive rural development strategies. Economic growth strategies should support infrastructure, healthcare, social welfare, and education investments. Uplifting women, expanding family planning facilities, and addressing regional inequalities can assist rural India attain sustainable population outcomes.

Keywords*:- Indian economic, population, development.*

INTRODUCTION

Although there is a large body of literature in natural resource economics that population growth and economic development can negatively affect renewable environmental resources1, few studies have empirically explored these relationships at the country level or over a long enough time to allow these complex interlinkages to manifest. In this chapter, I discuss a study I did with two colleagues, many research assistants, and experts from several domains. The 30-year research evaluated forest change with population and economic development in India. fresh insights into these relationships have arisen since the study began 10 years ago, requiring fresh methodologies.

This chapter summarizes the study and analyzes its general findings concerning people-environment relationships. The chapter has five sections. The first portion emphasizes theory and the challenge of proving environmental externalities to population growth. This section also highlights the model's foundation for analyzing how population growth and technology advances affect forest cover. After describing the key results, the study's data is discussed. I conclude with a key idea: selecting the correct analytical scales.

THEORY

Recent development economics research has highlighted the importance of local-level processes, such as agricultural encroachment and product extraction through firewood collection and animal grazing, which are heavily influenced by the fact that forest resources in most developing countries are not privately owned (Dasgupta, 1995; Filmer and Pritche). Recent study has shown the relevance of local-level dynamics in deforestation in poor nations, despite global economic factors. The non-private ownership of pasture, garbage, and forest lands has sparked two inquiries:
if forest activities are based on a "tragedy of the commons" (Hardin, 1968);

(2) Whether overpopulation exacerbated this calamity (Lee, 1991). These analyses demonstrate that municipal institutions have managed many common property resources successfully, despite the belief that fast population increase depletes them. Thus, Jodha (1985:247) argued that fast population expansion has been "mediated by institutional factors and often overshadowed by pressures arising from changing market conditions."
The considerable economic literature on how well emerging countries manage common lands like forests discusses forest area selection very little. This literature's main flaw is that it ignores population growth, consumer demand for forest products, and the possibility that forest area will be significantly influenced by relative returns to forests versus other land uses. These exclusions are unjustifiable given current forestation and deforestation rates in affluent and poor countries. In particular, private owners' investment choices in some areas (such as the northwest United States) and declines in agricultural returns in other areas (such as New England) due to changing labor costs, a key input in extracting forests, and shifting consumer demand for forest products have contributed to the recent expansion of forests in the developed world (Sedjo, 1995). Thus, a study of deforestation must include land, labor, and forest product markets and land management practices.
Our forest study began with the need to evaluate forest resource management and predict population change from management failures. The long-running debate about environmental resources as externalities to childbearing centers on whether a couple fully considers the effects of their childbearing on environmental resources and, therefore, on the wellbeing of other couples when deciding how many children to have. Demographic and environmental policy depend on this answer. If couples don't consider these ramifications, family planning services should be publicly funded.
Environmental policy might benefit from understanding the key natural resource management flaws that cause these external effects.
This suggests that if open-access environmental resources are significantly correlated with the cost of raising children or their long-term economic prospects, then the rate of childbearing may be higher than if these resources were rationed through the market. Environmental degradation may increase incentives for childbearing, creating a vicious cycle in which higher rates of environmental degradation promote higher population growth and higher population growth increases environmental degradation (Nerlove, 1991). As natural resources grow scarcer, families must be able to replace.
Even if reverse causality is addressed, proving that population affects forest cover or that forest cover affects population does not establish an externality that could be used to justify fertility interventions on efficiency grounds. Markets or other comparable systems must not

directly mediate these effects. Even in formal marketplaces, price data is hard to collect when many market transactions are bargainable. Sometimes, behavior's costs can't be measured. Under these situations, social controls may create market-like outcomes. As said, there is a lot of evidence that local groups may manage the use of common resources without direct monetary price or government involvement.

Setting up a basic model based on the concept that forest land may be managed like agricultural land was an early and critical decision in this research. Because we needed a framework to separate the multiple elements affecting population growth, technological improvement, and forest cover, we chose this model. The model proposes an empirical approach to separate these components, emphasizing how population increase and technology improvement affect forest commodities demand and labor costs. The model is also used to evaluate more complicated models that account for market flaws or other government aims than revenue maximization.

The benchmark model assumes that the relative nontradability of many forest products between villages distinguishes them from other agricultural commodities.3 Kindling and fodder, which have high volume-to-value ratios, are unlikely to cross village lines. The model is common for agricultural goods and varies from standard models of the economics of forestry, which focus on forest expansion and management due to biophysical constraints.

Population variations impact forest product supply and demand due to the nontradability assumption. Population growth, whether through bigger or more households, increases labor supply. If there are more workers for a piece of land, incomes will drop and land rentals would rise. The relative labor intensity of agricultural and forest products will force land to be reallocated between forest commodities and agricultural goods as economic returns to land and labor vary. However, a bigger village population typically raises village revenue, which increases demand for forest items.

Separating supply and demand consequences is challenging yet necessary. Separating these consequences may help assess forest resource management. If well-maintained forests create local nontradables like fuel and feed, local demand should raise local supply and expand forest acreage. However, unmanaged forests may utilize non-sustainable resource exploitation to meet rising demand for forest products.

If household size significantly affects per capita forest product demand, comparing the effects of increasing household size and increasing population for a given household size may help us understand this issue. As expected, firewood use should decrease as home size increases for a given population. Given equilibrium land prices, wages, household income, and the number of households, comparing how household size impacts forest product demand and forest acreage provides an indirect measure of forest area management.

This model was used to test forest resource management assumptions. Despite this market failure, forest areas were selected to improve local welfare. This model concluded that private owners wouldn't desire forest land since they couldn't rent it. Thus, communal access to forest commodities required public ownership or control of forest land. Another idea considered using forest acreage to secretly transfer resources to low-income households. This model assumed that forest coverage in a town affected forest product prices and revenues. Since poor households are net labor suppliers and may consume different forest products, increasing forest area may shift economic resources. These models showed certain demographic and environmental resource prediction links and validated the test for successful commons resource management. It was astonishing how frequently the qualitative predictions of the ideal markets model were likely to come true even in models with imperfect markets.

DATA

As mentioned, the initial motivation for this project was to investigate population-forest interaction mechanisms, but it became clear during the analysis that even the most basic descriptive analyses had not yet been performed on a data set with the geographic and temporal scale developed in this project. Much of the information on the relationship between economic well-being and forest cover (e.g., Cropper and Griffiths, 1984) was derived from cross-national studies and could not account for differences in land quality, among other factors, that might affect forest cover and economic well-being in different geographic locations. Thus, it is uncertain whether agroclimatic factors like soil quality explain wealth, population density, and forest cover. Given the diversity of economic systems and economic integration, it is uncertain whether the mechanisms underlying these variables are consistent across countries. The few extensive longitudinal forest cover maps available either have little spatial diversity or cannot be matched to representative household survey data. Our study uses a 30-year panel data set in a rural Indian sample that may be linked to local forest cover measures to circumvent these challenges.

Population growth and forest change are best studied in India. First, India has minimal primary forest, making forest change a national policy issue. Forests have traditionally helped humans survive by providing fuel and fodder (Dasgupta, 1995). The World Bank has identified India as a key test case for cooperative forest management, in which local people have some control over national forest reserves (Kumar et al., 2000).

India has ecological, ethnic, and economic diversity. Ecological variability in India causes a large spatial and temporal variation in agricultural production growth. It provides a platform for assessing the relationship between agricultural output development and forest cover. This natural variety may cause inference problems. Although 95% of India's woods are tropical, they vary from mangrove forests near the coast to rain forests in drier areas. Thus, regional biological constraints on forest growth vary greatly. This suggests that cross-sectional relationships between population, economic success, and forest cover are likely quite misleading. Regional variations in population and economic change reflect state-level economic policies that have caused income growth to vary across the nation and cultural attitudes, such as women's status, that may affect fertility decline (Dyson and Moore, 1983). Despite these discrepancies, India has strong economic integration, with states having essentially equal trade-related restrictions at borders and well-equilibrated tradable prices (such as grains) internally. Thus, fundamental mechanisms in various communities throughout the country presumably connect agricultural productivity to forest cover similarly.

The National Council of Applied Economic study (NCAER) in Delhi, India, collected 30-year panel survey data for the study. In the 1968–1969 growing season, the first study examined the impact of this concerted attempt to boost agricultural productivity on farm incomes. A clustered stratified random sample of rural Indian houses was surveyed. 5,115 households were picked from 259 villages in 100 districts in India's 17 biggest states. It oversampled populations in districts or sections of districts that participated in two programs—Intensive Agricultural Areas Programme and International Associate Development Program—that were well-suited to high-yielding cultivars. Each hamlet's census included household income. Income stratified families were oversampled. Surveys were taken the following two crop years. Comprehensive village and household statistics initially became available in 1971.

Due to sample attrition and nonresponse, 4,527 houses were interviewed. In 1982, 4,979 families in 250 of the original villages (Assam was removed) were surveyed. Two-thirds were the same households as in 1971. Reinterviewing families required the original household or head to be alive. Only the household with the original household head was questioned after a breakup. Village households made up the final third of the 1982 sample to assure rural representation.

251 original villages (Jammu and Kashmir excluded) were questioned in 1999. In this scenario, 7,474 households were surveyed, including the 1982 hamlet households and any split-off homes. Because a complete census was created in each survey year and can be linked using names and relationships over time, the interviewers should have tracked all splitoff households in the villages and identified households that left the study villages. Before calculating follow-up rates, the census lists must be computerized, which is now ongoing. Proxy responses from current household residents' relatives provide information on out-migrant households. Every cycle, weights are supplied to guarantee that summary measures are representative at the village level and, barring any new villages, of the rural population.

data are based on administrative records of land devoted to forest, and it was again Data on income, expenditure, household members, and a demographic module on fertility, health, and death are collected. Agricultural inputs and outputs by seed type and crop are well documented. Village modules include information about local programs, normal yields, infrastructure, jobs, industry, wages, and pricing.

We also calculated nearest-station rainfall values from our geocoding of settlements and meteorological stations. 40 Indian weather stations provided monthly rainfall data. Plate 10 shows the sample communities and weather stations used to gather rainfall data.

The census figures contain hamlet woodland data from the original data. The project's early stages showed that this data was inadequate. In particular, the measure was limited to the village's administrative area rather than a fixed catchment area, and it was unclear whether the criteria used to report forest cover were comparable across areas, whether it included forest reserves that did not always have standing trees, or whether it included plantation forest. District-level forest cover figures in India may not accurately reflect tree stock. Additionally, district-level variation would prohibit us from benefitting from village-level economic diversity. Thus, we examined forest recovery using satellite images.

To offer regionally and temporally consistent village-level forest cover evaluations using remote sensing photographs, it needed a lot of time and work. Satellite photographs have changed most. Landsat I's 1974 photographs only covered four bands and weren't digital. We predicted 70 scenarios based on picture size and community locations.

Manually scan and register the needed photos. Data storage was another challenge given the technology. In the early 1980s, these pictures were seldom accessible. Landsat pictures were available since the early 1990s, but they were too expensive and had to be replaced by lower-quality shots. The 1999 Landsat 7 images we utilized were digital, affordable, and high-quality. Resampling all photographs to 500 meters yielded a similar time series.

This series' forest measurements needed supervised classification and verification. Given India's ecological diversity and the number of images, we used the Normalized Differentiated Vegetation Index (NDVI) (Rouse et al., 1974) to measure forest density. Our research employed two NDVI summary measures. The first was the proportion of pixels above 0.2 within 10 km of the village center. The second was the radius-wide NDVI average. Some worry that the NDVI's relationship with forest cover may not be monotone (Wulder, 1998). Given the focus and context of our experiment, a detailed comparison of NDVI in one region of the research area with more precise and trustworthy forest cover estimations showed that this was not a substantial concern (Firestone, 2000).

RESULTS

Two papers—one published (Foster and Rosenzweig, 2003) and one under review (Foster, Rosenzweig, and Behrman, 2003)—present our primary results. The first component discusses this investigation's surprise discovery that India's rural forest cover has expanded dramatically during the previous 30 years. We assumed that India, like other developing nations, was losing its forests when we began this research. We felt that administrative land classification, not tree growth, had increased India's forest area. Our first two waves of satellite pictures showed some improvements in forest cover, but we focused on regional variances. We were feared that the satellite and storage medium utilized in the prior two rounds may have caused forest cover fluctuations. The third satellite image wave confirmed this good trend. The 1974–1982 statistics were adjusted to resolve concerns about image quality changes, confirming the trend. Several unrelated sources supported this finding of growing forest cover.

The satellite imagery time series of tree coverage for India, shown in the figure, shows that forest coverage has increased from just over 10% in 1971 to over 24% in 1999, lagging behind officially designated forest land.

This forest cover increase is unusual relative to economic and population expansion in the studied localities. Between 1971 and 1999, the average population in the investigated villages rose 90%, from 2,033 to 3,877. Family income rose 83% from 2,846 to 5,214 rupees in 1982. Real salaries rose 150 percent from 6.7 to 16.7 rupees in 1982. At least nationally, population and economic activity growth and forest cover rise harmoniously.

To determine the causes of India's forest growth, we examined many possibilities. The statistical study's primary aim was to estimate a set of equations relating a village's forest cover to agricultural production, household size, population number, and infrastructural metrics. We used fixed effects to account for unmeasured differences in meteorological conditions and biophysical constraints across communities. Problems arise when soil conditions improve forest growth, agricultural production, and population density. In the cross-section, these variables may affect population and agricultural production. For certain soil conditions, increasing agricultural output would tend to diminish forest cover, although the cross-sectional connection between agricultural productivity and forest cover may be positive. In the cross-section, tripling agricultural productivity increases the village's tree cover by 5 points. However, using differences and instrumenting to account for the fact that actual farm yields estimate the true projected yields with inaccuracy at a given period, we found that doubling agricultural output reduced forest acreage by 30 points.

Our results rule out three of the primary ideas attempted to explain this literature change. First, India's increasing seed yield has not lessened the need for agricultural land and accelerated forest growth. As agricultural land yields increase, one has an incentive to convert additional forest area to agriculture and export the excess. Over the research period, Indian grain markets have integrated with world prices. As noted, data shows this influence. Forest cover decreased greatest where agricultural productivity rose fastest.

Second, despite some evidence to the contrary, family income, household size, and the returns to traditional agricultural land suggest that rural wage increases have not appreciably affected forest cover. One's forest management model strongly determines whether they believe salary increases should affect forest cover. However, if the main cause of forest decline is unsustainable extraction of forest resources (e.g., cutting trees for firewood or fodder beyond the capacity of the forests to regenerate), rising wages will generally reduce this extraction and increase forests because they will create more jobs. Given family income and agricultural land returns, a wage rise would depend on how sensitive forest product consumption is to the effective price if the forest area is managed as an agricultural resource. Wages grow, therefore labor needed to extract forest resources decreases. Forest product production decreases. If forest product demand is relatively price sensitive, prices will rise but forest volume will not. If forest product prices don't change demand, they'll need to rise to cover the higher labor costs. Thus, retaining land as a forest yields a high return, and more land may be converted from agriculture to forestry.

Third, local prosperity has little effect on forest cover. The theoretical effects again depend on forest management and, in this case, how family income affects forest product demand. Wood items used in dwellings and furnishings may increase as affluence grows, yet firewood need may decrease. If local supply must largely match local demand, money-driven demand would effect the forest area differently depending on how forest resources are managed. Higher wages may raise demand for environmental quality, such as larger or better forests, or the capacity to pay for their conservation. under sustainable forest resource extraction, demand increases (decreases) forest acreage, and vice versa under nonsustainable management.

After examining these three theories, we propose a different explanation: the increase in forest area is primarily due to the national demand for wood and paper products and trade restrictions that prevented these goods from being imported until recently. Many facts support this perspective. First, India's plantation forests have increased, making a large amount of its woodlands agricultural commodities. Second, wood and paper consumption has grown far faster than net imports. Third, the nation's low forest cover and protections limit suppliers' ability to meet this demand by chopping old-growth forests. Finally, income growth and forest growth are strongly correlated at the international level in countries with relatively closed economies (i.e., those with significant trade barriers), but not in countries with relatively open economies, where trade meets demand changes (Foster and Rosenzweig, 2003).

Given market systems and conditions, population and economic growth have increased forest cover, contrary to popular belief. This broad pattern of consequences is driven by national demand for forest products, although regional population increase may negatively influence forest cover.

Our findings suggest that population has a variety of effects on forest cover and that it is important to distinguish between population growth caused by an increase in the number of households and population growth caused by an increase in household size, as Liu did in the Chinese Wolong Nature Reserve. As discussed in the theory section, the structure of demand for, the technology of production of, and the management of forest resources affect how household size and number affect forest cover. These factors cannot be determined theoretically. For a given number of families, increasing household size has minimal effect. Forest area decreases by 4 points when households double. For a given family size, doubling the number of dwellings increases forest land by 9 points. The household effect is observed after adjusting for wages and land prices, suggesting that it is not due to the fact that more families increase labor supply. As envisaged in the basic model, local production meets some local demand for forest goods.

Due to scale effects, household size may affect forest product demand and forest land. Another indicator of poor forest management is the average drop in forest area with family size.

In our second study (Foster, Rosenzweig, and Behrman, 2003), we examine how local commons management of forest land impacts agricultural production, population, wages, and forest acreage. Popularly owned forest land negatively impacts forests more than other locations. We reject the benchmark model's premise that increasing family size, which increases demand for forest commodities, should increase forest acreage in places where forests are commonly owned. In areas without forest management, this conclusion is accepted. These data suggest a distinct demarcation between traditional forest commons and privately owned and managed forest regions like plantation forests.

SCALE

This study's key universal theme is the crucial link between topic type and analysis size. The work's restrictions and power stem from this size concern.

Addressing this challenge requires distinguishing between scale and unit of analysis. The research area's underlying source of variation is the unit of analysis. This chapter defines scale as the data's geographic coverage. Thus, a unit of analysis may be a person, a family, a town, a district, or a state.

The analysis scale must be reasonably constant for a mechanism to be statistically detected. Let's examine a method linking village population growth to forest changes. This circumstance requires analyzing a set of villages, such as a country, with different population growth rates. whether the unit and size of analysis are smaller than this, it is difficult to determine whether population growth strains surrounding woodlands. This analysis only works if the mechanism is nearly consistent throughout the inquiry. If population and forest cover vary among villages, comparing them would not support such a process.

Market size and data availability have greatly affected our work's analytical scale. First, determine whether income affects fuel and wood product demand. For instance, exchanging firewood between families in the same village is easy, but between households in other villages is harder. Based on the first premise, households in the same hamlet should have similar firewood costs. The second assumption causes village-specific unit costs. Given these two premises and the unavailability of precise estimates of firewood costs, within-village variation in firewood consumption is the best measure of income sensitivity of forest product demand. Thus, the house and village should be the proper analytical units and scales.

Let's discuss what scale to use to assess how Indian agriculture's technical advances have affected forest cover. In this context, we presume that grains are entirely marketable across villages and even nations, therefore each village and India as a whole may take grain prices as given. Comparing forest growth rates in places with different agricultural productivity increases may help determine how to allocate land between conventional agriculture and forests. Thus, the village is the analytical unit and the country the scale. Without the assumption that there is just one market in the country, it would be difficult to discern between supply and demand effects. That is, the measured impact would represent the direct effects of agricultural productivity on the relative productivity of agricultural land less the local price loss, which is determined by how sensitive agricultural product demand is to price fluctuations. Due to demand and supply consequences, India, a significant grain producer and consumer, cannot accept world grain prices. In this case, the measured impact of the Green Revolution would only consider the production impact on forests and ignore the possibility that, other factors being equal, the Green Revolution in India may have contributed to a global grain price decrease, reducing the incentive to convert forested land to agricultural use.

Finally, consider the assertion that India's demand for wood and paper products drove forest cover growth throughout the 30-year study period. Even though paper markets in India are effectively connected, there is no evidence that a rise in paper products demand increases forest cover. In an interconnected market, paper products demand is independent of local supply. India's paper products demand is stable. The only method to directly test the notion is to analyze nations using the set of countries as the scale. Even this comparison does not hold true for relatively open economies since one needs the frictions caused by a lack of openness to establish whether increased paper products demand substantially affects forest cover.

From this viewpoint, comprehending the multiple scaling up/down processes is crucial. The fact that village family size generally lowers forest cover does not imply that national household size will do the same. In a closed economy, population expansion driven by paper product demand may increase forest cover. However, local family size increases lead to lower pay and higher rents, which may transfer production from forests to conventional agriculture, particularly if the latter demands more labour.

FUTURE WORK

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, reproductive externality issues were one of the key motivations for this investigation. First, it became clear early in the research that we could only indirectly evaluate whether forest area changes were caused by a commons tragedy and if increasing forest area was associated to greater or lower fertility. To directly test for a reproductive externality, further information on family members' forest product harvesting time and fuel source relevance was needed. The 1999 survey provided this data, and we wish to keep studying this subject.

Understand and simulate population change processes and land cover interactions. Home size and household number increase population growth, although their effects on forest cover differ. In a separate study (Foster and Rosenzweig, 2002), we developed a household division model that heavily relies on the conflict between financial savings from joint consumption of a public good and subhousehold unit conflicts over how to divide expenditures between public and private goods. Given that land cover may affect fuel and housing expenses, which include a public component, forest cover and family composition may have important population-environment interactions.

Third, forest growth types must be identified. As said, planting forests have increased India's forest cover. Thus, a few economically successful species may have dominated the forest's spread. In general, forest species and variety in expanding forests may vary from those in the early nineteenth century. Secondary secession in Brazil shows these distinctions as well. A more detailed classification of remotely sensed photos may help establish whether the natural diversity is being retained.

CONCLUSION

This experiment resembles previous demographic and environmental experiments in this book. First, the survey methods and questions have changed dramatically. Although we have preserved the initial focus on commons management concerns, we were unaware when we began the study that one of the primary factual truths that needed to be addressed was India's increasing forest cover despite rapid population and economic growth. This does not minimize forest loss in certain places or species and forest variety changes. However, it implies that the subject field is at a stage where identifying essential issues and questions in a given research setting would be vital to any analysis.

The research uses remote sensing and local representative poll data. Since our survey data lacked forest cover information, we needed to add remotely sensed data to create our unique temporal frame. The first remotely sensed images were different in quality and format from those taken afterwards. This raised comparability issues and limited our forest cover analysis. Methodological study on how to merge remotely sensed images of different sorts and quality across places with diverse agroclimatic conditions is needed.

Our project differs from most others in this book in two important respects. First, our research transcends time and space. This scale is important because local people and environmental activities have a lot of geographical and temporal spillover. Thus, only large-scale research can study many important population-environment interactions. Though fascinating, trends at lower levels are unlikely to illuminate these connections at larger dimensions. Local-level dynamics, such as biophysical limits or market or political functioning, may differ. Thus, a balance is needed between local research that focuses on particular conditions and ecosystems and helps assess the extent and importance of local-level variation, and broader studies like ours that only partially cover it.

We also created an analytic framework to contextualize the empirical investigation and highlight population-environment interactions. This project's use of such a structure rather than a more generic explanation of the pathways linking circumstances and outcomes may be a limitation since many of the assumptions may only be approximately accurate. Specified structure helped us move beyond empirical regularities. The strategy has helped us find study subjects with obvious solutions we would have missed otherwise. This systematic method will guide our research as it analyzes household-level processes and how they interact with external forces.

REFERENCES

1. *Brown C. The Global Outlook for Future Wood Supply from Forest Plantations. Rome, Italy: Forestry Policy and Planning Division, Food and Agricultural Organization; 2000. (Working Paper No. GFPOS/WP/03)*
2. *Cropper M, Griffiths C. The interaction of population growth and environmental quality. American Economic Review. 1984;84:250–254.*
3. *Dasgupta P. An Inquiry into Well-Being and Destitution. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press; 1995.*
4. *Department of Agriculture and Cooperation. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance. New Delhi: Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India; 1997.*
5. *Dyson T, Moore M. On kinship structure, female autonomy, and demographic behavior in India. Population and Development Review. 1983;9(1):35–60.*
6. *Filmer D, Pritchett L. Environmental Degradation and the Demand for Children: Searching for the Vicious Circle. Washington, DC: World Bank; 1986. (Policy Research Working Paper No. 1623.)*
7. *Firestone L. Brown University; 2000. Land-Cover Change in Eastern Gujarat During the Green Revolution: A Case Study in the Use of Satellite Imagery in Social Science and Environmental Research. Unpublished undergraduate thesis.*
8. *Food and Agriculture Organization. Forest Resources Assessment 2000. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2000.*
9. *Foster AD, Rosenzweig MR. Household public goods, household division, and rural economic growth. Review of Economic Studies. 2002;69(4):839–69.*
10. *Foster AD, Rosenzweig MR. Economic growth and the rise of forests. Quarterly Journal of Economics. 2003;118(2):601–637.*
11. *Foster AD, Rosenzweig MR, Behrman J. Brown University; 2003. Population, Income and Forest Growth: Management of Village Common Land in India. Unpublished manuscript.*
12. *Hardin G. The tragedy of the commons. Science. 1968;162:1243–1248. [PubMed: 5699198]*
13. *Harris JM. Environmental and Resource Economics: A Contemporary Approach. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin; 2002.*
14. *Jodha NS. Population growth and the decline of common property resources in India. Population and Development Review. 1985;11(33):247–264.*
15. *Kumar N, Saxena N, Alagh Y, Mitra K. Alleviating Poverty Through Forest Development, Evaluation Country Case Studies Series. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2000.*
16. *Lee R. Population policy and externalities to childbearing. In: Preston S, editor. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Philadelphia, PA: American Academy of Political and Social Science; 1990. pp. 17–32.*
17. *Lee R. Evaluating externalities to childbearing in developing countries: The case of India. In: Tapinos G, Blanchet D, Horlacher D, editors. Consequences of Rapid Population Growth in Developing Countries. New York: Taylor and Francis; 1991.*
18. *National Climate Data Center. Monthly Global Surface Data. Asheville, NC: National Climate Data Center; 1997.*
19. *Nerlove ML. Population and the environment: A parable of firewood and other tales. American Journal of Agricultural Economics. 1991;73:1334–1347. [PubMed: 12345424]*
20. *Nerlove ML, Meyer A. Endogenous fertility and the environment: A parable of firewood. In: DasGupta P, Mäler KG, editors. The Environment and Emerging Development Issues. New York: Oxford University Press; 1997.*
21. *Ostrom E. Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. New York: Cambridge University Press; 1990.*
22. *Pender J. Rural Population Growth, Agricultural Change and Natural Resource Management in Developing Countries: A Review of Hypotheses and Some Evidence from Honduras. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute, Environment and Production Technology Division; 1999.*

(Discussion Paper 48.)

23. Richards JF, Flint EP. Historic Land Use and Carbon Estimates for South and Southeast Asia: 1880–1980. Oak Ridge, TN: Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; 1994. (Environmental Sciences Division Publication No. 4174.)

24. Rouse JW Jr, Haas RH, Deering DW, Schell JA, Harlan JC. Monitoring the Vernal Advancement and Retrogradation (Green Wave Effect) of Natural Vegetation. Greenbelt, MD: NASA Goddard Space Flight Center; 1974. (Type III Final Report.)

25. Sedjo RA. Forests: Conflicting signals. In: Bailey R, editor. The True State of the Planet. New York: The Free Press; 1995.

26. Wulder M. Optical remote-sensing techniques for the assessment of forest inventory and biophysical parameters. Progress in Physical Geography. 1998;22:449–476.