



CONFERENCE PAPER SAMPLE

Poverty Line

After the Second World War, poverty has ceased to be a subject of politicians' interest; it has become a forgotten problem. "It was almost in all the more industrialized countries, which can be explained by the variety of different circumstances: - in the 1950's, unemployment was relatively low; expenditure on social needs of the population was continually growing and economic growth was recorded everywhere (Mack & Lansley, 1985, 3). Because of economic and social progress, people have believed that shortages and poverty are a thing of the past. It even more emphasized the comparison with the 30s and the war years. - Prematurely optimistic about the elimination of poverty was based on poverty lines derived from food regulations (Sen, 1983, 154). It seemed enough to solve the problem of hunger to automatically solve the problem of poverty. - Most of the time, the poor have become a relative minority. All societies have a common feature not to see what they do not want to see. "Although our ignorance (of poverty) can be explained, one cannot forgive us," wrote Galbraith in the Society of Abundance (1960). Poverty was "re-discovered" in the 1960s. At that time, traditional sociologists and economists often explained poverty to "negative risk factors", such as low education, physical and mental disadvantages, age, poor medical condition, large and unstable families, etc. These factors were linked to "negative personal traits": apathy, idleness, low work morale, and chronic addiction. O. Lewis alluded to the fact that the poorest population makes a distinct subculture, which is renewed (Townsend, 1979, 65). This was called a "poverty culture", suggesting that the causes of poverty are in the very people, and that the problem of poverty can be solved through the education and the provision of various social services that would make it easier for these people to adapt to the community they live in (Ferman, Kornbluh and Haber, 1969, 218). It is important to emphasize that most of the criteria for defining the culture of poverty were established from the point of view of middle class values and that in many cases they had no basis in the actual characteristics of the poor. They. Most of them worked diligently, had more aspirations and suffered from stigma. Negative personal characteristics rarely produce poverty. As a rule, poverty only reproduces, and new poverty creates some additional external factors (e.g. lack of jobs, low wages, forcible retirement, consequences of an accident, etc.). The real reason why people remain poor is not the inability of the poor to take advantage of existing opportunities but lack of opportunities. In the 7th years of age, the poor did not accuse them solely because of their problems, but also for national problems, primarily for the decline in economic growth. At that time, they watched idle people and single parents with much less sympathy than the old and helpless ones who could not stand alone. In the 7th years of age, the poor did not accuse them solely because of their problems, but also for national problems, primarily for the decline in



economic growth. At that time, they watched idle people and single parents with much less sympathy than the old and helpless ones who could not stand alone. Over the last decade, scientists have renewed their interest in poverty, as can be seen from numerous books, articles, and dissertations on the subject. In the 8th and early 90s, only poverty was quantitatively and qualitatively changed: quantitatively because it was affected by a large part of the population in terms of numbers, age groups, gender, education, socio-economic groups, classes, ethnic origin and regions; (Benington, 1990) and political change and war in Europe. That is why many people, who would otherwise be able to support themselves and their families themselves, are unemployed and live in poor conditions or they are without home. Because of all this, poverty can no longer be considered in terms of scope and spatially limited problem of social protection. Poverty is a multi-dimensional economic and social problem that has consequences on defies, health, education, living conditions, free time - in one word, on the overall living standard of an individual and his family. The public's attitude has also changed: it feels - in order to better understand the real reasons for poverty and to sympathize with recipients of social support. The poverty line is a pragmatic solution for differentiating wealth from poverty.

Generally, we define it as the level of income below which we consider people to be poor and beyond which we do not consider them as poor. It must be perfectly clear that the term "poverty line" is not really the real border between the really poor and inadequate. Different authors define the line of poverty at different levels, which is, inter alia, the reflection of a different understanding of equity, needs and values. The absence of only one definition of poverty indicates that poverty is not a natural state that could be objectively defined. The definitions of poverty vary with regard to this: - is the origin of the author an absolute or relative concept of poverty and - whether their background is subjective or objective. Choosing a certain definition of the poverty line is often a pragmatic consequence of data availability or political decision making (Hagenaars and De Vos, 1988, 212).

The first lines of poverty at the end of the 19th century 'were based on expenditures for' basic needs', among which they usually classified food, apartment and clothing. By absorbing the amount to meet these needs, the authors came to the poverty line, expressed in income, which differed from the types of households. Rowntree came to the poverty line by summing up the money equivalent to the average nutritional needs of adults and children and some other needs (in 1901 clothes, lighters, lighting, soap etc., which in 1936 added radio, books, newspapers, beer, tobacco, gifts and leave). The family was considered poor if her income, minus the rent, was below the appropriate poverty line. His approach has been faced with numerous criticisms of arbitrariness, disparities in the nutritional needs of individuals, disregarding the economy of the volume, the establishment of accounts on the actual expenditure of the poor, etc. This approach was frequently applied - most frequently the US official line of poverty -



although many questions, to which there was no unambiguous answer: - what are the basic needs? - Which goods and services should be included in the bill and at what prices? - How to get satisfaction out of the cost basic needs (mostly food only) to the poverty line? The definition of basic needs of products and services for their satisfaction depends on the degree of development of a particular country. As in practice it is not possible to reach agreement on basic needs, and needs are generally defined arbitrarily, ignoring the different habits of the population. When calculating the cost of food, experts usually take the calories needed to preserve "physical effectiveness", i.e. determine the economical nutrition sufficient to survive and work. The needs of individuals for calories vary with age, gender, occupation, physical activity, living conditions, climate, leisure activities, etc., not only in different countries but also within the same state. That is why there are no universal food standards that would be properly used for all people. In addition, people do not hold expert advice, and their diet affects their own habits and common habits in the community. The consumption habits of lower income groups have been included in the minimum shopping cart in the United States, but they are only overwhelmed by the inclusion of their actual consumption in the definition of the needs of that population. In theory and practice, this problem has not yet been satisfactorily resolved. As far as prices are concerned, in defining the minimum expenditure to meet the basic needs, it should be considered that it is possible to buy similar types of different quality products at different prices. Poor consumers are usually poorly informed and cannot take advantage of the affordability of buying a larger amount of goods. Therefore, we cannot expect them to buy at the lowest prices.

REFERENCES

- Mack, J. & Lansley, S. (1985). *Poor Britain*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Sen, A. (1983). *Poor, Relatively Speaking*. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 35, 153 - 169.
- Galbraith, K. (1960). *The Affluent Society*. London: Hamilton.
- Townsend, P. (1979). *Poverty in the United Kingdom: A Survey of Household Resources and Standards of Living*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Ferman, L. A., Kornbluh, J. L. & Haber, A. (1969). *Poverty in America* (revised edition). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Benington, J. (1990). *Lessons from the Second European Programme to Combat Poverty*. Coventry: The Local Government Centre, The University of Warwick.
- Hagenaars, A. & de Vos, K. (1988). *The Definition and Measurement of Poverty*. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 23, 2, 211- 221.

