

Perspectives on Relevance of Gandhi for Happiness and Development

Vijay Kumar Shrotriyia

ABSTRACT

Happiness is supposed to be the ultimate goal of development. If the economic indicators are the parameters to determine development, the well-being and life satisfaction of people determine their happiness level. Gandhi's teachings can help us better to know how the policies can be developed to keep the well-being of the people as a priority. Gandhi's views on happiness and development could provide an input as guiding principles for the developmental policies at every level. Gandhi should not be viewed in isolation with the existing environment, now and then. What would have been his prescriptions for a nation, at least not of his dreams, needs to be researched and studied. The transformation of economies and urbanization of social masses have witnessed vital shift in the thinking minds during the past 5-6 decades. How the state can take initiatives to be able to improve well-being of people, both visible as well as invisible well-being is the basic premise of this paper which is written in the background of Gandhian prescriptions.

The economic concept of development surrounds economic indicators which is little beyond the concept of development for a layman. Gandhi's concept of development was different from that of economists' thinking. For him, development was not just being positive towards the visible macro-economic indicators but also the development of subjective as well as emotional well-being. Hence the paper concentrates on Gandhian philosophy of development and not just economic development.

The paper is divided in Four parts, viz. Background, Happiness and Development, Relevance of Gandhi, Paradox and Prescriptions.

KEYWORDS: *Gandhi, Sarvodaya, Happiness, Development, Subjective and Emotional Well-being.*

Background

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi revered as Mahatma, respected as Gandhiji, lovingly called Bapu, and affectionately known to few close people as Mohan, was an institution in himself. Truth, Nonviolence, *Swaraj*, *Swadeshi*, *Sarvodaya*, *Satyagrah*, *Trusteeship* and many more similar terms to which Gandhi is intertwined have established him as one of the greatest personalities of the Twentieth Century. He was an Indian who is studied, researched, taught and practiced in many of the important academic institutions of the world without any religious prejudices and racial considerations. His message of truth and non-violence has transformed the lives of many leaders as well as common people. However, it is ironical to see how defence expense has been going up during the last 50 odd years. And truth has become a rare practice. 'I shall work for an India, in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country in whose making they have an effective voice; an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony. ...We shall be at peace with all the rest of the world, neither exploiting, nor being exploited. ...This is the India of my dreams. ...I shall be satisfied with nothing less' (Gandhi, 1947). We have done things for better or worst, we all know. The government is for the people, by the people and of the people. Hence we are governed by the government which we elect and which we deserve. So the responsibility is equally shared by all of us. What would Gandhi have thought in these days when small industries are winding up, market is dominating all spheres of life, community feeling is minimal if not negligible (specially for some non-political reasonable positive ends), concrete jungles are fabricated all over the places, etc. etc. Gandhian views are practiced by an exception class and among the masses it has almost lost its relevance. Ironically it is visible from the general practices that the society has accepted the contemporary social transformation, political system and economic system where more concentration is on climbing the towers of visible economic indicators irrespective of the mental and emotional growth of people in general.

'India lives in villages', was the focus which Gandhi put across to the people and the refore his concentration was on an economy which is based in the villages, "...if the village perishes India will perish too. India will be no more India. Her own mission in the world will get lost" (Gandhi, 1947). He would surely be at an emotional shock noticing that 'at the end of 2000, for the first time in Indian history, more than half of India's national income was generated in cities and towns. Yet 71 per cent of India's population and 74 per cent of the labour force still lives and votes in rural areas'.⁴ The inequitable distribution of income is the result of inequitable distribution of resources which are in the control of a few. Where is the focus now? Yes we do see the organizations which are initiated by the government at the village level but how they are managed and what is their contribution in improving the satisfaction level of the affected people needs to be studied. Gandhi's economy was basically for the grassroots people and that is where we still see lot of grey areas even after more than fifty years of 'so called' mixed economy follow up.

Gandhi sounds relevant but just talking of his being relevant in the 21st century does not solve the problem in hand rather it questions the considerations of Gandhian thoughts which are in most cases thought about in isolation of the exist(ed)ing environment. It has become a fashion and ritual to talk about Gandhi's relevance and remember him but the practice of his thoughts is visible in the corners and margins of society which is very less in number and slowly fading off. The need at present is to look at Gandhi from the existing environmental point of view and then relate it to the respective field of our life.

It is evident from Gandhi's writings that his concern for humanity was much stronger than just the freedom of India. This is one of the reasons why he theoretically sounds relevant for any cause of humanity in any part of the world. His teachings properly adapted to the environment, provide us a stimulation to direct our thoughts and actions in the direction of the well-being of the people. Practically speaking he has lost relevance in many areas near to his heart. 'Civilization, in the real sense of the term, consists not in the multiplication but in the deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants. This alone promotes real happiness and contentment, and increases the capacity for service' (Kripalani, K.). Where do we see 'voluntary restriction of wants'? Yes it is a noble idea to restrict wants to lead our life towards happiness but what is the probability of its real applicability. That is one important and relevant area where we might find Gandhi irrelevant in the present time. Yet there might be an agreement to an idea of reduction in mass consumption and wastage which fundamentally takes us back to the Gandhian view of deriving happiness. Gandhi further states that '...the mania for mass production is responsible for the world crisis' (Kripalani, K.). Mass consumption is the cause of mass production. Hence the issues pertaining to economics, welfare and development are found relevant in most of Gandhi's works. His concern for the masses and understanding of the relating issues in the setting of Indian environment provide us a basic background to discuss his relevance in the present times.

Happiness and Development

Happiness is a highly subjective as well as relative term. It depends on the surrounding environment, whether the subjects are happy or not. At times ignorance tends to provide a feeling of happiness even while in utmost poverty. Haves and Have-nots are determined by the forces of economies like market, environment, consumption, and competition and alike. The level of happiness can be judged only when the haves do not affect the have-nots. This is generally an impossible proposition. In the economy of welfare, it is expected that the state would be in the driver's seat and would direct the policies towards improving satisfaction level of people. The pace of development is not to be compromised for short term gains against long term losses. Therefore the state takes initiative to sustain the pace of development. The philosophy of development has to be studied in consonance

with the philosophy of happiness. 'Welfare' is taken as a comprehensive term of which happiness and well-being are the constituents. Wright (1976) has termed happiness and well-being as 'aspects', 'components' or 'parts' of Welfare. He suggests that there is a broad sense of 'happiness' and of 'well-being' to mean more or less same as 'Welfare' and happiness is the consummation or crown or flower of welfare. The primary concern of public-good^b should ideally occupy the first priority while framing development strategies.

Happiness is sometimes taken as an instant emotional reaction to an event which makes one happy. It is also considered as a momentary response and need not necessarily be a stable and sustainable feeling. The sum total of the elements like, Moments of pleasure and enjoyment, Positive feelings and thoughts, Absence of negative feelings and thoughts, Fully healthy and functioning, Positive relationships, Positive expectations of the future, Positive actions, Success and achievement, Positive self-concept, Positive assessment of one's life, Virtues and strengths, True love and good sex, Humor and laughter, and Meaning and purpose have widely been accepted as a perfect picture of happiness.^c I would put across my view on happiness as not merely an instant feeling but a sustainable positive response to the events and situation. Therefore, happiness needs to be maintained and monitored so that it does not get affected by minor incidents.

Happiness is attained when the needs are satisfied. This notion tries to relate the sense of happiness with that of satisfaction but this relationship does not seem as close as the one between unhappiness and dissatisfaction (Wright, 1976). So happiness is related to needs and needs need to be satisfied. The needs for human beings and that of an organization are different. Human needs (Maslow, 1954) are fulfilled by the institutions be it a family, market, work place, etc. Happiness is attained when the needs are satisfied. Worcester (2004) identifies seven fundamental needs of human beings as—food, water, shelter, health, clothes, education, happiness and love. (p. 125) She considers happiness and love as a human need but one attains happiness when other needs are fulfilled. This notion tries to relate the sense of happiness with that of satisfaction but this relationship does not seem to be as close as the one between unhappiness and dissatisfaction (Wright, 1976). Satisfaction depends on one's aspirations so once the aspirations are not met it results in dissatisfaction and ultimately into unhappiness. However, if the aspirations are met one feels satisfied which may not really result in attaining happiness rather interestingly it tries to put the aspirations at higher level. And this process of step-by-step meeting aspirations develops a momentary sense of satisfaction, however, increases wants and aspirations. If the aspirations are set modestly and the wants well crafted, a degree of happiness could be attained which does not make the individual dissatisfied as the chances of frustration gets reduced. Wright (1976) calls it 'the ascetic ideal of life'. Happiness as a subjective well-being (SWB) of people is not just an instant emotional response but it is a stable as well as sustainable feeling which is more inclined towards a broader time frame.

The climbing economic indicators are very deceptive in nature. Public-good is compromised at the cost of goodness for selected few who dominate decision. The cries of the masses get unheard and are rarely given ears. The weapons of mass destruction might help a state boasting of more power but that does not reflect the notion of public-good as a whole.

Money and happiness have been the primary concern for people to a certain level but there have been instances where the feeling of looking for solace has reduced the importance of physical money. What we have is less and what we aspire for is more at every level. We keep aspiring for more and after achieving our aspirations perpetually our aspirations are set higher. So we have reasons to be happy about as well as to be unhappy about. It depends on what we are concentrating whether on our achievements or on higher aspirations. The choice is ours. If we put a state in the position of such individual, it would make us realize as a state of more displeasures and discontentment than a sense of satisfaction and happiness. Happiness is highly a relative term. Let's not forget that. Poor economies have transformed themselves as under-developing economies but how can we forget that the developed economies have not been complacent and have constantly kept their eyes open for the runners behind them. In this race of which (what) comes first and remains there at a large level public-good of happiness is ignored not only compromised. Curle (1999) agrees 'Certainly we all long for happiness' but cautions us by 'You remember, I am sure that Jefferson said that, along with life and liberty, it was our inalienable right to pursue it. But how successful are we in catching it? In general, I would say, not very'. This is what we all are not pursuing in the right direction.

The welfare economists have streamlined the priority areas for the third world nations to make the development sustainable. Among these priority areas, health and hygiene, education, social security, poverty alleviation, gender related issues, people participation etc. have occupied basic focus. In one or the other ways all these issues are happiness driven. Ironically these areas are substituted by infrastructure development, industrialization, improving service utilities etc. among the nations which fall in the so called 'developed' bracket or the First world nations. Does one derive a conclusion that the first world has shifted the focus from basic areas of public-good or happiness towards improving disclosure practices and concentrating on economic indicators? Is happiness a non-issue among the developed nations, since they are monetarily sound? Should it be only the underprivileged or sometime suppressed for whom the tablet of being happy is provided? There are several such questions which object to the so called standards set up to determine the status of a nation as economically, socially and politically developed.

Happiness depends on gaining freedom, to a certain degree (Thinley, 1999, p. 18) because when one is free the feel of happiness is derived. But this freedom has to be taken very cautiously that is the reason 'a certain degree' is thought

about. It has to be within the purview of the law of the land so that if one goes beyond that *certain degree* established by law, proper measures are taken against such people to set them right. This way the freedom would provide happiness to the individuals. The freedom is also related to the availability of choices. So it is freedom to choose from. It is possible in a world of competition where the economy of the state encourages and supports it. State is responsible to encourage competition by providing choices to its citizens. However one needs to remember that you can provide only what you have. Hence if freedom is not available to state, state cannot offer it. In the process of enjoying the fruits of freedom, the state has to create a friendly environment where choice is offered within the broader purview of the freedom for state.

Gandhi said, "True democracy is what promotes welfare of the people."^d This statement shows the role of political system for the welfare of the people. The state should take the responsibility to look for the welfare of its citizens through its planning measures. The policies and plans of the state are generally oriented towards the development and improvement, directly or indirectly of its residents. '...we live in a world of many interactive institutions—the market, the government, the democratic process, the media, the NGOs, the research institutions, public and private, and so on. Each of them can play a major, but complementary role in enhancing the well-being and freedom of the individuals in the society and in the world at large...' (Sen, 2000). All the efforts of the organizations, business or social, can easily be linked to the improvement in the quality of the population. Well-being of the people and population has been a major agenda for the development strategies across the nations.

Gandhi's basic equation is "happiness equals needs satisfied divided by needs perceived." The West has chosen to increase happiness by increasing needs satisfied (the numerator of the quotient); so has the Soviet system, and the general philosophy of development through growth. Gandhi and Schumacher choose to increase happiness by decreasing the denominator, namely perceived needs. This is like putting a premium on LESS greed, i.e. the exact opposite of Western economics. (Newcombe, 1989) The relationship of needs satisfied with needs perceived provides the output in the form of Happiness. Gandhi also relates need with greed when he says that 'the earth provides enough to satisfy every man's need but not for every man's greed'. He believed in needs based economy as compared to wants based economy which is related to 'man's greed'.

Happiness is a pre-condition for development. Therefore, physical quality of life is as important as happiness or subjective well-being. Further, interestingly it is also argued that development is the end result of happiness. Both these hypotheses need to be proved to reach to a conclusion. But visibly one can say that not all the residents of developed nations are happy as well as not all the subjects being happy, makes a developed nation. Gandhi provides us a philosophy which can affect the satisfaction level of the people positively whereby making

them happy as well as the mechanism which, if followed, can transform nations to a developed state. In the next chapter we discuss the relevance of some of Gandhi's important thoughts.

Relevance of Gandhi

To attain happiness and to develop the state, Gandhi's views are found relevant in many ways. Some of them would be discussed here. His prime value named Truth or *Satya* is the essence of all his teachings. And Gandhi lived by this value. He is very clear about his values (Duncan, 1972, pp. 40-64), ranking *Satya* (truth) as his highest criterion, followed closely by non-possession, fearlessness, tolerance, humility and of course *Ahimsa* (non-violence). He is able to explain in detail the internal processing which leads to each of his actions, such as fasting or handling immediate physical violence (Duncan, pp. 65-99). The value of non-possession is an important value to derive a sense of happiness amongst people. *Sarvodaya* (well-being of all) was another important value which Gandhi followed through his life. Basically the social goal was described by Gandhi as *Sarvodaya*, which he paraphrased from John Ruskin's book *Unto This Last*, meaning the 'welfare of all' without exception. The thinking of good for all human beings without any consideration was the basic thinking behind this concept. One should derive happiness in making others happy or by putting efforts for the well-being of all, individual well beings derive happiness. The concept of public good discussed above is all about *Sarvodaya*. 'All individuals are believed to be capable of high moral development, and of reform' (Murphy, S.). It was this belief of Gandhi which provided him a sound base of thinking that doing good to/for others make one satisfied which is a moral concern for human beings.

Non-Violence or *Ahimsa* was another important lesson which Gandhi taught to the world. It is basically 'harmlessness' which he preached and practiced. The states or nations seem to be least concerned about this practice, it is being experienced that huge funds are being pumped into defending the borders by increasing defense expenditure. We would discuss this issue further in the next Chapter.

'The basic premise of Gandhi's economic constitution for the world was that its primary task was to ensure that no human being suffered from hunger and that the production system was so structured that the poor were enabled and empowered (ownership of means of production) to produce food locally for their own consumption as far as possible. This was to minimize their dependence on bringing in (imports) food into the local area. Local production of food was also to ensure employment to the largest number of people thus putting purchasing power in the hands of a larger number.' (Jain, 2003) Fundamentally this premise of Gandhi's thought is relevant to improve the quality of life of people both in an objective as well as subjective approach. Further Gandhi's concern for self reliance was basically

concentrated towards the idea of *Khadi*. According to Gandhi '...it (*Khadi*) connotes the beginning of economic freedom and equality of all in the country. It means a wholesale *Swadeshi* mentality, a determination to find all the necessities of life in India and that too through the labour and intellect of the villagers. That means a reversal of the existing processes.' (as quoted by Jain, 2003). 'The components of *Swaraj* are based on two independent variables—psychology and ethics. Since resources are scarce, production cannot be increased indefinitely. Psychology of affluence is an irrational phenomenon. The basic principles of economic activity are based on needs and not on affluence. Affluence breeds inequality, as it is based on economic distortion. Greed grows out of desire to be affluent. Human desire role is played by psychology. Values which condition the mind can change human behaviour. Conscious value preference influences economic behaviour. The goal of *Swaraj* brings limits to human wants, and it also limits monetary gains.' (Chaudhury) This is where small towns and villages were supposed to play a major role for economic transformation of India. As mentioned earlier this was targeted towards providing employment to the farmers during the slack period of the year and to make them self-reliant for the basic requirements. His suggestion 'to make villages function in a socially cohesive way' was that 'each village be left to function as a republic with a Pinhead, a group of individuals freely elected by its residents, as its governing agency, taking care of all disputes and managerial problems. The whole country would then be a republic with all the village republics as its building-blocks'. (Prasad, 2001)

Gandhi's basic advice was "don't rush into technologically oriented development; first make sure what impact it will have on employment, and through this on the well-being of the poor people." (Newcombe, 1998) This shows his concern for the well-being of the people. He did not want to compromise it at the cost of development. He was in favour of having an indigenous and local way of development, using, as far as possible, local or indigenous resources, without compromising with India's cultural and ethical traditions. This was known as *Swadeshi* movement. He had a strong belief that if people have *Swadeshi* spirit in them, the country would awaken from darkness to light and the industries would flourish in the villages. *Swaraj* and *Swadeshi* if followed together were to change the destiny of India by providing overall development and equality of life lived by an average Indian.

Trusteeship was another idea which Gandhi gave for solving many economic and social problems. This concept is very close to the concept of community farming, community ownership and community responsibility. 'The concept of *trusteeship* was designed as an alternative to both private ownership and monopoly of power by a soulless state machinery.' (Datta, 1986). The basic difference is that the concept of *trusteeship* was for more decentralization of operations than in community setup. Datta (1986) opines that 'His (Gandhi's) theory of *trusteeship* has come in for a lot of controversy. For Gandhi it was an extension of the idea of

non-possession.' (p. 16) As non-possession reduces the burden of expectations, it was to improve the emotional well-being of people. It is also important to mention here that it is our possessions or over-possessions which are the primary causes of the initial sense of dissatisfaction and unhappiness because the expectations and possessions go together. This idea of *trusteeship* was also good for countering the ill effects of capitalist society and ideally I would still feel that it is a good idea to encourage the sense of non-possession among people and practice *trusteeship* wherever possible.

Paradox and Prescriptions

Gandhi's main charge against the British Government in India is that it has led to the oppression of the poor. From the beginning of her history India has been known for her wealth and possession (Radhakrishnan S, 1957). It was a true charge but ironically the rule of 'power makes the man corrupt' and 'the stronger exploits the weaker' is very much visible even after more than fifty-five years of the departure of British Government. Gandhi never would have dreamt this.

Gandhi's prescription for peace is non-violence or *ahimsa* or harmlessness. As an individual he practiced it and this was one of the strength he lived by and became a force to influence the British Government to resolve the issues at their earliest. He was against violent responses but still he put violence as an action better than being a coward. 'I have been practicing with scientific precision non-violence and its possibilities for an unbroken period of over fifty years. I have applied it in every walk of life—domestic, institutional, economic and political. I know of no single case in which it has failed. Where it has seemed sometimes to have failed, I have ascribed it to my imperfections.' As mentioned in the preceding chapter, the public money is being spent on manufacturing and acquiring better quality of arms and ammunitions. '...I was for some years, even during the most grim days of the Cold War, relatively optimistic. Now, I have to admit sadly, that I believe the forces of light are being eclipsed by the forces of darkness. We live in a culture of violence, which we have all helped to create through working with its institutions and sharing—to some extent—in its values. How Gandhi would have grieved' (Curie, 1999).

We are living in a world full of extremist groups using technically strong weaponry. Where are we heading for no one knows and we tend to suffer from TINA^o syndrome and accept the things and environment as it is. Can we play a role somewhere and make Gandhi proud?

'New technologies have opened fantastic opportunities for development and enrichment; if we have the basic financial resources we can become amazingly wealthy simply by employing a skilful stockbroker or of course, ruined, but that's our own fault. But, if we have been successful we have also become powerful. There is no longer an aristocracy, not even a meritocracy, but a plutocracy, a cashocracy. And its possession includes the means of defending and expanding its

wealth—the guns, the tanks, the planes, the nuclear devices. I need not suggest to you what Gandhi would have thought of all this' (Curie, 1999).

The paradox of *Swaraj*, according to Jain (2003) is that 'there is not a single village out of 350,000 villages which is self-governing. Is it surprising we still have 300 million people who are poverty-stricken and as many who are ignorant; deprived of literacy; and there are starvation deaths in villages alongside with bufferstocks of 60 million tonnes. Gandhiji had advocated food self-sufficiency at the village level as the primary task of village panchayats...' (p. 4). Still Gandhi's model has not lost relevance in full and conceptually it is viable equation to make the villages self-governing. The principle of *trusteeship* needs to be little redefined keeping in mind the existing environmental position and then it should be tried in the villages. The establishment of community centres in the rural areas could be one of such step which can bring happiness to the people.

The government has been taking initiatives to promote *Khadi* as a whole and handlooms and handicrafts through state owned agencies. But we still a lot has to be done as Jain (2003) mentions that 'we may have won some battles, but have lost the war' (p. 8). *Khadi* has not yet been created as a competitive brand and the craft is primarily done through machines and looms in the villages are idle. Jain (2003) warns that 'their (handicrafts and *Khadi*) security and survival in the future cannot be taken for granted as stronger winds of globalization blow and are in fact being invited for our authorities to blow in this land.' (p. 8). Further he suggests initiating 'a movement to establish craft museums at every panchayat and municipal level', 'organising fairs' etc. (p. 9).

For the overall development the emphasis on mass production needs to be shifted to the creation of more opportunities. The priorities needs to be redrawn in the light of Gandhian view point where the expense on defence should be reduced and public health and education and other social sectors should be given preference. 'Under Gandhian economics, fewer luxury goods would be produced, because the emphasis would be on producing enough necessities for everyone. This would simplify life styles, which could be of benefit in causing people to focus on the real values that produce happiness, such as family solidarity devotion to the arts and sciences, and spiritual pursuits. Gandhi defined "happiness" as the ratio between want satisfaction and the number of wants. We can increase this ratio (and therefore happiness) either by increasing want satisfaction (as we are doing under capitalism) or by decreasing wants, i.e. living lives of voluntary simplicity'. (Newcombe, 1998). The choice is ours. And for us the later proposition would suit where we decrease our wants.

It may look odd these days to be so much concerned with ethics or morality because, many including a good number of the ruling elite, think that in public life, in one's executing a public project or development scheme, some immoralities are unavoidable or not worth bothering about. That is why immoralities which Gandhi would have considered serious go unnoticed, or are not taken seriously

even if noticed (Prasad, 2001). Again there is a sense of complacency in our behaviour in dealing with the environment. We become party to the decisions which we might not be convinced about. This attitude in itself invites troubles in future dealing. The message of Truth or *satya* can lead our way to success and it could provide us mental contentment.

We are driven by attachment to the material things and hence make great acquisitions throughout our life. We attach ourselves to these physical items and get disturbed by a minor harm to them which causes distractions and disturbances. We give more importance to money in our public as well as private life. Money is important to fulfil basic needs but beyond that there are many other things which make us happier. The present time is dominated by a general view (which is a myth) that 'money can buy you happiness'. In fact researches have shown that it is not just money which provides you life satisfaction; rather there are many more things in life which are important such as your leisure time activity, companionship, spiritualism, etc. Further the dominance of material things in life influences our creativity negatively and we tend to go away from our roots as well. Curie (1999) admits that '...going back to such places several decades later, it is plain to see that the virus of material achievement has spread: the man who has been to the city and made enough money to buy a Peugeot, have an air-conditioned house... The story teller has given way to the video; the craftsman to the Do It Yourself store. I also have a video and visit the DIY store; there is nothing wrong in them, but they are not the substitute for skill and artistry.' We are leading a mechanised life where we do not have time for others. The race of acquiring more and more does not really take us to the path of attaining happiness. That is where Gandhi was opposed to mass consumption as well as mass production. Can we learn something from this? Prasad (2001) rightly sums it up as—'His understanding, or diagnosis, of India's problems was basically right then and is no less right even today. It cannot be called wrong on the ground that it has failed because it has not been tried in all seriousness' (Prasad, 2001).

END NOTES

- a. 'A question of flexibility? A new labour law is the least of India's job worries' www.businessworldindia.com/mar0104/indepth.asp
- b. I am using the term 'public-good' as a broader sense of happiness of people. Happiness of people together is different from the individual happiness. The State has to look beyond individual happiness to the happiness of people which is termed as 'Public-good'.
- c. www.meaning.ca/articles/presidents_column/happiness_aug03.htm
- d. As quoted by Mr Bhairon Singh Shekavat the Vice President of India in Rajyasabha (http://rajasabha.nic.in/publ/golden_jubi/speech.htm)
- e. TINA stands for (T)here (I)s (N)o (A)lternative.

REFERENCES

- Choudhary, Ranjit. *The Crisis of Growth: A Gandhian Alternative*. (<http://www.mk Gandhi.org/articles/the%20crisis%20of%20growth.htm>)
- Curie, Adam. 1999. *Gandhi: The Great Soul of the Century*, 1998 Mahatma Gandhi Lecture on Non-violence. Centre for Peace Studies. McMaster University. Hamilton. Canada. (Presented on March 25, 1999)
- Datta, Amian. 1986. *The Gandhian Way*. North Eastern Hill University Publications, Shillong.
- Duncan, R. 1972. *Selected Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*. Fontana/Collins, London.
- Gandhi, M.K. 1947. *India of My Dreams*. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad. p. 104.
- Jain, L.C., 2003. Securing Their Future. This paper was presented in a symposium on the state of handicraft 'CELEBRATING CRAFT'
- Krishna Kripalani (ed), *Ahimsa or the Way of Non-Violence*, Chapter IV, All Men Are Brothers: Life and Thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi as Told in His Own Words. http://die_meistersinger.tripod.com/gandhi2.html
- Krishna Kripalani (ed), *Man and Machine*, Chapter VII, All Men Are Brothers: Life and Thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi as Told in His Own Words. http://die_meistersinger.tripod.com/gandhi5.html
- Krishna Kripalani (ed), *Self-Discipline*, Chapter V, All Men Are Brothers: Life and Thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi as Told in His Own Words. http://die_meistersinger.tripod.com/gandhi3.html
- Maslow, A.H., 1954. *Motivation and Personality*. Harper & Row. New York.
- Newcombe, Hanna. 1989. The Expansions of Economics. M.V. Naidu (Ed.), *Peace Research*, 21(4), 3-10, 91-97. p. 94.
- Newcombe, Hanna. 1998, Review: Gandhian Economics. *Peace Magazine*. March-April. (<http://www.peacemagazine.org/archive/v14n2p28.htm>)
- Prasad, R. 2001. Gandhi, Globalization, and Quality of Life: A Study in the Ethics of Development, *Gandhi Marg*, Vol. 22; No. 2; July-Sept.
- Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli (ed). 1957. *Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections on his life and work*, Jaico Publishing House, Mumbai.
- Sen, Amartya, 2000, *Discussions on Bridging the Digital Divide, Development Outreach*, World Bank Institute, Vol. 2, No. 2, Spring 2000, p. 13.
- Stephen Murphy, Brief Outline of Gandhi's Philosophy. <http://www.mk Gandhi.org/articles/murphy.htm>
- Thinley, Jigme Y., 1999. Values and Development: Gross National Happiness, In the edited book *Gross National Happiness - Discussion papers*. CBS. Thimphu.
- Worcester, Tracy, 2004, Operationalising Gross National Happiness, Conference Proceedings. CBS. Thimphu pp. 125-143 (www.bhutanstudies.org.bt/publications/GHN-papers-1st_5-8.pdf)
- Wright, G.H. Von, 1976, 'The Good of Man' Chapter 3 in *Talking about welfare, readings in philosophy and social policy*, edited by Noel Timms & David Watson, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.