

Monograph

No. 87

HOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT : THE STRATEGY FOR THE NEW INDIA

V. R. Panchamukhi



Centre for Multi-disciplinary
Development Research (CMDR)

2017

HOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT : THE STRATEGY FOR THE NEW INDIA

V. R. Panchamukhi

Former Chairman

Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi
and Former Chancellor

Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth (Deemed University), Tirupati



Centre for Multi-disciplinary Development Research (CMDR)

R. S. No. 9A2, Plot No. 82

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Nagar, Near Yalakki Shettar Colony

Lakamanahalli, Dharwad - 580 004, (KARNATAKA, INDIA)

Tel (EPABX): 0091-836-2460453, 2460472 Fax : 0091-836-2460464

www.cmdr.ac.in

2017

CMDR - Monograph No. 87

All rights reserved. This publication may be used with proper permission and due acknowledgement to the author(s) and the Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), Dharwad

© Centre for Multi-Disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), Dharwad

ISBN No : 978-81-935209-0-1

First Published : August - 2017

HOLISTIC DEVELOPMENT : THE STRATEGY FOR THE NEW INDIA

V. R. Panchamukhi*

ABSTRACT

There have been several Paradigms of Development and International Economic Relations, both in the Indian Scenario and the global scenario, over the past six to seven decades. Equally, there have been series of crisis situations, each of which has given birth to a new Paradigm. The sequence of a crisis leading to adoption new paradigm leading to a new crisis leading to another new paradigm has been proceeding in an unending fashion. The root cause for this unending sequence lies in the inadequacy of the theory of economic science, as perceived and as practiced, from time to time. The conception of Man as an Economic Man-qua Economic Man, and perceiving the analysis and search for solutions to the challenges of development, in the framework of Materialistic benefits alone, has been erroneous. Man is a Holistic Man, combining a Materialistic Dimension with a Spiritualistic Dimension, The Indian Classical Economic Science (ICES) provides the contours of this Holistic Approach. Here is an account of this Holistic Approach to the challenges of Development, with focus on the Concept of Human Resources, Holistic Goals of Human Activities, Human Duties (as against the Human Rights), Holistic Concept of Environment, A Profile of Values, and A

* Former Chairman, Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi and Former Chancellor, Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth (Deemed University), Tirupati, E-mail: vadirajp36@gmail.com

Holistic Model of Human Welfare, as conceived in the Sources of the Indian Classical Wisdom. It is hoped that this new approach would provide the Strategy for evolving a Prosperous New India and a New Welfare-oriented and crisis-free World Order.

Shifts in Development Paradigms in India

There have been several Paradigms of Development, which have been conceived and implemented in the history of development experiences, over the past 5-7 decades. In the early fifties, when Independent India launched its development process, the nation debated a number of options of development paradigms. Conceptually, these alternative paradigms could be captioned as follows: Central Planning Paradigm, or State driven development paradigm, Market driven development paradigm, Private Sector focused Development Paradigm and Public Sector focused Development Paradigm, Import Substitution-Oriented Development Paradigm, Export-Oriented Development Paradigm. Agriculture-focused Development Paradigm, Industrial Production focused Development Paradigm, Consumption- goods-oriented Development Program and Capital goods-oriented Development Paradigm, etc. etc.

In the fifties, there was not enough of the history of the Development experiences of the economies of the world. Essentially, there were two Models of Development. One was the centrally planned, public-sector oriented Development paradigm of the erstwhile Soviet Union and the other was the market-driven, private-sector focused development paradigm of the Western world. It is very well known that India under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru and as advised by the well-known Statistician, viz., Professor

P. C. Mahalanobis, adopted the middle path of what became known as the Mixed Economy Paradigm of Development. Under this paradigm, there was a blend of the Private Sector and Public Sector, as also that of the Market and the State. In due course of time this Mixed Economy paradigm of development became a *Model* in itself.

There have been many shifts in the paradigms of development in the history of development experience in India, as also in the world. The paradigm of focus on Import-Substitution, adopted in the nineteen fifties, was modified in the nineteen-sixties itself when export orientation was explicitly introduced in the development strategy. The strategy of physical controls on imports and domestic industrialization was further modified in the late nineteen seventies and early nineteen eighties, when import controls were partially replaced by fiscal measures and liberalization was inducted in regard to imports and industrial licensing system. The period of 1978-79 constitutes one water-shed in the shift in the paradigm of trade policies and development, when import controls were replaced by tariffs and export-promotion became an explicit part of the trade policy regime, thanks to the recommendations of the well-known Alexander committee Report on Import and Export Policies and Procedures. (I had the privilege of being the member secretary of this Prestigious Committee, which heralded the beginning of a new era of Trade Policy Regime). This phase of the Policy Reforms, which may be duly called as Phase One of the Reforms process was launched at a time when the Foreign Exchange Reserves position of the country was very comfortable, Agricultural performance was superb and the overall economic situation was very comfortable. Thus these reforms were prosperity-driven reforms for rationalizing the then policy regime.

The late nineteen eighties and the early nineteen nineties, saw a global shift in the paradigms of development. The paradigms of *inward orientation and/or protectionism* were replaced by the paradigms of what has come to be known as "*Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization (LPG)*" strategy. This LPG paradigm of development pervaded all through the world as a wild fire and was projected as the *panacea* for all the challenges of development. The LPG paradigm was first imposed on the developing countries, almost, uniformly without the considerations of the stages of development, in which different countries were located. The seeds of this paradigm were sown in the form of conditionalities for structural adjustment imposed by the World Bank and the IMF while sanctioning loans and financial assistance to the developing countries. This strategy took the shape of a development paradigm through the medium of what was known as "Washington Consensus" in the debate on development paradigm. This shift in the development paradigm at the global level was further strengthened by the *collapse* of the Soviet Union, in the late nineteen eighties, which was interpreted as the collapse of the paradigm of Centrally Planned Development and the triumph of the Market-driven Paradigm of Development. The world embraced the paradigm of globalization in the fields of Trade in Goods and Services and also in regard to Capital flows.

Global Shifts in International Economic Order of Trade and Development

The oil price hikes of the 1970's and the consequent emergence of the Stagflation in the developed world had led to radical shifts in the patterns of international economic relations and the consequent shifts in the development paradigms of the different countries. The collapse of the fixed exchange rate

regimes in the world, earlier imposed by the disciplines of the IMF, had led to a new exchange rate regime and capital flows order. The induction of floating exchange rate regimes had paved the way for the collapse of the world financial system. The establishment of the World Trade Organization in the mid-1980's and the imposition of the new world Trade order in a liberalized framework, had given impetus to a new Trade-Driven Paradigm of Development. The trade regime imposed by the rules of WTO had also the effects of the emergence of the various forms of Non- Tariff Barriers and subtle forms of protectionism in the world trade order. This period also coincided with a new wave for many regional and sub regional trading arrangements, resulting in some sort of collapse of multilateralism of the world trading order.

The waves of North-South Dialogue and those of South-South Cooperation, that had taken roots at the national and the international levels, in the late 1970's and the whole of 1980's, and the debates on *new International Economic Order* of the mid-1970's had brought about many shifts in the contours of the Economics of Development and international economic relations. But these dimensions of the debates and actions survived only until the onslaught of the *Globalization Wave*, which swallowed all other initiatives for changing the world economic order.

In the context of paradigm shifts in India, 1991 stands out as another watershed, in bringing about a radical shift in the paradigm of development and international economic relations. This water-shed is characterized as the beginning of a new era of liberalization, globalization and privatization in the politico-economic scene of India. All these shifts are captioned under a single phrase of *Economic Reforms*.

Now during the past 5-6 years, since 2012-13, there has been a trend of what one may call as Reverse Globalization, which process is aggravated by the recent outbursts of what one may call as Trumponomics (if that can describe the most radical thoughts of US President Trump). Now the world order seems to enter into a state of chaos and uncertainties. The IMF had been rendered ineffective due to the emergence of flexible exchange rate systems some years back and also due to the continuation of the unmonitored and uncontrolled system of international capital flows. The world trading order once seemed to have been monitored and regulated by the disciplines of the World Trade Organization (WTO). But now, that is also being threatened, by the open flouting of the WTO disciplines by the powers that be. The time has now come for the search of a New Paradigm of Development and Trade Strategy.

While reflecting upon these shifts in the Development and Trade Paradigms, one is reminded about the perceptive analysis, presented by the famous economic historian, Robbie Robertson, in his celebrated book titled, "Three Waves of Globalization: A history of developing a Global consciousness". Robertson perceives that the waves of globalization were all prompted by the "*struggle for survival and well-being*", as is perceived by quite a few knowledgeable among the humanity. The First Wave of Globalization was the processes of international migrations, international conquests and international commerce-all induced by *the concerns of some for security and well-being*. When this wave collapsed due to the internal pressures and conflicts of interests, the Second Wave of Globalization began with the advent of Industrial Revolution of the UK and Europe, and the emergence of new relations between Colonies and Colonial Masters. The widening of the disparities between the

haves and the have-nots, became the cause for the collapse of this wave. The process of decolonization and the growth of "*American Corporatism*" and the *emergence of New Technologies* have heralded the Third Wave of Globalization.

With the emerging symptoms of the collapse of this Third Wave of Globalization, it seems that the world is poised to search for a new paradigm of development and world economic order.

Fundamentals Factors behind Crisis Leading to Crisis

Thus, there have been several shifts in the paradigms of Development and those of international economic order. These shifts have been characterized by a series of crisis situations of different kinds, We would name only a few of them. We had two Mexican crisis situations in the 1980's. Then, there was the East Asian Economies' crisis. This was followed by South East Asian Economies' Crisis, Latin American Economies' Crisis, European Euro Crisis, subprime crisis of USA, Japanese Estate Price collapse. India's Financial Crisis of 1991, etc., etc.

The causes for the emergence of different crisis situations and the steps taken for their solutions have been analyzed with great intensity in the analytical literature. Most of the studies touch upon the peripheral causes and deal with symptomatic remedies to the challenges of crisis situations. They do not touch upon the fundamental causes that are responsible for the generation of the crisis situations and their perpetuation. The cycle of crisis leading to paradigm shift which invites new crisis. has been perpetually going on since the basic factors responsible for the crisis situations are not well identified and dealt with squarely.

The fundamental factors for the different crisis situations can be identified

as follows: The crisis situations are caused by the mismatch between the perceptions of different groups of people. If the gap between the rich and the poor widens, if the craze of some for excessive profit-making goes beyond tolerable limits, if the problem of unemployment gets aggravated to serious proportions, if the livelihood security of some is threatened, if the perceived levels of empowerment of some sections of the society fails to materialize, if the struggles for security and survival become unevenly spread, then the crisis situations would emerge. It is puzzling and interesting to note that the very causes which prompt the search or selection of a new paradigm of development become the causes for a new wave of crisis situations.

Man as a *Holistic Man* and *Holistic Goals* of Human Activity

We have to look for the fundamental causes for the failures of every paradigm of development and for the generation of new waves of crisis situations. The fundamental cause lies in the conceptual basis on which the Modern Economic Science is conceived and the premises on which the models and strategies are worked out.

Modern Economic Science (MES) is based upon the premises that *Man is a rational Economic Man and all his decisions are aimed at optimizing Economic Benefits*. As per the Indian Classical Economic Science (ICES), Man is a combination of Materialistic aptitudes and what one may call as Spiritual aptitudes. The blend of the two aptitudes makes Man a Holistic Man. The Modern Economic Science (MES) considers only the partial dimension of *Man* and thus defines only material benefits as the contours of the human welfare.

Viewed in the framework of a *Holistic Man*, as per the ICES, the concepts of Happiness, Well-being, Individual and National welfare will all have to be redefined. Happiness of a *Holistic Man* is not a function of materialistic possessions or income levels, as in the case of a rational economic man. Happiness of a *Holistic Man* is a function of income *plus* some values, like contentment, sacrifice, sharing etc., which are induced in him by his *spirituality dimensions*. National Domestic Welfare Product needs to be defined as a sum of National Materials Domestic Product *plus* National Values Product, in whatever measurable fashion, the latter could be defined.

The holistic framework of the goals of a *Holistic Man*, as per the ICES, is characterized by the four goals, viz. *Dharma, Artha, Kama* and *Moksha*. *Dharma* has been wrongly conceived as Religion and Religion means *Rituals*. The concept of *Dharma* has a much wider connotation. *Dharma stands for the Values of life, Artha stands for the materialistic achievement in terms of capital formation, Kama signifies consumption demand and Moksha stands for freedom from all prejudices, biases and negative attitudes of life*. Interpreted in this way, *Moksha* stands for a state of highest efficiency, which is realisable in a setting of freedom from *Biases, Prejudices, Negative attitudes*, which act as a binding on the realization of full potential of an individual's capabilities. Thus, the four *purusharthas*, viz., *Dharma, Artha, Kama* and *Moksha* provide a holistic framework for the goals of life. As per the ICES, they together mean, *Optimum Capital Formation so as to satisfy the minimum basic needs of all, realized in the most efficient manner in a Values-based framework*. As against this, the Modern Economic Science talks about only *Artha Capital Formation* and *Kama-Consumption Demand*. Thus, the models based on the Modern Economic

Science cannot provide the basis for the analysis and the solutions for the Challenges of Development and human transformations for better welfare. Further, the MES treats *Consumption Demand* as the engine of *growth*, thereby creating a scenario for excessive consumerism, which has its own negative fallouts on the process and the pattern of development.

Before considering the contours of Holistic Development, we will devote some time to bring out some of the typical distinctions between the approaches of MES and those of ICES.

Focus on Human Resource as against that on Capital and Technology

The MES gives emphasis on the role of Capital and Technology in the process of economic transformations. As against this the ICES gives emphasis on the role of Human Resources. Again, the concept of Human Resource as per the ICES, is not confined to the concept of labour as considered in the MES. In ICES, Human Resource means *Labour* of MES combined with the attributes, such as aptitudes of commitment, dedication and selflessness, duty-consciousness etc, to ensure highest levels of productivity. Labour in the MES is measured by the number of workers and the extent of their qualifications on paper. In ICES, however, the human resource is measured by the extent of the attributes which the Labour possesses. In ICES, the human resource is classified as *Satvika*, *Rajasa* and *Taamasa*, depending upon the nature and the intensity of the attributes that each labour unit possesses. For example, a *Satvika Human Resource* is the one who possesses the following attributes: He should be totally committed to his Duty: He should be such as not to say, “I did it”; He should be full of enthusiasm

and courage; He should be unruffled during great successes and utter failures. A Human Resource is called as *Rajasa*, if the labour is endowed with qualities, such as, highly selfish, always mindful of the results, always crazy, always pursuing unfair means. Similarly, Labour, which always adopts nefarious means, which is mean in its attitudes, would be considered as *Taamasa Human Resource*.

The above fundamental difference in dealing with the factor of production, labour, as between MES and ICES, brings out, the imperatives of adopting a *holistic approach* in dealing with the challenges of human resource transformations in the country. As of now, we think that expanding the opportunities for skill generation, for creating additional number of engineers, doctors, skilled labour, is necessary for strengthening the human resources levels of the nation. We do not consider the compulsions of inducting proper attributes in the so called *skilled labour* that would make the same as a useful *human resource*. These observations should be useful in designing a Holistic Policy Framework in the matter of evolving a truly productive Human Resource in the Economy, so that the crisis situations do not arise in the nation.

Unless a *productive human resource* is generated, as discussed above, any amount of Capital and any nature of Technology would not be useful, in generating the desired impact on the development process of the economy. This mismatch between the nature of human resources available in an economy and the induction of huge amount of capital and technology, could be the source of failures, in regard to the use of the latter resources in an effective manner. Crisis situations become imminent when such mismatches occur in great intensity and wide canvas. Unfortunately, this factor is not recognized in the debates on the causes and remedies of crisis situations.

Focus on Duties as against that on Rights

The debates on development paradigms in the MES focus on the *rights* of the different segments of the society-women, the poor, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes, etc., etc. While the emphasis on the fulfillment of the rights of the different segments of the society is well taken, the analysis of the causes for the non-fulfillment of such rights should be done in a *holistic framework*. There is a one-to-one relationship between the fulfillment of the *rights* of some and the performance of *duties*, by the same or the other segments of the society. *Rights* and *Duties* are two sides of the same coin. While adjudicating on the issues of violation of *rights*, we hardly adjudicate on the failure in the performance of *duties*. We have *Human Rights Commissions-National Human Rights Commissions, State Human Rights Commissions* and *United Nations Human Rights Commission*. But we are not aware of any *Human Duties Commissions*. Even in our Constitution, a Part on *Fundamental Rights* was enshrined to begin with, while that on *Fundamental Duties* was inducted much later-after twenty-five years. Thus, there is a fundamental error in our perception about the issues of Rights violations in the framework of *Duties Violations*.

Our ICES has laid emphasis on the matter of *Duties first and Rights as a corollary to come later*. There is a famous principle laid down in the *Bhagavadgita* that says "*you care for your duties and the rights would follow automatically*". Unfortunately, this fundamental principle of work-culture laid down in the ICES, has often been misinterpreted to mean that in the Indian Classical setting, work culture is exploitative in the sense of emphasizing only on the hard work by the labour without caring for the rewards. This has been an erroneous interpretation of the ICES work culture, which has aimed at providing a holistic framework for

matching fulfillment of rights with the performance of duties by one and all.

The above observations also pertain to the need for considering the Human Resources in the Nation, in a Holistic Framework, in which commitment to one's own duties is required for ensuring the evolution of a fully balanced Human Resource in the economy.

Sustainable Development as Perceived in the ICES

Sustainable Development, as per the MES, refers to the development pattern, which implies less pollution of earth, *water, air, space* and *energy sources*, and in the present times for a better future. The concept of *environment* as per the ICES is much wider. It refers not only, to the five elements of the material world, viz. *Prithivi, Aap, Tejas, Vayu and Aakaasha*, but also to four more elements, viz. *Kal (Time), Dik (Direction), Aatma (Conscience) and Manas (Mind)*. Even if you keep the five elements of the material world pollution-free, as per the strategies dictated by the MES, *environmental pollution* becomes a repetitive aspect of life if *Kala, Dik, Aatma and Manas* are polluted. Pollution of Time means not maintaining the discipline of timeliness and completion of projects in the prescribed time limits. Pollution of *Dik* means not following the principles of *VastuShaastra*, so as to ensure control over the emission of negative energies in the system. Pollution of *Aatma*, means not acting as per the dictates of the inner conscience. Pollution of *Manas* is the most dangerous factor for perpetuation of pollution in all the spheres of life. The ICES framework in the matter of *Sustainable Development*, is more *Holistic* and hence superior to the framework considered in the MES.

Moreover, MES is based on the premises of excessive consumerism, which is a corollary to the approach of treating consumption as an Engine of Growth. Unless the principle of *Sustainable Consumption*, is inducted in the system, sustainable development becomes a mirage. In contrast to this, the ICES prescribes, *Restraint on Consumption* as an engine of growth process with equity and sustainability and hence provides a better scope for the prospects for sustainable development.

Growth: Not Enough for Holistic Development

In the recent years, we have been over-obsessed by the single parameter *Growth Rate of GDP* in assessing the nature and magnitude of the development performance of a country. We make historical comparisons in a given country and also between-country comparisons of growth performances, by using the single parameter of *growth rate of GDP*. Professor VKRV Rao, a famous economist of the country and a pioneering researcher on national income issues, had expressed a categorical view that inter-country comparisons of growth rates of GDP are meaningless in drawing inferences about the levels of the well-being of the peoples. For the same reasons, as put forth by VKRV Rao, historical comparisons of growth rates of GDP are also meaningless in regard to the question of drawing inferences about the well-being of the peoples.

An interesting study by UNDP, on Human Development, has argued that five types of growth are not useful in drawing inferences about the quality of development. They are listed as follows: *Job-less Growth*, *Ruth-less Growth*, *Voice-less Growth*, *Future-less Growth* and *Rootless Growth*. It is useful to mention briefly about each of these terms. *Job-less Growth* refers to that pattern

of growth, which does not create additional jobs or which reduces the quantum of available jobs. *Ruth-less Growth* is that pattern of growth, which increases the inequities in the system. *Voice-less Growth* refers to that pattern of growth, which does not improve the voice of the disempowered segments of society such as, women, other deprived sections like tribals etc. By *Future-less Growth* is meant that pattern of growth is such that destroys the environmental and ecological balance of the economy. Finally, *Root-less Growth*, refers to that pattern of growth, which ends up in destroying the basic foundations of *Values, Traditions, Life styles, Faiths and Social norms of life*.

Thus, the above discussion makes it clear that the recent focus on Growth Rate of GDP as a signal of development, in the current paradigm of globalization and development is highly misleading. It provides only a partial measure of the nature and the intensity of the development process. This leads us to present the contours of what one may call as Holistic Development as a new paradigm of development.

Contours of Holistic Development

We define the contours of Holistic Development as consisting of three interrelated dimensions as given below:

1. Economic Aspects focusing on Growth Rate of GDP in overall and per capita terms:
2. Social Aspects, covering dimensions such as employment, reduction in inequities, empowerment, environmental sustainability, social infrastructure-including education, health facilities. rural development-and human resource development:

3. Cultural Aspects, preserving and fostering of values, conserving cultural roots, maintaining life style, traditions and faith etc.

The objective of High Growth Rate of GDP is a must, so that the cake for distribution of the benefits of development is fairly large. But this dimension cautions one against the temptation of aiming at high growth rate for its own sake. But content and quality of growth are even more important than the mere quantity of growth;

Further, in order to avoid the pitfalls of the growth alone strategies, as pointed out earlier, we have added a second dimension. viz. Social Aspects of Development and a third dimension which deals with values, norms, and civilizational roots etc. Thus, the paradigm of Holistic Development would consist of the three dimensions of the development process. The strategies for Holistic Development should be worked out in such a manner that all the three dimensions are fulfilled in the most appropriate manner.

The series of crisis situations, described earlier, have been largely caused by the neglect of the second and third dimensions of the concept of *Holistic Development* and by focusing on growth alone strategies of development.

Delineation of Values and Cultural Roots for Holistic Development

We propose to list out some of the values that have been eroded from our midst and which need to be preserved and fostered for ensuring a Holistic Development process to become a reality. We would only list some of them, for the purpose of illustration, with brief notes appended on each of them.

These are the following:

- Value of Contentment and Value of Restraint on Consumption: At present, there is a tendency of desiring more and more without contentment. The corollary of the *Value of Contentment* is the *Value of Restraint on Consumption*, which is prescribed in the ICES. This craze for more and more for consumption leads to a situation of excessive consumerism leading to a situation of ecological imbalance and environmental pollution. The craze for more and more should be curtailed by proper control over consumerism.
- Value of Cooperation: Presently, viewing every activity in the framework of competition, has generated a tendency of using the principle of competition to destroy all avenues of cooperation and cooperative tendencies. Unhealthy competition would generate forces of destruction rather than avenues for higher efficiency. In a developing society, cooperation rather than competition should be the modality for organizing economic relations.
- Value of Caring and Compassion: In a globalizing world with cut throat competition, there is little scope for Caring and Compassion. In the ICES, there is prescription for caring, compassion and sharing of the resources for optimum social welfare. The principle that the world is like a family and that we should all share the resources and distribute the benefits of development in an equitable manner, is advocated in the ICES.
- Principle of Managing oneself before thinking of managing others: The ICES has laid emphasis on the need for managing oneself before thinking of managing others. Each one should be an optimum performer, by

conforming to certain principles of self-control, ethical living and caring for others, and setting norms for public behaviour. Bhagavadgita is a treatise on optimum management of oneself for ensuring optimum social benefits. The ICES prescribes that each one should follow the principle laid down in the Bhagavadgita for stress management, self-control, efficient work culture etc.

- Principle of Using Trust/Faith as the basis for Human Relations: The ICES prescribes that all human relations should be based on the principle of using Trust/Faith. The aptitude of Love and Affection is based upon the approach of mutual trust. The trust of the management in the employees, the faith of the employees in the management are the guiding principles for optimum management.
- Principle of Consistency, Competence and Commitment: The theory of Karma Yoga, as prescribed in Bhagavadgita, puts emphasis on the principle of Consistency, Competence and Commitment. The concept of Yoga is defined as the tendency of being efficient in a consistent manner with commitment. These three C's are supposed to define the contours of what is known as the Japanese Industrial Culture. In so far as Bhagavadgita provides the basis for the Indian Classical Economic Science (ICES), these principles define the contours of efficient governance of the self and inter-human relations.
- Value of Composure: The ICES prescribes the attitude of composure, during situations of prosperity and those of depletions. Both at the individual level, and at the societal level, the approach of proper balance in the reactions and responses helps in maintaining a situation of harmony,

peace and happiness. Bhagavadgita prescribes the practice of *Samatvam-Equanimity*, for realizing *True Happiness* in a *Stress-Free environment*.

The above list of values is illustrative, only to bring forth the point that maintenance of proper *Values System*, as prescribed in the framework of *Holistic Development*, discussed here, is very important in ensuring a proper quality of growth and development in the system.

The Holistic Model of Human Welfare

Finally, let me present the contours of a Holistic Model of Human Welfare as enunciated by Kautilya, the well-known social scientist of 4th Century BC, and author of the famous Treatise on Statecraft and Social Science, entitled, "ArthaShastra". It runs as follows:

Sukhasya Mulam Dharmah; Dharmasya Mulam Arthah: Arthasya Mulam Raajyam: Raajyasya Mulam IndriyaJayah; Indriya-Jayasya Mulam Vinayah; Vinasya Mulam Vruddhopasevaa: Vruddhopasevayaah Mulam Vijnaanah; Vijnaanaena Atmanam Vindet.

A proper *Values System (Dharma)* is the cause for optimum Human Welfare (*sukhasya*); proper capital accumulation (*Artha*) should be utilized for generating a *Values-based System*; for suitable capital formation (*Arthasya*), one requires proper governance and political system (*Raajyam*); for proper governance and political system, one requires a group of leaders who are free from corruptive tendencies (*Indriya-jayah*); for developing tendency for self-control one should have the aptitude of being modest (*Vinayah*); for developing a tendency of being modest and service-oriented, one should have the aptitude of respecting the elders

and the scholars (*Vruddhopaseva*); for developing an aptitude for serving the elders and the scholars, one should possess the faculty of analytical and mature thinking (*Vijnaanam*). It is only through an analytical reasoning that one can realize the status of being an accomplished person.

Thus, here is a Holistic multidisciplinary Model-encompassing *Moral Science, Economic Science, Political Science, State Governance and Administration, Sociology, and Philosophy-for realizing the True State of Happiness and Human Welfare* (Sukha). If the messages of this Holistic Model of human welfare are expanded in the jargons of the modern sciences of economics, political science and other social science disciplines, one would get a Model which is much more meaningful than the Models of Social Welfare, enshrined in the Modern Economic Science.



References

1. V.K.R.V Rao (1953), Some Reflections on the Comparability of Real National Incomes of Industrialized and underdeveloped Countries. Volume III of the International Income and Wealth Series 1953 (reproduced in the Indian Economic Journal 56(2) July-September 2008, Special Issue)
2. V . K . R . V R a o , “Redistribution of income and Economic Growth”, Review of Income and Wealth, Vol. 10, Issue I
3. V.R. Panchamukhi (2014), Human Science in Indian Heritage, National Institute of Vedic Science, Bangalore: Amar Granth Publications, Delhi 2014
4. V.R. Panchamukhi (2012), Readings in Sanskrit for Economics and Management Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan (Deemed University). Literature
5. V.R. Panchamukhi, 81 You-tubes of Lectures delivered on “Bhagavadgita-Its relevance for Contemporary Life”, Telecast by the TTD Channel, Sri Venkateshwar Bhakti Channel (SVBC).
6. P.R.Brahmananda and V.R.Panchamukhi (ed. 1986), Indian Economy: A Survey of Economic Development Hindustan Publishers
7. Jagdish Bhagavati and Padma Desai (1970), India: Planning for Industrialization, Industrialization and Trade Policies since 1951, Oxford University Press

8. Robbre Robertson (2002),
The Three Waves of
Globalization: A History of
developing Global
Consciousness, Zed Books
9. Jan NederveenPieterse (ed.
2000), Global Futures:
Shaping Globalization, Zed
Books
10. Gilbert Rist (2009), The
History of Development-
From Western Origins to
Global Faith, Academic
Foundation



About CMDR

The Centre for Multi-disciplinary Development Research (CMDR) has been functioning since 1976 at Dharwad as an autonomous non profit research organisation. It has been registered in 1980 under the Society's Registration Act. The Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR), New Delhi, an all India apex body created by Govt. of India to promote social science research in the country, recognized CMDR in 1990 as a national level research institute for social science research. The intellectual base of research and development activities of the Centre is found in its distinguished Governing Council. The aims and objectives of the Centre include, among others, conducting research on issues of socio-economic development, and decentralised planning at the sub-regional, regional and national levels in a multi-disciplinary framework, covering economic, social, political and cultural dimensions of human behaviour. CMDR has been organising capacity building programmes, research methodology workshops and Ph.D. programmes in Social Sciences.

Setting up of CMDR was inspired by the advice of a band of dedicated and eminent social scientists. Being located in Dharwad, which combines both urban and semi-rural features, the Centre has the unique advantage of providing a suitable environment for the analysis of the socio-economic problems of the rural people and regional economy at the grass root level. Hitherto, there has been an unusual concentration of research institutions in urban and metropolitan areas in the country. Further, there is no adequate effort made to induct multi-disciplinary approach in the analysis of the socio-economic problems of the people. In North Karnataka, there is a significant scope for strengthening the institutional infrastructure for conducting socio-economic analysis of regional problems. Dr. D. M. Nanjundappa Committee of Government of Karnataka for Redressal of Regional Disparities in Karnataka had also visualized such a role for a research institution from north Karnataka and CMDR eminently fulfils this vision. The Government of Karnataka has instituted a Chair in respectful memory of Dr. D. M. Nanjundappa and has accorded a grant for establishing Shri Abdul Nazeersab Chair for Panchayat Raj at the centre. CMDR also has Canara Bank Endowment under which the Centre carries out studies on decentralization, Banking, etc. It may not be wrong to state that CMDR has been one of the pioneering institutes among ICSSR institutes in highlighting the importance of action research in social science research by actually conducting such action research. CMDR has now emerged as an active Think Tank of North Karnataka.

Centre for Multi-disciplinary Development Research (CMDR)

R. S. No. 9A2, Plot No. 82,
Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Nagar, Near Yalakki Shettar Colony,
Lakamanahalli, Dharwad - 580 004, (KARNATAKA-INDIA),
Tel (EPABX): 0091-836-2460453, 2460472 Fax : 0091-836-2460464
www.cmdr.ac.in