



Integral and Sustainable Development: Challenge for Peaceful Co-existence

John Chathanatt, SJ

Prof (Emeritus) Vidyaajoti College of Theology

Abstract: Every nation, no doubt, is interested in development. But what sort of development, development at what cost, development for whom – are serious questions to be addressed. Given the situation in India today, one must look for a right paradigm of development. A lengthy analysis of the notion of integral and health developmet is presented. Genuine development must be based on justice that ensures equal opportunities in education, job opportunities and realizing all other potentialities. It is clear that without justice authentic and integral development is impossible. The paper points out that it is not proper to always blame the Government for everything and the citizens of the nation should realize their responsibilities as well. Drawing insights from the recent writings of Pope Francis, like *Laudato Si* as well as *Misericordiae Vultus*, the paper finally seeks to propose a model for an integral and sustainable development that is suitable in India.

Keywords: Integral Development, responsibilities of the citizens, Pope Francis and Justice, Ambedkar as a icon for of equality, freedom and emancipation.

1. What Am I Focusing on?

Given the various contradictions in India today, here is a search for a new paradigm of integral and sustainable human development, in the light of the insights given in our

foundational constitutional document and the principles given in the social teachings of the Church. The establishment of such a paradigm is a *sine qua non* for peaceful co-existence today.¹ The insights of Pope Francis given in his various sermons and speeches² and the recent documents of *Laudato Si* as well as *Misericordiae Vultus* add richness to the already prevalent historical experience of the Church over the years given in the social teaching of the Church. They help us very much in molding this new paradigm of integral development.

2. The Experiential Reality

The heart-renting newspaper report of Soni should shake us from our slumber. It was reported in the front page of *Hindustan Times*, a prominent Delhi based English daily, that Soni, a poor village girl aged five, was eating mud laced with silica – a raw material for glass sheets and soap - just to survive. She is reported to have said, in all her innocence, that the mud she eats tastes like powdered gram.³

Yet in another world of the ‘richy rich’, it was reported that in a marriage the wedding ring alone was costing one million dollars; and another million dollars to design the garden where the wedding would take place, and the wedding dress costing another \$ 100,000. Besides, there is the reception expense. Another wedding reception of a marriage, costing 2.5 million dollars, took place in two continents! The famous case of one of the corporates having a 173 meter high, 27 storied housing complex with 3 helipads with 169 car parking slots just to house three people is a common knowledge and talk of the town! Whereas 500 million of his compatriots go to bed hungry!

This is today’s India of contradictions; of riches and squalor; of utter destitution unto death and display of riches unto scandal.⁴ These contradictions are reinforced by the ideology

of contemporary fundamentalist cultural ethos mingled with extreme sectarian religious sentiments.

There are thousands of such Sonis in today's world of destitution and riches; and there are lakhs of them, unheard and unreported in the unnoticed and even positively ignored villages and shanties of the city slums scattered and hidden all over India. There are dozens or even hundreds of such 'richy rich' displaying and squandering their wealth, created, by and large, by the sweat of the labourers who are denied of decent wages.⁵

Suppose you are facing a situation where the whole of Unites States and Canada starves every day, or the whole of Europe put together lives in utter destitution, having just a square meal a day! Believe me, the world today will not remain the same.

At the same time, we have a group of actors, those who are at the helm of governance, especially in countries like India, making positive efforts to hide poverty and destitution from the sight of especially the foreign visitors, as the Commonwealth Games (2010) revealed in the Capital city of Delhi, where large welcoming posters were put up to hide the slums behind.

In the last minute preparation for the Commonwealth games, which started in October 2010, a huge effort was done in Delhi to remove the slums situated, especially, near the sports sight. The poverty experienced in the villages of most of the north Indian states is driving them to form city slums of utter unhealthy atmosphere. Instead of removing poverty we seem to be working hard to remove the poor from the public sight, so that the people, especially the foreign guests who come for the games will not see the poverty of India. How long will we pretend to be 'rich'? Though we feel ashamed of the realities (eg. Poverty and destitution), we seem not to be guilty of the existence of the reality itself!

The naked reality stares at our face. According to a new measure called the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), created by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) at Oxford University and the Human Development Report Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), South Asia has the world's highest levels of poverty. 51 percent of the population of Pakistan is MPI poor, 58 percent in Bangladesh, 55 percent in India, and 65 percent in Nepal.

The analysis by MPI creators reveals that there are more 'MPI poor' people in eight Indian states (of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal – *they are known as the Bimaru /sickly states*), amounting to 421 million) than in the 26 poorest African countries combined (410 million).

Further analysis shows that in India, the Scheduled Tribes have the highest MPI (0.482), almost the same as Mozambique, and a headcount of 81 per cent. The Scheduled Castes have a headcount of 66 percent and their MPI is a bit better than Nigeria. 58 percent of other Backward Castes (OBC) are MPI poor.⁶ Dr. Jeni Klugman, Director of the UNDP Human Development Report Office and the principal author of the Report, said that The MPI provides a fuller measure of poverty than the traditional dollar-a-day formulas and that it is a valuable addition to the family of instruments we use to examine broader aspects of well-being, including UNDP's Human Development Index and other measures of inequality across the population and between genders. The MPI captures deprivations directly – in health and educational outcomes and key services, such as water, sanitation and electricity.

OPHI researchers analyzed data from 104 countries with a combined population of 5.2 billion (78 per cent of the world total). About 1.7 billion people in the countries covered – a third of their entire population – live in multidimensional

poverty, according to the MPI. This exceeds the 1.3 billion people, in those same countries, estimated to live on 1.25 dollars a day or less, the more commonly accepted measure of 'extreme' poverty.

Half of the world's poor as measured by the MPI live in South Asia (51 per cent or 844 million people) and one quarter in Africa (28 per cent or 458 million). Niger has the greatest intensity and incidence of poverty in any country, with 93 per cent of the population classified as poor in MPI terms.

At the same time, over the last few years, the number of USD billionaires in India is jumping to higher and higher numbers. India is paraded in the media, especially in the international media today as a success story. Countries like Britain has recently thought of reducing the developmental aid given to India because of such propaganda. Increase in the number of Indian billionaires from 9 in 2004 to 36 in 2006, and now in 2015 to 124, up by 15 from 2014, is treated with pride as success stories. The foreign exchange reserves is over \$350 billion, the movement of the Sensex over the years from under 6,000 to over 25,000, an emerging network of modern retail hyper markets dotting the Indian urban market space, new modern townships and super luxurious housing complexes, food chains like McDonalds, Kentucky Fried chicken, Dominos Pizzas, and now Starbucks, etc., are again the success stories.

We have thus an 'India' of the 'richy rich', who is never tired of parties and picnics, foreign tours in countries like Switzerland and doing week-end shopping in London, Singapore and Dubai. We have another 'India', better described as '*Bharat*' of the marginalized majority. Thus, a new class structure, something in correlation with caste, is emerging in our country, especially after India's embrace of the liberalized new economic policy in the 1990's, and this new configuration can be described as '*Bharat*' vs '*India*' –

the *Bharat* of the marginalized majority and the ‘India’ of the few affluent and the “richy rich.”

The question is whether the growth model of our economic planning, with its ideology of privatization, liberalization and marketization which are intrinsic to the newly embraced phenomenon of globalization, would help usher an egalitarian social order.

One can argue that globalization has brought in new opportunities to India: boost to Indian economy, employment creation through “outsourcing,” faster mode of communication, professionalism and competition, e-mail shopping, availability of luxury consumer goods, greater access to more markets and technology transfer. All these hold out promise of improved productivity and higher living standard. All of us are beneficiaries of internets, and e-mails, though limited mainly in the cities and towns. Our political dispensation talks of making India e-mail rich. Are they really concerned about making starving village people healthy? ” We talk of ‘shining’ India. Perhaps what is shining is the empty plate of the poor person!

So, in spite of all these and various other achievements in various fronts, India is still at a “crisis point” today. By crisis point I mean a critical crossroad in the development of the country affecting every sphere of our life one way or other – socio-economic, political, religious, cultural or even personal level – such that its continuing identity, aspirations, vision and mission, nay the very foundations of an envisaged free, secular and egalitarian India, as proposed by the freedom fighters, the fashioners of the Indian Republic and the founding fathers and mothers of the Constitution of the Republic, are seriously threatened.

Some of these success stories may be the very problem. The way globalization is affecting the majority of the people of

India, seems to be ugly and detrimental. It is making a negative impact on the marginal groups of our land. Poverty is on the increase. The recent policies of liberalization, marketization, and privatization, has brought in further marginalization of the already marginalized by caste-class structures of the social order. The assurance of a basic minimum floor of economic income for a decent and dignified life in society for a large section of the people seems to be receding resulting in hunger deaths and even suicides. **From 1997 to 2008**, i.e. in a decade, **1,82,936 farmers have committed suicide!**⁷ Globalisation of agriculture is killing families! We don't hear about farmers committing suicide, en mass, in USA or in European countries.

All the same, it is good to be reminded of the African Proverb that the most difficult person to wake up from sleep is the one who is pretending to sleep. In the pretension of "India shining," attempts are made to hide the fact of two (or even many) 'Indias', by and large, correlated with the caste make up.

The India of today is a country of contradictions. What is promised and proposed and what is actually taking place are substantively different. Majority of the population remains poor then and they continue to remain poor now, in spite of the human knowledge and technological progress for a better way of life. The commitments enshrined in the constitution are being subtly undermined by lopsided state policies, reinforced by liberalization at the cost of the social sector (eg. mining) and people's rights. The growth model adopted by the political dispensation in collusion with multinational and indigenous elites perpetuate poverty and destitution, forcing people to migrate to cities where they are thrown into the squalor and misery of the city slums, street corners, hutments along the railway lines and railway platforms. We need critical appraisal of our development models, government policies and planning, and structures of implementation. The validity and

applicability of our knowledge system, the blind application of modern technologies in the development process, the displacement induced method of development – all these need critical scrutiny. We need to listen to the marginal people, their aspirations, their sighs, their development model, mapping the grass root success, in the process of achieving a better paradigm of integral development.

In the light of glaring disparities, what kind of a social order should we aim at? What type of development should we pursue? What direction does the Church give through its social teachings? In the present privatized, marketised, globalised and liberalised (PMGL) world, the need of the hour is a positive pursuit of integral and sustainable development taking into consideration the grass-root level aspirations.

The real wealth of any country is its people, the human resource. People are not just numbers, but the employable, the creative, the resourceful, the caring, the innovative, who are the real assets and richness of a country – the sons and daughters of our *Bharatmata*. They are faces, not just numbers. *Why are we only counting them, not counting on them?*

3. Historical Aspirations

It is the particular type of growth models adopted for planning, policies implemented, cultural ethos adopted that have resulted in the uneven development that is taking place, and insurmountable disparity that are being produced.

On the eve of the Independence Day and the departure of the British, Jawaharlal Nehru, on August 14, 1947 declared: ‘Long years ago we made a tryst with destiny, and now the time comes when we shall redeem our pledge.’ ‘The achievement we celebrate today,’ continued Nehru, ‘is but a step, an opening of opportunity, to the great triumphs and achievements that await us.’ He warned the country that the future tasks lie in ‘the ending of poverty and ignorance and

disease and inequality of opportunity.’ Six decades have passed since the promise of the redemption of the ‘pledge’. A critical look at this task in terms of a promise and fulfillment is necessary today, and attempted here.

Article 38 of the Indian Constitution on Directive Principles of State Policy, one of the best in the world on social order, directs the State to secure a social order for the promotion of welfare of the people – “(1) The State shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting as effectively as it may a social order in which justice, social, economic and political, shall inform all the institutions of the national life. (2) The state shall, in particular, strive to minimize the inequalities in income, and endeavour to eliminate inequalities in status, facilities and opportunities, not only amongst individuals but also amongst groups of people residing in different areas or engaged in different vocations.”

Economic justice involves equality in opportunities, distribution of wealth, participation and preferential treatment for the weak, the infirm and the marginalized. Historical reality shows the paucity of this endeavour.

The preamble of our Constitution reads like a scriptural prophetic voice.⁸

With defined indicators and measurable targets, the United Nations, in the year 2000, signed the “United Nations Millennium Declaration” which includes eight millennium development goals (MDGs) to be achieved by the year 2015. MDGs are agreed global and measurable targets to be achieved by the global community. The very fact of giving such a declaration points to the fact of the failure, perhaps, of achieving the Nehruvian pledge in the Indian context. Has the growth model advocated by the international institutions like World Bank, IMF, etc., and adopted (or rather forced to adopt) in the case of countries like India in particular by its

planners, helped fulfill the pledge made by visionaries like Nehru, directive so clearly articulated in the Constitution, and the good life advocated by Institutions like the Brettonwoods sisters?

The Millennium Project was commissioned by the United Nations Secretary-General in 2002 to develop a concrete action plan for the world to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and, especially, to reverse the grinding poverty, hunger and disease affecting billions of people. In 2005, the independent advisory body headed by Professor Jeffrey Sachs, presented its final recommendations to the Secretary-General.⁹ The latest in this theoretical visionary process is the new 2030 goal of 17 items which just now the United Nations has adopted. The question is when are we going to put all these into practice?

4. Obsession with Growth

There seems to be an obsession with growth. Our planners, and the political dispensation talks only of growth. In their speeches there is hardly any mention of authentic and sustainable development. In this respect it is good to recall studies done elsewhere. In a study done by a working group of the Debt Crisis Network the root cause of the debt crisis is attributed to the growth model ideology of the financial system as such: “The roots of the international debt crisis penetrate to the core of the international financial system: the ideology of its founders and their preferred growth models; and the decades-long practices of bankers, elites, and government technocrats. These groups of individuals, like actors in a Greek tragedy, are well aware that their actions are contributing towards disaster, but none acts to alter its behaviour ... The time is long past for cosmetic changes. The entire system is in drastic need of reconstruction.”¹⁰

The plight of the majority of the people who cannot take advantage of the gains of modern growth based economy seem to be of no concern for the corporate managers, the planners, and those who are at the helms of decision making. The economic reform of improving efficiency and growth through free competition in an open market economy has not ushered in an era of integral development. Technological progress manifested in the few shopping malls, and massive buildings of the cities is not development of the type which this author is trying to fathom.

5. The Development Challenge

It is not that we should belittle the progress that we have achieved in the last six decades of our independence. But, when will we wake up to the other realities of India? If one Indian is starving the whole of India is starving.

There are hard, but unpleasant, questions to be raised. Will we rise up to the challenge or waste our time and hard earned money of the taxpayers in our rule makers' bickering and fighting on silly things in the parliament?

The present paradigm of development under liberalisation-privatisation-globalisation (LPG) model involves the fast depletion of non-renewable natural resources, especially through mining. People are displaced instead of developed. The parody seems to be that the guardians of democracy are unconcerned with the plight of the poor displaced ones. There is no tangible concern manifested and action undertaken on their behalf is the concern of many concerned ones.¹¹

One has to look beyond the issues of economic reforms, liberalization, deregulation, marketisation or even globalization. Attention ought to be given in our political economy to the neglecting of public policy matters dealing with education, healthcare, social security, employment creation, agricultural investment, social aspects of purity-

pollution, over emphasis and embrace of ethnic and casteistic politics, superiority complex and ethnic mindsets. Many seem to have rejected an egalitarian society of equality and dignity for all, resulting in deeper gap between the haves and have-nots.

6. The Great Divide

There is a great divide between the rich and the poor. There is persistence of extreme poverty and destitution. It has persisted for centuries; and, if the present pattern of LPG is what is going to continue, definitely, the gap will widen further to the detriment of human life itself. India is already showing the signs of human misery and destruction. Soni is only a symbol of what is going to happen, in large scale, if middle course correction is not adapted at the earliest. Time will not wait. It is already too late. One will have to struggle to save India and the world from this titanic destruction which the consumeristic culture would bring about. The death toll is already there, (eg. farmers committing suicide).

When we look at our concrete experiences like the case of Honda Factory workers in Gurgaon, Haryana, the brutal beating up of the striking workers and local people at Placimada, Kerala, the trouble at Singur, West Bengal and so on, they manifest another side of globalized India. These, among many others, manifest the labour problem in the contemporary Indian context.

Excessive accumulation of wealth in a few hands, and the subsequent experience of power that entails, have their correlated moral fall outs. The era of colonization did not allow the then India of yesterdays benefit from the prevalent industrial technology and thus missed the opportunity of an integral development, and even economic growth. Though our Prime Ministers are talking in terms of not ‘missing the communication era’, the contemporary India, with the nexus

of many of business corporates and executives, politicians, high level civil servants etc., does not provide the opportunity for the majority of the people of India with an atmosphere for integral and sustainable development. For these internal actors the new direction of the economy is a success story. But they remain a small minority. Looking at the reality through the optic of the vast majority, a different picture appears and a groan is heard. While “India” jubilates and celebrates, “*Bharat*” agonizes.

In a globalised, liberalized, and privatized world, a major section of the people are almost totally not only sidelined, but positively neglected and marginated. In the case of countries like India, even after sixty years of independence, a new ideology is emerging that the existence of the poor has to be taken for granted; that they will always be there. An embrace of this ideology is even protecting a large number of guardians of law makers from serious prick of conscience. The destitution and the inhuman conditions in which a sizable population of countries like India lives do not even prick the conscience of the planners and those who decide the destiny of the nation. Their marginalization is considered the unavoidable social cost of development. Development for whom is the big question today. What is going on in developing countries like India in the name of progress and planning for development is to be challenged, questioned and many of the items even discarded.

In countries like India, the new phenomenon and stage of development by the creation of SEZ (Special Economic Zones), need very careful critical appraisal, in terms of protection and enhancement of the dignity of the person, the principles of common good, social justice, preferential option and the values of solidarity and subsidiarity. Here a critical appraisal of SEZ is very much in order. The kingdom metaphor needs a revisit.

India is not a poor country. India is a very rich country with plenty of poor people in it. This is the contradiction of our life even after six decades of independence and developmental planning process. At the present scenario of globalised, privatized, liberalized and marketised world we need an alternate model of integral, humane and sustainable development (IHSD). Such an alternate development model can be created basing on Christian/authentic humanism and the Social Teachings of the Church. This model can emerge from our concrete commitment in the economic, socio-political and religio-cultural arena.

7. Integral Development

The phrase ‘Integral development’ indicates many parameters, and implies a hosts of policies, that work in tandem to foster sustainable development in the world today. The issue of development has become so important and crucial today as the nations of the world have become interconnected and integrated and are existing in a globalised, liberalized and privatized world.

“Development cannot be limited to mere economic growth. In order to be authentic, it must be complete: integral, that is, it has to promote the good of every (hu)man and of the whole (hu)man.”¹² We should not separate the economic from what is authentically human, nor development from human civilization. What is important is the person, the whole person, even the whole of humanity. Conditions that are more human are given by *Populorum Progressio* (PP): “passage from misery towards the possession of necessities, victory over social scourges, the growth of knowledge, the acquisition of culture.... Increased esteem for the dignity of others, cooperation for the common good, the will and desire for peace.”¹³ So, many economists, including our own A. K. Sen, began to reject the understanding and presentation of

development based on Gross National Product (GNP). It was clear that absolute poverty, imbalance in income distribution and unemployment were becoming more and more serious in these countries that claimed quick growth based on GNP.

The economy should be at the service of persons: “But it is unfortunate that (A) system has been constructed which considers profit as the key motive for economic progress, competition as the supreme law of economics, and private ownership of the means of production as the absolute right that has no limits and carries no corresponding social obligation.” This unchecked liberalism leads to dictatorship rightly denounced by Pius XI as producing “the international imperialism of money.” Further PP says, “an economy of exchange can no longer be based solely on the law of free completion, a law which, in its turn, too often creates an economic dictatorship. Freedom of trade is fair only if it is subject to the demands of social justice.”¹⁴ Excessive economic, social and cultural inequalities among peoples arouse tensions and conflicts, and are a danger to peace. The common good of humanity, according to PP, requires “to wage war on misery and to struggle against injustice is to promote, along with improved conditions, the human and spiritual progress of all (hu)men, and therefore the common good of humanity.”¹⁵ Development is the new name for peace.

Development is integral when it is seen “in terms of the expansion of the real freedoms that the citizens enjoy to pursue the objectives they have reason to value, and in this sense the expansion of human capability can be, broadly, seen as the central feature of the process of development.”¹⁶ Hence poverty is thus, ultimately a matter of ‘capability deprivation’. Normally economic growth is understood in terms of expanding Gross National Product. So, “(T)he success of development programmes cannot be judged merely in terms of their effects on incomes and outputs, and must at a basic level,

focus on the (quality) lives that people can lead.¹⁷ The seed of potency planted in the personhood of each individual and in the culture and community as a whole by the Almighty needs to be nurtured, enhancing the capability of each and every person in the community. When this is ensured, development will follow. Creation of that conducive atmosphere for growth is the responsibility of the government.

In the writings of classical political economists like Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill much interest is shown “in the foundational importance of our ability to do the things we value, so that they saw the freedom to lead valuable lives as intrinsically important – not merely instrumentally so.”¹⁸ To lead these valuable lives we need some very basic items. Food takes the number one place in the lists of items like shelter, clothing, leisure, and so on. Whether we put them in the category of ‘basic need’ or ‘fundamental right’ it does not matter; what is essential is that they are absolute necessities to live a dignified life. Otherwise, death will be our immediate gift. We must not forget the words of Pope Benedict XVI that “every economic decision has a moral consequence...”¹⁹ This implies that a particular model of development embraced will have moral consequence. There are foundational questions to be asked. People are getting frustrated with the consumeristic happiness; hence what is that which brings authentic happiness in the lives of people?

8. Social Teachings of the Church

Pope, saint John Paul II’s encyclical, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, written 20 years after Pope Paul VI’s encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, on development, reiterates principles of that letter and addresses the need to go beyond a purely economic concept of development to promote authentic human development for persons and society. Continuing problems on the world scene have led to questions about the adequacy

of traditional economic development theories/strategies and policies of international organizations, if the goal is to improve the condition of humanity and not only achieve certain macroeconomic standards of growth. The peoples of developing countries experience obstacles to human progress because of the structures and policies of their governments, and because of their dependence on decisions made by industrialized nations. John Paul II's systemic approach to social concerns is effective in questioning the values underlying current policies and operations, and in presenting an alternative, more complete concept of development for the world to consider.

Pope John Paul presents his new encyclical as a reconsideration, after a lapse of 20 years, of the central theme of "development," covered by his predecessor in *Populorum Progressio*. The new document is, in addition, the most recent in a long series of encyclicals dealing with the social question, which began with Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (1891), followed forty years later by Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno*; then by Pope (now saint) John XXIII's *Mater et Magistra* (1961); by Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio* (1967); then by the same Pope's Apostolic Letter *Octogesima Adveniens* (1971); and Pope saint John Paul II's *Laborem Exercens* (1981). These represent not merely a chronological sequence, but a progressive application of the central concept of justice. The latest in the series of Church's thinking is the encyclical of Pope Francis, *Laudato Si'*.

As Pope John Paul sees it, the Catholic concept of social justice was applied first at the individual level - between employer and worker, then to the relationship between the classes, inevitably confronting the Marxist concept of "class struggle"; and was only finally applied to the inter-relationship between nations, and indeed between the major regions of the

world. Pope Francis is very focused on this. He himself says that he is left of the centre in his thinking.

Pope Francis, through his encyclical *Laudato Si* (LS), calls for action on the greatest threats facing the human family today – climate change, growing global inequality and the destruction of biodiversity. Pope Francis sees these as reflections of a world which has put personal profit and the drive for relentless economic growth above all other considerations. He urgently appeals for a “new dialogue about how we are shaping the future of our planet. We need a conversation which includes everyone, since the environmental challenge we are undergoing, and its human roots, concern and affect us all.” (LS, # 14).

‘Development’ is the application of the concept of justice specifically to that of relationship to one another. This gradual evolution from the individual to the international expression of justice follows the gradual development of the world economy itself. A world economy, linked internationally through the multinationals and the financial system, is a relatively recent phenomenon.

The Papal definition of “development” differs from the various purely political interpretations of the same concept (whether the liberal, capitalist, “free market” concept or the Marxist concept). Both of these define development in purely economic terms. The former insists that aspects other than the purely economic must be taken into consideration and must, in fact, regulate the adoption of purely economic remedies. The Simple accumulation of wealth is not true development. Greater availability of goods and services for some does not qualify for true development, if this is gained at the expense of the development of the masses, and without due consideration for the socio-cultural and religio-spiritual dimensions of the human beings.

In other words. “Development” which is registered in terms of higher GDP but which results in the disintegration of family and/or tribal cultural patterns, is not automatically to be regarded as progress - unless it can be shown that the institutions which have disappeared (like slavery) did not deserve to survive.

In the third section of his encyclical, John Paul II surveys the contemporary world and discovers that the social crisis which prevailed in 1967, and which it had been hoped that the application of Pope Paul’s principles would ameliorate, far from diminishing, “has become notably worse.” The awful expansion of poverty, the exacerbation of the housing crisis as a result of the flight of rural people to the “great wens” of the developing cities, the growth of unemployment and of under employment, war, terrorism, the tide of refugees, the heavy pressure of international debt - all of these constitute world-wide problems which are as familiar as they are apparently insoluble.

The Pope has no illusions concerning his own limited resources in finding a solution. The decisions which either accelerate or slow down the development of peoples are really political in character. “In order to overcome the misguided mechanisms mentioned earlier and to replace them with new ones which will be more just and in conformity with the common good of humanity, an effective political will is needed.”

As already affirmed in his encyclical, the Church does not have technical solutions to offer for the problem of underdevelopment as such. For the Church does not propose economic and political systems or programs, nor does she show preference for one or the other, provided that human dignity is properly respected and promoted.

What is possible for the Church is to (a) establish in the minds of its members a “commitment to justice,” (b) to offer certain guidelines as to the priorities which they should pursue, and (c) to delineate the special responsibilities of Catholics in seeking to influence the policies of their respective governments. John Paul II leaves no doubt that, for the Catholic, the central objective of social action is not to be found merely in its political dimension but in “our manner of living,” which should reflect the “love of and preference for the poor.” The Church advocates fostering of technical progress, spirit of initiative, expansion of enterprises, adaptation of methods of and strenuous efforts of all for production. These are the elements making for development.²⁰ Speaking of economic development, *Gaudium et Spes* reiterates: “The fundamental purpose of this productivity must not be the mere multiplication of products. It must not be profit or domination. Rather, it must be the service of (hu)man, and indeed the whole (hu)man, viewed in terms of his(her) material needs and the demands of his(her) intellectual, moral, spiritual, and religious life..... (E)conomic activity is to be carried out according to its own methods and laws but within the limits of morality.”²¹

9. Sustainable Development

It is a pattern of development wherein resources are used in a manner to meet genuine human needs not only of the present but also of the future generations. The Brundtland Commission gives the oft-quoted definition of sustainable development as that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” Remember the word is ‘need’ not ‘want’. This ‘need’, especially of the poor and the marginalised, should take priority over the ‘want’ of the rich and the powerful.

The notion of sustainable development can be divided into three constituent parts: 1. economic sustainability,

environmental sustainability, and socio-political sustainability. It is a pattern of resource use that aims to meet human needs while preserving the environment so that these needs can be met not only in the present, but also for future generations. Pope Francis is very emphatic on this, in his recent writings and speeches.

Sustainable development ties together concern for the carrying capacity of natural systems with the social challenges facing humanity. As early as the 1970s, “sustainability” was employed to describe an economy “in equilibrium with basic ecological support systems.” Ecologists have pointed to the limits to growth, and presented the alternative of a “steady state economy” in order to address environmental concerns. Our overexploitation of natural resources addicted by short term economic interest results in evermore widespread destruction of the already fragile environment. Our present overexploitation of natural resources, and the manifest attempt to ever augment this exploitation at the hands of both internal and external exploitative actors (national and multinational corporations and industrial houses) under the generous patronage of political actors have resulted in people’s resistance movements, even to pockets of movements that have gone into ideological embrace. Naxal and Maoist resistances could be such entities. When a particular people are pushed to a corner, they seem to think in terms of ethnicity and casteistic groups, and even violence.

The following table gives a contrasting picture of Integral Development and Globalisation.

Globalization	Integral Development
Stress on competition	Stress on cooperation and solidarity
Production for making profit	Production for people's needs
Emphasis on having more	Emphasis on being more
Priority to the wants of the rich	Priority to the needs of the poor
Sees the poor as expendable	shows preferential option for the poor
Mass Production	Production by Masses
Disregards cultural values	Respects cultural values
Over exploits nature	Eco-sensitive
Guided by economic laws	Guided by moral laws

The following foundational principles could be enumerated.

Acceptance of some foundational issues are central in our attempt. The following, among others, could be enumerated:

1. If we want a just and integral India, we need to respect and ensure the dignity and sacredness of persons as our first priority.²²
2. Further, we ought to view the human person as a relational, corporate and social reality, related to other human beings as equals, and related to the eco-system, as protectors. The human beings are only stewards of the earth to protect and sustain it, not to use and abuse
3. Accept the reality of our human condition in all its truthfulness; accepting even the sinfulness of our condition in its personal as well as structural aspects.

4. Every economic system embraced or economic decisions made must be judged in the light of whether it protects or undermines the dignity of the human person.
5. All people have a right to participate as equals in the economic life of the society.
6. All members of the society have a special obligation to the marginalized because of the structures and mechanisms involved in the phenomenon of marginalization.
7. The objective of the economic institutions must be common good, not self-interest.
8. There can be no common good without social justice, and sustainability of the environment.²³
9. We ought to work for a social order “founded on truth, built according to justice, vivified and integrated by charity, and put into practice in freedom.”²⁴
10. Development of people and work of development without challenging structural injustices is not enough.
11. Liberation from unjust structures without relationship to human persons and community is not integrated and integral liberation. This is the principle because of which one cannot accept violent and conflict-creating form of resistances – including that of the Naxals.
12. In a divided world – divided economically, socially and politically – aid, kindness (i.e. relief, band-aid charity) based on pity and sympathy is not enough. We need affirmative action.
13. In a divided world, commitment to integral and integrating development, liberation, promotion of justice and human rights become true, valuable and

effective only through an option of the marginalised and marginated ones. The rights of the poor marginalized become a criterion for action, decision, priority and policy. Hence our approach is structural, political and always in solidarity.

14. Poverty is a condition, not a destiny; it is an injustice, not a misfortune; poverty is a face, and not a mere number to be counted. Hence the necessity of structural changes for integral and integrating development. Remember the idea of John Chrisostom that Poverty is the creation of the wealthy.
15. The task of the Church is to become a redeeming Church. It is said that over 92 times, at different occasions, Pope saint John Paul II asked pardon from history for our sinfulness of the past to redeem our history. Pope Francis too is continuing the same tradition. Our present ought to be molded by the memory of a past (which is wounded) and the hope of a future, which is already redeemed by the blood of Christ. “Our life is 90 percent despair and 10 per cent hope. But the 10 per cent hope should give enough energy to eliminate the 90 per cent despair.” Adolfo Nicholas (The Jesuit General).
16. In fine, we should prioritize the need of the poor over the want of the rich, the freedom of the dominated over the liberty of the powerful, and the participation of the marginalized groups over the preservation of a socio-economic or politico-religious order that excludes them.²⁵

10. The Promise and Fulfillment

The promise is greater access to more markets and technology transfer holding out improved productivity and higher living standard. On the other hand, the reality is: growing

inequality across and within nations, increment in rich poor gap, growing poverty and environmental deterioration, and frustration among people, leading even to violence. There is a gap today between ‘the miseries of underdevelopment’ and ‘a form of super-development’. This super-development, i.e. ‘an excessive availability of every kind of material goods for the benefit of certain social groups’ is detrimental to a peaceful social order of equality, justice and peace. In the context of the availability of capital and the allurements of the comfort of capital, corruption is on the increase.

We know that the problems we face have an ethical dimension and a moral character. Who is left out and left behind is always a moral question. Poverty is a face, a person, not just a number. The health of a society is measured by how it cares for its weakest, the minorities and the marginalised. Globalisation and the subsequent growth model of development has its own logic, but not its own ethic. At this juncture one could be reminded of the **seven deadly sins** enumerated by Mahatma Gandhi: “Wealth without Work, Pleasure without Conscience, Science without Humanity, Knowledge without Character, Politics without Principle, Commerce without Morality, and Worship without Sacrifice.”

11. A Few Proposals

The following proposals, among many others, could be helpful in arresting the negative effects of the growth model and its subsequent repercussions.

1. **Ending poverty is a moral imperative.** Hunger should not be on the streets. It should be in the museum (as Muhammad Yunus says). Poverty is the end result of an absence of a social consciousness and social contract; the absence of a socio-relational existence. It is not created by the poor. It is created by our mindsets, ideologies, religious beliefs especially of a

hierarchical anthropology. It is created by the policies that we pursue, the various institutions that we have built. It is created by the structure of wages that we give to those in the lowest economic level. In order to create a poverty-free world we need new mindsets, new conceptualization, new analytical framework which takes into consideration the dignity of every human being, irrespective of class, caste, race, colour or gender as its central task. In order to have peace we need integral development resulting in a poverty-free world. We need justice culminating in solidarity and fellowship. Today we need to seriously ask and answer two challenging questions in the Indian context: who am I in relation to the other; who is the other in relation to me?

2. Commitment to Common Good and Social Justice.

A firm commitment to the universal common good should be at the heart of an envisaged model of development.

3. Work for integral and sustainable development.

We need a vision of human progress and integral development that is consistent with human dignity and human rights, social justice, common good, respect for nature, and to a greater international solidarity. How to ensure that the poorest and most vulnerable participate, create and share in the benefit that is accruing through globalization, is perhaps, the greatest challenge.

4. A Humanisation process of development is needed.

Today we have to set a priority in terms of development with a human face; it is a great challenge to civilize economic growth from its cut-throat competition?

5. Creation of a Culture of solidarity, a new spirituality. We need to create a culture of solidarity

– a solidarity without marginalization. We have to move from an isolation to a culture of dialogue, from a culture of competition and consumerism to a culture of cooperation and sharing, from a culture of corruption to a culture of integrity in public life. In other words, good stewardship of our resources is a moral imperative. The economy of exchange can no longer be based solely on the law of free competition, which may end up in economic dictatorship. Freedom of trade is fair only if it is subject to the demands of social justice. In short, “every economic decision has a moral consequence” (Pope Benedict XIV, No. 37. *Caritas in Veritate*).

Conclusion

Socio-Economic and Integral human development as a subject of study has got to do with those aspects of human activity in society which make healthy human relations possible. Actualisation of our vision of integral development would take place only from a consistent and concrete commitment in the socio-economic, political, and religious-cultural sectors. So integral development is a ‘healthy human relationship.’ Fidelity to the demands of that relationship is justice. Hence without justice authentic and integral development is impossible.

The plight of the poor is seen not primarily as a call for charity, but as part of a disordered system calling for justice, understood as “fidelity to the demand of a (true) relationship,” and for the establishment of a new socio-economic relationship, starting with at least a minimum floor of availability of goods and services for a decent living worthy of the dignity of the human (the *humanum*), and acceptance as equals in a participatory social order. In our broken world tragically divided by various forms of injustice, personal and/or institutional, built into economic, social, religious or

political structures that dominate the life of individuals and nations and the international community, reconciliation, development, peace and communion cannot be brought about without an order founded on truth, built according to justice and graced by love. Hence a structural relationship in economics, politics, religion or culture, whereby at the local, national or international levels a tiny minority of the 'rich and powerful' control and exploit the masses of the poor, is morally unacceptable to a serious follower of Christ. Hence our social involvement to establish such relationship takes a sacramental significance because of the life of Jesus and His actions (see 1 Cor 1:30).

And lastly, not the least, one should have an yearning desire, a passionate pursuit, that we can achieve it. We should not make peace with poverty. The discomfort of utter destitution should prick our conscience and disturb our sleep. As Muhammad Yunus, the Nobel Peace Prize recipient and the Founder Managing Director of Grameen Bank, Bangladesh, says, 'poverty should be kept in the museum, not on the streets.'

There is a psychology in India that the government is the feeding parent. People tend to blame the government for everything. This is just a mechanism of a people who is not wanting to accept their social responsibility. Of course, the government should do its part. The very *raison d'être* of any government is the performance of the common good, the good of all and the good of each. That the government ought to perform this function should not be ignored. The government should be made accountable to this task, by the power vested in the people.

Hence the necessity of addressing this issue. A careful revisit of the social teachings of the Church is very much needed today in order to create a framework of critiquing the very idea of growth. What is happening to our option for the

poor? Was there a serious option either? The parameters of integral development need to be articulated and emphasized all the more. In the Indian context, perhaps, we need a combination of Gandhi and Ambedkar: Gandhi is a symbol of self-sufficiency and dignity, Ambedkar is a symbol of equality, freedom and emancipation. It is not an “either or,” but “both and” model that we should embrace. The insight of the Church is worth repeating: ‘We cannot have peace without development, we will not have peace without justice, and we cannot have peace without solidarity.’ And now Pope Francis has added a new dimension that ‘we cannot have peace without merciful love’. Without mercy and forgiveness we cannot even think of lasting peace. Development is the new name for peace. Development is freedom. Development is experience of dignity. Development is authentic relationship with forgiving love.

Such development is integral.

Notes

1. Some of the data given in this paper is taken from the forthcoming book, *Economic Growth, Democracy and Human Development: In Reference to MGNREGA & Panchayati Raj Institutions*, by John Joseph Puthenkalam and John Chathanatt. Bangalore: Claretian Publications, 2016.
2. See *Unto the Margins: Pope Francis and His Challenges*, edited by John Chathanatt, SJ. Delhi: Media House and Claretian Publications, 2015.
3. *Hindustan Times*, April 5, 2010.
4. I am reminded of Charles Dickens’s opening lines in the *Tale of Two Cities*:

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we

had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way. (*A Tale of Two Cities*, London: Chapman and Hall, 1880, p.1}

5. The first social encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, clearly mentions that the labour of the poor is indispensable, and “(I)ndeed, their co-operation in this respect is so important that it may be truly said that *it is only by the labour of the workingmen that States grow rich.*” (emphasis mine) (#27, *Seven Great Encyclicals* (SG), p.16). This is reiterated in *Quadragesimo Anno* (See #53.): “... that the huge possessions which constitute human wealth are begotten by and flow from the hands of the workingman....” SG. P.140.
6. *Hindustan times*, July 15th, 2010. See the *UNDP Human Development Report*, 2010.
7. *The Hindu* – Friday, Dec. 12, 2008

8. THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

PREAMBLE:

WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN SOCIALIST SECULAR DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC and to secure to all its citizens:

JUSTICE, social, economic and political; LIBERTY of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; EQUALITY of status and of opportunity; and to promote among them all FRATERNITY assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity and integrity of the Nation;

IN OUR CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY this twenty-sixth day of November, 1949, do HEREBY ADOPT, ENACT AND GIVE TO OURSELVES THIS CONSTITUTION.

9. The following are the 8 MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS:

- 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. 2: Achieve universal primary education. 3: Promote gender equality and empower women. 4: Reduce Child Mortality. 5: Improve Maternal Health. 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases. 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability. 8: Develop a global partnership for development
10. See. J. Chathanatt, “Reclaiming our Vintage Values: This Hour of the Economic History of India.” In *Jeevadharma*, p.448.
11. Thousands of poor people affected by the Bhopal gas tragedy, or lakhs of them displaced over the years due to the construction of large dams or removed from city slums. They are still waiting, perhaps for years, to get some sort of solace and justice to their very condition of existence.
12. See *Populorum Progressio (PP)*, No. 21. in *Gospel of Peace and Justice*, p.391.
13. PP. No. 21. *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*. p. 393.
14. PP. No. 59. *The gospel of peace and justice*, p. 405
15. PP. No. 76. P. 410
16. John Derez & Amartya Sen, *India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity*. New Delhi: Oxford University press, 1995. Derez and Sen give quite a lot of authors to substantiate their argument. See footnote 4, p. 10, in *India Economic Development and Social Opportunity*.
17. Ibid.
18. In the case of Smith, see both *The Wealth of Nations* and *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Smith, 1776, 1790), and in the case of Mill, *Principles of Political Economy, Utilitarianism, On Liberty*, and also *The Subjection of Women* (Mill, 1848, 1859, 1861, 1869). See Jean Dreze & Amartya Sen, *India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996.
19. *Caritas in Veritate*, No. 37.
20. Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, #64, *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*, p.301.
21. Ibid.

22. Muhammad Yunus, captures the sentiment very well: "Poverty is not created by the poor. It is created by the institutions we have built and the policies that we pursue. We cannot solve the problem of poverty with the same concepts and tools which created it in the first place. To create a poverty-free world we need new conceptualization, new analytical framework **which takes ensuring human dignity to every human being as its central task.**" (emphasis mine). *Towards Creating a Poverty-free World*, New Delhi: Institute of Social Sciences, 1997. p. 27.
23. Economic justice involves equality in opportunities, distribution of wealth, participation and preferential treatment for the weak, the infirm and the marginalized. Article 38 of the Indian Constitution states: "The state shall try to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting effectively a social order in which justice shall inform all the institutions of national life
24. Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, # 167, in *The Gospel of Peace and Justice*, p. 238.
25. See David Hollenback, *Claims in Conflict*, p. 34.

Article received: Mar 4, 2016

Article approved: Sept 16, 2016

No of words: 9050