

## **Sustainable Living And Development**

***Vaishali Saxena***

***“Sustainability is neither economical nor ecological but philosophical-philosophy of life.”***

### **ABSTRACT**

Sustainability is the core concern of present day development. Although, its inception and emergence in international development dialogue was due to the conflict between developed and developing nations over the priorities of economic development and use of natural resources. Consequential to these conditions sustainable development has emerged as compromise, accommodating economic and ecological extremes, rather than any serious concern and approach. And so it is devoid of essential social imperative. Sustainability is largely determined by living i.e. values, norms of the people, culture and society.

This paper purports to analyse the historical context and content of the development, sustainable development and their impact on present day concept. Further it attempts to re-define sustainable development in context to sustainable living.

‘When I look at lives of people today and compare it with the lives of our parents and their generation, I feel, now we have less children, small families and more materialistic life. Now most of us have our own car-sometimes more than one, own house, plenty of clothes, latest electronic gadgets, smart phones and sufficiently right income to meet these needs but our monthly budgets always fail to meet our expectations, we are burdened with debts to adopt this latest life style and still when we see others they always seem to have more, so we suffer from false sense of deprivation and remains unhappy. Our children demand i-phones and technology add

---

\* Asst. Professor, Department of Public Administration, University of Lucknow, Lucknow

further to our misery, international holidays in a year, eating in the high end restaurants etc. more than reading books. We feel exhausted to fulfil their wishes. Compared to this the lives of our parents was simple. Family had limited income but space to accommodate everyone's wishes in the house. We visited our relatives frequently, went to see television at neighbours, demanded books for studies and as a hobby, played lot of indoor games and still remain contented and happy. Over the years priorities of people have changed. Today even poor are earning more relatively. But they also do not prefer to eat fruits, fresh vegetables and other health foods but whenever possible, prefer to eat junk food. Technological advancements are improving life in some respect. Now, I see more and more children even of poor getting educated. Today better health technologies and health care system is being followed, but preserving health is not a priority as earning money is the highest priority. Now, money is prior to health.....Now we have better infrastructure, broader roads, better community hygiene, but pollution, regular power cuts are also on the rise.

What has changed our lives? Government says- we are developing. What kind of development is this; which is devoid of human happiness, psychological growth; How and who had constructed this design of development- remains the question in our mind. In this quest, exploring development, its genesis, dimensions, approaches, is natural. Like a tree, what we see today, sown long back. So, the starting point for this understanding may be the history of the term, its emergence and various circumstances within which it emanated. This is an attempt to reach this understanding through historical route.

Sustainable Development is viewed as precariously balancing the economy and ecology which gets disturbed due to overuse of resources at the wake of development. The concept of sustainable development has emerged as a compromise concept between developing and developed countries in economic growth and development debate. The various circumstances which led to this compromise have profound implication in the development of this concept and approaches. The concept is also

naturally linked with the development philosophy. So the perception of development and its approaches also have profound impact on it. Like sustainable development concept, the circumstances within which the concept of development had emerged after Second World War.

### ***Genesis of Development Context & Content***

The construction of the term development has emerged post industrial revolution and after second world war only. Many European nations and later on North America had adopted industrialization as a mode of progress in their countries. Through industrialization, they have become 'production power house (Desai, Vandana & Potter, 2002); have improved standard of living in their countries (material); enhanced their per capita income.....and started producing surplus.. This also led to establish dominance of capitalism.

Although at the same time, many other countries, especially Asian, African and Latin American countries had totally different picture. Most of them, at that time were not even able to feed their population; their economies were primarily depending on agriculture; their economies were collapsing as colonization had changed the world economies and situated them at the periphery and; capitalism has ensured this placement permanently. As these countries were severely economically suffering, they were depending on international financial aids and funding from these well off nations.

In this context, to refer to these two states, 'developed nations' and 'developing nations' labels were given. So development has become symbolising the progress and achievement through industrialization and capitalism which were sought by those so called developed countries. That is how context of the development has influenced this content of the concept. Consequentially there exist affinity of the development with modernization and industrialization. This economic model presumes that industrialization will bring faster economic growth than the agriculture based economies. So,

economic and western parameters are used to conceptualize development and development become visually similar to industrialization. This perception is reflected in various approaches, models and analysis of development. For example, initially development was conceived as economic growth. Economic growth refers to an increase in an economy's output of goods and services and overall amount of income that it generates. Measured by the gross domestic product (GDP) index, it is still given a high priority by governments of all over world. Although, growth in mean income alone does not however guarantee availability of necessities like food, water, health etc. to all. So, in addition, well being and human development have been embraced in defining development. Economic development led to rise well being in the society as a whole, as reflected in the expanded set of opportunities. But enhancing opportunities and choices for the people would require surplus in terms of goods and services. Even the journey of development, from economic growth to human development reflects the same perception. Another model of development to describe developed, developing and underdeveloped nations proposed by F. W. Riggs i. e. Agraria- Industria or Fused- Prismatic- Diffracted also reflect the same. (Saxena, Vaishali, 2012)

One of the natural consequences of industrialization adopted by developed countries is spatial and rural areas have vanished fast in such countries, converting them more urban. So, development, industrialization and urbanization tend to be visually similar (Saxena, Vaishali, 2013). Development and urbanization are conceptually distinct phenomenon, but visually they appear similar. The broad and clean road system, well illuminated areas, sky high buildings ,good infrastructural facilities, good educational facilities, health services construct the portrait of development. The optic of urban area is not different and deposit almost similar picture in mind. Hence there exists a visual relatedness between the two. The relationship is not merely at visual level. Urbanization has been considered as 'engines of growth'. It provides for opportunities for employment. Education and ready market to industrial and other products.

Another consequence of opting industrialization has been the rise and promotion of consumption- production and competition based thoughts per se in diverse discipline to facilitate such economies. Present a notion of development latently support capitalism (which is based on consumption and production values).So, capitalism is its valid child and neo-liberalism is mere an extension and good governance (primarily IMF construction in the form of conditionalities) is its illegitimate prodigy. Liberalization, privatization and globalization are being enforced and imposed through the politics of good governance. In another terms it is promoting consumption, production and competition based values globally in the name of development. All this has serious repercussions on society on the whole. At first, it has created false needs of consumption in the society. Need can be described as state of deprivation while competition based continuous marketing and advertising in still false sense of deprivation among people Second is rise in unnecessary production to match up with demands. Society falls in the trap of consumption and production. Economies of the nations are dependent on consumption production and benefits therein. Affluenza is a term used to describe addiction to overconsumption and materialism exhibited by lifestyle of affluent consumers (Tyler Miller, 2006).

Third, is emergence of fragile economic and social structures. Most people are with the disease of overconsumption and have telltale symptoms. They feel overworked, have high level of debt and bankruptcy, suffer from high level of stress and anxiety, and have declining health and feel unfulfilled quest to accumulate even more stuff. So social relationship suffers. To add to their misery, they may be laid off and witness salary cuts due to market and economic slump.

Fourth, is surmountable pressure on our resources? For example it takes about, 27 trucks trailer loads of resources per year to support one American and 7.9 billion truck load to support the entire US population. Stretch end to end, these trucks were more than to reach the sun. Proliferation of technology has added another dimension to this complexity.

It has enormous environmental impact and unsustainable pattern of development (World Resource Institute, 1996-97).

Here, emerges the issue of sustainable development. If we continue to exclude sustainability factor in conceptualization of development itself, sustainability remains its antithesis. Development needs to shed off its western clothes i.e. viewing development in terms of consumption and production.

### **Genesis of Sustainable Development Context & Content**

Like development, construction of the concept of sustainable development is also influenced not merely by development perception but also context of its genesis. The sustainable development had emerged as ambiguous compromise as development has not incorporated environmental impact of the activities needed to generate the income upon which it depends during 1980s. During 1960s environmental revolution sparked off and there was mounting and widespread disquiet about the environmental impacts of unfettered human population growth and industrialization. Their emerged a dominating perception that the entire planet was under severe threat from resource depletion and pollution driven by population growth and capitalist greed. And, so during 1970s, environmental protection had become significant and acceptable goal by major developed nations. The rise of environmentalism as a political force was paralleled by increasing efforts on the part of conservationist to protect as many of the planets remaining pristine natural eco-systems. But strong opposition emerged, specially in developing countries. They were modelling country's development and progress by following developed countries and wanted to replicate success stories through industrialization. By exploiting their natural resources, they wished to obtain quality of life and also desired to bridge the gap between developed countries (global north) and developing countries (the south). Giving low priority to development was not possible by these countries. It was incompatible for them to maintain healthy environment and economic

growth. They viewed environmentalism as political action to confer illegitimacy to their right to development.

Although conservationist retained their ideal but also realized that they could not ignore the claim of developing countries also. This led to launch of many integrated conservation and development projects. For example UNESCO had launched man and biosphere program which combined the establishment of protected areas with the initiative to improve the lives of the local people.. Few steps forward, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) published a report in 1980s titled as 'World Conservation Strategy' , enunciating the idea of sustainable development

*'Humanity's relationship with the bio-sphere.....will continue to deteriorate until new international order achieved, a new environmental ethic is adopted, human population stabilized and sustainable modes of development become the rule rather than the exception.....For development to be sustainable it must take account of social and ecological factors as well as economic ones of the living and non living resource base, and of the long term as well as short term advantages and disadvantages of alternative actions.'*

Later, after seven years, Brundtland Commission, World Commission on environment and development in its report 'Towards our common Future' reiterated the same strategy (Michael Redcliff, 2002) to reconcile these two different perspectives of development through sustainable development. So, in this backdrop, sustainable development emerged as a ambiguous compromise between developed and developing countries development perspective rather than any idealistic, well thought approach (Grainger & Martin Purvis, 2006). Consequently, Sustainable development becomes sustainability of consumption and production and has gained dominance and popularity. And like development, sustainable development perception is also constricted to consumption and production. In another words, it envisages economic dimension predominantly and assimilates ecological dimension to limited extent. It is more of an international political agenda than any serious approach to obtain sustainability. This bias is also

reflected in subsequent definitions of the term. For example WECD defines it as an ability to meet the needs of generations present as well as future.

It contains within it two key concepts: the concept of needs in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given and the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs.

This need based approach to sustainable development is merely an outcome of the context in which the issue of sustainable development has emerged and linked the sustainable development with the economic dimension in one form or another. Unfortunately this trend continues in post Brundtland development also.

In this need based approach to sustainable development, which seems simple but is deceptive. Two basic fallacies are visible in it. At first, it obscures underlying complexities and contradictions in respect to human needs. Needs are defined in terms of each culture and society distinctly while sustainable development is necessary for all of us. As these needs are distinct and sometimes contradictory, how different definitions match up. For example tribal society needs open spaces, fresh air and forest while it is increasingly difficult to accept this with those of other societies seeking more material wealth even at the cost of pollution.

Moreover, when it is difficult to have uniformity of needs amongst the present generation, it would be impossible to understand future needs. So, what needs to be sustained for future generations cannot be determined. Needs themselves change so it is unlikely that those of future generations will be the same as those of the present generation. So it is impossible to decide what needs to be sustained for them. Interestingly, answers to this question in context to the present generation also incur contradictions and diverse opinions. Conservationists believe that natural resource bases need to be sustained. Various development efforts should be so designed to maintain soil fertility, waste absorption and assimilation, water and nutrient

recycling, biodiversity etc. Their primary interest is in ecological system. They prefer conservation of natural resources due to its intrinsic values (Pearce, D, 1991).

Another way to answer this, argues that it is present level of production and consumption that need to be sustained. These writers reasons that growth in global population will lead to pressure and demand on environment. Sustainable development must incorporate this fact. They cite evidence of India and China, given the choice everyone wants to have car, mobile, television but unable to have due to poverty and poor infrastructure.

Is there anything inherently unsustainable in broadening market for consumer goods like car, television etc. Different discourses on sustainable development have different view to this. Those who favour the sustainable goods and services that we receive through market and business would argue to broaden the basis of consumption. Others argue that the production of most of the goods and services is inherently unsustainable. So, it is leaving ecological footprints. There is urgent need to downsize or shift our pattern of consumption. Here, emerged another fallacy in defining sustainable development in terms of needs. Humans are wanting animals. Their desires are unending, so the level of consumption keeps on rising. To match consumption, production needs to be enhanced proportionately Sustainable development becomes once again constrained by economic parameters. Although some attempts have been made to accommodate ecological and social dimensions in conceptualizing sustainable development. For example, ecological economist considers economic system as a subsystem of wider biosphere system or global ecological system. It views flow of income and material within an economy as a part of the wider transfer of energy and materials with in the biosphere. Thus the long term viability of human activities is deemed to depend upon how well they comply with the rules governing the biosphere. If the scale of human economy grows too large in relation to biosphere, then it will threaten its sustainability as well as of the biosphere also. The ideal condition for sustainable

development is where human economy scale must not exceed the critical level- equivalent to the carrying capacity of the planet (folke)- at which it threatens the sustainability of biosphere. Any development path is compatible with this condition as long as it does not breach this upper limit. Practically it requires that there is no decline in natural capital. Daly in 1990 has proposed the set of operational principles (Daly, 2004). These principles are:

1. Limit the human scale to a level which, if not optimal, is at least within the carrying capacity and is therefore sustainable.
2. Achieve technological change that increases durability and efficiency while limiting throughput.
3. Preserve the harvesting rate of renewable resources at a level below the regenerative capacity of the environment.
4. Preserve the waste emission rates at a level below the assimilative capacity of the environment.
5. Restrict non-renewable resource use to levels equalled by the creation or access of renewable substitute.

Like ecological economics approach, another approach which is more comprehensive is environmental economics (Daly, 2004). In contrast to ecological economics, it is based on a modified neo-classical economic model in which environment is integrated into the economic system. Development is portrayed as an accumulation of human and man-made capital at the expense of the reduction in natural capital. Development is generally deemed sustainable when balance is struck between these processes of gain and loss, so that capital stock does not decline. Here sustainable development implies the management of these resources in the interest of natural capital stock.. Economic inheritance sits uneasily with the sustainability. It strikes only one form of value albeit the principal one within capitalist, industrial societies. The German sociologist Habermas expressed this criticism of this view forcefully, in the following way;

*'Can civilization afford to surrender itself. Entirely to the .....driving force of just one of its subsystem.....namely the pull of dynamic.....'*

*recursively the closed economic system which which can only function and remain stable by taking all relevant information, translating it into and processing it in , the language of economic value' (Habermas, 1991).*

These two approaches, although attempted to accommodate ecological concern but in economic framework only. This narrow framework to define sustainability overlooks totally social dimensions. Social imperatives are treated here in limited context of social equity and fairness. Another attempt has been made to balance the three imperatives of sustainability by Robinson and Tickner (Robinson and Tickner,). They view economy, environment and human society as three interacting, interconnected, and overlapping prime systems. They are interconnected for collective survival of humans. These are stable, resilient and self organized. But, they also have spilt over effect on each other – positive as well as negative. Each is subject to stresses that threaten its survival and so the survival of other simultaneously. For example, economic growth and the use of fossils fuel threatens global climate. All these calls for crisis level response from governance. Each system is crucial on its own but maintaining equilibrium among these three requires social and political imperatives- participation, effective governance, human rights etc. The challenge of ecological imperative is 'it remains within planetary biophysical capacity'. The economic imperative is to 'ensure and maintain adequate standard of living for all people'. The focus here is on material well being and security. The social imperatives which extends to political one is to 'provide social structures, including system of governance which effectively propagate the values people wish to desire.' Given this system based view of sustainability, the challenge of contemporary governance is to sustain each system internally as well as maintain appropriate balance among them. It is possible only through political processes. The view taken here is that by considering the environmental system on the same conceptual level as economic, social and political system. Robinson and Tickner further explored the elements of environmental sustainability. Human health and well being which is inclusive of adequate sanitation, clean air, drinking

water, exposure to toxic; ecosystem health- i.e. habitat protection, water diversity, water stress, climate stress and; resource sustainability – i.e. water supply, renewable energy, forest resources, soil erosion/equity. Environmental sustainability is a goal to which all societies should aspire, The contribution of Robinson and Tickner is immense in highlighting social system in respect to sustainability. Although it does not seem to be complete, as their interpretation of social system is limited to political processes and does not elaborate other dimensions of it. Moreover, how to achieve balance among these three systems remains un-answered. Moreover, they elaborate on challenges of these systems, but do not answer how to maintain balance among them and obtain sustainability. Various literatures on sustainability consider it in a stereo type economic framework consequential to the genesis of its suffix ‘development’. Humans are at the core of these three systems- economic, ecological and social.. Interrelatedness, interaction among them is through humans only and maintaining a balance among them is determined through human indulgences, their activities and behaviour (which is primarily, governed by their value system). Practically sustainability is not possible without involving humans and human living in its conceptual framework. Although emphasis on humans do not in dissonance of the basic premises of ‘Deep Ecology’ movement. Deep ecology is a diverse social movement, taking its inspiration from set of radical philosophical ideas about humans and their relationship with nature. The key thinker with deep ecology movement start with a views of humans as inseparably connected to the rest of nature (Ted Benton, 2007). So deep is its connection and interdependence, that for them it makes no sense to see humans as uniquely valuable (The American Romantic environmentalist, H.D. Thoreau and John Muir are often cited’ as predecessor of deep ecologist).

### **Deep Ecology Movement**

The flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth has intrinsic value. The value of non-human life forms is independent of the usefulness these may have for narrow human purposes.
--

	Richness and diversity of life forms are values in themselves and contribute to the flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth.
	Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs.
	Present human interference with the non-human world is excessive, and this situation is rapidly worsening.
	The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of the human population. The flourishing of non-human life requires such a decrease.
	Significant of change of life conditions for the better requires change in policies. These affect basic economic, technological and ideological structures.
	The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of intrinsic value) rather than adhering to a high standard of level. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.
	Those who subscribe to the forgoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to participate in the attempts to implement the necessary changes.

### **Sustainable Living:**

The key to sustainable development is sustainable living .Although sustainable development has emerged as an international issue in 1980s but sustainability as a core value in human living had been practiced in various communities and cultures. Although, sustainability literature has ignored it totally and fails to accommodate social construction of it..

For example, in Andean region of Latin America (Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador), a phrase ‘sumak kawsay’ in Quechua language means living (David Isakson & Others, 2014). According to Quechua traditions ‘Sumak kawsay’ consider people as an element of panchmama or mother earth. The idea is to seek a life in balance with the earth and our resources, a sustainable way of living. In the indigenous traditions, the individual forms a part of an ecological and social whole in which one never own land.....The indigenous traditions also contains strong sense of collectivism in terms of decision making and ownership of land. Sumac kaway philosophy has become constitutional doctrine of Bolivia and Ecuador. The following lines:

‘We.....hereby decide to build a new form of public co-existence, in diversity and in harmony with nature, to achieve the good way of living. Thus the economic, social, political, cultural and environmental areas should be arranged to guarantee the sumac kawsay development.’”

Constitution of Ecuador envisages living well. Similarly a law on the rights of mother earth has been enacted in Bolivia. The law defines mother earth as a collective subject of public interest and declares both mother earth and life systems (which combine human communities and ecological systems) title holders of inherent rights specified in the law.

Inspirations from sumac kawsay, emerged a post-capitalist, and also post socialist concept of buen vivir. The concept of buen vivir is also a reaction to traditional western idea of development. It is also not the idea of good living, inspired by cosmo vision which could be interpreted as carefree way of living, consuming, drinking beer and eating fast food.

In Indian context, to achieve Buen Vivir i.e. living well can be obtain by following the path of ‘dharma’. Here dharma does not mean religion which is its English translation, instead ‘a way of living’ following duties and responsibilities. A man has responsibility towards self, family, fellow man, and community and mother earth. In fulfilling the responsibility towards self and family, he enjoys rights to arrange to feed himself and his family. So, he has a right to livelihood, right to acquire wealth and possessions. His responsibility towards community and fellow man puts a check on his greed to acquire. He must share his possessions and wealth with his fellow man for their as well as welfare of the community. For example, it says that before going for sleep in the night, one must ensure, no one is sleeping hungry in his neighbourhood. If so one must feed them. One’s responsibility towards earth is immense. Nature is sacred. All its elements, like river, bio-diversity needs to conserved and protected by them. Mother earth and nature must be given due respect like any other being. Hindu philosophy elevates the concept of sustainability to the spiritual plane. Sustainability of human happiness is possible when one follow the divine path of eternal

satisfaction, peace and happiness. Material possessions give temporary pleasure only. While following one's dharma one can obtain eternal happiness i. e. fulfilling responsibility towards self, family, community and earth and bring about, balance in life. So, responsibility not rights, cooperation not competition are intrinsic to this thought. It assimilates all human needs in a balanced way, brings harmony between man and nature and maintains equilibrium among society, ecology and economy. Sustainability here is not merely an economic concept but a philosophy of life, value, normative concern and a way of living. In India, traces of such living is still visible in few tribal communities and rural areas. One still finds system of joint family, common water sources for communities, open spaces, worshipping of earth, river, trees, cow worship, necessary household consumption etc. Although westerns interpret it as backwardness, lack of education and development. Negligence of sustainable living and enforcing western thought and idea of development has serious repercussions all over the globe. If our development model fails to bring happiness, psychological growth of the society, contentment, peace, harmony etc. needs reconstruction. Human race is economically and technologically progressing tremendously but still hunger and poverty exist severely, income is rising but real human happiness is missing, standard of living has improved but inequity is more, consumption and production have enhanced but sense of deprivation is more, stress is more .....

If societies encourage unreasonable lust for overconsumption, greed cannot be satiated. Economy and ecology are meant to satisfy man's needs but definitely not greed. If societies encourage unreasonable lust for over consumption defined through political processes also, human greed cannot be contained. Sustainability should be the part of their value system, behaviour, attitude, habits, norms and day today living.

In this backdrop, development should be reviewed with reason. If hunger and poverty are economic ailments, surely, affluenza and overconsumption are mental ailments. Many have argued that affluent provide money for developing technologies to reduce pollution,

environmental degradation, and resource waste. Environmental kuznet curve has indicated that environmental pollution increases during early stages of industrialization but decreases as industry finds more money invested in cleaner technologies. Such arguments are not tenacious. No one want to get the disease of cancer because one can afford its medical and hospital bills. Unnecessary greed for income, money, materialistic consumption is aimless and perilous. So, I recommend develop with reason and responsibility Sustainable living is thus living responsibly and with wisdom. As Tonybe summarized that true measure of civilization growth is law of progressive simplification- 'true growth occurs as civilization transfer an increasing proportion of energy and attention from the material side of the life to the non material side and their by develop their culture, capacity for compassion, sense of community and strength of democracy'.

Such a living is not possible without cooperation and sharing. Traditional Indian society had joint family system. It is still prevalent in some areas and cultures. Concept of joint family rests on cooperation and collaboration..members of the joint family not only share and pool their income but also their resources. Children of such families share clothes, books, spaces, toys, food and other articles. They take care of each others needs irrespective of their individual income. Even in modern efforts of sustainable development have recognized concept of sharing and cooperation. A sharing economy, collaborative consumption and peer to peer economies are combination of old and new. But entirely rests on cooperation.

Following this principle requires not alone man to man cooperation but man to society, nation to nation. We need to take care of needs of each person and each country. Cooperation is key to intra-generational equity. Without intra-generational equity, intergenerational equity is not possible. World should be viewed as federation of nations and through cooperative federalism at global level, sustainability is possible. Here, the value of cooperation needs to be contrasted analytically with the value of competition. (Which is defining value of production consumption model of

development and sustainable development.) Competition is not only an economic value but it becomes a social value. Consequentially, cut throat competition is visible in modern society, beyond a threshold, it may threaten many cardinal human values like compassion, affection, trust, truth etc. Competition as a socio-economic value is generating many false needs among us. Heavy marketing and advertising of products result in unnecessary forced consumption. Affluenza is already discussed above in this respect.

To, sum up the entire deliberation, three defining pillars of sustainable living can be discerned out (Saxena Vaishali, 2013):

- Responsibility
- Cooperation
- Reason/wisdom

Sustainable development can be defined as developing with reason, responsibility and cooperation. Sustainable development is not possible without sustainable living, so these three must be the basic values of living of people and communities defined politically and socially. By incorporating these values as part of living, will reduce an individual or society's use of earth resources, reduce their carbon foot prints, alter their transportation, alter their life style per se. Sustainable living is consistent with natural balance, respects humanity's symbiotic relationships with earth, society, and ecology. Development policy at the global, national and local level must not ignore this imperative. We need to view sustainable development in a holistic perspective, not merely, economic, ecological sense but also understand changes and values in one realm may influence another. As we have seen in case of competition- introduced as economic value becomes social value. The basic assumption is man is man can not be segregated in economic, social or any other parameter and hence the human values. So the policies must be designed in holistic manner to achieve balanced living and sustainability.

## **References**

1. Vandana Desai and Potter, 'Companion to Development Studies, Arnold Publishing, London, 2002, 87-88'.
2. Saxena, Vaishali, Urbanization and Sustainable Development, Anthropological Bulletin, Vol. 1, Issue 1, December 2013.
3. Saxena Vaishali, Vikas Avam Stat Vikas, Vikas Paricharch, July-December, Vol 39, 2012, pg. 14-21.
4. Saxena, Vaishali, Right to Development and Environment, Anthropological Bulletin, Vol. 1, Issue 2, 2014.
5. G Tyler Miller, Environmental Science, Thompson Brooks Cole, 2006, pg. 16. World Resource Institute, United Nations Environment Program, UNDP and World Bank, 1999, World Resources 1996-97, A Guide to the Global Environment, Washington D C, World Resources Institute.
6. Michael Redcliff, 'Sustainable Development in the Companion to Development Studies, p. 275.
7. Alan Grainger and Martin Pulvis, Exploring Sustainable Development, Geographical Perspective, Earthscan, London, 2006.
8. Pearce D. Blueprint to Greening the Economy, Earthsacn, 1991, pg. 13.
9. Daly H.E., 'Towards some operational Principles of Sustainable Development, Ecological Economies, 2(1), 2004, pg. 1-6.
10. Habermas, What does Socialism Mean Today in R Blackburn ed. After the Fall London Versa, 1991.
11. David Isakson and Others, 'Balanced living', Development Dialogue, no. 62, 2014, Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, pg. 48.
12. Ted Benetan, Deep Ecology in, The Sage Handbook of Environment and Society. Ed. By Jules Pretty, Andrew S. Ball, Ted Benton, Julia S. Guivant, David R. Lee, David Orr, Max J. Pfeffer and Hugh Ward, London, 2007, pg. 75-85.

