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Foreward by Rajagopal PV and Jill Carr-Harris.

In this meeting of 100 persons from 20 or more countries, the discussion on a Nonviolent Economy was appropriately held in Gandhi Bhawan, Bhopal. Throughout these three days—which included simple food and accommodation, people networked intensively inside and outside of the meeting, and many said that they were able to identify a growing number of nonviolent economic activities existing in different localities and various countries stretching from France to Senegal, from Bolivia to Sudan to Japan. Some of these included organic farming, spinning “non-killing silk”; various forms of weaving, food processing, and many other similar activities. The presence of a large contingent of tribal (adivasi) people—that lit up the atmosphere with numerous songs and slogans—lent an authenticity to the discussions and this left people feeling that they were an integral part of what was going on. The ambiance was very home-like and culturally grounded, quite a contrast from the opulent forums that help to promote a globalized economy.

People recognized how different human relations are in a non-violent economy. Using local money, exchanging services, organizational and business management based on greater social equality and ecological relationships, promoting values in educational institutions, ‘green’ and local politics were all important elements in the discussion. These inputs gave the group a feeling that all these activities were indicative of an emergent non-violent economy still in its nascent stages. If it were to become more commonplace, however, it would lead to a healthier, more socially benign, and environmentally sustainable world.

There is no quick fix to the violence that we face in the economy today. The Bhopal Gas Tragedy is a testament to that. However the exercise of reframing the economic, social and political relations into a non-violent and Gandhian perspective, breathed fresh life into the concepts of self-reliance, local development and trusteeship. Ironically, some of the industrial nations are now taking this effort seriously whereas some of the emergent economies like India, are choosing to bypass this thoughtful direction, at great risk to its population in future.
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This volume is a collection of the talks, discussions and papers presented at a conference held in the city of Bhopal, India from January 30 to February 2, 2010. January 30th was an auspicious date for the participants, being the 62nd anniversary of the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi; Bhopal was an auspicious place, being the site of the 1984 environmental disaster caused by the now defunct Union Carbide Chemical Company.

The theme of the conference was, “Toward a Non-violent Economy”, and the organizers conceived it along the lines envisaged by Gandhi in his critique of modern civilization first articulated in the book *Hind Swaraj* in 1909.¹ That is to say, they drew its themes from three key notions that Gandhi proposed as the basis for an alternative to the modern economy and its violence: *swaraj* (integral self-sufficiency); *swadeshi* (re-localization of livelihood resources and systems) and *trusteeship* (ethical responsibility toward possessions and property).² As Etienne Godinot notes in an essay on Gandhian economics included below, “Gandhi was not an economist but his economic vision was endowed with a rich comprehension of the dynamics and processes of the economy as well as of human social reality”.³

In this sense, Gandhi’s notions were complex and challenging in his own time and, partly for that reason, they never achieved the status of either of the ‘great’ economic models that have dominated the twentieth century, communism and capitalism. Yet ten years into the new millenium and still under the shadow of the global financial crisis of 2009, they have come back to life with a remarkable freshness and prescience. Through the ideology of the neo-liberal economics of globalization, the market economy has since been reshaped into a world-wide corporatist system that has grown beyond anyone’s imagination or control. As the financial crisis circled the globe, the drama of

---

¹ See the essay by Satish K. Jain, “On the Normative Structure of Gandhian Thought With Special Reference to *Hind Swaraj*,” for an analysis of Gandhi’s critique and his insight that the ‘system’ of modern civilization was based on the meta-principle of “self-interest” and that “that any normative structure which assigned such large domain to self-interest could not be sustainable in the long run”.

² See the Etienne Godinot, “The economic thought of Gandhi” for an explanation of the key terms of swaraj, swadeshi and trusteeship

³ Godinot, infra.
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multinational corporations which were considered “too big to fail”\(^4\) and the governments that did indeed rescue them in desperation, also revealed that we had arrived at a kind of endgame.

If that financial crisis truly opened the door on the need to search for genuine alternatives, the shadows of the abandoned Union Carbide reminded everyone of the inherent and systemic violence of the market economy. The link between economic centralization, corporate globalism and these outcomes of environmental and human violence were easy to see in Bhopal. Two months after the conference, like a second shoe dropping, BP’s gulf oil disaster brought home once more the urgency of the situation and our apparent helplessness in the face of it.

The passing months of helplessness experienced as the oil continued leaking into the Gulf also underlined the nature of the problem: it was neither simply technological nor economic (neither know-how nor money could fix it). By overreaching all ‘natural’ limits, the economic system had created a dynamism (or rather several dynamisms on the environmental and human levels) which were horrendously out of control—out of all our control. The problems, we now realize, are systemic, deeply rooted in a market economy that has transformed all of our lives. It may well be time to reflect on Gandhi again. In this light, the gathering in Bhopal, and the reflections on ways to reconstruct the economy on a human—though still global—scale, were auspicious and timely in several ways.

The conference, which was co-sponsored by the grassroots people’s movement of India, Ekta Parishad and the French NGO, Gandhi International, was auspicious in a first sense because it brought together activists and intellectuals from many parts of the globe who were able to accomplish a remarkable breakthrough dialogue between the global north and the global south.

In terms of participants alone, it brought together 120 people: from the global North—among them representatives from England, France, Finland and Switzerland and Canada—and from the global South, representatives from Africa (Algeria, Morocco, Senegal, Sudan), Asia (Bangladesh, Burma, Japan, Malaysia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Thailand) and Latin America (Brazil, Mexico and Paraguay). This diversity brought with it a series of richly diverse perspectives: professional economists from both France and India (like Jean Boillot and Satish Jain), activists both old and young from the global north and the global south, (Yves Berthelot and Bernard Dangeard from France, A.T Ariyartne from Sri Lanka, Aye Aye Win of Burma and Amitabh Behar from India) as well as those from

\(^4\) This is the phrase used by the economist, Jean-Jacques Boillot, in his summary “A Concluding Vision.”
further afield: Sebastien Perez Vasquez from Chiapas, Liliane Esther Alfonso from Paraquay, Ziad Medhouk from Gaza and Light Aganwa from Sudan. But more: there were Gandhian theorists (Dr. K Gopal Iyer and N. Vasudevan) and CEO’s of multinationals (Emmanuel Faber), members of the European Parliament (Karima Delli) and campaigners for Greenpeace (Ramapathy Kumar). In short, the diversity was broad and deep but remarkably *in dialogue* and open to it.

What united all of the participants—including the village activists from Ekta Parishad who welcomed them—was an intuition or a deeply proven commitment to the way of non-violence in the broad sense in which Gandhi defined it: as a quest for truth and a respect for the truth of others. Since for Gandhi that truth was a seamless garment that included the life and well-being of the least, the poorest of the poor, non-violence demanded to be worked out in the concreteness of human life and society. The issue before them was how to apply this truth and full justice to the context of the market economy that now envelops both the global north and the global south.

This deep commitment to non-violence that reaches so easily across the global divide can be attributed to Gandhi himself, but its real cause (and the impetus for the conference) was the more recent meeting between two quite remarkable individuals, Louis Campana and PV Rajagopal. Campana, a life-long Gandhian activist in France who conceived and initiated the idea for the conference, had already crossed the divide when he came to India in 2007 to walk on the Janadesh March with Rajagopal. Like Lanza del Vasto, the father of French Gandhianism, who came to meet Gandhi in 1937, Campana came to witness first-hand an unprecedented, grassroots revival of Gandhian activism, the Janadesh Padayatra of 25,000 landless peasants walking for one month down the national highway from Gwalior to New Delhi. What Campana saw there and documented in his movie, “*La Marche de Gueux*” (*March of the Despised*), is best heard in his own words:

This film witnesses to the resurgence of a gandhian spirit, both full of compassion for a people who have been deprived, abandoned and despised by the powers of the public—and, at the same time, capable of empowering these men and women who had been convinced that their karma was bad and that their miserable condition was the result of a dissolute life.

Rajagopal embodies that spirit. Never, in my forty years of non-violent struggle, have I met a man like him, someone close to the poorest of the poor and also capable of empowering them with enough determination and confidence in themselves that they dare to confront the politicians who are so distant and
This very Gandhian combination of compassionate walking with the poor and an ability
to empower them to challenge the structures of an economy that was destroying their way
of life, is something Rajagopal has practiced over thirty years of work in rural India,
fighting for the livelihood rights of Adivasis. The struggle to defend the rights to “land,
water and forest” that he waged so tirelessly in the villages of rural Madhya Pradesh, is,
sadly, now something we are all very familiar with. And now, through the crisis in the
global economy and the environmental crises, we see it clearly as a struggle with the
market economy itself, an economy of ‘unlimited growth’ and greed.

The participants to the conference (both those from the south and those from the
north) often refer to Gandhi’s now well-known maxim on economics: “The world has
enough for everyone’s need, but not enough for everyone’s greed”. Gandhi’s actual words
were, as one participant reminded everyone, even more telling: “The world has enough
for everyone’s need, but not enough for one person’s greed”. Need is self-limiting and
knows its boundaries; greed creates more greed and ultimately, cascades beyond all
control. As is often noted now, in the ‘consumer’ society of the west one can never have
enough. Greed has become inventive beyond anyone’s expectations and the market has
become its systemic expression.

None of this critical insight takes away from the passionate optimism of the
Gandhian. Rajagopal himself embodies this optimism for fundamental change. Yet his is
a knowledgeable optimism; as he notes in his concluding talk:

A society based on Sarvodaya—the well-being of all, is not going to happen just
because we wish it. It has to begin somewhere and I tell you that it has to begin
with the well-being of the least, Antyodaya (as Gandhi called it). Therefore, the
philosophical framework in which this action is going to be put begins with a
strong faith in the power of the poor. It begins with the fact that poor people can
really make a change. If we believe in that then we can start looking at the so-
called weaknesses of the poor as strengths.6

5 In a letter to the author: “Ce film témoigne de la résurgence d’un esprit gandhien, à la
fois plein de compassion pour un peuple déprimé, abandonné et méprisé par les pouvoirs
publics, et capable de faire se redresser fièrement des femmes et des hommes convaincus
que leur karma était mauvais et que leur condition misérable était le résultat d’une vie
dissolue.
Rajagopal incarne cet esprit-là. Jamais, en quarante années de combats non-violents, je
n’ai vu un homme comme lui, proche des plus petits, des plus désespérés et capable de
stimuler en eux assez de détermination et de confiance en eux-mêmes pour oser affronter
des hommes politiques si distants et parfois méprisants à leur égard.”
The conference itself and the association with Gandhi International are an expression of the growth in confidence and vision in Ekta Parishad since the Janadesh March. Since Janadesh, this has taken form in a series of well-articulated positions on land reform and the protection of livelihood resources (water, forest, minerals) from industrialization, tourism and corporate agriculture. To bring these issues to the table, Rajagopal is planning a larger march, Jansatyagraha/The March for Justice in 2012. His plan is to walk through India for a year, beginning at the ocean in Kerala on October 2011 and arriving with 100,000 people in Delhi in October 2012. That, if you like, is the activist point of all this talk: solidarity in the work of creating a new economy (see the final resolution of the Conference below).

What follows is a selection from papers submitted to the conference in several languages, in addition to short talks and reports transcribed from some 25 cassette tapes recorded during the sessions. Given this diverse material, I have tried to organize the material into a readable flow by following the three topic areas of the conference: the reflections on swaraj, swadeshi and trusteeship. Each of these is the focus of one of the three main chapters:

3. **An Economy Based on Human Needs: Voices from the Field on Swaraj.**
4. **The Possibility of a Local Economy: Voices from the Field on Swadeshi**
5. **The Possibility of an Ethical Economy: Voices from the Field on Trusteeship.**

The image of ‘voices from the field’ derives from the character of many of the reports and documents: they constitute practical concrete reflections from around the globe on the possibilities and the actualities of a new, non-violent economy.

These three chapters are preceded by important but quite different material: first a selection of four, more theoretical papers developing the Gandhian approach to economics (**Chapter 1 Background: Gandhi’s Economic Thought**). These are very helpful and insightful essays and their ideas will continue to resonate throughout the talks, but they can also stand on their own. Along with this, there is an important transitional chapter between the theory and the practical reports: **Chapter 2: Opening the Conference: An Invitation to Consider the Alternative to the Market Economy.** These are brief and passionate statements of the urgent need for reconsideration of the
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economy from around the world. The book concludes with a series of reflections in
Chapter 6 on “The Way Forward: Reflection on Grassroots Action to build the New
Economy.

In his welcome to the delegates, the venerable Gandhian activist, Sr. Subhao Rao
tells the story of how Gandhi was first approached by the famous scholar, Kripilani who
expressed to him his skepticism that change could happen non-violently. “This has never
been the case in history,” Kripilani argued. Gandhi’s reply was, in its wise innocence
unnerving to the great scholar: “What makes you think that the last chapter of history has
already been written?” Kripilani became a believer on the spot.

Change and its possibility are very much the issue for us now and now as then, the
resistance to change is often a debilitating sense of hopelessness. You will hear the
opposite of that in these dialogues: a realistic but abundant confidence in the possibility of
human good. That speaks for itself.

I want to thank three people for their invaluable help in the editing process. Jill
Carr-Harris, a leading activist in Ekta and the wife of Rajagopal for her calm, clear
confidence throughout. Dr. S. Jeyapragasam, an inspiring friend and companion in the
discovery of Gandhi in the modern world. Christophe Grigri, a translator extraordinaire
and activist (‘oui, militant’) in the best sense for his translation assistance and wry
humour. Finally, I would like to thank both Louis Campana and Rajaji for their vision and
passion and commitment from which I have already learned so much.
Welcome, by Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan, Chief Minister, Madhya Pradesh.

We are gathered here on what for us is a very sacred day India, a day to remember Gandhiji, the day on which he was assassinated. It is wonderful for us to have people from all over the world come here to join us and to think about the importance of the thought of Mahatma Gandhi. In our culture, a the guest is equal to god. We welcome you in that spirit, with honour and with what Aye Aye Win from Burma has just mentioned, lovingkindness…

You have gathered here to reflect on the idea of a non-violent economy and to bring it to light from the central concepts of Gandhi’s thought and to see how it is relevant today in the context of modern capitalism.

As Mahatma Gandhi recognized in his great work *Hind Swaraj* there is one underlying root around which the modern economy is built, the root of pleasure, the pleasure of the body. The question of bodily pleasure is and has become the supreme measure of everything in modern civilization—-all economic, cultural and political development is measured by this, Gandhi recognized. As such, it is excludes the values of the spirit.

We certainly see this in the modern political economy which is basically exploitative of nature and of the people who of the less powerful. In my own state of Madhya Pradesh we have many mineral resources but we do not use them for the well-being of our own people. Rather they are taken—exploited—and sold to other countries. For example, we sell much of our iron ore to Japan and we sell it to them very cheaply,
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much more cheaply than we sell it to any Indian company. This is exploitation and it
benefits very few people. It is driven by the goal of accumulation of money and therefore
‘bodily pleasure’ as Gandhi said. If we were to use our resources in a different way, a
non-exploitative way we would be moving to a non-violent economy and away from
exploitation.

Gandhi has a very famous saying about this that you know, he contrasts need and
greed. The contrast between need and greed is often misquoted; what Gandhi actually said
is, “there is enough for every person’s need but not enough for a single person’s greed.”
A “single person’s greed”-- Gandhi is very particular in his words. Greed of one person
creates more greed in other and misfortune for all. And this is the greed that is at the
centre of the modern economy, of politics and of culture. This is the soul of the modern
economy.

Unless we put some limit on ourselves, on our ‘greed’ as Gandhi said in Hind
Swaraj, we will head for disaster. Gandhi also argued that our forefathers put a ceiling on
progress, they knew the wisdom of those limits. But now we have to ask, ‘where does
this restraining power come from?’ It is developed in culture. When we ask what we live
for as human beings. We can answer, for happiness. We want to live and live happily.
Where is that happiness rooted? In the body, and the five senses? Is that the goal of my
life? We know it is not. Satisfying our inner self is more important. That is what leads to
happiness Gandhi also said that everyone has this inner self or inner voice. Even a thief
has an inner voice. That is what tells us what is right and wrong. It is what Gandhi called
the voice of God. When we listen to it we find happiness and joy.

If we look around us at the modern economy we see the exploitation of nature,
culture, and of human beings—does this lead to satisfy the inner voice? No, of course not.
If we are to find the way to a non-violent economy we must learn to listen to the inner
voice that we all have.

I welcome you to India and to Madhya Pradesh. I want to tell you that I am open
to your ideas. I wish you every success.
Some Stories about Gandhi and a Welcome, Shri Subha Rao

I am happy to be here and welcome you to this meeting on the non-violent economy. I think it is wonderful that people have come from around the world, from South America and South Asia and Africa and France, to dialogue with us about Gandhi and his ideas. I think you will have very important discussions together and that you will come to some good conclusions.

Let me just tell you some stories of my own experience teaching about Gandhi over these many years.

One of Gandhi’s favorite stories was called the ‘golden necklace’. It is about a man who was walking in the market and another man offers him a beautiful golden necklace—very cheap! And the man thinks, well everyone will think well of me if I buy this necklace at this price. It will be a bargain. And so he buys the necklace and takes it home. His wife and his daughter are very pleased with it and especially when they hear the price. But the next day the man hears the news of a murder. A young girl has been murdered in that town. The police are searching for the murderer who killed the girl for a golden necklace.
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You can relate this story to the problem of the non-violent economy I think. We buy and sell, and look for the most inexpensive things, but we do not ask ourselves where these things come from, how they are made, what violence is behind their low cost. That is the structural violence. That is what the modern economy is about.

I am glad that you are coming here to talk about Gandhi’s ideas. I often tell people in India that only we in India remember him—around the world people no longer think he is relevant. But recently I traveled to America and there I saw in John F. Kennedy Airport a banner with a portrait of Mahatma Gandhi and under it were written the words, “What made Gandhi, Gandhi?” That is a very important question, ‘what was the real inner strength that allowed him to do what he did’? He was after all just one man and he stood against the British Empire.

There was also a portrait of the great American President, Abraham Lincoln at the airport. Under Lincoln were written the words, “Failure, failure, failure, President”. You could say the same thing about Gandhi—he had many, many failures before he began to succeed. He was a failure as a lawyer. When he argued a case and he realized that his client was being dishonest, he asked the judge to convict him. That is not how to succeed as a lawyer. He went to South Africa because he failed as a lawyer and wanted to try again there. When he got there circumstances led him to follow a different course however.

You know the story about how he was thrown off the first class train, because he was a ‘coloured’ person. He thought after that there were three possibilities: he could fight back, he could ignore it or he could resist the system of apartheid. That is what he did, as you know, and it led him to discover a courage that he had not known before. It was a courage that was roused when he resisted injustice.

Everyone of us has this inner strength. So do not ask yourself how one person can confront such a large injustice. Look around you when you are here in any village in India and you will see a little boy with stick herding large bullocks. That is the image of the strength of non-violence.

Another story: when Gandhi was beginning his work in India, he was confronted by a very important Professor, a man named Kripilani, who taught India history. He was very skeptical about Gandhi plan for a non-violent revolution. He said to Gandhi, “There has never been an example of a non-violent revolution in the history of the world. What makes you think you can bring one about?” And Gandhi answered him, “What makes you think that the last chapter of history has already been written?” Kripilani realized then that Gandhi was moving on a deeper level and he became one of his most dedicated followers.
That again, was the power of the inner strength, the moral courage to stand against injustice.

I want to tell you that that is something each of us has. Within each of us is the power to resist injustice, the power to stand for non-violent change. I hope you will let that idea guide you in your discussions over the next few days and I wish you every success.
Welcome of Grassroots Leaders from Ekta Parishad

I welcome you all. Yesterday I heard many voices speaking about our problems. I couldn’t understand all the voices and what they were saying. One thing I would like to say is that until and unless the voices of the people from the villages are included here among those voices, I don’t think we will make very much progress from this auditorium. We have to be there, only then we will move ahead.

Narmadabai, Ekta Parishad National Council Member

I want to salute you. I want to salute Mahatma Gandhiji. I want to salute this nation and this earth. Jai Jagat.1 Because of the people’s organization, Ekta Parishad, I have much strength and I have strength because of the membership and the leadership. They have given this opportunity to me to lead the campaign at the grassroots level and to come here to speak on behalf of Ekta Parishad. I think we community leaders too must learn to speak here in the main speeches of this presentation.

Manto Adivasi

1* Editor’s Note: Jai Jagat, or ‘Victory to the World’ is the slogan of Ekta Parishad activists. It comes from a saying of Gandhi later turned into a popular song.
I. BACKGROUND: GANDHI’S ECONOMIC THOUGHT

An Outline of Gandhi’s Economic Thought, Etienne Godinot.2

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) developed a vibrant critique of the mode of development and also of the very idea of ‘civilization’ as it was then exemplified by the British Empire and the western nations. This model of ideology, as he argued, rested on violence and exploitation (slavery and then colonization), and abandoned both morality and spirituality, while creating new needs which were impossible to satisfy. In all of these senses, western civilization essentially created misery and marginalization. Yet as he foresaw with great prescience: “this civilization is such that one must just be patient and it will self-destruct”. The industrialization and globalization of the economy was, he argued, a disaster for India.

For Gandhi, the economy was meaningful to the extent that it opened out the possibility of well-being for all people. That implied a system of production, of distribution and consumption defined by the essential needs of most deprived people in the society (antyodaya—‘the least’) with the aim of supporting the highest values of human life, recognizing human dignity, non-violence and creative labour.

It was in this context that Gandhi’s notion of the ‘well-being of all’ (sarvodaya) emerged as the term to describe social and economic justice. His understanding of the path to sarvodaya was through a village economy which maximized the powers of the traditional Indian handcrafts and only employed modern machines that allowed for a ‘production by the masses’ rather than ‘mass production’. In this light, Gandhi choose the spinning wheel (charka) as a symbol not only of the battle in India for the liberation from British imperialism but also of economic independence.

Gandhi’s economic thought depended very much on the English artist and writer, John Ruskin (1819-1900). In his outrage at the injustice and inhumanity of industrialization, Ruskin denounced the savagery of capitalism which destroyed the social fabric and created poverty while ravaging society with an economy that had no morality. He proposed to ‘discover a different type of technology which was founded not only on rationality but also on the spiritual life of the human being’: that which is true for science and technology is also true for politics and the economy.

2 This is a translation of a section of the document “Vers une économie non-violente: Compte-rendu du colloque international organisé à Bhopal (India),” by Etienne Godinot included as Appendix II.
Gandhi was also inspired by the thought of the American activist and writer, Henry David Thoreau and above all, the Russian writer, Leo Tolstoy. From them, he developed his understanding not only of non-violence but also of his own chosen way of life: a simplicity of needs, a focus on the means and techniques used to achieve the ends, the fundamental requirement for a sharing of wealth among all people, a commitment to the greatest possible autonomy of action, and a focus on grassroots self-organization of decentralized and democratic communities.

Gandhi was not an economist but his economic vision is full of a rich understanding of economic dynamics and processes as well as of human and social reality. It was also stimulated by the alternatives which it proposed: for the ‘father’ of India’s independence, it was the dignity of the human being rather than their material prosperity which ought to be the basis of economic structures. Both economics and politics should not be reduced to only material things but should become the means to the realization of spiritual and cultural goals.

In this light, Gandhi distinguishes the following:

1) self-government/self-reliance (swaraj),

Political swaraj (as in the book, Hind Swaraj) envisages India’s independence of English colonization. Economic swaraj is based on the capacity of each country to use its own resources for its proper development. Gandhi thought that it was not the development of the cities which would make for a non-violent autonomy of the Indian people: only the consolidation of the political and economic autonomy of villages could, in his view, support the building of a non-violent society.

“True independence”, he said, “will not come from some people seizing power but rather from the power which we all have to oppose the abuse of authority. In other words, we ought to come to independence by inculcating the masses with the conviction that they have the possibility of controlling the exercise of authority and of maintaining it with respect.”

Gandhi’s conception of economic self-reliance is well summarized in a passage from a text drawn from Return to the Sources, written by Lanza del Vasto in May, 1937.3

In it, Gandhi, speaking to young people, says:

---

3 Editor’s Note. Lanza Del Vasto, an Italian born poet and activist, met with Gandhi in India in 1937 and thereafter returned to France to found a Gandhian style community called, The Ark. He wrote and carried non-violent actions in Europe until his death in 1981. The book, Le Pélerinage aux Sources, mentioned was a “huge success” and made him the most recognizable ‘Gandhian’ in Europe.
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“I send you to the villages where we will be companions in the struggle against the occupier who awaits you. May each of you care for yourself, and think of yourself and your needs without becoming dependent on anyone: that would be well-ordered charity. At that point where the individual cannot take care of their own needs, may the family take care of them and at the point where it cannot, may the village take care of them and where the village cannot, may the whole region do it.

Always try to produce things in the place where you are and avoid the unnecessary circulation of goods—for that is where waste occurs and then there arise the work of the brokers, the speculators, the national politicians or others who have taken away the products on which the life of the people depends.

You will be supporting or reestablishing the old village industries and you will be creating new ones.

Wherever you are, encourage the spinning of cotton/khadi which will reduce unemployment. The spinning wheels cost very little and cotton is abundant: we ought no longer to buy our cloth from the English, who take cotton from our country make into cloth and import it again to our country.

Prepare for political independence through economic independence: and I remind you of what is the unique goal of the economy—not economic development as such, but rather the development of the human person, of their interior peace, the elevation of their spirit and their liberation.

My children, may the human being always remain greater than what they produce and more precious than what they have! Go, root our misery and cultivate sobriety.”

Swaraj rests upon the satisfaction of needs and not on the abundance created by mass production: “The earth supplies enough to satisfy the needs of each person but not greed of each person. It is more greed and the hardness of heart (rather than a scarcity of resources) that have created the problem as much for this generation as for the following ones”. Greed comes from the desire for excess, swaraj aims to limit human desires and to satisfy first basic needs.

An important axis of the economic thought of Gandhi is the simplification of needs or more accurately, the self-limitation of desires, that is the reason that many people think that he is the originator of the idea of a ‘zero-growth’ economy: “To live simply so that others can simply live”; “It is necessary to bring an end to this mad rush that drives one to always want more money”; “In what concerns my rule of life, I must say that I have never dared to possess that which I did not need”.

Among the ingredients of the idea of swaraj, it is necessary to note the predominance of the traditional sector. The highest importance is given to agriculture and to food crops. A balance should be maintained between this primary sector (agriculture, forestry, fishing), the secondary one (industry) and the third sector (service) and the balance should be based on the human resources available in each country.

Secondly, the villages ought to be more important than the cities. Gandhi observes: “You cannot build non-violence in a civilization of factories, but it can be built in self-limiting
villages. You ought therefore to have a rural mentality and to have that you should have faith in the method of weaving”.

Seven criteria characterize economic independence according to Gandhi:

- Elimination of poverty and the minimizing of wealth.
- Self-sufficiency of each unit in its basic needs.
- Identification of basic human needs and the means of meeting them.
- Agriculture that is respectful of the environment as a basis for the creation of a durable economy.
- Production that is based as far as possible on small groups.
- Control and elimination of distorted views by basic education and technical formation.
- Limitations to the concentration of economic power.

2) Self-sufficiency (swadeshi)

*Swadeshi* is a mode of production that is decentralized, home-based, modeled on handcraft, respectful of life (especially animal life) and of the environment, rather than the modes of production which are centralized, industrial and mechanical. Mass production requires people to leave their villages, their homes, their lands, their customs in order to work in a factory.

Following the principle of *swadeshi*, everything that is made in a village should be used above all by the members of the village. Exchange between villages, between villages and cities and even more between nations should be limited to the minimum. *Swadeshi* thereby avoids the use of unnecessary transportation which is unhealthy, unproductive and destructive of the environment.

In order to avoid separating the economy from the profound spiritual foundations of life, it is best when each individual participates as much as possible in their own community, when the production of goods is kept to a small scale, when the economy is local, when the preference is given to handcrafts and local manufacturing.

3) The guardianship of ethics and spirituality over economics (trusteeship):

The Gandhian idea of trusteeship emerges from his faith in the law of non-possession. It is based on the belief that all things come from God and belong to God. All the resources of the universe therefore are ordained for humanity as a whole and not for particular individuals.
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When an individual obtains more than their respective share, they become a trustee of that portion, they have control of it for the sake of all of humanity.

In essence, Gandhi is proposing this idea as a solution to the financial inequalities of inheritance and income, a sort of non-violent solution to resolve the social and economic conflicts in the world. It is the dignity of the human being, and not their material prosperity, which the centre of Gandhi’s economic thought. The Gandhian economy envisages a redistribution of material wealth as way of guaranteeing human dignity.

- Private property is not absolute but is subordinated to the common good.
- An individual cannot retain and used their wealth for egotistic satisfaction, ignoring the interests of society.
- The differences in income ought to be reasonable, equitable and variable over time—with the tendency toward reducing the discrepancies.
- Production should be determined by need and not by personal whim.

In many texts, Gandhi illustrates the connection between ethics and economics:

“The true economy is never in opposition with the highest ethical principles, in the same way that true ethics, to deserve that name, has to become at the same time a good economics…The true economy defends social justice; it promotes the good of all through an equality that includes the weakest; and it is indispensable for a good life”; “The fact of extending the law of non-violence to the domain of the economy signifies nothing less that taking moral values into consideration when determing the rules of international commerce.”

Gandhi was far from hostile to science whose methods he admired so much that he attempted to transpose them into the context of his life and action. He did not criticize science itself but rather the uses that were made of it by modern civilization and industry.

At the same time, Gandhi was not opposed to all technology, indeed, he recognized that it could ease the suffering of people. He was full of admiration for the bicycle and the Singer sewing machine. Yet he wanted machines to remain subservient to the worker and he recommended small machines that could be used by a greater number rather than large machines aimed at mass production. He was very critical of heavy industry. It is necessary, he argued, “to favour production by the masses rather than mass production”, that is to say to give work to all through small enterprises in agriculture, industry or handcrafts and to limit the control of machines.

For Gandhi, a machine-based civilization was not a civilization. A society in which workers were chained to their work, where animals were treated with cruelty in farm factories, and in which economic activity led to ecological destruction could not be
considered a civilization. Its citizens are neurotic, the world is being transformed into a
desert and its cities are jungles of concrete, pavement and steel. “The craze of wanting to
make everything 'by the dozen' is the cause of the world crisis we are experiencing.
Suppose for an instant that a machine could meet all human needs. Production would find
itself concentrated at certain points in the world so that it would be necessary to organize
a complex distribution network to supply those needs of humanity. On the contrary, if
each region produced what it needed, the problem of distribution would be automatically
solved.”

The ‘Gandhian plan of economic development’ proposed in 1944 allowed for a
limited role for modern industry. “I have never envisaged, nor even less recommended
that we abandon even a single of the industrial activities which are healthy and profitable,”
he argued. But the Congress Party proposed the ‘Bombay plan’ which was developed by a
group of industrialists and supported by Jawaharlal Nehru.4

While marxist socialism insisted on control and violence for overcoming an
oppressive order, the program of Gandhi anticipated first a change of heart on the part of
the wealthy, but it didn’t exclude control: “If despite everything, and after the most
dedicated efforts we cannot persuade the wealthy to truly protect the poor, and if that
latter are truly oppressed, what can one do? It was in trying to answer this question that
the methods of non-cooperation and civil disobedience appeared to me to be the one
capable of satisfying both justice and effectiveness. The wealthy cannot make their
fortune in a given society without the cooperation of the poor. If this truth took root
among the poor and if they were convinced of it, they would take confidence and learn
how to free themselves on their own, with non-violent methods, from the oppressive
inequalities that have borne them to the edge of starvation”. Gandhi clearly sees therefore,

4* Editor’s Note. Wikipedia: “The Bombay Plan is the name commonly given to a set of proposals for the
development of the post-independence economy of India. The plan, published in 1944/1945 by seven
leading Indian industrialists, proposed state intervention in the economic development of the nation after
independence from the United Kingdom (which occurred in 1947).

Although Jawaharlal Nehru the first Prime Minister of India, did not officially accept the plan, "the
Nehruvian era witnessed [what was effectively] the implementation of the Bombay Plan; a substantially
interventionist state and an economy with a sizeable public sector." Its perceived influence has given it
iconic status, and "it is no exaggeration to say that the Bombay Plan has come to occupy something of a
mythic position in Indian historiography. There is scarcely a study of postwar Indian economic history that
does not point to it as an indicator of the developmental and nationalistic aspiration of the domestic
capitalist class."

The basic objectives were a doubling of the (then current) output of the agricultural sector and a
five-fold growth in the industrial sector, both within the framework of a 100 billion Rupee (£72b, $18b)
investment (of which 44.8% was slated for industry) over 15 years."
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the forces on the field of battle and he knew how to apply them through public opinion and the press.

The call for the conversion of the rich and to a voluntary sharing was to be the conception of Vinoba Bhave, Gandhi’s disciple, in his ‘bhoodan campaign’ (land-gift) aimed at land redistribution to the poor. The other disciples of Gandhi, however, took a different approach, for example, Jayaparakash Narayan or Martin Luther King Jr. who both understood that the Gandhian political campaigns, while they were addressed to the conscience of the oppressors, also exercised a pressure and constraint which obliged them to act politically. The approach of Rajagopal also moves in this direction based on the recognition that the right to land is a right of the human being and justifies non-violent actions of pressure and constraint with the goal of changing the existing legal and social situations.

It remains a task for us today to realize intelligently these intuitions of Gandhian thought… The best disciples of a master are those who don’t simply repeat like parrots but rather who adapt to new contexts and eventually dare even to contradict the master on this or that point. Let me give one example in the Gandhian tradition to conclude.

Joseph Chelladurai Cornelius Kumarappa (1892-1960), a friend of Gandhi, was his foremost disciple in the area of economics. Kumarappa was a commerce and economics expert trained at Columbia University. He dedicated himself to the study of the practical and theoretical bases of different forms of economy. In 1940 he became the secretary of the AIVIA (All India Village Industries Association). He built his work from the premise that every being, in fulfilling its proper way of acting is at the same time fulfilling the role which is assigned to it in the largest cycle of of life. He explained these ideas in the work entitled, The Economy of Permanence: A Quest for a Social Order based on Non-violence.

Kumarappa recognized clearly that the world was not made for a complete non-violent cooperation among its different elements. In fact he identifies five types of economies with very different natures: parasitic, predatory, entrepreneurial, gregarious and service-oriented. For him, the service-oriented economy is the highest kind of

5’ Editor’s Note: Wikipedia: “The Bhoodan mission was to allow wealthy landowners to voluntarily give a percentage of their land to lower castes. Bhave walked across India on foot, and as it has been well recorded, was quite persuasive. He was followed by crowds nearly everywhere he went. Philosophically, Bhave was directly influenced by the Sarvodaya movement of Gandhi, of which he considered Bhoodan a natural extension. His goal, as stated in his memoir, was to provide holistic uplift.

The movement was started in 1951 when telangana peasant movement on the land issue reached the peak. It was a violent struggle launched by poor peasants against the local landlords.Rural rich must participate in voluntary distribution of land.”
The contemporary economy, dominated by the quest for infinite growth, generating environmental degradation and social ills, is a transitory economy with a future.

The work of Kumarappa illustrates how the conception of the human being which is presupposed in classical economic science is really derived from capitalist society and is far from being universal. Kumarappa tried to elaborate on the mechanisms of production and distribution within a *sarvodaya* economy, but his work remained incomplete, in part because he put so much of his energy toward his work in the area of village industries.

The *Kumarappa Institute of Gram Swaraj* or KGS, created in 1967, elaborated and developed his methods toward a development that was based on balance and autonomy. It focussed particularly on women, untouchables, tribal populations and the marginalized through its projects of micro-development to meet the basic needs of peoples (agriculture and cultivation, handcrafts, energy, irrigation, small industry, hygiene) and the creation of village councils.

In this light, finally, we can clarify the key concepts of the colloquium in Bhopal around the three concepts so central to Gandhi.

- **Swaraj** is political and economic independence but also the liberation of the human being from all systems and ideologies which would undermine human dignity.
- **Swadeshi** is economic self-reliance, but the reappropriation of one’s own life and an apprenticeship in taking control of one’s own interior power.
- **Trusteeship**, predominance given to ethics and the common good. A non-violent economy presupposes the autonomy of everyone, the right and the inspiration of everyone to begin an undertaking according to their own action while at the same time maintaining as the ultimate objective and rule of action, the interests of the community.

In the past thirty years, the new notion of ‘Thinking globally and acting locally’ has become prominent. To act locally is to express the autonomy of each person, group, village region. To think globally is to take into account together three aspects of our common good: the economic aspect (producing goods to satisfy human needs), the social aspect (protecting the interdependence of society and the dignity of all) and the ecological
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aspect (preserving the life and the biodiversity of our planet).Etine
We have experienced that neither Capitalism nor Socialism can be expected to promote the highest well-being of the masses. The mistake of both of them is that they are primarily interested in producing the greatest amount of material wealth, the capitalist for himself, and the socialist for all the members of the community. Hence it is that both of them adopt centralised methods of production. In addition to securing for the worker an abundance of material wealth, the socialist tries hard to promote human self-development. We have seen, however, the small degree of success this has achieved. You cannot, it would seem, have both. You cannot serve God and mammon. If this is so, it is obvious that if the socialist's goal of well-being for all is to be realised, it is such well-being and not more abundance of goods that should be the basis on which we should build the economic order. Self development at all costs, even if it means - less material wealth—that should be our slogan. Otherwise we are apt to continually sacrifice self-development for material wealth as the socialist appears to do.

This point is so important and yet seems to be so little realised today that it is well to develop it still further especially as it constitutes the basis of the new type of economic order which we have called an “Economy of Non-Violence” (ENV). Under Capitalism the efficiency of a method of production is judged not by whether, it helps or hinders human development, but by whether it is capable of turning out cheap goods which can be sold at competitive prices in the open market. We have become so accustomed in regarding cheapness as the mark of efficiency that it never occurs to us to ask whether we are right in doing so. Let us see.

Is cheapness or acquisition of material wealth all that people want? Formally, we might ask, would people want wealth that has been stolen, or that has been obtained by murder? Who would be willing, for example, to buy a bracelet which he knows to have been torn from the arm of an innocent child who has been murdered in the process and thrown in the jungle? Wealth is something we desire no doubt, but not when it is so obtained. Moral considerations outweigh economic values. If the bracelet were sought to be sold to those who knew how it was obtained, there would hardly be anybody who could be tempted to buy it, however cheap it might be sold.

A person will feel insulted if you tell him that he cares for nothing beyond money. And yet economists have dealt with human beings as though there is no other motive in human affairs than avarice — the grim law of supply and demand working like a soulless
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machine determining every detail of human economic life. Once these laws are framed by
the economist, they are regarded as fixed and eternal as any law of nature; and, what is
worse, people begin to believe in them and shape their economic policies in their light.
What may have been but a distorted view of human nature, harmless if confined to
textbooks, is unfortunately taken seriously and put into effect, and makes people behave
like the monsters that economists have imagined them to be — money-making machines
engaged solely in accumulating wealth, or so many pigs glutting themselves without
looking beyond their snout.

Thus the economist seeks to study the laws that control the management of
business. She or he assumes that business is business and that all other considerations,
even if existent, are irrelevant to his field of study. And then they proceed to formulate
laws as though for the human being nothing matters besides acquisition of wealth.

Yet as we have just pointed out, the human being is not a purely economic being.
They have other interests besides wealth— intellectual, moral, social, aesthetic and
religious interests, and when they come into play, they often completely override the
economic motive. This being so, it is folly to dismiss them as of no importance, since they
control human life as much as any economic motive.

An economy of nonviolence starts by seeking to rectify this initial error
underlying the prevailing economic schools of thought. It takes the human being as they
are, a complex being, actuated by hopes, ideals and aspirations, and not merely dominated
by the desire for economic gain. And it seeks to outline an economic order which can
ultimately satisfy this human being. Obviously such an individual cannot be content with
mere economic goods. Cheapness obtained at the cost of these higher values, is something
that this human being will reject when they know how it has been obtained.

An economic system which seeks the well-being of all is in the end also the
cheapest for the community, as it will save expenditure on elaborate organisation and
machinery for quelling disruptive forces working against its interests. We have found that
under capitalism civil strife and war are inevitable, while under socialism they were still a
possibility. So long as that is so, much of the wealth of the people is wasted on the police,
the army, and weapons of defence; and not only material wealth but also human lives are
sacrificed without counting the cost. In the end, then, a system in which there is less
likelihood of strife and war may, even considered from the purely economic point of
view, be more satisfactory than one which inspite of producing an abundance of wealth
during peace, has to expend it and more in times of internal conflict and war.
Here then is a fundamental principle on which an economy of nonviolence rests - that human well-being and not mere material wealth constitutes the basis on which alone any sound and stable economic edifice can be built. Or, in Gandhian language, the solid criterion to be used in testing, an economic system is nonviolence. If a system leads to suppression of the individual, exploitation, or prevention of their developing to the fullest—all of which are cases of doing violence or injury to them—it stands self-condemned, however much material wealth it may bring. The goal of such an economy is spiritual, the goodness or badness of an economic method of production being tested, not by the amount of material wealth it brings, but by whether it promotes the greatest amount of non-violence or in other words, self-development, cooperation, unselfishness, and brotherliness amongst human beings.

**Basic Principles of Non-Violent Economy**

Keeping self-development of the individual or human well-being as our goal, we must seek to formulate the principles on which we may build our economic system. Whatever this system may or may not secure for us, it must not be said of it that it cannot lead to human well-being or the development of even the humblest. At the same time that it leads to individual human development, it must lead also to the development of the ‘neighbours’ or the community as a whole. The individual and the society to which they belong must thus find their good in each other, the individual losing themselves for the good of the group, to discover that thus they have found themselves, and the group seeking the good of even the least of its members, and only in this way finding the justification of its existence.

The trouble with capitalism was that it allowed full freedom to the individual to pursue their ends, never mind what happened to others, with the result that it led to selfishness, greed and social injustice. Socialism, on the other hand, was eager to secure the good of all, but in the process, owing to its clinging to large-scale production, it tended to sacrifice the freedom of the individual for the good of the group. We err, therefore, if we seek the good of the individual apart from the group, or the good of the group apart from the individual. For this reason an economy of nonviolence bases itself on the *via media* between these two extremes. And if Hegel is right in claiming that truth lies neither in the thesis nor in the antithesis, but in the synthesis which holds together within itself the partial truths of the thesis and the antithesis, then we may claim that our solution is valid in principle. To use the language of the socialist's dialectic, we move here from the thesis of capitalism (uncontrolled individual freedom, unmindful of social good)
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and the antithesis of socialism (complete social control, unmindful of individual freedom) to the synthesis of an economy of nonviolence or individual freedom, which finds its good only in the good of all.

An economy of nonviolence, on the other hand, which seeks to do justice to the soul of goodness both in capitalism and in socialism, thus accepting what is good in both of them, is, synthetic, and therefore, from this point of view also, true to our own genius. And, what is more, this synthetic attitude, which refuses to condemn and destroy wholesale but is glad to welcome and retain after modification, is the only one consistent with nonviolence. India had discovered from her experience with the several races and tribes, which lived within her borders, that the only way by which she could hold them together and prevent endless internecine feud and bloodshed, was through inculcating in them the spirit of ‘live and let live’, the spirit, in the last analysis, of nonviolence, which unwilling to aggravate and perpetuate conflicting elements, seeks to reconcile and synthesise them.

An economy of nonviolence may, from this point of view, be regarded as nothing but an expression, in the economic realm, of the nonviolent soul of India. It is the solution which India has to offer today out of her rich heritage to a world torn by strife and violence, and eagerly groping for a way out of the desperate situation in which it finds itself.

As for the lines along which we should proceed in order to attain the ideal which an economy of nonviolence sets before itself, we obtain guidance from the principles which we found to underlie our own ancient economic organisation. We saw that in those days individuals were free to carry on their enterprise as best they could, but only within the limitations set for them by society. Neither private enterprise, it would seem, is evil in itself, nor social control. It is only when private enterprise exceeds its limits and works to the detriment of others that it is evil. Similarly, social control is not evil in itself. It is only, when social control exceeds its limits and deprives the individual of initiative that it becomes evil. That being so, our solution should be one which has room in it both for private enterprise and for social control. If we would preserve the liberty of the individual, which socialism tends to take away, and at the same time see that the interests of the community are not sacrificed, as happens under capitalism, it would seem that that, the individual should be allowed to think and plan production as best they can, though at the same time be curbed, in the interests of the group, from misusing their liberty. This double purpose requires to be kept constantly in mind, and can be served by a two fold method, which we may call (A) Decentralisation in production, and (B) Swadeshi or localization in consumption.
(A) Decentralisation in Production

This means that as far as possible all enterprise should be left in the hands of individuals who carry it on, not in factories, but each under their own roof, so far as they have the capacity to run their own business. Those pursuing the same occupation may of course join together and work co-operatively. But the unit for which they produce will be strictly limited. It will be the village to which they belong, or a small group of adjacent villages, which will form a corporate whole and aim to be self-sufficient for its primary requirements. In regard to some articles, of course, the unit of self-sufficiency will vary, and may be, as large as a block or taluka, a district or even a whole state. There need be therefore no rigidity in maintaining the principle of self-sufficiency.

Only it should be borne in mind that, as far as possible, whatever can be produced in the village for the needs of its inhabitants should be produced there, especially in respect of essential requirements like food and clothing. For the rest, the village may depend on industries run by itself in cooperation with neighbouring villages; or where this is not possible, they may be run by the State for the needs of the regions concerned.

Judging from our past, our genius, or traditional mode of behaviour as a people, seems to be along the lines of decentralisation. We have seen this to be true of our ancient economic organisation, where the village was the ultimate unit of production. In political life also each village was self-contained, being governed by its own Panchayat or Village Councils. Similarly, Hinduism, the religion of the vast majority of our people, has never believed in centralising faith. On the other hand, it has left the individual free to believe whatever appeals to them in regard to ultimate problems, provided the action of the individual is not anti-social. Hence it is that there has never been in Hinduism any attempt to convert people to one standardised creed, as happens for example in other great faiths like Christianity or Islam. And in worship, Hinduism is individualistic, while worship in a church or a mosque is congregational. Our music also is essentially individualistic, for it is melody pure and simple, unlike western music which is built round harmony, or the coordination of several divergent notes to mingle together to produce jointly an agreeable effect. It would be an interesting study to develop this theme also in regard to other fields of thought and activity, to show that our genius formed and developed through the centuries lies in decentralisation. Not that we lacked organising power, which is necessary for centralisation, but that whatever organisation we had—for example the joint-family, caste, or self sufficient village economy—was directed to safeguarding and protecting the average run of individuals against the activities of selfish or wicked persons. The
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organisation which we associate with large-scale production, on the other hand is not of
this kind, but aims at collecting large numbers of people together, not for protection but
for aggression, not for guarding the weak against the strong but for making the strong
stronger and more efficient.

The Place of Centralised Industries in Decentralised Production

We have already stated that not all industries of a country can be run thus on a
small-scale. There will be need for centralised production in the case of (1) key industries,
* i.e., industries which provide the machinery, fuel and raw materials for small industries.
Thus, for example, if we are to have sewing machines we need factories where they can be
produced. Similarly, if electricity or coal is required as fuel, it cannot be supplied by each
man running his own centre of supply; and if raw materials such as chemicals are to be
used, factories will be essential. Or pulp for paper-making may be produced with the aid
of power and distributed to village paper-makers. So also (2) public utilities like railways,
telegraph, and telephone, require centralised manufacture and control. As by their very
nature they cannot be under-taken by the village artisan locally, they will have to be
conducted in a centralised way for the benefit of all by the State, or on a cooperative basis
by the people, with no eye to profit but entirely for service of the community.

So far as all other industries go, they will be carried out on a decentralised cottage
basis. In other words, large-scale production will not enter into competition with
decentralised cottage production. The two spheres will be kept distinct, and large-scale
production undertaken only where it cannot be helped, and to aid cottage production.

Place of Science and Machinery in Decentralised Production:

Till now science has concerned itself with the problems of large scale production. But under this new economy, it will devise ways and mean of aiding the cottage
producer in improving his implements, processes and technique. The aim will not be as
now to bring in as much wealth as possible for the machine-owner by exploiting the
labour of hundreds of others, but to make the work lighter for the cottage producer. The
need of the producer will be the motive behind research, and not selfishness and greed.
The scientist will have even more scope than now for research under this new scheme of
things, for while it is easy to invent expensive and complicated ways of improving
production, it is not so easy to devise simple and inexpensive improvements such as a
village producer with limited resources can adopt.

It is often thought that an economy of nonviolence advocates a return to the
primitive, a turning away from all that science makes possible. If it did so, it would
indeed be a grievous fault and grievously shall it suffer for it. But there is no reason why it should turn away from science. There is no virtue after all in sticking to the old. On the other hand, there is every reason why we should apply our intelligence to make work lighter and life more enjoyable. As we have already said, intelligence is given to aid us in our struggle for existence, and if we refuse to use it, it will but decay and die. Science therefore must by no means be discarded. It must still remain our light and guide - teaching us new ways of tackling old problems, and making us more and more efficient in the performance of our tasks. Only its role will be different.

Hence it is that in an economy of nonviolence the one condition that is laid down in regard to machinery is that it should not centralise production. All other machinery which will aid the cottage worker to do his work with speed, ease and comfort will be welcome.

B. Swadeshi (localisation) in Consumption:

One of the best ways of preventing manufacture of goods without limit, then dumping them on other people upsetting economic equilibrium and producing unemployment among them, is to inculcate in people the ideal of Swadeshi, i.e. their duty to purchase goods produced by their immediate neighbours rather than goods imported from elsewhere. This means that in economic reconstruction, the aim should be to make the village, or a group of four or five villages, self-sufficient for their primary requirements, so that all the fundamental wants of the people can be adequately met by the group itself. Each unit will then be using goods, produced by itself in preference to goods from outside; and so if a person wishes to increase his business so as to supply also the needs of others than those who belong to his unit, they will find that no one else will buy their goods. Thus they will be prevented from developing into a large-scale manufacturer. If the articles produced elsewhere are more attractive than those produced locally, they will not be allowed to flood out the local product, but the local artisan will be required to improve his production to come up to the standard of the foreign product. In this way consumers will limit themselves to, and help to improve, local production.

Conclusion:

Too long have human considerations been carefully excluded from the economic sphere. If India is not to follow the industrialized countries of the world into exploiting the masses, impoverishing and enslaving weaker people, and plunging people into periodical strife and bloodshed, and if in accordance with her spiritual heritage she is to
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show an oppressed and war-worn world the way to freedom and peace for all peoples, her only means is the establishment of an economic order which will deliberately aim at making production and consumption of a kind which will enable her people to be strong and capable of looking after themselves, without however having any need to exploit the weak or go to war with the strong. The principles of an economy of nonviolence have been formulated precisely with this aim in view. When through decentralisation, the people have opportunities for acquiring strength, courage and self-reliance, and through Swadeshi they have learnt to cooperate and work for the good of their neighbours, they will not only have achieved for themselves freedom from exploitation and slavery, but also be a powerful influence for bringing about freedom from exploitation, and good-will among men. Under such a system we may be poorer in this world's goods, but we shall be on the way to establishing non-violence and peace on the secure foundations of economic life.

The method to be employed is the simplest possible. Not a violent revolution conspired and effected by a group of individuals, but the non-violent, decentralised method depending on the understanding and good-will of every citizen. We have to persuade our innumerable villages to work towards self-sufficiency in production and consumption.

Nay more, even if you live in the city, and I, and every consumer in our country can at once help to bring about this new economic order if we willed to buy only products of decentralised manufacture. Do we care sufficiently for the abolition of the poverty of our people, and to make ourselves into a strong, self-reliant, well-knit, independent people, not bowings our heads to the foreigner, now and in the future, the remedy is in our own hands—to promote village production by consuming as far as possible only products of cottage manufacture, and by working for village self-sufficiency if not directly at least by refusing to buy anything but what is produced by our own village neighbours. When we do this, no foreigner will care to take possession of our land; for all that the foreigner aims at by his aggression are our raw materials and our markets. And even if they do invade the country, our people will have acquired, by managing their affairs themselves, sufficient resourcefulness, courage and non-violent strength to resist him and set his efforts at naught.

By this simple, non-violent method, then, we shall be able to establish ourselves as a free, industrious and prosperous people, simple in living perhaps, but high in thought and culture, in direct line of descent from our own great spiritual past, and able to show to a world mad with lust for wealth and power, and torn with strife and war, the way to
abiding peace, freedom, progress, and good-will amongst the
members of the human family.

*Appeal:*

Whether our arguments have been convincing or not, everyone must admit, whatever type of economic order they advocate for our adoption in the future, that the best we can do at the present, when our people are dying by inches through starvation and disease, and we are helpless to move the Government, is to strive to do all we can as individuals to make the villager, even with the very limited resources available to him, a little more prosperous. It is certain that even political freedom will mean little if our masses, the bulk of whom live in the villages, are not profitably employed, and do not have at least some of the amenities of civilised life. Let us not then waste our time in idle controversy, but act; begin with whatever little can be done here and now, leaving the next step to reveal itself in its turn. We do not need to see the distant scene: one step enough for us. What we can do, we have outlined in the preceding pages. It is for each to pick out from the programme what suits him or her best—be it village sanitation, health, diet, education, social reform, anti-untouchability, communal harmony, work amongst women, co-operation, child-welfare, youth movement, recreation, literature, art, religion, agriculture or industries, and the rest will follow in due time. The field is vast and varied, and calls for the best efforts of all, men and women, officials and non-officials. We may differ in our views in regard to what is ultimately good for the country. But let us not in fighting over issues relating to the future, neglect our duty in the present—the duty which we owe to our fellowmen in the village.
Gandhi was a prolific writer; his writings, speeches, letters and notes run into thousands of pages. He wrote and spoke on a large number of subjects; which is not surprising in view of the fact that for the greater part of his public life of more than half a century he was the supreme leader of the Indian people struggling for independence. In addition to political and social matters, throughout his life he gave considerable thought to civilizational matters as for him the possibilities of reconstruction of the Indian society were linked with the choices that the country made with respect to them.

If one considers Gandhi’s writings in their entirety, one would expect inconsistencies on at least two counts. Given the fact that the writings span several decades, it is almost inevitable that inter-temporal inconsistencies would be there as ideas tend to evolve over time. Furthermore, the requirements for advancing the goal of Indian independence and the exigencies of circumstances were not always consistent with his considered views. And indeed there are inconsistencies. But what is remarkable is that there are so few of them. The substantive part of the Gandhian thought is not only internally consistent but has organic unity as well. One important feature of Gandhian thought is the predominance in it of the normative element. In this paper an attempt will be made to look at the normative structure underlying the Gandhian thought. In this context Gandhi’s *Hind Swaraj*¹ will be taken to be the most authoritative of his writings. This is not only in conformity with the general view as to the status of *Hind Swaraj* but also with Gandhi’s continued adherence and subscription throughout life to the views contained in the text.

Throughout this paper the work will be referred to as *Hind Swaraj* (1938). Twenty-nine years after publication of *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi, referring to its contents, says: ‘I withdraw nothing except one word of it, and that in deference to a lady friend.’²

For the purpose of delineating the normative structure underlying the Gandhian thought we first look at its core ideas relating to institutions, technology, and the relationship between ends and means; and then see how these core ideas fit into a unified framework.

Normative analysis of institutions can be done from two different vantage points;

---

¹ In this paper all references to Hind Swaraj are for: Mohandas K. Gandhi, Indian Home Rule or Hind Swaraj, edited and published by Jitendra T. Desai, Navajivan Publishing House (Navajivan Mudranalaya), Ahmedabad; Translation of ‘Hind Swaraj’, published in the Gujarat columns of Indian Opinion, 11th and 18th December, 1909; Published by Yann FORGET on 20th July 2003, with LATEX 2ε.

from that of the society or from that of the individual. One important question that one can ask about any institution is regarding the nature of outcomes which result under it. In particular, one can ask which values are upheld by the institution in question and which are not. When individuals act within the framework of an institution, their actions partly depend on their own goals and values and partly on the nature of the institution. An institution sets the rules of the game within which individuals are required and expected to act. As different sets of rules in general can be expected to elicit different responses from individuals, it is clear that the values which will materialize at the social level will be different under different institutions even when individuals comprising the society are the same. It is of course also true that under the same institution outcomes in general will be different with different individual goals and values.

The idea that different rules of the game elicit different responses from individuals can be expressed in another way to highlight an important role that institutions play. One reason why individual behaviour varies with institutions is because the attainment of desired goals and values requires differential behaviour under different institutions. But more importantly, why individual response is dependent on the nature of the institution is that not every individual value can be properly articulated and every goal attained just under any institution. Different institutions are required for articulation of different individual values and for attaining different goals. This means that the choice of an institution determines to a great extent which values can be articulated and which goals attained. If some individual values do not get articulated or get articulated only weakly because of the institutional structure of the society then one can expect in most instances such values to fade away sooner or later. Individual values also get affected by the dominant social values. Thus individual values are partly determined by social values; and we saw earlier that the social values are partly determined by individual values. Thus, given the institutional structure, in general, one can expect an equilibrium to emerge of individual and social values. It is the characteristics of the equilibrium which need to be looked at for analyzing the normative implications of having a particular institutional structure.

Thus we see that from a normative perspective an institution may be found wanting because of any of the following reasons: (i) The institution in question results in undesirable social outcomes; or fails to facilitate materialization of those outcomes which embody the desired social values. (ii) The institution does not enable articulation of appropriate individual values; or is conducive for attaining goals embodying undesirable values. A close reading of Gandhi’s criticism in *Hind Swaraj* of the legal system instituted by the British makes it clear that Gandhi is faulting the system along the lines
Enough for Everyone’s Need discussed above. Gandhi points out that the legal system is so constituted that it is the duty of the lawyer to side with his clients and to find out ways and arguments in his favour; and that if he does not do so he will be considered to have degraded his profession. He also says that people who opt to become lawyers do so to enrich themselves, and not for helping others. Consequently, their interest lies in multiplying disputes.3

The legal system is faulted by Gandhi because the social outcomes which result under it as a consequence of individual actions are not desirable. The system instead of minimizing and settling quarrels tends to increase and advance them. The system is also to be faulted because instead of being conducive to articulation of appropriate values like justice, it on the contrary induces individuals to enrich themselves, and in the process tempts them to commit acts which result in social discord. From an analytical point of view Gandhi makes an important distinction between acts induced by an institution and acts undertaken because of one’s inclinations. Making this analytical distinction in the context of acts of lawyers he says:

‘Lawyers are also men, and there is something good in every man. Whenever instances of lawyers having done good can be brought forward, it will be found that the good is due to them as men rather than as lawyers. All I am concerned with is to show you that the profession teaches immorality; it is exposed to temptation from which few are saved.’(Hind Swaraj, 41)

The legal institutions were not the only modern institutions that Gandhi was critical of; he was critical of almost all modern institutions. And the reasons for disapproval were similar to the ones because of which he disapproved of the modern legal institutions. The twin characteristics of most modern institutions of resulting in ethically undesirable social outcomes and of inducing individuals to behave in ethically questionable ways constituted the reasons for disapproval.4 Gandhi’s harsh criticism of the institution of parliament in Hind Swaraj parallels his criticism of the legal institutions. While in theory modern legal institutions might exist for the realization of values like justice, in reality they are not able to perform this role because of the reasons discussed above. Similarly, the institution of parliament in theory might find its justification in terms of various

3 He says [Hind Swaraj (1938), p. 41]: ‘It is within my knowledge that they are glad when men have disputes. Petty pleaders actually manufacture them. Their toots, like so many leeches, suck the blood of the poor people.’

4 For instance, regarding the medical profession Gandhi makes a similar point as about the legal profession [Hind Swaraj (1938), p. 44]: ‘It is worth considering why we take up the profession of medicine. It is certainly not taken up for the purpose of serving humanity. We become doctors so that we may obtain honours and riches. I have endeavoured to show that there is no real service of humanity in the profession, and that it is injurious to mankind.’
ideals including that of as a locator of social good; in practice none of these ideals is likely to materialize. If everyone transcends one’s narrow interests and thinks of various alternatives facing the society solely from the perspective of common good, then it makes perfect sense to argue that, more often than not, what the majority will decide after debate and discussion will be the correct decision from the perspective of social good. But Gandhi realized that given the institutional structure of parliament there was no possibility of such a scenario ever materializing.  

Gandhi’s almost total opposition to modern technology stemmed from several sets of reasons. One set of reasons were clearly instrumental in nature. From Gandhi’s numerous writings on cottage industries it is clear that he considered their revival essential if all in the country were to be assured of at least a minimum livelihood. He saw a link between the poverty of Indian masses and the spread of industries based on modern technology. Another set of reasons for the anti-technology viewpoint were strategic. Gandhi in some respects had greater awareness of the economics underlying the British imperialism than many of his contemporaries. He understood that if, instead of using the products of the British industries, Indians started using Indian products the lucrativeness of the Indian occupation for the British was bound to diminish.

Gandhi’s opposition to modern technology however went beyond these strategic and instrumental considerations. Strategic reasons by their very nature are transient and instrumental reasons in principle can be so. There was however nothing transient in Gandhi’s opposition to modern technology.

Gandhi’s understanding of technology was not only original but in some ways extremely insightful. Among the insights there are three which are particularly important for understanding the Gandhian viewpoint regarding technology. The first and without doubt the foremost of these insights relates to the realization that choice of technology is invariably normatively significant. Consider for instance his views on medicine in Hind Swaraj. Talking of diseases caused by negligence or indulgence, he says that in the

5 5 On parliament Gandhi writes [Hind Swaraj (1938), p. 27]: ‘Let us examine it a little more closely. The best men are supposed to be elected by the people. The members serve without pay and therefore, it must be assumed, only for the public weal. The electors are considered to be educated and therefore we should assume that they would not generally make mistakes in their choice. Such a Parliament should not need the spur of petitions or any other pressure. Its work should be so smooth that its effects would be more apparent day by day. But, as a matter of fact, it is generally acknowledged that the members are hypocritical and selfish.’

And further: ‘When the greatest questions are debated, its members have been seen to stretch themselves and to doze. Sometimes the members talk away until the listeners are disgusted. Carlyle has called it the ‘talking shop of the world’. Members vote for their party without a thought. Their so-called discipline binds them to it. If any member, by way of exception, gives an independent vote, he is considered a renegade.’

6 6 Of Hind Swaraj Gandhi himself says [Hind Swaraj (1938), p. 15]:

41
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absence of medicine one would have suffered the deserved punishments and therefore would have learnt not to be negligent or indulgent in future. But the intervention of medicine helps one to indulge without any physical suffering; but at the cost of resultant weakening of mind. From the perspective of the question of normative significance of technology this argument is particularly important. The crucial point that is made by Gandhi is that a person may have preference for indulgence over discipline, but such a preference is non-realizable in the absence of medicine. It is the medicine which makes indulgence possible on a sustainable basis. His unfavourable opinion of the medical profession stems from this consideration. He writes:

‘I was at one time a great lover of the medical profession. It was my intention to become a doctor for the sake of the country. I no longer hold that opinion. I now understand why the medicine men among us have not occupied a very honourable status.’ (Hind Swaraj, 43)

The important point to note is the non-neutrality of technology with respect to values. A particular technology may facilitate realization of certain values and at the same time make adherence to certain other values difficult or even impossible.

The second Gandhian insight regarding technology relates to the fact that the choice of technology in general has unintended consequences, some of which of course can be normatively significant. In Hind Swaraj, in the context of railways, apart from drawing the normative implications as he does in the context of medicine, he also talks of the unintended consequences (Hind Swaraj, 35). He points out the role played by the railways in spreading the bubonic plague; in the absence of railways there would have been natural segregation which would have arrested the spread of the scourge. He also attributes the increased frequency of famines to railways.

One of the most interesting insights developed by Gandhi, although in all likelihood of marginal importance in his own times, but of the greatest importance and relevance for contemporary times, establishes a connection between the technology and the nature of products it makes possible. The common understanding about technology in this respect is quite at variance from the facts. While in the general perception modern techniques of production are associated with increased productivity, it is not often that one differentiates between the product manufactured with the traditional technique and the product made possible with the modern technique. The occasions when one does differentiate, it is because one wants to draw attention to the superior quality of the

The booklet is a severe condemnation of ‘modern civilization’. It was written in 1908. My conviction is deeper today than ever. I feel that if India will discard ‘modern civilization’, she can only gain by doing so. The strength of his negative feelings regarding modern civilization can be gauged by the following statement on p. 68:

Like others, he will understand that deportation for life to the Andamans is not enough expiation for the sin of encouraging European civilization.
product manufactured by the modern technique compared to that of the product made using the traditional technique. It is never really the case that the product made using the modern technique is compared unfavourably with the product manufactured using the traditional technique. Gandhi, unlike his contemporaries, was convinced that most of the products manufactured using modern techniques were inferior to their traditional counterparts. He devoted a lot of thought and wrote and spoke extensively on the problem of comparative qualities of modern and traditional variants of some of the products, particularly rice, wheat and gur. The following is a summing up of his views in the matter:

‘Thus, in my campaign for unpolished rice, hand-ground flour and village-made gur, I am simply asking people not to pay for undermining their health. For that is what they are at present doing, and I am thankful to say that I am supported in my view by the highest experts in the land.’ 7

Considering various aspects of Gandhi’s views on the question of technology it seems that the following two propositions underlie his thinking in the matter: (i) Although there is no determinstic relationship between technology and values in the sense of technology determining values or values determining technology, the two are related. Given a particular technology not every value-system will be consistent with it; and given a particular value-system not every technological structure can coexist with it, and (ii) modern technology is essentially inconsistent with some of the most cherished values, particularly non-violence.

More than anyone else Gandhi believed in the necessity of purity of means. For him the ends and means constituted an indivisible whole. If one changed the means then he believed that the ends would change as well. In Hind Swaraj he says:

‘Your belief that there is no connection between the means and the end is a great mistake. ... If I want to deprive you of your watch, I shall certainly have to fight for it; if I want to buy your watch, I shall have to pay you for it; and if I want a gift, I shall have to plead for it; and, according to the means I employ, the watch is stolen property, my own property, or a donation. Thus we see three different results from three different means. Will you still say that means do not matter?’ (Hind Swaraj, 52-52).

If we interpret the above passage literally, it would seem that Gandhi is implying that given any ends, the means are uniquely determined. But such an interpretation is not warranted. If ends embody a particular value and the means employed repudiate that value then in such a case it should be immediately clear that the means in question, if
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employed, will defeat the very purpose at least partially, if not fully. What will be
attained will be quite different from what was originally envisaged. But even if there is
no value embodied in the ends which is directly repudiated by the means there can still be
tension between means and ends. Simply because there is no direct contradiction between
the values embodied in the ends and those embodied in the means, it does not mean that
the means employed cannot corrode the ends. A value without contradicting another
value directly nevertheless can be such as to weaken it in the long-run. For given ends,
while in general it will be true that there will be more than one means of attaining it, it
will certainly be not the case that any means whatsoever can be employed for their
attainment and with no change in their character.

We see that Gandhi’s opposition to modern institutions and modern technology was
rooted in his disapproval of values which in his understanding they tend to promote. He
found their normative implications unpalatable. Although civilization is much more than
mere sum of institutions and technology, they do constitute important elements of it.
Consequently, it is not surprising that Gandhi was extremely critical of modern
civilization. In Hind Swaraj on the one hand he condemns modern civilization in
extremely harsh language; and on the other praises Indian civilization in superlative
terms. Because Gandhi’s commitment to non-violence was of a very high order, at one
level one can understand his condemnation of European civilization and adulation of
Indian civilization, as, like many others, he must have found the modern civilization
rather violent, and certainly more violent than the Indian civilization. But adopting this
approach makes rejection of modern civilization contingent on one’s commitment to a
value which is by and large violated by it. If modern civilization is found wanting only
from the perspective of some normative value or the other then someone who is not
particularly enamoured of that value will have no reason to disapprove of or reject it.
Thus understanding Gandhian criticism solely in terms of a value or a set of values will
rob it of general applicability. While there is no denying that part of the reason why
Gandhi was critical of modern civilization was because of its violent character, the point
that is being attempted here is that this was not the only reason.

There is another reason why it will be a mistake to think that Gandhi’s criticism of
the modern civilization can be entirely explained in terms of this or that value. The
reason lies in the fact that whether we consider an individual or a society there is bound

8 8 ‘I believe that the civilization India evolved is not to be beaten in the world. Nothing can equal the seeds
sown by our ancestors, Rome went, Greece shared the same fate; the might of the Pharaohs was broken;
Japan has become Westernized; of China nothing can be said; but India is still, somehow or other, sound at
the foundation. ... What we have tested and found true on the anvil of experience, we dare not change. Many
thrust their advice upon India, and she remains steady. This is her beauty: it is the sheet-anchor of our
hope.’ [Hind Swaraj (1938), p. 15.] And that (p. 48): ‘The condition of India is unique. Its strength is
immeasurable.’
be to be multiplicity of values. And wherever there is a multiplicity of values, conflicts of values are inevitable. When values are in conflict, choice in favour of one or other value will have to made. Thus if we want to characterize an individual normatively, to speak in terms of his or her commitment to this or that set of values does not really describe the individual precisely. What is required for a correct and complete normative description of an individual is to specify the domain and sub-domains of each and every value.

Individuals differ not so much in terms of sets of values they subscribe to as they do in terms of extents of domains and sub-domains they assign to different values. Similarly, if we abstract from material aspects of civilizations, then they differ from each other not so much with respect to presence or absence of this or that value, but with respect to domains and sub-domains which they assign to different values. To put the same thing somewhat differently, the normative aspect of a civilization can be described in terms of a meta-principle which determines for every context which value must have precedence over which other values. Gandhi’s definition of a civilization namely ‘Civilization is that mode of conduct which points out to man the path of duty’ is quite close to identifying it with the normative meta-principle discussed here (Hind Swaraj, 45).

In the context of comparative normative analysis of civilizations one major difficulty arises because of apparent absence of any objective desiderata in terms of which meta-principles embodied in civilizations could be compared. It is only natural that an individual belonging to or shaped by a particular civilization will internalize, at least to a certain extent, the normative meta-principle embodied in that civilization. From the vantage point of the internalized meta-principle any civilization with a radically different meta-principle will appear flawed. If comparative analysis of civilizations is to have general applicability then objective criteria, criteria independent of meta principles, are absolutely necessary.

A close reading of Hind Swaraj indicates that Gandhi in all likelihood did have such an objective criterion in mind, even if only intuitively. This is of course not to say that some of his criticism is not based on looking at the modern civilization from the vantage point of the meta-principle embodied in the Indian civilization. One of the central points in Gandhi’s criticism of modern civilization was that it places too high an importance on bodily comforts. Not only that, the achievements in this respect are regarded very highly. It was obvious to him that any civilization which placed such great importance on good things of life was bound to assign a large domain to self-interest. Gandhi believed,

---

9 9 ‘Let us first consider what state of things is described by the word ‘civilization’. Its true test lies in the fact that people living in it make bodily welfare the object of life.’ [Hind Swaraj (1938), p. 29.]
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and in all likelihood correctly, that any normative structure which assigned such large
domain to self-interest could not be sustainable in the long run. This of course implies
that any societal structure which rests on a non-sustainable normative structure also
cannot be sustainable. Gandhi’s statements as to the transient nature of modern
civilization in all probability are premised on this logic.710

To sum up, in this paper it has been argued that Gandhian thought from a normative
perspective is not only internally consistent but also has an organic unity. Gandhi’s
rejection of modern civilization, among other reasons, is based on his understanding that
any normative structure which gives so much importance to indulgence and self-
regardingness as does the normative structure underlying the modern civilization cannot
be sustainable in the long run. In other words, a prerequisite for societal sustainability is
that the domain of self-interest and the so-called good things of life must not be allowed
to exceed certain limits; and that the social institutions must not be such as to frustrate
this basic requirement. His disapproval of the institutions of modernity stemmed from his
belief that they were not capable of fulfilling this basic requirement.

710 ‘Indian civilization is the best and that the European is a nine days’ wonder.’ [Hind Swaraj (1938), p.
67.] ‘This civilization is such that one has only to be patient and it will be self-destroyed.’ [Hind Swaraj
(1938), p. 30.]
Gandhian Economics – How Relevant? N. Vasudevan

I thank the organizers, the Gandhi International and Ekta Parishad, particularly Sri Rajagopalji for giving me the opportunity to participate in this significant conference. It is an important initiative. “Nonviolent Economics” is another name for Gandhian Economics, though I would prefer the more inclusive term “Sarvodaya Economics”.

This particular aspect of Gandhian thought, i.e. Gandhian economics, has not received the attention it deserved and, therefore, has not been practised or applied by economists and the ruling class. I congratulate the organizers for this new initiative to focus attention on the relevance of Gandhian/Sarvodaya economics not only in India but globally. It is an important area and requires serious study and research by experts for practical application. There have been, it is true, small stray ad hoc experiments here and there, including the one by the Gandhian Lanza del Vasto at his Ashram “Ark” in France. But no one has been able to create a successful working model based on Gandhiji’s economic ideas for wider application.

We have just celebrated the 60th anniversary of our Republic with a display of India’s military might and a lot of pomp and fanfare and lavish parties at the Presidential palace in Delhi and at Raj Bhavans in State capitals.

The truth of the matter is that only half of India – i.e., the ‘haves’ – were part of the celebrations. The other half – the ‘have-nots’ – were not invited to the party and they didn’t even know what the celebrations were all about.

We are gathered here in Bhopal to give voice to those excluded, dispossessed and deprived half of India – the ‘have-nots’, and to express our solidarity with them in their fight for their basic rights – food and social justice.

No doubt, during the last sixty-odd years India has made tremendous progress: “The Wonder that is India”, headlined The Times of India a few days ago, followed by “Up, Up and Away” statistics of 60 years achievements. The report claimed that the salary of IAS officers rose from Rs 350 to Rs 26,000; life expectancy rose from 32 to 68 years; literacy rate from 18 to 68%; population from 361 million to 1,161 million; per capita income from Rs 255 to 37,490; wheat production from 6.5 million tons to 78.6 million tons; defence budget from Rs 168 crore to 1.7 lakh crore (an increase of 1,01,100%); government revenue from Rs 338.59 crore to Rs 10.2 lakh crore; government
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expenditure from Rs 337.88 crore to Rs 10.2 lakh crore; telephones from a mere 100,000
to a whopping 543 million.

Impressive figures! We feel happy and satisfied by such statistics. We use these
figures to impress others. Sometimes one can even hear people boast that we produce one
Australia every year!

However there is no mention of the other grim side of the picture. The other side
of the picture is this: 350 m. or more hungry; 320 m. illiterate; 25 m. children wasted due
to child mortality; 61 m. stunted due to malnutrition, which the PM says is “a national
shame”, but does very little to mitigate. So, such statistical figures are used by the powers
that be and the media, as camouflage to cover and hide the ugly reality that is also India.

I am not belittling our achievements; I am only bemoaning the opportunities lost,
and what we could have achieved.

The reality is that the suffering masses are not on the radar of the daily governance
of this vast land of ours. They are the socially and economically excluded and exploited,
living on the periphery in the dark interiors of the hinterland of rural India; eking out a
life like their rustic ancestors did – untouched by modernity and progress.

We saw a section of them during the first “Janadesh” satyagraha in 2007 and later
in October last year when Sri Rajagopal brought them to Delhi. Like many of you, I too
watched them, with a lump in my throat: thousands of Adivasi and rural men and women,
hungry, emaciated, skin and bone with sunken emotionless faces in tattered clothes. They
came to demand their due here and now – in this life and not posthumously. Nothing has
happened except setting up two more committees!

Sixty three years have gone by. It is a helpless situation. It is a hopeless wait for
the hapless millions. What is the way out for the poor? Are they to be left to perish as
poor without ever partaking – leave alone enjoying – the fruits of freedom, development
and progress the country has made.

Whatever be our moral outrage and protest, I am pretty certain, the present pattern
of governance and development will continue, which will benefit only the already-rich
and well-to-do. The system is heavily loaded in favour the rich and privileged. It cannot
be easily reformed or reversed. The entrenched vested interests will not allow it to be
changed. There is no social, political or moral force, at present, to alter this. The wealth
will continue to accumulate in the hands of the rich and elite. And the upper class and
their cousins the middle class have no genuine concern, compassion for the poor. Lip
service cannot be a substitute for mitigating measures; nor the crumbs thrown to the poor a substitute.

The only way forward is to mount well organized pressure and nonviolent non-cooperation from below by the poor, repeatedly, like the one Ekta Parishad mounted in 2007 is again being planned for 2012. Jayaprakash Narayan did this once in mid-1970s, but that was led by the middle-class vested interests for a mere change of rulers, not the transformation of the system.

In his last will and testament, Mahatma Gandhi had asked his followers, especially the rulers, to consider whether the steps they contemplate will in any way benefit the poor and whether such steps will restore the poor to a life of self-reliance and dignity.

We are ruled by a class of people – who are corrupt and self-serving – who lack commitment and compassion for the poor and needy. Where there is no compassion, we see only injustice. That is what we witness every day all around us. The over-liberal constitutional democratic model of governance we chose for ourselves has failed to ensure an equitable social order.

Is Gandhian/Sarvodaya economics the answer? Or a mix of both – a middle path? It is for the experts to find out. Gandhian economics was never considered seriously, much less applied in our development process. There is a lot of misconception about Gandhian economics: that it believes in acceptance of poverty, in the simplicity of India’s economic past; elimination of machinery and so on. These are widely held misconceptions. But examination of Gandhiji’s writings would show that he did not advocate any of these measures. He was all for the use of appropriate technology, for example. He only wanted that machines should not overwhelm and dominate human beings and render them jobless.

Gandhiji did not admire poverty and did not see in poverty any virtue. In order to identify himself with the people of India, he adopted their dress and their simple ways of living. He said: “No one has ever said that grinding pauperism can lead to anything else than moral degradation. Every human being has the right to live and therefore to find the wherewithal to feed himself and where necessary to clothes and house himself.” He wanted India to develop herself economically to make possible a satisfactory life for all.

As early as 1928, he wrote “According to me, the economic constitution of India and for that matter the world, should be such that no one under it should suffer from want of food and clothing. In other words, everybody should be able to get sufficient work to
He wanted sufficiency for all. He wanted enough development to enable all people to live in comfort and dignity. He was opposed to extreme inequalities and to the pursuit of ever-rising unbridled materialism and consumerism because he realized that such a path would not lead to happiness.

He wrote in his important book Hind Swaraj: “We notice that the mind is a restless bird; the more it gets the more it wants, and still remains unsatisfied....” And this is what is happening now, thanks to global capitalism and global consumerism.

Gandhi called his ideal republic Ram Rajya, a mythical past, where perfect justice prevailed, which to the modern mind will seem utopian. This only means that Gandhi admired certain attributes of India’s civilization like the recognition of the dangers of multiplication of human wants and the need to exercise restraint, and he wished that his countrymen would not forsake those civilizational attributes and values. His feet and face were firmly turned toward the future and not toward the past.

In a letter to Nehru, for example, Gandhi drew a robust picture of the ideal village of his dreams: “My ideal village will contain intelligent beings. They will not live in dirt and darkness as animals. There will be neither plague nor cholera, nor small pox; no one will be idle; no one will wallow in luxury.”

Gandhi was uncompromisingly opposed to social evils like untouchability, lack of freedom for women, caste system and extreme inequalities. He said “Today, there is gross inequality. The basis of socialism is economic equality. There can be no Ramaraja in the present state of iniquitous inequalities in which a few roll in riches and the masses do not get enough to eat.” These words are eloquent and relevant even today.

Gandhi was a firm believer in socialism, but his socialism is of a very radical kind. He wanted socialism to be attained through the use of nonviolence. In 1942 he wrote: “I see coming the day of the rule of the poor, whether that rule be through force of arms or nonviolence.”

If Gandhi’s advice to his countrymen to establish socialism through peaceful means was heeded, the present social tensions and conflicts and the menace of Maoist violence the country faces today, could have been forestalled, and even prevented. It may not be too late even now.
What is required urgently is empowering the poor and the under-privileged by providing education, including vocational training, followed by employment opportunities. This is possible only by a conscious, deliberate policy shift in the utilization of resources in favour of the poor. And a cap on the benefits to the already rich and privileged at least for some years, coupled with a moratorium on greed, avarice and corruption. Ensure equitable distribution of essentials like food. Is this possible? Not on its own, but under concerted pressure from the poor.
Ladies, gentlemen, dear friends, It is with great pleasure that I find you all assembled here.

I want to spare you a long list of formal thanks and acknowledgements by name, nonetheless, with our friends from *Ekta Parishad* and the *SAPA*, I should like to express heartfelt thanks to all those people who are honouring us with their presence and kind support: the Prime Minister of Madhya Pradesh, the delegate of the French Embassy in India, religious leaders, and leaders of indigenous communities.

We would like to acknowledge and thank for their presence all the delegates of movements and associations working with the very poor, to defend human rights, or to defend the environment, members of the academic community, company directors, researchers seeking alternative solutions in all domains, those working on the ground who have made it here today, and those unable to be here who have contributed to our reflection.
We extend our thanks in particular to all those who, in France and in India, have been involved over the last months with defining the structure and the intellectual content of this convention, with fundraising, with logistical and material preparation, with contacts, invitations, bookings, translations etc... (and most especially Jeanne).

We thank in advance those who, over the next few days, will provide nourishment for our bodies, by preparing food, for our minds, by translating and interpreting, and for our souls, by all sorts of artistic and musical entertainment.

If there were an ounce of humility among the leaders of this world these last months, we would have might have heard them say something like the following: “We have been on the wrong way, the current economic model leads to a worldwide ecological, social and financial disaster, it leads to frustration, insurrections and war. In our society, without a minimal direction, the greed and the mad self-indulgence of some people are matched only by the poverty and despair of many others.”

But no, we didn’t hear that, not at all! They tell us in all seriousness about a short crisis from which we will emerge by continuing business as usual, with just some little reforms of the banking rules, with a few limitations to the traders’ earnings and with some reforms in favour of renewable resources, but also with the same reverence to the dogmas of competition and to the total opening of the food markets and with the same devotion to nuclear weapons.

Four billion human beings are living in poverty, one billion are suffering from hunger and are sick from malnutrition. At the same time, when we look around us we see the ecological crisis, several climatic calamities, both present and predicted, the loss of biodiversity, the food crisis, the economic crisis, the financial failure, the ridiculous incomes for some and the financial frustration for others. All these facts are presented as small errors at best, errors that can be corrected, or at worst, as the consequence of fate, of the climate, of some people’s bad luck or of other people’s cleverness.

To you who have come to this convention in the hope of constructing a non-violent economy, I propose, by contrast, Gandhi’s experimental approach. That man who occupies such a eminent place in the history of the humanity used to say that he didn’t deserve to be honoured as „Mahatma“. And he explained: I’m just a man seeking the truth, nothing else. I have made many mistakes, but I seek, I seek intensely; and for me, if the poorest is not included in the economic process, than the system is not good.”
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Obviously, the current new liberal system which destroys so many lives of women and men, is like a blind and unstable colossus. It is in the process of collapsing, which is fortunate, but in collapsing it creates ruins, and behind them, it leaves deserts: an agricultural desert, a desert in our relationships, a cultural desert and a religious and spiritual desert, because all these preoccupations are considered as accessories; the only things that count are material well-being and competition.

In answer to the question of why some of the most ancient peoples have kept their distance from an economical domination, certain anthropologists have quickly decreed that these people were quite simply unable to dominate. No, say other observers today: these people have been wise enough to value social cohesion above all the activities directed exclusively to an individual profit. The question is: should we prefer private property and accept the race to material goods as an universal aim which justifies any action, or should we give greater value to the maintenance of the common goods? And is there a way to guarantee the freedom of everybody and at the same time to protect the interests of the planet and of humanity? Is this not what we mean when we speak of a non-violent economy? Where there is autonomy for the individual and each person has the right and is encouraged to express his creative talent, but where everybody will follow the permanent goal and the practical rule of the common well-being?

How can this apparent contradiction be transformed into a practical way of life? More than thirty years ago, René Dumont, the Brundtland-Commission or organisations as Attac have developed the concept of ‘thinking globally and acting locally’. Acting locally means respecting the autonomy of every person, of the village and of the small entity; thinking globally means the consideration of the economical aspect of producing goods and services for satisfying the human needs, and at the same time the social aspect of maintaining social cohesion and the dignity of all, and the ecological aspect of preserving life and biodiversity on our planet.

As early as 1909, in his book Hind Swaraj, Gandhi affirmed in the face of the British Empire, the necessity for the political autonomy of India, for appropriating her own identity so that the Indian people, subjugated and reduced to his daily servitudes, could lift up their head and rediscover their pride. Inseparable from political autonomy, for Gandhi, was economic independence. Spinning and weaving for oneself, wearing the khadi (hand-spun cotton clothes), being self-sufficient in food, collecting salt—all of these are an expression of Swaraj (self-rule) that is, political and economical autonomy, but also emancipation from all systems and ideologies that take away human being’s dignity: lack of self-respect, voluntary submission, blind obedience, the caste system, drug addiction etc.
Gandhi’s call to nothing less than to spiritual revolution is addressed not only to his fellow citizens, but also to all his contemporaries, because this is as relevant for the Indians as for the English (whom he asks to consider whether their position of world-domination is not unworthy to them). The mental colonisation, that silent and resigned acceptance of the actual state of the world, is it not an universal syndrome? And how can we liberate ourselves from it? At this point, another key concept of Gandhi appears, „Swadeshi“ which is the reappropriation of our own life where we learn to retake in our own hands our most personal forces. Spinoza calls it „potentia“, or „empowerment“ in English. And every poor person, whatever he or she earns, should get back the capacity to regain self-confidence and to see his or her own life in a new and brighter light – under conditions where there is a minimum of resources available for all.

Today, everything is privatized: the earth, the water, the seed, the forests and the sources of energy. Everyday, more of these resources are falling into private ownership, sometimes into the monopoly ownership, of the big private companies. Yet we all know the principle of the communicating vessels: there are physical and economical rules you can’t escape in a space with the limits of our world. When such important nations like China or India allow five to ten percent of their population to move into what they call the „middle class“, then twice as many people are left behind, deprived of basic resources. They experience poverty in the modern sense as a dehumanizing experience. Poverty, in the traditional sense, of „frugality“, „simplicity“, „subsistence“ has been the most ordinary condition of men and women for thousands of years. This human adaptability has allowed communities on all continents to face up to that situation of natural limits imposed by environment and by climatic circumstances, at the same time, integrating them into a culture of solidarity and autonomy, of joy of life and beauty.

But as Majeed Rameena, an Iranian-French diplomat used to say: „In the current economical system, misery is hunting poverty. The excluded people leave their country seeking the occidental eldorado, or they are transformed in national refugees living in slums or running desperately around.“ That’s why there is a last question to answer: should we allow to continue working without any control this disconnected economy which destroys our planet, makes rich a small minority and leads to the misery of billions of human beings? Or should we apply to the economical sphere an ethic of common well-being? Is the search of truth a utopia or is it an essential condition of human fulfillment?

We need a lot of humility for accepting the evidence and taking up the path of truth: the day when Gandhi let aside his western barrister’s suit and put on the khadi of
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the common Indian people, he discovered what joy is, the joy that freedom brings, and his
eyes opened to the dazzling light of the truth. After Siddhartha Gautama, the Buddha who
reached enlightenment five centuries before, Jesus said: „The truth will make you free.‟
Many very famous philosophers and thinkers and many other anonymous people have
experienced this reality, and through it, opened its possibility to their contemporaries the
ways of humanity.

Today we are in Bhopal, one of India‟s most ancient towns. Ye since the tragedy
of the 3rd of December 1984, the Union Carbide industrial site here is still polluted to this
day. It is a symbol of the suffering of innocent persons, victims of so many irresponsible
multinationals whose arrogance is inversely proportional to their courage. In Bhopal,
there are also the headquarters of EKTA PARISHAD, the non-violent movement of the
landless farmers, of the poor and of the excluded of India. We will not pass all these three
days only by reflecting on what a non-violent economy might be. On the fourth day, we
will try to turn our words into action with a march through the city. We are also planning
a coordinated international mobilization for 2012 involving simultaneous actions across
several continents. This will coincide with the „Jan Satyagraha‟ march of 100'000 people
to Delhi. The movement will reach its climax between the 2d of October, international
day of non-violence, and the 17th of October, international day of the eradication of
poverty.

We wish you all a good convention: thank you!
Reflections from India: The Violence of the Modern Economy, Prof. Satish Jain.

The theme of this conference is ‘towards a non-violent economy’. Obviously this makes the presumption that today’s economy is violent. Someone in Delhi asked me before I left, ‘how can the economy be violent?’ I was surprised that they could ask that question but I think the answer is in the question itself. There is a need to look at how many different ways that the economy is violent. At an intuitive level, I think we all realize there are many ways in which today’s economy is violent. Yet it would be helpful if we could categorize them in a systematic fashion.

To my mind possibly the most violent manifestation of today’s economy is with regard to extinctions. Hundreds of thousands of species are on the endangered lists and every year this is multiplied manifold. Seven or eight years ago, there were hundreds of millions of sparrows in India. They used to make nests inside people’s houses. But they have vanished almost completely from India. Up to the beginning of the nineties, South Asia used to have at least a hundred million vultures. Before the beginning of the new millenium, none was left in the wild. The astonishing thing is the number. We are talking of hundreds of millions of creatures disappearing in two or three years. The way the sparrows disappeared is astounding: in 2002 they were everywhere and then within two years they disappeared.

The second form of violence is to humans themselves. Languages are disappearing, ways of life are disappearing. If you look at the food items for example, many foods I ate in my childhood are simply no longer there. There used to be a fruit that was available throughout India called kirni. It was very delicious and nutritious and the tree was very beautiful. In fact in Sanskrit poetry much was written about this tree. Ten thousand birds nest on a single kirni tree. It is not extinct completely but there is no longer enough fruit to sell.

There is something else which I think we must call extreme violence. Sparrows disappear from India. It was an extraordinary event, the disappearance of this bird which came to people’s houses. But it was not talked about anywhere. Nothing in newspapers was written about it or in the hundreds of TV channels—all of them talking but no one mentioned something that vanished from everyone’s neighborhood and everyone’s homes. This was a complete rupture in our surroundings, a violent upheaval of our moorings. The astounding thing is that this does not register with us.
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Alright someone might say yes, this economy is violent, its nature is violent but you have to pay a price if you want to have all of these ‘goodies’ that modernity is giving you. In this case, it becomes very important to look at what we are getting. We can come to the ethics of it later, but I want to focus on the way we have started thinking, that process of thinking is very fundamental. Take for instance how we look at changes which have taken place. We say for example that milk output was only this much but now it has increased twenty percent, or we say that cereal output was only this much but now we have increased it by fifty percent. There are two points to note about this. The first is with regard to what I have already mentioned, namely, the loss of variety and diversity. In fact, in a single region, in Malabar in Kerala there used to be three thousand different varieties of rice. If you take the whole of India the number of varieties was even greater. And we are no longer asking what has happened to these varieties. Rather we only look at the totals, the volume and don’t ask about the quality and the things we are getting today are in fact much lesser in quality. We are completely leaving out the inputs that are necessary for these increased inputs. If we take these qualitative issues into account a totally different evaluation would emerge. In what sense is this food that we have now better? I think we have to look at the kind of processes that are transforming one food into another kind of food. If we only talk in terms of the goods that this system is making available, we overlook the nature of the goods that we are getting.

How is this process going on? How is it that the economic processes that we have are leading to these extinctions and loss of diversity. If we look at the modern institutions that we value unquestioningly then we may ask different questions about the processes. Take the market itself for example. Many people see it as the embodiment of freedom, of economic freedom. Democracy is the embodiment of political freedom and the market is the embodiment of economic freedom.

Imagine a hypothetical situation. There is a forest area and there a particular species lives. But the market theory says that anyone can come there and set up a factory. We know that all these modern processes contaminate, all these processes toxify. This particular species may disappear overnight because here the market forces are completely unfettered. So what they do is that through contamination and toxification of the environment, they impose external costs on non-human life forces. No one takes these costs into account and of course, they are also causing high costs in terms of human needs. Millions of people are forced to migrate because of these market forces.

All of these processes are connected with the institution of the market. If we analyze them, these institutions including democracy we will find that the way they have developed is not toward the embodiment of freedom but rather to the situation where
there is a total loss of control on the part of human beings. In fact, human beings have become completely recipients, passive consumers. Autonomous processes are going on and we are not in control of them any longer. The way we have designed these institutions is that they are leading to a situation where we have no control any longer. So there is tremendous violence as far as the contemporary processes are concerned.

How does one move beyond this situation? In this context, I want to briefly discuss what Mahatma Gandhi has to say. Gandhi was greatly respected during his lifetime but no one really paid any attention to what he was saying. And Gandhi’s followers, in fact, worshipped him but decided not to read about or think about what he was saying. Throughout his life, he gave very serious thought to the problems caused by modernity. I do not know of any person before Gandhi who was able to see so clearly the violence implicit in the modern processes. That is the reason that he talked about technology and institutions and he repeatedly said that the kind of values that are supported by modern technology and modern institutions—these values are such that they can only lead to destruction.

Gandhi, however, had a very brilliant idea. What does one do, Gandhi thought, in the face of very powerful processes where one really has no power—political or otherwise? What does one do in these circumstances. Gandhi’s brilliant idea was that one can always dissociate oneself from these processes. Dissociation would not necessarily be a smooth process, Gandhi realized, in fact it would often be very painful, but it was possible to dissociate. One could say clearly, by the way one lived: I do not want to be a part of this process.

Let me conclude with two points. First, there is a very urgent need to look at the nature of institutions, at the nature of technology and at the nature of the processes which are going on hidden from view. Secondly, the time has come to have a fresh look at thinkers like Gandhi and some of his predecessors, like Henry David Thoreau, who thought about these processes before they had become endemic.
I would like to thank you for the invitation to come here. I come from a sacred place where the Mayan civilization grew and I have come to a sacred place that is India. I am glad to be in this place where Gandhi fought for non-violence. I live in a place of violence, murder and injustice. We have learned to struggle against it—non-violently and now we want to learn to live in a different way in a non-violent economy. I will just tell you a little about my country and the situation where I live in Chiapas.

After the liberation from the paramilitaries, the authors of the massacre of Acteal several years ago, it was clear to us that in my country there is no justice. That led us to look for alternative solutions, so we decide to join with the struggles of other peoples of Mexico to construct a real justice from below. The government has not reassured us, from the time of the massacre, it keeps on applying politics of contra-insurgencia, so that we cannot keep on denouncing their actions with impunity.

Today it has increased the political repressions at the national level: the most common one is to select the leaders of peoples and organizations that defend the territories and the natural resources from megaprojects imposed by transnational companies, and to invent crimes and sentence them from 60 to 100 years of jail. Our actions against those policies have always been peaceful. Nevertheless, they criminalize our struggle and actions for justice and peace. Also the government supports the military and paramilitary control with aim of facilitating the plundering in our territories.

This is the political, economic and military ambience that one finds in Mexico. In spite of the absence of a constitutional state, we have many organizations and social movements that we work with to root out the violations to our human and indigenous rights, especially.

We still don't have common actions with other countries, but our principles don't let us be remote from your struggles.

---

8 Editor’s Note: Wikipedia: “The Acteal Massacre was a massacre of 45 people attending a prayer meeting of Roman Catholic indigenous townspeople, including a number of children and pregnant women, who were members of the pacifist group Las Abejas (“The Bees”), in the small village of Acteal in the municipality of Chenalhó, in the Mexican state of Chiapas. It was carried out on December 22, 1997 by unknown paramilitary forces…Las Abejas, composed of people from 48 indigenous communities in the highlands of Chiapas, continue to work for peace and demonstrate their solidarity with other social struggles by issuing communiqués that denounce violence and, most importantly, through actions centered around fasting and prayer. In November 2006, 100 men and 100 women members of the Abejas organized a peace and justice caravan to Oaxaca, to show their support for the Popular Assembly of the Oaxacan People (APPO) and denounce the repression and violence perpetrated by the state and federal governments. They also delivered at least three tons of food, water, and medicine to the APPO.”
Reflections from the Sudan: What a Non-violent Economy could mean given the Situation in Sudan, Light Wilson Aganwa

I am a member of SONAD, a Sudanese organization for non-violence and development. It is a pleasure for me to be here on behalf of my organization and on behalf of my country and behalf of my continent. I hope it will be an opportunity to hear an African voice in Asia today.

When we look at the theme of the conference—Towards a Non-violent Economy—it is very striking from the perspective of Africa because in Africa we are known for the violence of our economy, for mismanagement, for corruption, for lack of leadership. We do not have a stable economy, we have a very violent economy.

This is a specific case for a country like Sudan. Sudan is a rich country but it has found itself in continual conflict with itself. People in the north, the people in Darfur, the people in south—all fighting among themselves and with the government. This is summary of the economics issue: the fighting is first of all about resources.

It is not only case of Sudan, the same thing is happening in Nigeria. The oil of the Niger Delta has not been used for the benefit of the people but for exploitation. A similar thing happened between Nigeria and Cameroon over oil.

Africa has been plunged into conflict between nations and ethnic groups, a conflict with is ‘inter’ and ‘intra’. What is the way forward toward a non-violent economy?

I would say that we have to work for a democratic non-violent society where everyone will have a right to life and dignity. That should be the overall vision for Africa.

In order to achieve this kind of society, we need to look first at the education of the people. We need not the tradition, colonial education of basic reading and writing but an education for critical awareness and liberation. This education has to take into consideration: youth, women, the marginalized and oppressed. It must aim to change attitudes.

The second thing is to look at non-violence as a tool that looks at the root causes of poverty. In Africa we live below the poverty line. We need to analyze and address this poverty. That means we have to look at the social factors, economic factors and at political factors. We then need to empower people politically and socially and
economically. All of the excluded groups need to be included in the planning for the future.

The third thing is *that non-violence must look at religion as an element of co-existence and diversity*. In Sudan for example, the hatred between Christians and Muslims creates a violent economy. It has been going on for decades.

Finally, we have to have non-violence as a tool that enables forgiveness and change of attitude. In my country, if we have don’t have an element of forgiveness, we will never move forward. We need to forgive those that we hate. That is the only way ahead. We need to fight the negative aspects of the situation that create this hatred. We have to change this behaviour to go back to the goodness of all people. In the Christian tradition we are created in the image of God and that means that we are not basically evil.

This brings to what Gandhi himself said, ‘be the change you want to see in the world.’ You must learn to forgive and be an example of change.

In south Sudan, we are looking at teacher training as an element of a non-violent economy. We are looking also at a micro-finance economy especially for women. We are looking at the empowerment for the youth. We are looking for a peaceful social change.
1st day: Meeting real individual and collective needs.

The goal of Gandhi’s Swaraj is one of political autonomy (not to be subject to a foreign power or to a domestic tyrant, etc.) and of economic autonomy (to meet one’s basic needs with little or no dependence on other people …)

Food is a basic need and agriculture is the basis of all other activities. Agriculture must be sound and healthy and must respect nature, plants, animals and natural cycles.

Craft and manual work provides another way of regaining control of one’s life. It is at least as noble as intellectual work, if not more so. It helps balance body, intellect and sensitivity. It should be offered to all and not only to manual workers and to handicap victims.

As for manufacturing, it should focus on useful goods that will last and are easy to use. Waste must be avoided.

Human desire knows no limits. Desire for personal fulfillment can be satisfied by exchanges, meetings, creation, culture and spirituality. On the other hand, desire for possessions generates imitation, frustration, rivalry and wars.

Business must satisfy needs without artificially increasing desire for possessions.

Changing the economy means changing culture and education and moving towards a culture of non-violence.

**Criteria** for an economy of non-violence to serve real human needs:

- Does the economy satisfy the essential, physical, psychological and spiritual needs of people and of groups (according to Maslow’s classification of needs, for example)?

- Does the economy serve mankind or does it exploit mankind?

2nd day: Decentralising and re-localising economic activity
Creating and inventing your life: Gandhi’s \textit{Swadeshi} is the seal of personal development and inner peace.

Unwholesome desire for power, for possessions and domination of others is a form of personal and collective malfunctioning (colonisation and war).

Appropriating your life and living it with others, recognizing your dependence on others, knowing how to be in others’ debt … all these things can reflect on the way we organise society and especially on the way we organise the economy.

Placing the machine at man’s service, rethinking systematic mechanisation, automation and Taylorian industry, providing work for all, breaking down the barriers between manual work and intellectual work … are all priorities that have been affirmed not only by Gandhi but also by Annah Arendt, Georges Bernanos, Jacques Ellul and Ivan Illich.

Favouring short supply chains to save energy and to limit the power and nuisance of intermediaries (brokers etc.)

In any case, the end of oil will force us to make painful but salutary changes.

\textbf{Criteria} for a non-violent, decentralised and re-localised economy:

- Does the economy contribute to the overall development of the people?
- Can the poorest people and those most in need, most dependent and most handicapped find a place in the economy?
- Does the economy avoid waste?

3\textsuperscript{rd} day: Submitting the economy to the ethic of the common good

We can compare Gandhi’s \textit{Trusteeship} to the common good of Thomas Aquinas.

The \textit{utopian socialists} and the Gandhian community of the \textit{Arche} share the same quest, within the limits of their historical experience.
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If we express this ethic in terms of Christian social doctrine we obtain: “to satisfy the needs of honest subsistence and uplift men to a standard of ease and of culture that would no longer be a hindrance, but would indeed be of singular help to virtue”.

Criteria for a non violent economy subject to ethical principles:

• Does the economy have the permanent goal of eradicating misery?

• Does the economy combat the concentration of power and excessive differences in personal income?

• Do the political aspects, such as living together and managing local communities with long term vision, control and guide the economic aspects, such as manufacturing, consumption, distribution and sharing?

• Does financing (savings and credit) serve the economy through initiative and creation or does it infest and infect the economy through speculation and tax havens?

• Does the economy promote creative stimulation or does it favour ravaging competition (bearing in mind that the border between the two is not always easy to define)?

• Does the economy bring harmony, happiness and enjoyment of life?

• Is a search for life’s meaning (interiority or spirituality) also reflected in political and economical decisions?

In conclusion:

It takes a solid commitment to error to promote an economy based on speculation, domination, predation and a never ending race for money and material goods.

We are watching the tragic decline of western “civilisation”, drunk on power and enjoyment, excluding two thirds of humanity, scorning mother earth, ignoring the suffering it inflicts on humans and animals, blind to its own injustice and even blinder to its own suicidal nature…

… and yet it has become a model for so many “poor” countries because it has not yet collapsed far enough, but we will get there…
I would like to make three main points today.

The first one is about the violence within the structures, the economic, political and social structures. Let me ask a basic question, does the world economy we have today serve the basic needs of each and every human being alive today? The answer is a
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resounding ‘no’. We have a system that the economists say is dominated by a neo-liberal paradigm in which profits are put before people and greed is put before need. That is very clear in the system where we have. It is also a system in which people can get rich very quickly. If you follow what is happening on Wall Street or in the various stock markets around the world you see that people are earning enormous amounts of money without producing anything. If you look at the Global Inequality Chart you will see that you have just twenty percent of the world’s global elite who are controlling eighty percent of the world’s wealth.

The problems of extreme inequality and extreme poverty are linked. More than half of the world’s population live in that extreme poverty, without adequate food, education and health care. This poverty is no longer just a problem of the global south. If you look in the European Union which is one of the world’s wealthiest set of nations, you will find over eighty million people living in poverty.

The economy has also produced one crisis after another. We are going through a world ‘financial and economic’ crisis right now, we went through a ‘fuel crisis’ and a year or two ago, we went through ‘a food crisis’. What you are seeing is a big shift marked by a massive rural to urban migration, a dominant growth of agro-business and governments providing subsidies to them. We have excess production in the north, dumped in the global south and sold more cheaply than anything that can be grown locally. That puts local and small farmers out of business and makes them prey to growing crops for export. It also creates destitution in rural areas and that feeds into urban migration. We now have the growth of mega cities. Within ten years, if these trends continue you will have more than half of the world’s population living in urban centres.

Moreover what you have in the urban centres is the growth of slums. If you look in Bombay or Nairobi or Mexico you will see large numbers of people living in conditions that are very inhumane, in cramped conditions, without any prospect of a job. In one of these slums typically you would have a space of ten square metres in which a family of ten would be squashed with one toilet facility. This is the reality of how people are living in the cities.

What bothers me about this is the injustice of it. When I first visited Nairobi some years ago, we had a forced eviction of people by the railway line. In Nairobi you have a railway line that runs across the city and you have a big slum, the largest in Africa—it’s called Kibera. It is on one side of the train tracks and on the other side of the tracks is a golf course, very modern and large and well-kept. There might be a hundred people a week frequenting that golf course. And in Kibera there are 300,000 people living in abject
squalor, where they struggle to get any water to drink at all, while the golf course is being sprinkled daily.

What makes me most angry is that people in the slum have to pay more for their water than the people at the golf course. It is an injustice heaped upon an injustice.

This injustice is structural. It is in the structures of the economy and the social order. I mean why is it that women constitute seventy percent of the global poor? Because it is embedded in the patriarchal structure. This patriarchy is the dominance and control of the world by men. Similarly, if you look at the economic, political and social structures, the people who have power and wealth control the structures and they use that structure to make themselves more powerful and to keep themselves in power. There is an accumulation syndrome going on. People’s values are not judged by their inner values or their works but rather just by their earning and material possessions. Money, money, money. Greed, greed, greed. This consumption model which has been drilled into people’s heads by the neo-liberal economics makes people just continue to buy and buy. If you go and open your fridges you will see them filled with food that you can’t eat or your cupboards will be filled with machines that you don’t use and if you look in the garbage cans they will be filled with plastic and packaging.

There is an element of pillaging in all this structure; it is an economy that is pillaging the earth’s riches. It suppresses the human spirit and imprisons the soul. We become helpless and just move from one thing to the next from ipod to an iphone to and ipad. Communication is moving fast and we feel we have to buy just to keep up. But behind this is the feeling that we have lost the control of our lives and lost the power of the human individual.

The second point I want to make is more optimistic. It is about how we can begin to get out of this mess. It is possible to transform these oppressive and violent structures. I offer the framework of human rights as the way to transform this system. It is a system that is based on justice, justice in all its forms, social justice, economic justice, gender justice, legal justice.

If you look at the human rights system properly it actually brings back power to the people and especially those who are out in the margins. What you are doing in a human rights framework is framing the question of human needs as basic human rights. It is therefore not a matter of charity. It moves the people from a position of weakness to a
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position of strength. It moves people from a position of disempowerment to a position of empowerment.

Over the years I have really come to discover what human rights is really about. And the power of human rights lies not in the moral authority that it has—like for example in the Gandhian tradition, but rather in the legal authority it can wield. Governments have signed the International Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant of Human Rights that accompanies it. It ensures that everyone should have the right to decent work, adequate food, adequate standards of housing and education. These are all human rights and we have legal backing for this. Human rights is actually very clear about the obligations of the state to respect human rights, to protect people and to progressively fulfill these rights.

So if you look at human rights in terms of participation and in terms of accountability the potential of the human rights tradition is very strong to restore the status of the individual. If you look at Gandhi’s writing you will hear him talking about ‘the India of his dreams’. Similarly if you look at the human rights framework what you can see is ‘the world of our dreams.’ I hope that in the workshop that are coming up in the next few days that we will really look at the potential of the human rights system to transform these violent structures and really construct the economy and political system that will be the world of our dreams.

The third and final point that I want to make is that even though this will take time to transform the structures. It may take a long time but actually, personally we can start the project right away. Here I think we can learn from Gandhi, especially his thinking about manual labour and self-sustenance. You have your household which can produce enough to sustain your family.

I just want to tell you about the example from my family. I am living in France right now but we have our home in Portugal, in the countryside in a town called Alcochete which is out from the city about 25 kilometres. It is a very beautiful place, where sustainability is possible. I am not a professional farmer by any means but we have a small plot of land where we grow our vegetables, potatoes, tomatoes and those things. You can produce enough in that 1000 square metres for our family and even for the neighbourhood. The man across from us is an ecologist. He has 500 square metres and that includes his house which is heated by solar panels and the water is pumped from the well. From that plot of land he is able to grow basically everything he needs, potatoes, tomatoes, cabbages, and more than twenty different types of teas. Even the oil that he
needs to cook comes from the olive tree. He has them pressed at the mill but then he has enough for the rest of the year.

So on the one hand we have this consumer culture where people are driven at breakneck spend to spend and buy and consume and on the other hand there are people or communities that are able to produce enough for themselves and their families. In this way, I think, we can subscribe to that self-sustenance model which Gandhi proposed.

I want to end with a story of an experience that I had with my young child recently. I read a quote in the Gandhi exhibit next door yesterday and it inspired me to thing about this story. I have two young daughters, one nine, the other seven. We often talk about ‘our land’ together; it is like a game of imagination that we play. They ask me, ‘mehmeh, what does your land look like?’ I describe it as a beautiful place. Then they will tell me about their land, with beautiful houses and then my daughter said, ‘in our land there are schools, but they are not the sort of schools we are going to now where we feel that we have to learn the alphabet and the multiplication tables—all of the learning from books.’ And she said, ‘that is just killing me, Mehmeh’. ‘In my land we learn but we learn about the world from making things, drawings and pottery.’ And I am thinking, this is what Gandhi said about learning about the world from the craft. Then she went on and said, ‘In my land there is no money. Here everybody is talking about money, money, and money and people seem so crazy about it.’ I asked her how people get what they need, and she said ‘well they trade things.’ Then I challenged her, I asked ‘well what if people abuse the system?’ And she looked at me very seriously and said, ‘you know in my land, people are kind, people care.’ So with that I want to leave you, not only with the land of Gandhi, the India of our dreams but also with the land of our childrens’ dreams, where there is compassion and strong solidarity.

So I will end with the quote that I read yesterday because it inspired me to tell you this story about my children. Gandhi says, “The law of love can best be learned from children”.

Once again, Gandhiji, how right you are.
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Re-evaluation and Development of Manual Work and Cottage Industries as a Means to develop Strength, Talent and Intelligence, Bernard Dangeard

Summary: The reflection which follows is based on a long experience of agricultural work and community life coupled with complete income sharing. This “model” of a non-violent economic life, which is both interesting and necessary, however, is not sufficient to support a political project on a wide scale.

Any political impetus which tries to combat social exclusion by obtaining farming land or allowing crafts people to earn a living, should be accompanied by a reflection on social organization, government, conflict resolution and the means of assuring and perpetuating a more just society. The spiritual dimension of such an undertaking should give a meaning to this work. There should be an underlying consensus amongst intellectuals, farmers and crafts people, to promote such a non-violent revolution and thereby found a new generation of men and women who accept these values.

__________________________________________________________________________

I am here representing the community of the ARK which was founded by LANZA DEL VASTO after his encounter with GANDHI in India in 1936/1937. This encounter not only created the community but also enabled the ARK to inspire other communities in the future.

I have been a member of the ARK for nearly 35 years. After a higher education in science and some professional experience as an engineer, I choose a path of greater simplicity which led me to adopt, with determination and joy, manual work: that is the life of the farmer. This choice together with that of organic agriculture and techniques of working with animals such as horses, meant also that the tools themselves were simple enough technically to be made by a blacksmith or local cottage industry. This work is still my professional activity.

My work basically consists of walking on the ground behind one or more harnessed horses, which prepare the earth for the growing of vegetables, cereals, fodder as well as working in the vineyard. Between the horses, the equipment and tools and myself who leads, something happens which is difficult to define.

Eugene, a former work colleague, with whom I learned a lot, used to say: “It was well met”, when everything went well in harmony and at the right time. The good economical result or yield is only a consequence.
Another former worker used to say: "Ploughing the land is preparing the earth to fall in love with the seed that it will receive". Beyond the result and the expected yield of my practical agricultural work, it is the type of experience and contacts that I seek, and this I am happy to share with others. The account which follows is based on this experience of manual work that is more agricultural than crafts-oriented.

The choice of manual work is remarkable in that it itself imposes limits. It is associated with limited production. Gigantism is impossible. Monopolization of capital, of land and of distribution networks is incompatible with crafts and agricultural work. Until recently the productive capacity of land, and its ability to replenish itself, together with our demands of increased yields, seemed to be infinite, taking in account the technical capacity of the time. We now know that this is not the case, precisely because the concentration of enormous means remains in the hands of a few people. This is not only because we are more people on the earth to feed, but because the earth itself has its limits.

In literal terms, manual work is limited to the physical capacity of the human being whereas the arm is extended by a tool and technical knowledge. This allows us to transform matter, objects and products of nature and agriculture…into something new, transformed, elaborated, thought out and to give them a meaning : a sense of sharing, the inclusion into solidarities and local and family life formed by exchanges. In the agricultural sector as well, manual work remains limited to physical strength and the capacity to create larger crop-growing areas, in spite of the contribution from animals which help considerably the agricultural work which is done entirely by hand. The choice of a technique imposes both a structure and limits.

Such a structure does not allow for the accumulation of great resources in the hands of few ; therefore, if by making the choice of simple means were to be generalized, or at least widely in use, inequalities would be strongly diminished and the distribution of riches much more equitable.

Can such a structure be imposed? Of course not! This would amount to the renouncement of democracy in favour of totalitarianism which by imposing itself would put everyone under the yoke and this would be intolerable. This was the case of the Khymer Rouge and their regime in Cambodia.

9 This is just an image : there are of course manual tasks which imply the use of much more complex techniques than a simple hand tool which extends the action of an arm.
Enough for Everyone’s Need

We need on the contrary a profound basic support and voluntary action from each person: it’s essential.

But…is it possible? Can we promote it?

I believe that it is an aim of this conference: the creation of the network of partners who accept the need to limit and to apply this limitation to themselves and also to fight for the rights which stem from the common dignity of human beings: the right to work the land, to work to be able to live and provide for the family with dignity. But is it sufficient?

Do the ”landless” of all the continents lack only the lands taken over by unscrupulous large landowners either illegally or legally? From what I have been able to observe in France, but also in Brazil, it seems clear that there are other mechanisms at work. Humanity is not by nature virtuous; the situations are diverse and complex. The capacities of each social organization including the family situation, do not allow that everyone has the same means to escape from a situation which is common to us all at the start. I have seen landless people who after having acquired land by a struggle, or an agricultural reform, did nothing with it nor rented it back to their former big landowner! This does not mean that there should not be a redistribution of land through agricultural land reforms; but it is not sufficient!

There is therefore a political dimension towards the struggle for the dignity of manual workers and peasants, but it is not the only element involved.

In both poor and rich countries alike, manual work is often a sign of social exclusion, the absence of a future and of a banning outside the town, outside the slum, outside the social sphere, outside the modern economy, out of sight….Today’s manual workers are transparent. They don’t exist, they no longer exist. In agriculture, which is a domain that I know the best, the work with animals, even it is judged to be acceptable for reasons of economy, of energy (fodder instead of petrol) or for efficiency related to small areas, is still regarded with a feeling of exclusion. Someone living in France and still working with animals will inevitably be viewed as being backward. The obstacle is more cultural than technical. If the ruling class were numerous enough to adopt a more frugal way of life, and started cultivating the land, preferably with animals, that would have an important impact on how small farming and manual work would be considered. We should therefore support and promote this.

This indeed, has been my own choice. The work is slow, regular and done by walking on the earth which allows all the senses and the feet to feel it. It is a time which is
favourable as well for reflecting on the meaning of the work and also the awareness of collaborating in a task which surpasses us.

Everything is linked together, which means that it is not relevant to oppose manual and intellectual work. On the contrary, it is important to recognize that they are woven together. This is my personal experience. The reflection on what we are doing, and why we are doing it, should be made by intellectuals as well as crafts people and farmers who know practically what they are talking about, because either it has been or is their life. Those who ‘think’ about promoting manual work and small farming are the good intellectuals when they talk and innovate in relation with those whose task is to accomplish the work. And those who work often have the capacity to reflect on their work and on the end result as well as on a more fair social organization. We should at least listen to what they have to say!

There are other questions however which also are as important and profound. They arise from my experience of community life with a fairly complete pooling and sharing of income and communal assets.

The first point concerns the organization of social life and the way the decisions are made at family community, village, district and regional level. How does the power structure work, how is it renewed, regulated, how can conflicts be overcome, which are inevitable in a social life?

The second point concerns the time transmission between one generation and another. A slogan which is easily repeated says: “the land belongs to those who work it”. Should the nourishing earth be rented? ... belong to individuals? ... collectively owned? How do young people and newly formed couples find an access to working the land? Is this done within an enlarged family or on the contrary by means of becoming independent of parental relations? And how could this be organised and perpetuated?

On this first point, the organization of social life: I must admit that I was disappointed by the failure of an attempt at rural community life, which I personally experienced on a farm working exclusively or almost, with animals and quite simple techniques and tools; and that in the midst of a French society which has rejected this model for fifty years as being archaic. Our failure was not due to economic difficulties because on that level with quite a sober standard of living, life was rather good. Even being alone with our choices and decisions, it worked.
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The failure was linked to the difficulty of human relationship, to the inability to overcome conflicts to agree on a fair place for each person, to create a harmonious life within social relationships and to give a meaning to the whole experience. This touches on the spiritual dimension, that is, that the meaning of this human adventure was no longer shared. By crafts and agricultural work, it is possible to avoid misery, live modestly but not become rich. And in the middle of an opulent society what meaning does sobriety and frugality have?

With regard to the second point, that is, the perpetuity, the transmission in time, I am struck, by reading the works of French historians, to learn that the rural population has increased at certain periods due to technical improvements (conquest of new spaces with the cultivation of land more arid, meagre, humid or on a slope) and how, on the contrary, severe epidemics have reduced cultivated areas. Today, we are confronted with the limits of our earthly paradise, not that all cultivable land is already cultivated, but we are now able to see better than ever that the global envelop at our disposition is limited; there are hardly any more ‘far wests’! The main problem concerns the allocation of an area which is certainly still very large, but in which the natural resources are unevenly distributed.

The second question is thus: how can the succession be organized through time, the transmission of land from one generation to another, the transmission of crafts skills to the successors, and under what conditions will there be successors? What will be a fair distribution after one or two generations? Under what conditions will be justice perpetuated? For example, what will become of the family farm, shared between the children after one or two generations?

It appears to me that in addition to the political struggle, the legitimate claims on land by deprived rural communities and families, who wish to live and work on these lands there are thus two basic questions: organization of social life and transmission in time.

Traditional societies have a well-run organization, and although somewhat rigid; there are accepted ways of doing things which are accepted and known by everyone to organize themselves, to solve conflicts, to allocate land to new families, to take up from those who have died. We must be careful perhaps not to idealize these models. Would I

10 It is not a question here of tropical and equatorial deforestation for wood and soya cultivation: that is another subject. I am talking only about the cultivation of deforested land which is left abandoned, laid fallow and ‘frozen’ by state and private landowners.

11 The massive buying-up of agricultural land by foreign companies, especially in Africa is very worrying (see the n° 991 of the ‘International Courier’ magazine, beginning November 2009)
accept to live in such traditional environment? In France, the social organization no longer functions. The handing down of land, the knowledge and skills of the job, is no longer done well: its even done less and less, the occupation of the father usually is no longer handed down to the son. New rules need to be invented, because there has been a break down in the system.

A last point is that in every well thought-out and efficient organization which respects each person for their talents and dignity, there will always be rebels who put into question the organization, and the way of doing things...or can’t find their place. Will there be a place for them as well, or at least an attitude which respects their differences?

Although we desire to support an agricultural and cottage industry model, at least for the country and rural areas, I am wary of the system which creates excluded people, like the present economic system does. In the training that we should transmit to the new generation, lets us not forget to keep a place for the rebel, for the person who contests our vision of things.

I am pleased to conclude by noting that in my community we have developed a new program--Learning to ‘LIVE TOGETHER’, according to the theme of project named: FEVE –Seeds, which means in English: Training and Experimenting to Live Together. This will start in 2010 at the community of the ARK of Saint Antoine, in France, in partnership with EKTA PARISHAD.

Toward a Non-violent Economy from the Grassroots’ Village Level Up, A.T.Ariyaratne
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At the outset I like to extend my thanks to Gandhi International, Ekta Parishad and South Asia Peace Alliance for inviting me to this international Conference held on the theme “Towards a Non Violent Economy”.

I think it is in order if I first introduce myself and what we are doing in Sri Lanka towards building a Sarvodaya (‘welfare of all’) social order. We have worked extremely hard for over the last 50 years to bring about a transformation of our society towards a Sarvodaya Social Order. We are active in 15,000 villages in Sri Lanka which is approximately half the number of village communities in the country.

We have developed programmes for awakening of human personality (Paurushodaya), awakening of families (Kutumbodaya), awakening of rural and urban communities (Gramodaya and Nagarodaya), village self-governance (Gram Swarajya) and a programme for national awakening (Deshodaya). Also we have helped groups of people who have come from other countries to observe our Movement to start their own awakening programmes in countries like Nepal, Bangladesh, U.S.A, U.K, Belgium, Netherlands and Germany.

This attempt is known as a universal awakening or Vishvodaya.

What we consider to be Sarvodaya is the aggregate of the processes realized by all those programmes starting with individual human beings and extending up to the universal level. The total impact expected of all processes will be an integrated awakening in spiritual, moral, cultural, social, economic and political life at all levels in human society.

In this Conference I have been asked to speak on basic needs satisfaction of communities. While I will certainly speak on this subject given to me, I would rather deal with it in a broader context of building a non-violent social, economic and political order based on spiritual, moral and cultural values.

The Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement of Sri Lanka realized at the very beginning of its work that it is much easier to work with poor communities rather than with affluent classes. Well to do people will always pay lip service to spiritual, moral and cultural values but when it comes to making sacrifices to transform social, political and economic structures where the basic needs satisfaction, justice and fair play that will benefit the poor particularly in the economic sector are concerned they would hesitate to act responsibly.
On the other hand communities of poor people can be motivated and inspired to engage themselves in self-reliant, community participatory activities and to share their labour and meager resources to satisfy one or more of their basic human needs.

Our first approach was to organize Shramadana (‘gift of labour’) Camps where members of the community can be persuaded to donate their labour, their knowledge, their skills and even whatever small amounts of money or useful material they could share for common good. By this process we succeeded in spreading a Shramadana movement across hundreds of village communities where they could, with their own efforts carry out basic needs satisfaction programmes pertaining to the following sectors:

1. A clean and beautiful physical environment along with a peaceful psychological environment.
2. A clean and adequate supply of water for drinking and personal use and a sustainable supply of water for home gardens and bigger agricultural irrigation purposes.
3. Optimum requirements of clothing for a healthy and simple life style.
4. An adequate supply of nutritive and healthy foods mainly produced from within the community itself to ensure food security.
5. Shelter or modest housing for all the families in the community preferably using the material as well as skills available within the community itself.
6. Health and medical care facilities using indigenous as well as modern preventive and curative methods.
7. Use of energy sources available within the community keeping in mind the limitations of non-renewable fossil based resources.
8. Communication facilities both with regard to access roads and also means of exchanging information using appropriate technologies.
9. Promoting a system of total education that commences from the conception of a child in the mother’s womb up to the very end of one’s life. In other words, a total education where formal education is only a fraction of total life experiences of a human being throughout life.
10. Satisfying spiritual and cultural needs of people by reviving and using to the maximum all the available traditional resources of culture, knowledge and wisdom.
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During the first few years of the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement of Sri Lanka, we were able to subdivide these basic human needs into over 300 sub needs which people themselves identified in the process of implementation of this programme. The word Shramadana (gift of labour) and its practice spread like wildfire going beyond our movement. Other civil society organizations and even governments accepted this programme and in the decades that followed non-monetized capital was created through Shramadana by way of roads, irrigation tanks, irrigation canals, waterways, re-forestation, construction of houses, wells, sanitary facilities, community centres, schools, multi-purpose centres etc. These were accomplished without any formal expenditure of government funds but mostly by voluntary donations of cash, material, land, expertise and so on which amounted to several times that of the government budget. Unfortunately, formal political and administrative sector of the society, politicians and bureaucrats never understood the deep significance of this movement for national re-awakening, development and creating national wealth with our own human and natural resources. They could not simply conceive of a people’s participatory development as of much national significance. For them writing project proposals for IMF, World Bank, Asian Development Bank and Bilateral grants and aid was the only they could conceive of finding capital.

A very important contribution of this Shramadana activity was the leadership that emerged out of this national wave of constructive work. When thousands of people were working together shoulder to shoulder it brought about a qualitative change in personal relationships that transcended all divisive factors in the society, namely, caste, class, race, language, religion and political differences. Similarly, because of a strict code of self-discipline we maintained in Shramadana camps generations of young people were brought up who got used to sharing, speaking pleasant language, giving up destructive activities and treating every body living throughout the country with equality. If not for this movement the racial conflicts that were created by communal differences that ended in a thirty year war could have brought about much more damage than even what took place. Detlef Kantowsky in his book “The Other Development”, Joanna Macy in her book “Dharma and Development,” Sugathadas Gupta in an essay on Sarvodaya in Sri Lanka and George Bond in his book “Buddhism in Community Development,” and others have extensively written on the benefits of shramadana activities and their consequence in transforming the consciousness, the economy and the human relationships in the country.

During the post-colonial period in the country, by government and NGO handouts most of our poor communities have developed a dependency syndrome. It is our
experience that it is extremely difficult to get rural communities into a sustainable development process by sharing their resources and labour alone. In the short term this is possible. Certainly, such sharing and satisfaction of basic human needs get the rural community to go a long way on the right path of sustainable development. Yet, at this stage it is important that there should be a certain community organizational structure involving all members of the community. What Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement does is to organize village level Sarvodaya Shramadana Societies and get them incorporated as legal entities under a relevant law. This enables a village society to survey their resources and potential, do their own planning, own property, undertake contracts, employ people, start economic activities such as agriculture, small industries, handicrafts etc. and learn to evaluate their progress.

All these activities need capital. Our banking system is not geared to provide the necessary capital for the poor. On the other hand, banks are organized to help rich people to become richer. Even though we do not like, it this is the system that prevails. So, poor people have to develop an alternative method from which they could find the required capital. Sarvodaya Economic Enterprise Development Service Programme was started twenty five years ago for this purpose. Today, in over 5,000 villages micro-finance programmes involving savings, credit and micro enterprises are going on opening the way to an alternative economic path. They are also trained in entrepreneurship and vocational skills. Even though Sarvodaya Societies have saved well over a billion rupees and provided credit facilities amounting into several billions, Sarvodaya could not get the necessary legal backing from the finance regulating institutions in our country to make a giant step forward to provide the capital needed by the poorer communities to generate income from the resources they have. May be very soon we will get the legal sanction from the Central Bank of Sri Lanka to develop into a level where Sarvodaya can have a greater influence on the national economy.

Poverty and powerlessness go hand in hand. In the same manner affluence and power also go hand in hand. Unless we empower the poor politically there is no way that poverty can be substantially confronted. As a movement based on Buddhist and Gandhian values and principles, the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement rejects the existing power-oriented party political system. Hence, we cannot take the same path to political empowerment as various political parties and groups. Our path is not to capture political and economic power at the centre like other political forces are trying to do. We
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want to convert the pyramidal structure of the present political and economic system to what Mahatma Gandhi called the oceanic circles of people’s power – A Commonwealth of Village Republics.

The 15,000 villages where we are active is the foundation on which we want to build that new economic and political order. So, already, 3,000 of these villages have been identified to build village self-governance or Grama Swarajya. These Grama Swarajya villages so far have been formed at Divisional and District levels from 300 Deshodaya or National Awakening Councils. They will together form what is called the Deshodaya National Assembly. While the present parliament of Sri Lanka has 225 elected members, National Deshodaya Council will have 112,000 members all over the country. These community leaders will live with, conscientize and serve the people. In other words each village community will have three to four Deshodaya National Assembly Members. They can assist the existing government institutions as well as civil sector organizations to get a first hand knowledge of the UN Charter, UN Charter on Children’s Rights and other important UN documents and documents such as the Earth Charter and so on.

Already parallel to the Deshodaya networking, Sarvodaya is developing trade and commercial enterprises linking the Sarvodaya villages so that non-exploitative, non-polluted and ecologically sound agricultural and industrial production systems can flourish in our country. As I mentioned before, the poor people need empowerment both politically and economically. We can always begin with Shramadana getting its justification from spiritual and social inputs. But to satisfy secondary and tertiary needs we have to evolve further with novel economic and political structures.

National Deshodaya Assembly Members can promote non-violence, protection of the environment, mobilize people and judicial institutions to take up issues pertaining to protection of basic human rights, anti-social practices such as corruption, fraud and violence, guaranteeing every citizen fair and equitable treatment under the law. In other words good governance can be made prevail in our society at all levels with the Deshodaya programme. Maybe in the foreseeable future the Deshodaya movement can evolve itself to what we have called a Vishvodaya, Universal Awakening, a Movement to awaken the whole of the humanity to the Sarvodaya Social Order that Gandhiji conceived.
Walking Along with Rural Women in Paraguay: An Experience of Education in Human Rights and Culture of Peace. Lilianne Esther Alfonso

I am Lilianne Esther Alfonso from Paraguay. I want to tell you briefly about what rural women in Paraguay are doing to privatize organic and food producing agriculture as the basis for a viable economy. I want to explain how we give priority to organic agriculture as the basis for a viable society and economy.

Let me show you where Paraguay is on a map of the world. We have four provinces in the country where we work with rural women. The political scenario in Paraguay is that after many years of dictatorship we now have a democratic government that is supposed to be very progressive. All of the key issues have been identified by my distinguished colleague from Myanmar (Aye Aye Win), the issues which have led to the crisis: consumerism, migration to the cities, invasion of mass media.

The worst thing which is happening in Paraguay right now is soy bean production—which is 90% of the agriculture in Paraguay today—and is under the control of the multinationals and it has replaced much of our traditional agriculture. This impact of the expansion of this monocultivation is giving rise to the loss of biodiversity, deforestation, fragmentation and disappearance of habitat, pollution of the river sources, indiscriminate use of pesticides, pauperization in the communities, loss of cultivated lands, negative impacts on health, insufficient land, abandonment of subsistence agriculture.

Behind all this, however, is the fact that the land is being taken by multinational companies from the traditional farmers, with the violation of all sorts of human rights and also the existing land laws existing in Paraguay. As we recognized this morning, governments are not really interested in this land-grabbing or, they are helping the people who are doing it and therefore we have to unite ourselves in the struggle against it and we have to recreate ourselves.

I work with women who are organizing themselves and coming out of their homes to work collectively. Paraguay has been a very male-dominated society in which the men make all the decisions but that is changing slowly as women are re-creating themselves. There has developed a community practice of eating together traditional foods which is being carried out by rural women in Paraguay mainly to protest against the transnational
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invasions into their territory and their loss of land and foods. The women are realizing that they can’t resist this alone but have to do it as a community.

On small farms, which are owned by rural women, many of them are raising these traditional foods, this gives them independence and sustenance. Women are planting corn and the traditional plants and seeds which have almost disappeared from the soil of Paraguay (for example, pineapple). Since they live very far from the cities they must also produce their own detergents and cleaning products. They are now also raising pigs, cows and beginning milk production. In the rural areas, women don’t work alone on these farms but are accompanied by their family members who help them. They are raising things organically and collectively, for example, on one communal farm they have over 10,000 pineapple trees. They also have a training program to help women with issues like gender discrimination and human rights. Women also have set up their own local courts to resolve conflicts because the traditional legal system is to bureaucratic and biased.

Even though many rural women—especially indigenous women—are not literate, they have managed to do together many things to make a viable local economy and create a culture of peace.

The Role of Transformative Politics in Creating Social Cohesion, Amitabh Behar

I am really delighted that this workshop is happening at this moment. Let me just identify the context for this workshop. We are in the midst of a global recession in which millions of people have lost their jobs, and in that context we are talking about a non-violent economy. We are in the midst of a climate crisis which threatens the submergence of an island state near western Australia within the next few year. And also—because we are in the Indian context—finally we have the South Korean Steel giant, Posco, getting its
clearances to build factories in Orissa that will displace hundreds of thousands of people and snatching their livelihood. So that is the context in which we are talking about a non-violent economy.

Let me start with a very honest admission. My work has been limited and has not been in the area of economics. Therefore it might seem naïve or the questions of an inquisitive mind at best. Let me also be self-critical. I do a significant amount of advocacy work in this country working on issues of advocacy and self-government and human rights. In spite of this work, somewhere I feel we have not been able to put sufficient thought into the area of the economy, particularly into thinking about areas of alternative possibilities. Very often, as an activist, I am caught in a firefight—for the last five years we have been struggling against Posco’s attempt to enter India—and we don’t have the mental space or time to reflect on what an alternative would mean.¹² That is a critique of the activist life and a plea that we find the space for reflection.

I belong to the generation which saw the fall of the Berlin Wall and again since we are in India, the generation which saw the demolition of the Babri Mosque.¹³ These are very significant events for us, where I think, alternatives have had little space to develop. In this sense, how do we look at alternatives which are very far off and romantic from the current reality—that is the context. But let me also say that I belong to the generation that takes large inspiration from the World Social Forum and I believe that an alternative world is possible.

In that context, I want to make only a few points. I have been asked to speak about the topic: ‘Economic Activity to develop social cohesion and fight against exclusion’. Let me first start with comments and begin with some contradictions that I find in the topic itself.

Give the existing paradigm of economic activities—and the way we experience economic activities—I must say that it does not build cohesion—in fact it is divisive. I have already talked about Posco and about climate change. You also see this enormous growth rate which is about the economic activity happening in India—‘the shining

¹² Editor’s Note: Posco is a South Korean iron and steel company.

¹³ Editor’s Note: Wikipedia: “Babri Masjid or Mosque of Babur was a mosque in Avodya on Ramkot Hill (“Rama's fort”). It was destroyed in 1992 when a political rally developed into a riot involving 150,000 people, despite a commitment to the Indian Supreme Court by the rally organisers that the mosque would not be harmed. More than 2000 people were killed in ensuing riots in many major Indian cities including Mumbai and Delhi.”
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India”—but this growth is built on snatching the livelihoods of the poor and marginalized. But there is also the problem of the complete lack of alternatives. It is not only the Gandhian alternative that has been lost, but also many other economic alternatives which have no political support in this context.

The second contradiction is the inherent contradiction between the economic order and the social order or the creation of social justice. It is often said that the economic order is about creating a social order that is stable. However, in creating this stable social order, the questions of equity get pushed to the margins and don’t get addressed. The economic order really is not open to addressing these questions of justice and equity.

What have been the experiences of the civil society in this country, in terms of economic activity? I am speaking anecdotally. I can see three trends of economic activity with the marginalized that NGO’s and civil society have engaged in. The first is trying to integrate the poor and marginalized in the existing markets (so, how do you do the forward-backward linkages, how do you have a bigger share of the pie coming to the marginalized groups etc.). However I don’t see that as creating a non-violent economy because you are still conforming to the basic ideas of market economy and its social cohesion which is built around the idea of private versus community. The second trend is the creation of self-help groups. I am sure most of you are aware of this trend. I have seen how self-help groups have divided reasonably cohesive communities into the identity of small self-help groups and that is being promoted as a huge model in this country and again I see that it has not either social cohesion or inclusion. The third trend is the idea of the cooperative and here I must be honest, you have very few successful cooperative movements in this country at the moment. Increasing, groups seem to be leaving the idea and not talking about community resources or ownership. Even the Forest Rights Act that was approved a couple of years ago, that includes a significant jump and space for community ownership of livelihood resources—that is something on which most civil society groups are not working but rather on individual land ownership.

Having said all that let me come to the point. How do you build social cohesion—with social equity? It cannot be built around economic activities. I am saying this as a hypothesis. But the social cohesion that I have seen built has been always around transformative politics. So whether you call it transformative politics or, in a group like this, struggle for justice or even struggle for truth. Those are moments when we are able to create social cohesion and promote social inclusion. So the question really becomes, how do we create and build an order that is based on social transformative politics? I would propose the idea of drawing lessons from the feminist movement (where there has been a focus on the idea of nurturing) and also taking lessons from the idea of
participatory democracy and finally also from organic, sustainable development. I think that those could be the pillars, around which we could build an alternative economics that would allow for social cohesion and an end to exclusion.
Introduction: the actual situation in Palestine.

The actual situation in Palestine is marked by total despair and the absence of visions of the future among Palestinians. It is also marked by the pursuit of a colonial politics on the part of the Israelis and an unresolved conflict between the Israel and the Palestinians.

In the strip of land that is Gaza where a million and a half Palestinians live, there has been an inhumane blockade against the civilian population imposed for more than three years, involving the closure of borders and economic difficulties. The constant closure of borders means the movement of people who want to enter or leave Gaza is very difficult, to say nothing of the entry of merchandise—which is very sporadic. In the West Bank, there is an ongoing colonization in the Palestinian territories and a wall of apartheid which separates the Palestinians from their villages and lands, reinforced by check points and other military measures of the Israeli occupation.

We can say that we are constantly occupied and dominated. This occupation refuses any regional or international peace initiatives.

In the face of this occupation, the Palestinians have carried out two Intifada1: the first Intifada from 1987-1994 was a non-violent Intifada against the Israeli soldiers and the settlers who found themselves illegally occupying land recognized by the United Nations as ‘occupied territory’. The second Intifada from 2000-2004, was an armed uprising with the use of weapons and attacks against Israeli soldiers by various Palestinian factions. It was accompanied by very bloody and very violent reprisals on the part of the Israelis. We don’t believe that either of the Intifadas succeeded in realizing the hopes of the Palestinians, despite their legitimacy. Non-violent resistance with an effective strategic plan remains one solution as the resistance of the Palestinians to the Israeli occupation.

14* Ziad Medhoukh was not able to obtain a visa to attend the conference. His paper was read there and a resolution of support was passed by the conference. It is found at the end of this paper.

1 Intifada is an uprising and a revolt against occupation.
1. Non-violence in Palestine

Non-violence is practiced by Palestinians in their daily lives. Even if this non-violence does not rest on philosophical, historical or strategic references, it is still used almost everyday by the civilian population and before the various committees responsible for organizing non-violent action in Palestine. The difference here is that non-violence is not recognized or followed by people to confront the domination of the military factions on the ground or the Israeli provocations.

Among these non-violent actions, we can list the following:

1. Resisting on the land: the people of Palestine are always on their land in the process of cultivating their fields, despite all of the occupation measures and also the presence of Israeli settlers. In the Gaza strip, the inhabitants prefer to remain beside their houses ruined by Israeli bombs than to leave and abandon their land;

2. The peaceful demonstrations against the ‘wall of shame’ in the West Bank especially in the two villages of Biliin and Niliin. These demonstrations are gatherings of Palestinian villagers, as well as international guests and Israeli peace activists who come in solidarity;

3. The popular demonstrations of solidarity and support in front of Palestinian houses threatened by destruction by the occupation forces.

4. The boycott of Israeli products produced in the illegal colonies.

These actions are often effective because they attract more and more solidarity both internationally and from the Israeli peace movement. The weak point of this non-violent Palestinian movement is the absence of coordination among the different local groups and between them and outsiders. Their actions are not well known—even to the majority of Palestinian society, to say nothing of the fact that such actions on ignored by the media and this applies also the Israeli provocations which seem aimed at breaking the non-violent movement and encouraging violence. Another challenge is with the definition of non-violence in Palestine and with the balance between it and the violent struggle in Palestine. The Israeli authorities are embarrassed by this movement and moreso through
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the arrests of its activists and leaders, for example, Gamal Juma, arrested in September
2009, to say nothing the Israeli repression of the weekly demonstrations.²

This non-violence and its actions attracts many Palestinians as a form of resistance
to the occupation. Recently the United Nations Program for Development (PNUD)
published a report which noted that “70% of young Palestinians are against violence as a
way of resolving the conflict with Israel.”³

The majority of us, in fact, nearly all of us are able to imagine situations where
violence seems like the appropriate response to a perceived threat. No one among us, who
is a parent for example, would hesitate to resort to violence if it were the only means to
protect a child against the threat of violence. Few among us also would hesitate to resort
to violence to protect ourselves against the same kind of menace.⁴

Palestine has experienced a great deal of violence because it is the only occupied
country in the world, but still the forms of resistance are still being debated. On the one
hand, there are the people who defend the resort to violence as a response to the violent
actions of the occupation. These people are convinced that it is the only choice. On the
other hand, there are those who find in the strategy of non-violence an effective
alternative and one which will obtain better results. Non-violent action is, contrary to
what most people think, the most difficult choice because it demands an understanding of
techniques as well as much more coordination and cooperation in order to be effective
and to bring about positive results. Finally, the responsibility falls back to the
international community which does not support these actions with the aim of promoting
them around the world. All of this creates the real weakness of the non-violent movement
in Palestine.

On the other hand, non-violence is part of the mobilization of people which
creates fear in the occupiers and it is for this reason that Israel prefers armed conflict and
its factions and uses them as a pretext for bombing, attacking and eliminating the
Palestinians. Because Israel cannot portray the popular uprising as terrorism, it also fears

² 2 In May 2009, Abdallah Abou Rahma the leader of the committee for non-violence in
Biliin was murdered by an Israeli shot at a rally against the wall.

³ 3 This report was published in 2009 by the United Nations Development Program.

⁴ 4 Interview with Ziad Medoukh, “Résistance non-violente à Gaza,” Silence, n°371,
September 2009, p.36 -Article : La Palestine et la tactique de la non-violence. By Ray
Zwarich published on the 27 of April 2009 at the site : http://www.ism-
the development of a non-violent popular resistance in Palestine—this according to the
Israeli journalist Amira Hass.5

Because non-violence is practiced by Palestinians in their daily lives, we think that
the most important challenge for them is the development of a non-violent economy. This
kind of economy would not only develop the human person but also their independence
and thus their ability to resist the forms of injustice and the reprisals.

2. Toward a non-violent economy in Palestine.

A non-violent economy is really the total application of the concept of non-
violence whose aim is to assure the establishment of good economic structures without
recourse to violence and at the same time to find effective and positive means to either
develop or slow down economic growth.

Economic independence is assuredly part of political independence; in that sense,
the Palestinian people ought to discover the means of developing their own economy, on
the one hand, while weakening the grip of the Israeli economy upon them in a non-violent
way. In this sense, non-violence is a complete strategy which brings together all areas
while at the same time recognizing that the occupation has a profound and menacing
influence on the economic sector as well as many other domains of life in Palestine. For
example, we can confirm that 80% of economic and commercial activity carried on by
Palestinians is with Israel and that all the products which enter Palestine come through
Israeli controlled points of entry—except for those products that come to Gaza through
tunnels.6

According to a report on the Palestinians affected by the building of the wall, only
18% of the some 30,000 farmers of the West Bank who were separated from their land by
the building of the wall of separation constructed by the Israelis have today received
permits which allow them to reach their land.7

Palestinians may respond to this acts by various modes of non-violent resistance.

6 6 The Palestinians of Gaza dug tunnels beginning in 2006 at the start of the blockade
between Egypt and the Gaza Strip in order to get the most urgent supplies to the people of
Gaza.
3. Forms and Examples of Economic Non-violent Resistance

These are some possibilities:

1. to boycott Israeli products as an effective way of diminishing the profits to Israel of the occupation,
2. to encourage industrial and agricultural production in villages with the aim of having our own products and creating work for Palestinians in their own businesses,
3. to refuse to pay taxes to the authorities of the occupation (this action would require a coordination and cooperation between civil society organization to sensitize to the action and its potential impact),
4. to refuse to work in the illegal Israeli settlements. Palestinians themselves should be convinced of this action because by working in these settlements, they develop the Israeli economy and lose the opportunities to better their own economy,
5. to refuse to use the products of the settlers,
6. to encourage the economy of families and cooperatives.

Here one can speak of the equal role of women with men in this activity of non-violent resistance. In fact many Palestinian women have boycotted Israeli products and this has led them to create their own business which generate revenue. These businesses are mostly in the area of food or hair styling—things which take little initial investment. Cooperatives enabling the sale of artistic products have also been created. This has created a basic economic infrastructure for a purely Palestinian economy.

The most effective non-violent action from women has, however, been in the area of education (even if it was not consciously taken up as a non-violent technique). In this area, the woman is the pillar of the family, which is to say that she can have a great impact in forming the ideas of young people in an orientation toward non-violence.

---

4. Conclusion

To conclude, one can say that the Palestinians are always searching for an effective solution to help them realize their dreams of having a free and independent homeland. Already without knowing it, Palestinians have used the strategy of non-violence in their fight, even without having the philosophical or historical background to such a strategy. This kind of resistance can be an effective solution but it requires much more coordination among the political, social and economic actors and groups of Palestinian society. This also means that Palestinians should choose an effective strategy that fits with their non-violent struggle against the occupation.

Most importantly we need to bring to light the non-violent action organized in Palestine so that the world will realize that they are not simply counting on violence in their struggle against the occupation (though one could recognize that such resistance is the legitimate right of an occupied people).

In this context the international community has a role to play to support the non-violent movement in Palestine and to make known its non-violent actions as well as its groups and civil society organizations. In this new non-violent strategy, the recourse to a non-violent economy and the development of such an economy is crucial in order to encourage the Palestinians to remain on their land and to continue to cultivate without neglecting the development of an alternative and independent economy. This independent, familial and village-based economy will remain a priority in the non-violent struggle of the Palestinians to realize their goal of living in freedom and peace in their own land.

Resolution to support Ziad Medoukh

Dear Ziad,

During the International Conference "Towards a non-violent economy" held in Bhopal (India), we read publicly your letter outlining the tragedy that is being lived by the Palestinian people. All the participants admire your people’s courage and commend you
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for the determination of your sustained non-violent struggle for freedom. We understand
that the people’s freedom is related to the access to essential resources such as land and
water. In the declaration, you have cited in a UNO document that 70 % of the young
Palestinians want to resolve the conflict by non-violent means. Your fight of resisting
violence by establishing a non-violent economy is a victory. It is impossible to eradicate
a people that believe in their own internal power and we know that your commitment is
stronger than weapons. We assure you, and all the Palestinian people, of our solidarity
and moral support in achieving your aims in future.

Bhopal, 29 January-3 February 2010
To Ensure Self-Sufficiency of Every Village, Region and Country in Meeting Basic Needs, Dr. B. Mishra

A new civilization is emerging in our lives which brings with it new ways of thinking, working, living and loving; a new kind of economy; new political and social conflicts and beyond all this, an altered consciousness towards the changing patterns of climate on planet earth. The emergent civilization brings about a new code of behaviour for us and carries us beyond synchronization, and centralization, beyond the conception of energy, money and power. To make it happen we need a kind of governance that is simpler, more effective, yet, more democratic than we know today. It would be a civilization with its own distinctive world outlook, its own way of dealing with time, space, logic and causality. Unknowingly, perhaps, we are going back to Gandhi to seek the solution of the global problems through local actions.

Hence we are posed with a problem of meeting the basic needs of a common man who lives in a village and belongs to a region and country. So it is rather imperative to understand the basic needs of a human being irrespective of region, nationality or community. Gandhi, while discussing the idea of village self-rule (Gram Swaraj), has mentioned few ingredients of village autonomy or self-sufficiency and listed the basic needs of a community in his article in Harijan in 1942 i.e. pre-independence India. According to him every village is a complete republic, independent of its neighbours for its own vital needs, and yet interdependent with many others in areas where dependence is necessity. Thus every village’s first concern will be to grow its own food crops and cotton for its cloth. It should have a reserve for its cattle, recreation and playground for adults and children. Then if there is more land available, it will grow useful cash crops. The village will maintain a village theatre, school and public hall. It will have its own waterworks ensuring water supply. This can be done through controlled wells and tanks. Education will be compulsory up to final basic course. As far as possible every activity will be conducted on cooperative basis. There will be no castes as we have today with their graded untouchability. Non-violence with its technique of Satyagraha and non-cooperation will be the sanction of the village community. There will be a compulsory service of village guards who will be selected by rotation from the register maintained by the village.

Keeping the present culture in view, we might identify that the basic needs at village level may include food, cloth, housing with facility of sanitation and water supply,
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primary education, primary health care, recreation and sports facilities, energy and some sort of safeguard mechanism to protect the village community.

To ensure the provisions of basic minimum facilities as elaborated above a two-pronged strategy needs to be followed: 1) self-sufficiency at local regional and national levels and 2) networking for pooling of resources to enable exchange of goods and services and enhance the capacities at all levels.

Local self-reliance favouring development from within and not from without becomes the key word. The term local self-reliance is defined in various ways by different disciplines. To the ecologist, local self-reliance means “closed loop systems” where the waste of one process becomes the raw material for another; to the economist, local self-reliance means capturing for the benefit of the local community the greatest amount of value added to the original raw material through processing and marketing. Local self-reliance to biologist Russell Anderson is “a type of development which stimulates the ability to satisfy needs locally.” It is the capacity for self-sufficiency, but not self-sufficiency itself. It analyses the flow of capital within its borders and evaluates its “balance of payments”. It recycles money much as it recycles goods. Every added cycle increases the community’s wealth. Businesses are evaluated not only for the services or products they offer but for the way they affect the local economy. Local self-reliance is an inward-looking process with creation and active role of communities in promoting it. Nevertheless its dynamics may have major effect on regional and national economy.

Self-sufficiency in food first becomes the top priority. To ensure food security to all we need to address the problems of production, distribution and consumption. Food security is defined by FAO “that food is available at all times, that all persons have means of access to it, that it is nutritionally adequate in terms of quantity, quality and variety that it is acceptable within given culture, and that there is gender-equity in it.” To have enough local production the optimum use of productive natural resources particularly land and water is necessary along with maximizing the yield per unit area through appropriate agricultural practices. Grow only those crops, which give better outputs. If it is not possible to grow all you need or any you use then do something that is possible and earn enough to have purchasing power to buy all that you require. It is pertinent to remember that nearer the source of supply the greater the security. Similarly for cloth it is not possible to grow cotton or other raw material required everywhere so the solution lies in enhancing purchasing power. Community initiatives with adequate support of administration can ensure the facilities of education, healthcare and housing. Similarly efficient maintenance of water bodies alongwith water harvesting and judicious use of
water can ensure adequate availability. It is important to emphasise here that small water works in comparison to big projects are more sustainable and easier to maintain. Energy is a vital factor for development and generation of energy by burning fossil fuels is already adding to environmental problems and contributing to climate change. Therefore more emphasis on development of non-conventional sources of energy particularly solar and wind need to be harnessed. Provision of recreation and sports facilities is vital not only from point of view of physical and mental fitness but also for opportunities they provide to interact with one-another and help in keeping the social amity intact.

Looking back to Gandhi, the solution of our big problems lies in small initiatives, something that is pointed out by E.F. Schumacher’s ‘Small Is Beautiful’, because it is easy to operate and maintain, requires less resources, can be decentralized and even if it fails the loss is small. If these small initiatives scattered around are arranged in the shape of a pyramid bottom-upward the basic requirements of regions and the country are addressed effectively. It is quite appropriate to quote the Chinese proverb which goes “if you are planning for one year plant rice, if you are planning for ten years plant trees but if you are planning for a hundred years then educate the people”. In one line, we can say build up the capacities of the people and ignite a desire for development in their hearts and mind & they will take care of the rest.

Let’s not forget that we are at a turning point in history. The opportunity exists to many local political authorities through the advantages of modern technology to make more independent, self-reliant communities. Only at the local level can we design a humanly scaled production system that meet our unique local requirements. We can seize the opportunity and potential that comes from a period of rapid social change and design a society in which we and our children would want to live. So far, to be sure, the positive signs are few. Yet they point the way to a new vision, a new context, and a new way of thinking.
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Introduction to Workshops Summary on Swaraj: To satisfy true individual and collective needs (“Swaraj”), Rajiv Vora

We are going to have the summary now of your discussions in the workshops on the theme of Swaraj. I want to take a few minutes to try to explain this term, which Gandhi himself explained in some eighty pages. This term Swaraj may not be very familiar in Europe, but it is not a very common term also in the professional world of India. I think you could ask any professor of political science whether they teach this term in their classes here and few would answer yes. This term has been debarred from organized institutional educational discourse. It is only talked about in forums like this.

So what is swaraj, what is freedom? What Mahatma Gandhi does in Hind Swaraj, his book of 1909, is really to define freedom. That is the question he encounters. Freedom autonomy, liberation, sovereignty, deliverance—these are all similar terms in English. But really the meaning of a term is the meaning that people following that term have put into it through their action.

In my childhood I read the story of William Tell, the Swiss freedom fighter. The moment he took his arrow and shot the apple from his son’s head, he had attained his swaraj. He had liberated himself from the fear of his own life. The most essential meaning of swaraj is to seek and explore the ways of making life fearless and secure.

Stability and security, we understand these words, but we have to ask when do we really experience them in our economic life, or our intellectual or esthetic life or our spiritual life or our cultural life or our political life. These five are our basic needs of human beings. My economic needs are my basic needs to fulfill the needs of my body in a way that does not trample on the needs of the other. My political needs are that I must have a say in whatever impacts on my life. My cultural needs are that I must make a moral judgement upon things around me on reality on my actions as well. My intellectual need and esthetic needs are to see and understand that things are such as they appear to my heart inside. My spiritual needs are how I relate to you and to the creation and to the creator. Do I feel one? Do I feel the pain of another—just as the creator would? Seeing myself within you—that I tell is universal and it is the religious need of all human beings.

So in all these ways we exercise our basic needs but we must ask whether we have
evolved the institutions and the structures to allow us to fulfill these basic needs with fearlessness, in security and stability. The lion is fearless but in the presence of the lion others are filled with fear. In the meaning of non-violence however, we mean something more by fearlessness. Fearlessness in all these five areas means not only that I am fearless but that the other, who is less powerful that me is fearless in my presence.

Let me give an example of what is fearlessness. We see the sun, light or knowledge we called. People say that wherever the sun goes, darkness does not exist. But the sun thought what is this that people say? That darkness doesn’t exist in my presence? So the sun starting circling the universe searching for darkness. But the sun could never find it. True fearlessness is like this. Wherever fearlessness is, fear no longer exists. It has been banished, like darkness in the presence of light. This is swaraj. So how do we attain it? In the economic, political, intellectual, cultural and spiritual domains of our life. The economic domain is the most important because as Mahatma Gandhi says, for the hungry man, God comes in the form of a bread. But then Gandhi went on to say, that this demonic imperial power, this rule by the other has robbed my freedom of attaining my spiritual goals by robbing me of my bread. To have bread and fulfill the needs of the body is very important, crucial, but of course that is not all. The spiritual need to be related to others, to fulfill our duty as a human being by serving the others, that is swaraj.

J.J. Boillot followed then by explaining how we could translate Swaraj for western people. “Swa” in sanskrit means self, but the spiritual as well as the physical aspects. And “raj” was referring in Gandhi’s time not to the kingdom (hindustani translation of raj) but in opposition of the British raj, and express the “power” one takes from inside, from oneself. Hence, the workshops had to deal with the way humanity can today protect and even develop the integrity and the power of the people over their own life.

General Presentations of discussions:

Workshop 1 (Dr. B.B. Mishra / Shisir Khanal)
- To identify basic human needs and the means to fulfill them - To ensure self-sufficiency of every village, region and country in meeting basic needs

We were a group of people with diverse sets of background from the peace movement, human rights, community work, indigenous leaders, and Gandhian activists.
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When combined we had several hundred years of experience in the field of social change. We began with the brief discussion of Swaraj, which Dr. Karunakaran summarized as “man should have control over survival needs”. Dr. B.B. Mishra quoted a paragraph on the ingredients of Gram Swaraj, which he said was a “complete republic, independent of neighbors for its vital needs, and yet interdependent for many others in which dependency is necessity.”

With basic concept of Swaraj defined, we moved on to the question about: What are basic human needs? An easy question but not an easy answer. “Food, Clothing and Shelter” (Roti, Kapada or Makan) do they satisfy our 21st century needs? We delved into Maslow’s Heirachy of Needs, a famous psychologist who categorized basic needs into primary needs, social needs and needs for social actualizations. Are Maslow’s primary needs, food, clothing, shelter and reproduction basic needs? Aren’t these just biological needs of an animal? But as a human beings we have also needs on social relations. What about spirituality? Where is human dignity?

We discussed how the human rights concept can apply in the context of basic human needs. How can we have any basic needs without freedom, democracy and Swaraj? Some of us wondered. Then, what about a list, suggestions followed? 1. Electricity: We can survive without electricity, that cannot be basic needs. Objection was swift. After dwelling on the topic from more than an hour, we came to following grudgingly, I think mostly because we were tired to discuss any further, agreed on a list, not in an order of importance:

Then, different ideas and experiences to share. “The Gandhian way is the only way,” some of Gandhian leaders said. We discussed out the problems that exist in current context such as land ownership, market systems, which are roadblocks to achieving the self-sufficiency. “Everybody must be producers,” was one suggestion. “No, that’s impossible in the current context,” there was an objection. Despite all our disagreements we, however, came to a broad consensus that: we moved on to discuss how we can achieve these sufficiency at different levels. Clearly, we had

1. There must be local ownership of local resources and systems. For example, our indigenous leaders explained that there must be local teachers from the tribes or
communities, not outsiders.
2. Decentralization and devolution  3. End of corruption.  4. People to organize themselves to struggle for their rights.  5. Good governance.

In summary, “Every one must have access to basic needs and means for these needs such as water, land and forest, in direct and dignified way.”

We also discussed that since we cannot produce everything in a village or locally, we have to develop a system where the needs are spread on a system of concentric circles. Most fundamental and most frequently required needs must be produced in local area, however we should and go beyond local vicinity to meet other needs at regional and international level.

Workshop 2 (Praveen Jha / JP Dardaud)

- To prioritize organic and food-producing agriculture as a basis of a viable economy and society (with emphasis on food, health, land maintenance and man’s relationship to nature)
- To reassert the value of manual work and craftsmanship which develops strengths, talent and intelligence and is as noble as intellectual work
- To aim at the durability of goods and the simplicity of their creation and use

Here are the points which were raised:

- Property: How to organize the property of the common goods? The control upon them?
- The current economic system and the need to address more directly all these issues, to promote others approaches. The Swaraj is linked to the capacity to question the society, whether you call it neo-liberal globalisation, capitalism, mass-production, mass-consumption.
- About specialization, is it at the personal level? In the society?
- About research: which priorities? More focus on family planning efficiency.
- Creativity: more research/innovation in social organization.
- Governance: how to create the conditions in which everyone would be part of the discussions? At the local level as well as at the global level? And moreover, is it possible to have a real democracy in this context of mass production?

Ideas which came out:

- A general agenda: this reflexion might be considered as an exercise to be spread afterwards to enlarge the circle of sensibilised people;
- The high potential of the traditional societies, of their knowledge, arts, farming skills...
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We could speak about « antropologic economy »;
- To link up producers and consumers at the local level;
- The idea of interaction: All alternatives thoughts should interact more with corporative system. Everywhere, more and more people are asking the current system, even the one part or actors of it. We should interact also with them.

Workshop 3 (Amitabh Behar / Christine Marsan)
- Through economic activity, to develop social cohesion and the fight against exclusion -
  To provide opportunities for work for people facing physical, mental or psychological challenges
The correspondance and link with the sum up of the workshop 2 was highlighted.
- Education and training: private education is business oriented. For people to study here is really expensive. The non-violence and the human relationship are not part of the school: would it be possible to have non-violence in the schools from the beginning?
- The women condition: they are the last of the last in term of exploitation. How are the possibilities to achieve autonomy? Another issue was that most often they are blocked in their houses. They could share the daily routine instead of being in conflict. The example of the Paraguay women was mentioned.
- The issue of external hijack of banks into micro-credit was raised: how to deal with it? How to do not become dependent on it? If at one point it is needed, how to be able to get off afterwards in order to be independent?
- Stress was put on the need of change of laws and institutions to be able to react to solve problem such as eco- building (German/French examples)
- For all actions, the local situation and particularity should be taken into account. Too often, initiatives are taken without the consideration of the local situation. There is a huge need to consider the local particularities to understand each other and to find out how to go further together, beyond the differences. Then only harmonization will be possible and will allow the good implementation of inter-regional projects.
- European parliament contribution: minimum revenue for everyone. Speech for all and social standards to be reviewed (Work organization)
- How to reach autonomy? which internal efforts to develop it? In terms of personal efforts, in term of institutional efforts?

Workshop 4 (Amit Kumar / Thayaparam)
**How, in a time of war or foreign occupation, to survive economically?**

The group started its discussion by showing solidarity with our friends in Palestine, which is in a state of war/conflict. Louis Campana from Gandhi International gave a brief description of the situation in Palestine followed by a description of Sri-Lankan situation by Thayaparam. A summary of letter by Ziad Medoukh was given by L. Campana which described about the non-violent ways to protest against Israeli oppression. Mr. thayaparma informed us about developing dialogue among people to find solutions to their own problem. interactions and dialogues are the best answers to find the way out in the time of war.

Karima added by saying that one has to be kind and compassionate in order to have peace of mind. This will calm tension in the community. Ms Anupama Patel reflected on the propagation of Khadi and other villages industries to give employment to the people engaged in war like situation. She added that during Indian freedom struggle, Gandhi Ji experimented this idea and was very effective in improving economic status of the people. Amit Kumar added by saying that science should not been seen as an enemy but as a friend which is needed to light and guide – teaching us new ways of tackling old problems, and making us more and more efficient in the performance of our tasks. He stressed on the concept of decentralisation in production and localisation in consumption as the way forward. The discussion ended by giving successful examples of Cuba, Paraguay and Sir lanka.

**General Discussions**

Bernard Dangeard: I am surprised that I didn’t hear anything about Non-Violent Communication. This tool is linked to the good governance, to the way of a good management of the community.

Vinod from Tamil Nadu (Indigenous people representative). A point for me has been left on the side: non- violence means peace. And to achieve a peaceful society, there is need for equality, dignity and self-respect as basic conditions.

Christine: Non-violent communication should be taught at school. Actually, we can only learn it in private session. This should be free to unable everyone’s access. Progress should be made.

Rajagopal: We would like to express our solidarity to Mr Ziad Medoukh from Gaza, and to his non-violent struggle. We could vote a resolution to give him moral support. Lek. The need of diversity : we are always required to choose between one thing or
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another : choice 1 or choice 2, nothing in the middle. We should protect more diversity.
There is no place today for diversity. We need diversity to be recognize and to have a place. Gender equality : there is not a real gender equality, event in the conference and in the workshops.
Debate about technology : The point: Was Gandhi against any technology because technology was implicitly equivalent to the British rule, or was he basically against technology?
Fabrice : We should not forget that it is the one who suffer that is the one who is able to talk about solutions. We should listen to them and accordingly try to help them, but not think for them. They have centuries and centuries of knowledge and experience, much more than us. To listen to them is to learn humility.
Amit quote Kumarrapa about sciences: science must help us to perform more efficiently our tasks
Etienne : The technological choices should be supervised by politics. The politics should think about real alternatives. Up to now, they are only about regulations of technology, but regulations are not enough. They should make real political choices. This is difficult: example was given about tractors : If one farmer get a tractor, it might be good for him, but the hidden cost is that it will cut the income of 100 farmers without tractors, who will then migrate to the cities and their slums.
About technology again: We are now able of a better use of it, which can allow a better use of natural resources: to use technology to produce more energy with less basic resources. Tata’s example was given.
Light: In the paper it is said that economic activity could develop the social cohesion. For me, in Sudan, developing the economy is on the contrary to deepen the differences, and help raising the social disparity. Example was given about the natural resources exploitation in Sudan.
Shoubani : We don ‘t have any data about the balance and sharing of resources (natural resources, technological resources, land holding...) between man and women. We need these data in order to address the issue.
Dr. Karunakaran: We should know how much we have to produce to fulfill the immediate neighborhoods without external input. But there are geographical inequalities. Here technology should help people. Example was given about Sahara, where water access is a big problem and where technology may be use to help providing basic facilities.
Vijay : This is the story of an illiterate farmer. He stood up, acheived Swaraj and
transformed the whole village. It is possible. How can other continents do so? The first thing is to stand up, even if it seems quite impossible.

Louis. The voluntary poverty: “what a benefit from all these goods available in our shops in Europe? I do not need any of all these things!”

Naima: I would better say: voluntary abundance. This is another way to be rich.

_The session ended with a decision to post on the conference blog a resolution to express our support to the Palestinian non-violent struggle._
The Market and the Contemporary Ecological Crisis: A Concluding Reflection, Satish K. Jain

The contemporary ecological crisis is manifesting itself in manifold ways, the threat of extinction of a very large number of species and widespread degradation of the environment being possibly the most important of these manifestations. Extinctions and consequent loss of diversity seem to be among the key features of the crisis. The degradation of the environment is all-pervasive; there is nothing which has not been contaminated by chemicals and toxins.

When one speaks of a crisis one normally means a situation which is fundamentally unacceptable. Leaving aside crises which might be brought about by natural disasters, the genesis of social crises must be sought in categories which are social. The present crisis in any case being entirely man-made, can only be the result of the totality of actions of individuals mediated through social institutions. As individuals are generally purposive in their actions, and are motivated to act in specific ways by their preferences, objectives, goals and values; it seems appropriate to begin analysis of causation of the contemporary crisis by examining values and actions, and institutions which provide the environment for actions for the realization of values.

The source of crisis could easily be the values and preferences of individuals. It is not difficult to relate preferences for greater and greater levels of consumption, or values which exalt insatiable desires for material consumption, with environmental degradation. The institutional framework of the society could also be at fault. Even when the preferences and values are not troublesome in themselves, the social organization could easily be such that the outcomes generated by the totality of actions undertaken by purposive individuals in accordance with their essentially non-pervasive preferences and values would be quite perverse. It is also possible that the values and preferences of individuals may not be independent of the institutional organization of the society; in which case the crisis must be attributed to the complex of mutually reinforcing values and institutions.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold; to put forward the view that the main causes of the ecological crisis are to be sought in the normative meta-principles governing the contemporary society; and to argue that, although not a cause of the crisis, market as it has emerged in the modern times, is the chief factor propelling it. It would be argued that
The nature of the market system is such that not only does it, in general, transform individual preferences and values in a way conducive to the system but also renders non-conducive values and preferences ineffective by leaving them unarticulated.

The paper is organized in three sections. Section 1 looks at the institution of market from the ecological perspective. The second section is concerned with spelling out the relationship of the institution of market with certain values and normative meta-principles and their implications for environmental and ecological degradation. The last section contains a summary of the main points.

1. The Institution of Market

One of the most natural ways of looking at institutions is to regard them as ensembles of rules within which the individuals in the society must act. While individuals are motivated to act in accordance with their values and preferences; their actual actions to a certain extent depend on the institutions which define the framework of rules. The actions of individuals determine the social outcomes which result. The social outcomes which result as a consequence of individual actions can be analyzed from various perspectives. One perspective is that of values; one could ask which social values are satisfied by the outcomes and which are not. One could also look at the outcomes from the perspective of their responsiveness to individual values and preferences.

An institution could give rise to outcomes which are responsive without necessarily doing so invariably. That is to say, for some configurations of individual values and preferences and under certain conditions the institution in question could give rise to responsive outcomes; while for some other configurations or for the same configurations but under different conditions could give rise to non-responsive outcomes. The institution of market is highly responsive to individual values and preferences provided the preferences and values are backed by money. If a set of preferences and values are not backed by money they would have little or no impact on the market outcome. Market, like any other institution, filters in only some kinds of preferences and values under certain circumstances and filters out the remainder. If left to market, few individuals bent upon destroying biodiversity, for whatever reasons, would have greater decisiveness on the eventual outcome than a large number of people interested in ensuring survival of species if resources at the command of the former are greater than the latter.

How market forces unconstrained by regulations or appropriate values can lead to extinction of even abundant species is dramatically illustrated by the extinction of
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passenger pigeon in early twentieth century. Passenger pigeon used to be one of the most numerous of birds in the north American continent.\(^1\) The European colonizers describing the abundance of passenger pigeons used expressions like ‘beyond number or imagination’. John Audubon encountered an immensely large flock of passenger pigeons on a journey in 1813.\(^2\) The European settlers slaughtered passenger pigeons in large numbers for meat and fat. The most destructive of the devices which were used was that of the net. Large numbers were trapped under them and killed. The extension of railroads and telegraph lines enabled the netters to follow the birds wherever they went. Pigeons were pursued from one nesting place to another, netters sometimes following the birds a thousand miles at one move. The passenger pigeon became extinct in 1914 when the last of them died. A concatenation of factors doomed the bird. While deforestation reduced their numbers greatly, market forces reinforced by the newly discovered technology brought the bird to the brink of extinction. Even then the bird might have been saved from extinction if the appropriate legislative measures had been enacted.\(^1\) The number of individuals who were netters and who so relentlessly pursued passenger pigeons to extinction was surprisingly small. According to one estimate, in 1860 there were between 400 and 1000 netters. The number of people who were concerned about dwindling numbers of passenger pigeons in 1860 is highly unlikely to have been as small as a thousand. Today the situation is much grimmer. Many species have already become extinct. Thousands of species are on endangered lists. The concatenation of factors which brought about the extinction of the passenger pigeon is not only very much there, but many times more powerful.

In the context of the institution of the market not everyone counts equally. The importance that one has in the market is proportional to the amount of money that one has at one’s command. Market is a peculiar kind of democracy where the number of votes one is allowed to cast is equal to the number of dollars that one has. When the domain of market expands, the importance of those with poor command of resources, no matter how numerous, declines. The victims of ecological and environmental devastation are not confined to nonhuman species only. Poor people the world over suffer the harmful effects

---

\(^1\) According to Schorger (1955) as quoted by Catling (2001): ‘Passenger pigeons occurred throughout much of eastern North America. Only a few centuries ago their population density was 5-6 birds/acre and the total population was 3 to 5 billion. It comprised 25-40% of the total bird population in the U.S. at the time.

\(^2\) Wenninger (1910) writes: ‘This author also concludes with a reference to the growing scarcity of the bird. ‘The vast numbers of this pigeon’ he writes, ‘have greatly diminished during recent years and now the bird is on the verge of extinction. It is certain that unless laws are made for its protection, its extermination is only a matter of time.” On passenger pigeon generally see Audubon (1831), Forbush (1917), Kalm (1911), McGee (1910), Schorger (1955) and Wenninger (1910) among others.
of the environmental degradation. Expansion of the domain of market is thus resulting in
the shrinking of the domain of ecological justice.

As mentioned earlier, although individuals motivated by their values and
preferences can be expected to act in accordance with them, their actual actions would
depend on the institutional framework within which they are constrained to act. If
individuals are deciding on their actions within the framework of responsive institutions
then they can be expected to act in accordance with their values and preferences. On the
other hand, if the institutions are non-responsive it makes little difference as to what
individuals do. In the context of non-responsive institutions it would not be a particularly
good idea to make inferences from the observed choices of individuals regarding the
individuals’ values and preferences. If the institutions in question are perverse, one could
even expect behaviour contrary to the actual preferences and values.

From the above, two points seem clear. In general different institutions are required
for proper articulation of different values and preferences. One institution might do an
excellent job of articulating one kind of preferences and values; a second institution for
another kind of preferences and values. Even for the same preferences and values
different institutions might be optimal under different circumstances. Secondly, individual
actions can differ widely depending on the institutional framework, even though the
underlying motivational preferences and values remain constant. Market may or may not
be the most appropriate institution for articulation of preferences and values of economic
kind; but there can be little doubt that it is highly inappropriate for articulation of values
and preferences relating to ecology and environment. An institutional framework which
has been responsible for ecological and environmental devastation in the first place
cannot be expected to articulate concerns relating to preservation of species. If an activity,
destructive of habitat of a species, is more profitable than alternative avenues for
investment, then the profit motive would result in the undertaking of the activity and the
consequent destruction of the habitat of the species. The only way to stop the activity
within the institutional framework of market is to persuade the person contemplating
undertaking of the activity not to undertake it by compensating him for the profits
forgone. But, given the fact that it is a fundamental characteristic of the modern economic
system that almost all activities which are economic value-creating are also at the same
time destructive of the environment, it follows that persuasion by compensation is a non-
starter. The question of finding solutions to ecological and environmental problems
within the institutional framework of the market does not arise. The possibilities for
finding solutions can emerge only if the domain of the market is made to shrink.
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So far we have been discussing institutions as sets of rules. The institutions can also be viewed as embodiments of values. After all institutions are created for some definite purposes. To identify the embodied values with the purposive considerations would, however, in general, be not correct. There could be many reasons for the divergence between the objectives for the fulfilment of which the institution in question is supposed to exist and the embodied values. From our point of view the most important reason has to do with possibly the most profound characteristic of institutions that the realized values under them can never be invariant with respect to the values and preferences of individuals who interact within their framework. For instance, when individuals act according to their assigned roles the results are quite different from when they act solely in their self-interest. The values which would materialize if all judges gave judgments solely on the basis of law and evidence are bound to be different from those which would if they gave judgments to further their own self-interests. In this connection an interesting question arises namely: On what basis does an individual decide whether she or he would act in accordance with the assigned role or act in accordance with her or his self-regarding preferences and interests?

So far we have been taking individual preferences and values as given; and have only considered how they are mediated through the societal institutions. Needless to say, this is only an analytical simplification. Social institutions have a profound influence on individuals in relation to formation of preferences and values. If a social institution is of great importance in the social order, the values that the institution embodies are bound to have significance for individual values and preferences. The institution of market puts completely selfish behaviour on a high pedestal. In the market place only those who have imbibed the spirit of competitiveness and are capable of ruthlessness and predation of a high order are likely to succeed; not those with full of sympathy and compassion for their fellow human beings or for living things in general. It is of course perfectly possible for a person to be selfish in one domain; and altruistic in another. But if the society is so structured that its preeminent institutions encourage completely selfish behaviour, then it is quite likely that many individuals, if not all, would internalize the motto of completely selfish behaviour to such an extent that even in the context of institutions where they are supposed to act in accordance with their assigned roles, they may not be able to do so. Thus one possible answer to the question which was posed at the end of the last paragraph is that whether individuals by and large would act in accordance with their assigned roles or in accordance with their self-regarding preferences to a large extent depends on the nature of the dominant institutions of the society. If the dominant institutions of the society are such that they encourage self-regarding behaviour, then one can expect that individuals on the whole would not act according to the assigned roles. The dominance of
the market in the contemporary context then has the implication that in the context of non-market institutions as well we should expect from most individual’s self-regarding behaviour even though the design of these institutions might be such that their successful functioning depended on individuals performing their assigned roles, and not acting in their narrow self-interests.

Thus we see that there is a symbiotic relationship between institutions on the one hand and individual values and preferences on the other. The nature of an institution is partly determined by individual preferences and values. The most important determinant of the character of an institution is whether individuals act in accordance with their assigned roles or whether they act in accordance with their self-interests. Institutions on the other hand impact individual preferences and values in two different ways. Institutions by filtering in some preferences and values and filtering out the others determine which preferences and values would be articulated and which would be not. The preferences and values which are filtered out and consequently do not find articulation are bound to become insignificant sooner or later, if not disappear altogether. Secondly, the formation of individual values and preferences themselves is profoundly affected by the values embodied in the institutions, particularly those which are dominant.

In the light of this way of looking at institutions we can see the several distinct ways in which the institution of market is contributing to the environmental and ecological crisis. These are: (i) market filters in values and preferences which are environmentally and ecologically destructive and filters out those conducive for preserving the environment and the ecological balance. (ii) The dominance of market tends to weaken the pro-environment values and preferences. (iii) The dominance of the market paradigm is also resulting in more and more individuals acting, in the context of non-market institutions, including those having relevance from the perspective of preservation of species and their habitats, in accordance with their narrow self-interests rather than in accordance with their assigned roles, even though acting in accordance with the assigned roles might be crucial for the proper functioning of these institutions.

What has been said here about the institution of the market holds also for those institutions which have been designed to facilitate the working of the market and for those which have been transformed because of the ascendancy of the market paradigm so as to mimic the market.
2. Market, Values and Normative Meta-Principles

The two-way relationship between individual values and preferences on the one hand and institutions on the other, consisting of institutions playing a significant role in the formation of individual values and preferences and individual values and preferences partly determining the character of institutions, does not mean that the equilibrium of individual and social values which would obtain under a particular set of institutions would necessarily be unique. A particular set of institutions in general can co-exist with quite different equilibria of individual and social values. This naturally raises very important questions: What determines as to which equilibrium of individual and social values would materialize? Is it a matter of chance as to which equilibrium is arrived at; or is there something which systematically determines as to which equilibrium would be realized? The position that is taken in this paper is that the equilibrium of social and individual values in its ultimate analysis is determined by the normative meta-principle which the society subscribes to.

A profound fact about values is that the acceptance of a value does not determine its domain of application. Most values can be applied with widely differing domains. The importance of determining the domains of values arises from the fact that whether one considers a single individual or the society as a whole, there are competing values. A value may be able to co-exist with some values but not with some others. Some values can co-exist with each other in some circumstances but not under some other circumstances. For determining the domains of various values a meta-principle is required; a meta-principle which would determine the domains of different values, the expression ‘value’ being defined sufficiently broadly to encompass all criteria for making judgmental and evaluative statements. To put it somewhat differently, it is the normative meta-principle which is the ultimate determinant of what is considered as appropriate and what as inappropriate.

Take for instance the right of an individual to act in her or his self-interest or the right of a collective or a society to take measures for enhancing its material prosperity. Few would deny such a right. But it is not so much the question of asserting or denying the right which is important. Rather, the really crucial question concerns the scope of this right. Is one’s right to act in one’s own interests so wide that one can treat nonhuman living creatures in any manner whatsoever without any moral compunction? Are all
nonhuman creatures to be treated as mere resources? Does an increase in GDP justify measures which would lead to extinction of many species?

Anthropocentric thinking, viewing of all nonhuman creatures as mere resources being an integral part of it, is nowadays very widespread, if not universal. While non-modern societies differed widely in their attitudes towards nonhuman living beings, there was none which reduced all nonhuman life forms to mere resources to be used by humanity in any manner whatsoever as is the case with contemporary societies. The dominance of market seems to have played a crucial role in the ascendancy of the meta-principle according such a wide scope for self-interest. No non-modern society ever assigned such a wide domain to self-interest as is taken for granted by most nowadays.

Although American Indians also used passenger pigeons for meat and fat as did the European settlers, the Indians of Canada did not molest the pigeons in their breeding places until the young were able to fly. They did everything in their power to prevent the settlers from disturbing them, even using threats, where pleading did not avail. It is highly probable that if the European settlers had exploited the passenger pigeon within the bounds set by the American Indians, the extinction of the species might not have taken place. In this connection, it is important to note that while American Indians’ activities relating to passenger pigeons were constrained by a norm which took precedence over self-interest, the activities of the settlers were unconstrained by any such norm and were wholly in accordance with the market logic.

The meta-principle for determining the domains of different values which has emerged in the contemporary times is unique not only from the perspective of regarding all nonhuman life forms as mere resources but also for not putting any value to ecological integrity over and above its usefulness to humankind. One of the clearest statements of this viewpoint is to be found in Coase’s 1960 paper ‘The problem of social cost’:

‘To give another example, Professor George J. Stigler instances the contamination of a stream. If we assume that the harmful effect of the pollution is that it kills the fish, the question to be decided is: is the value of the fish lost greater or less than the value of the product which the contamination of the stream makes possible.’

Although pre-modern societies differed widely in the extent they accorded intrinsic value to the idea of ecological integrity, as they did with respect to the stringency of norms that

---

3 This enormously influential paper by Coase is one of the most cited papers in economics as well as in law; and is an important building block of the market ideology.
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they developed for the treatment of animals, none regarded the concept of ecological integrity to be as devoid of intrinsic significance as does the contemporary society. In fact, in some ancient texts the notion of ecological integrity has been put on such a high pedestal that all acts of contamination of waters, whether of seas, rivers, lakes or springs, have been uniformly declared as ignoble. In almost all pre-modern societies one can find an unbroken thread of imputing intrinsic value to the idea of ecological integrity, even if such imputation did not hold sway at all times in equal measure.

Because of the dominance of market paradigm, the nature of the contemporary discourse is so much constrained that even those who are concerned about the devastations brought about by the enormously powerful processes currently transforming the world are forced to invoke the very values for expressing their concerns which in the first place are responsible for these devastations. A perusal of the literature dealing with the issues relating to extinction of species currently going on with alarming rapidity shows that the most important and frequently made argument for the need to take urgent steps to halt this process of extinction consists of contending that the humanity would lose out much in terms of possibilities forgone of industrial and medical uses which could be made of the extant but endangered species. It is the anthropocentric values which in the first place have resulted in the grave ecological crisis. Then how can one expect the invocation of the very same values to rectify the situation? The current ecological crisis is of extreme gravity and requires urgent and concerted actions. But they can be forthcoming only if the paradigm induced by market ideology is rejected first.

3. Concluding Remarks

We have argued that for articulation of the kind of values and preferences which would be conducive for the protection of the species and the environment, the institution of market is particularly inappropriate for several reasons. First, the importance a person’s preferences command in the market place is mostly determined by the person’s wealth. As a consequence, environmentally destructive preferences of a few wealthy individuals can easily outweigh the preferences of a large number of individuals who feel strongly about ecological and environmental issues but with small amounts of wealth. Furthermore, in many contexts, it is not even possible to give effect to one’s ecological values and preferences through an institution like market. Market is a decentralized institution; and the only way certain kinds of values and preferences can be articulated is through institutions which have a centralized character. Most of the values and preferences which are conducive to ecological and environmental preservation can be realized only through centralized institutions or norms of a more or less universal character.
The institution of market is destructive of preferences and values conducive for the protection of the environment in another way also. In any society one would expect to find a certain coherence between the preferences and values of individuals on the one hand and the nature of the institutions on the other. If some social institutions are extremely important in the society then the preferences and values which are not in consonance with these institutions are not likely to survive; and if they survive at all then the individuals embodying these preferences and values are bound to be marginalized. The domination of the institution of the market in the contemporary context is of a truly mind-boggling order. Consequently, the values and preferences which are incompatible with the ever-increasing domination of the institution of market are bound to be in retreat. Although it may very well be the case that the number of people who feel strongly about environmental issues today is larger than anytime in the past, it is also the case that the rate at which the environmental degradation is taking place and the rate at which species are disappearing are much greater today than ever before; clearly establishing the marginal character of those having pro-environment preferences and values.
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4. THE POSSIBILITY OF A LOCAL ECONOMY: VOICES FROM THE FIELD ON SWADESHI

Swadeshi: The Economic Future and the Role of Civil Society, Louis Campana

For this second day’s reflection, I should like to focus your attention on the future of the planet where we live, and to quote to you some of the gloomy scenarios seen in the first 2010 edition of the weekly “Courrier International”.

One expert futurologist sees three states becoming dominant by 2030 and holding the balance of world power between them: Mexico, Poland and Turkey.

The arguments given are as follows: a certain vision of the geopolitical arena, with its power games, the impetus to dominate, the manipulation of energy strategies. A fantastic tale is unfolded of the USA being invaded by Hispanics and losing three quarters of its area to desert as the climate runs amok. India is reduced to desert too, along with China, the whole of Africa and three quarters of Latin America if the temperature increases by four degrees.

For the young Indo-American geopolitician Parag Khanna, the European model becomes the rule everywhere, promising a return to the Middle Ages for the twenty first century. “What will be the impact of hordes of migrants chased out of their countries by wars and natural disasters? Who will the new Mongols be?” he asks himself.

A third forecaster looks toward the “ultimate democracy”, expecting it to be purely formal, existing primarily to meet election candidates’ needs for money and communication, with any element of “people power” being nothing more than an illusion.

I prefer not to go into the perspective of brain implants or other notions that see us feeding ourselves on synthetic meat and such-like potential technological madness.

Someone else, quite seriously, proposed that we learn to live under water!

And then there are the nostalgists, who propose their vision of the world as it was twenty or thirty years ago, when everything was going so well...

If all these dismal predictions come to pass, the future is not just bleak; it is quite simply impossible, unliveable…

One more scenario: on the BBC, in November 2009, an economist declared:
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“Since the earth is only capable of providing food and biofuels for 1 billion inhabitants, we need to reduce the world population to 1 billion and no more”.

Nice idea! Who shall we get rid of first?

So much for that! What about us, here today in Bhopal? What are we here to say or to hope?

The theme for today is “Creating and inventing your life” on the basis of “swadeshi”.

That would seem to evade all the scenarios I have mentioned completely.

We are saying a firm and definite no to all those people who want to decide for others. It is undoubtedly great fun to play with other peoples’ lives, as if other people were saleable merchandise, or baby toys.

We mean to say no to attempts to monopolise life; for example, we refuse media pressure on health issues, or a little bout of flu that allows states to take their entire populations hostage. Other examples: we refuse the seed monopoly of Monsanto and others; we refuse the power of Exxon and others to wreck the Copenhagen conference.

We mean to say no to the systematic enforcement of the state’s power over individuals on the pretext of combating terrorism, which the states’ own policies have caused and which they intend to fight using, among other measures, nanotechnology, a radical means of controlling everyone, politically, psychologically, economically,… and atomically!!

We mean to say no to the appropriation of resources (indispensable to human life) by industrial lobbies and private energy companies.

How can we reclaim our own lives? and how can we live together avoiding the hellish global solutions willed on us by a coalition of political powers, multinationals and big financial groups?

Between a hard core of predators determined to control everything, and the people who are their direct victims - slum dwellers, small farmers, despised indigenous minorities, landless tenant farmers, refugees and homeless people, those who have been expropriated, those whose environments have been polluted by industry, the unemployed - there is a civil society, sometimes on the side of the predators, sometimes sympathising with the victims, and above all conscious of its own possible exclusion...
This civil society is our future, because it is us… and the act of taking command and reclaiming one’s own life must be fulfilled in order to be fully human. Taking command is the economic act par excellence which defines a human being. The spirit of enterprise cannot be suppressed without belittling humanity, but our civilisation deprives its outcasts of access to local resources and cuts the possibility of a subsistence economy off at the root by privatising the indispensible: land, water, seeds, forest, and the desire to do anything.

The current economic totalitarianism is a weapon of mass destruction.

Gandhian swadeshi is this vital aim, where every person becomes aware of his or her own existence and, prompted by this self-awareness, redefines his or her own life so that it can be lived and not simply endured, so that it can be shared with others without the temptation to use others.

It means understanding the relationship between what I take, and the work I do, which entitles me to take.

It means taking what I need and no more, and accepting that other people have different needs, sometimes greater than mine.

It means that my interests are bound up in other people’s happiness and, if this is reciprocal, the circle is complete.

What a distance travelled!

Let us stop dreaming and make this world a reality…! What is stopping us?

Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, as well as other ways of living fully and together, are all very good ideas!

We just need to put them into practice, really…
You may have read in the newspapers yesterday that very wealthy industrialist and entrepreneur with a well-known name in India, the CEO of Haldiram which is a national distributor of food products has been convicted and sentenced to life in prison. His crime was trying to murder a very ordinary person who was running a tea stall that was in the way of the construction of a grand entrance to his business contracting centre. He was a multimillionaire but he couldn’t restrain himself from snatching the very livelihood of a person running a tea stall; beautification at the cost of life and livelihood itself. This isn’t a solitary case. It is the same story of what happens all over the country in the context of development projects: the same story of evictions, uprooting the people, the same story of replacement and displacement and just a lip-service paid to rehabilitation. This is the story of one individual that clarifies the picture of what is happening at the macro level itself.

On the other side we are witness to the large-heartedness of the so-called poor people. There was an earthquake like in Haiti recently in India and some goods were solicited as aid. People were asked to prepare food to send to the survivors. At one place where the food was being collected, a certain poor lady was standing in line, and she was not moving forward. The people in charge thought she was a beggar and wanted to get some of the food for herself. Finally one of them asked her, ‘what do you want’. She took
out a small package and said, ‘this is the food I have prepared for the people in the earthquake. I have saved it from what I have received in the last three days. I came here to give it to you.’

How will you categorize the CEO of Haldiram and this beggar? Who is rich and who is poor? I think we can all think of inspiring examples of stories like that of the beggar lady.

In Tamil Nadu, the former chief minister, Jayalalitha who spent lakhs and lakhs of money in the marriage of her foster son. In the same state, a poor woman was performing the marriage of her daughter on the railway platform at a small station. The feast was going on on the platform. I happened to be there and I asked the lady whether she felt she also should have a lavish wedding like that that was given by Jayalalitha to her foster son. The lady answered me, “No, sir, she should have what she has and I will have what I have. We each get what we deserved. In my last life, I must have done something bad and she must have done something good, so she has rewards and I have sufferings. But now I am living a pious life and so in the next one I will have a reward.”

This teaching about karma in India brings a solace and it prevents revolutions also. I am thinking also of all the displacements of people that are happening around the country and also, I hear, in Africa. There many thousands of people who live in refugee camps and here in slums. It is as if by providing mere shelter we have addressed the problem, but we have not addressed the suffering of the people, their psychology and mental state. When you see all this, if we think of something like a non-violent economy it depends on two things, our worldview and our mental state or attitude.

These two things will pave the way towards the desired direction. For example, in the whole world the economy was essentially non-violent in the past. Some violence might occur but it was essentially non-violent.

It is because of the wrong worldview, now, and wrong attitude and wrong understanding of the human being and the surrounding world and the quest for happiness that we are compelled to discuss the possibility of a non-violent economy which for some people feels very remote. Once we understand that we have lived for centuries and centuries all over the world enjoying the fruits of a non-violent economy, then we will realize that the modern worldview that is now causing all of the violence and hardship we are now experiencing.
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The basic fault in our worldview is the claim that ‘man is conqueror of nature’. If you observe that the world is constructed for the pleasure of only one species, that is the human being, then that is where the problems begin. At the cost of the destruction of other species and the world, then, there is no harm if one pursues one’s own enjoyment. That is what necessitates the recent Copenhagen Summit. That is the experience of the last four or five hundred years.

In all of that, there is the lack of comprehensive world view which explains that rights flow from responsibilities. Nor is the human being merely a body, but also spirit (atman) and consciousness. Together these constitute human beings and human beings are much more gifted by nature or the almighty in order to perform certain duties. For an understanding of these duties, an understanding of the surroundings is also very necessary—an understanding in which happiness is not limited at the material level only. Happiness transcends that. GDP, rate of growth—may just confine yourself to the material level. But the quantum and intensity of happiness at the other levels of being and existence is far more intense, far more durable, less competitive, more cooperative and not conflicting.

That’s the true understanding of happiness and if that is there then there is a recognition of the natural sacredness attributed to all forms of existence (where it flora or fauna). Different levels of consciousness are there but the same consciousness permeates in all animate and inanimate matter and that leads you to a type of existence in which you are entwined with other life-forms and levels of existence—what is within, that is without. Whatever you see in the cosmos, that you can understand within itself. That generates a respect to other forms of existence and therefore that generates a motivation of striving and pursuing happiness in such a way that other forms of existence are not damaged or destroyed.

That leads to a couple of points. The world is not a market, but a family. Second, that happiness comes from within, not from without. At a certain level only, there can be a happiness that derives from material goods and that leads you to a mental state, a mental frame of restraint on consumption. Production and distribution have been much more discussed in the field of economics. Reflection on the restraint of consumption seems to be alien to economic theories themselves. So that is where we will be pushed into the frame of some moral reflection but there is a disconnect there for economics, it seems.

When we think this way we have shifted to an eco-centric worldview. Therefore if an eco-centric development becomes the order, so eco-friendly techno-economic order becomes the means. If that be so, the social structure, worldview, values of life, goals of
life—all needs to be thought through from the beginning once again. That alone can provide us with what is called sustainable and integral. And for all this basic edifice, the basic principle has to be that one dharma of ahimsa, non-violence. Ahimsa becomes the source of strength when it operates from the edifice of satya—truth. They have to be together, without truth, ahimsa doesn’t come existence.

All this together, an integral, holistic way of thinking, operative methods, lifestyle, values of life and goals of life have to be thought through and assimilated in one’s own self. There they must be translated into one’s own lifestyle itself, that will lead us for a better earth. That is what I feel. I have tried to describe some of the contours of the subject to be discussed in this session.
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**Access to basic services and decentralisation, Yves BERTHELOT**

Access to basic services is a human right and is key to permit individual and community development. Basic services should be delivered where people live, this is an argument in favour of decentralization and gives key responsibilities to local authorities.

**Access to basic services and human dignity**

1. Basic services contribute to the fulfilment of human sustenance, human dignity, quality of life and sustainable livelihoods. They are a prerequisite for the provision of other services and for the improvement of the potential of each person to engage in economic activity. Basic services must, therefore, be available, accessible, culturally acceptable, affordable, of good quality and provided on a non-discriminatory basis.

2. Basic services are of various types: water supply and sanitation, sustainable waste management, energy, transportation and communication are essentially infrastructure-based services, while education, health and public safety imply significant operating costs and, above all, skilled human resources.

3. Basic services are all strongly interrelated, both sectorally, as the availability of one is necessary for the production or the delivery of another, and geographically, as they require coordination of policies at the various territorial levels from national to local to neighbourhood.

4. Basic services are unequally available and accessible worldwide. Many individuals, families, communities and large parts of cities

---

1 * The text that follows is drawn from the Guidelines on access to basic services for all adopted by the Governing Council of UN-HABITAT in April 2009 to the elaboration of which I contributed closely and from the Guidelines on decentralisation and the strengthening of local authorities adopted in April 2007.
and regions remain without access to basic services, meaning that the poor and vulnerable are unable to lead decent and dignified lives and face great difficulties in improving their situations. They are mired in a vicious circle in which the lack of access to basic services is both cause and result of poverty, discrimination, marginalization and exclusion. Access to income and employment-generating opportunities is critically dependent on services; the lack of such services severely constrains productivity and, consequently, earnings.

5. Improving access to basic services for all is, therefore, a key means to achieving the Millennium Development Goals.

6. Access to basic services is a human right. Individuals and groups are entitled to claim good quality, available, culturally acceptable, accessible and affordable basic services provided on a non-discriminatory basis, i.e., without discrimination on the grounds of gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or age. The State should ensure accessible channels for remedies and redress (particularly for the poor or those suffering social injustice).

Access to basic services and decentralization

7. While the State has the primary obligation to ensure access to basic services, it shares this responsibility with regional governments, local authorities, civil society organizations and service providers. All together, they have to build and operate a democratic, productive and participative framework that would permit everyone access to basic services in a non-discriminatory and sustainable manner.

8. Governance in relation to access to basic services has a double political and technical dimension. In its political dimension, it requires participation, decision-making and leadership. In its technical dimension, it requires needs assessment, planning, the
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negotiation of contracts, accounting mechanisms, monitoring and impact assessment. Both dimensions require transparency and the appropriate training of the stakeholders involved.

9. Local authorities are well placed to assess the needs of the users of basic services (including through non-governmental organizations and communities), define priorities, bring together the various stakeholders and decide on the best way to provide services. Their role and responsibilities should be clarified in legislation and regulations and they should be granted access to appropriate financial and technical resources.

10. The participation of beneficiaries contributes to the delivery of services adapted to their needs. It creates a sense of responsibility and ownership that encourages users to care for infrastructure and to pay related charges. The participation of beneficiary groups should be sought systematically in needs assessment, planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring.

11. Since national Governments, local authorities, public or private service providers and civil society organizations share responsibility in ensuring access to basic services to all, there is a need to negotiate and formalise partnerships among them, taking into account their respective responsibilities and interests. Accordingly, partnerships should be encouraged and facilitated through appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks, including clear results-oriented contracts and monitoring mechanisms.

12. Central and local authorities, civil society organizations and service providers share responsibilities for improving access to basic services for the poor. While, in principle, fees for basic services should ensure adequate cost-recovery, pro-poor policies should entail affirmative actions, targeted interventions for the most vulnerable groups, awareness-raising campaigns, special tariffs and subsidies.

**Decentralization beyond access to basic services**
13. The principle of subsidiarity constitutes the rationale underlying to the process of decentralization. It is intended to ensure that decisions are taken as closely as possible to the citizen. This underpins the widely recognised need for decentralisation.

14. Effective decentralization is today regarded as an expression of democratic practice and effective public administration. Accordingly, elected local authorities, alongside national and regional authorities, are considered as key actors in democratic governance and administration. Local democracy, thus, constitutes an essential element of democracy itself whatever the form of the State, whether federal, regionalized or unitary.

15. Local authorities should recognize the different constituencies within civil society and ensure that all are involved in the progressive development of their communities and neighbourhoods. To that end, the central Government, on its side, should authorize local authorities to establish and develop partnerships with all actors of civil society, particularly non-governmental organizations and community-based organisations, as well as with the private sector and other interested stakeholders. On their side, the local authorities could adopt diverse forms of participation such as neighbourhood councils, community councils, participatory budgeting and referendums as far as they are applicable in their specific context.

16. Decentralisation is meaningless if local authorities cannot dispose of financial resources commensurate with their tasks and responsibilities. Any transfer or delegation of tasks or responsibilities by the State should be accompanied by corresponding and adequate financial resources: transfers of national resources or authorisation to levy taxes or to borrow depending of the capacities of the local authorities.
I am probably the wrong person in the right place. Danone is one of the biggest food companies in the world and I am the ‘number two’ person in this company. I am basically managing a multi-national company which delivers billions containers of yogurt, litres of water and baby food products to probably more than 300,000 million consumers on a regular basis. The people and families that depend on us and their families in doing business around the world are well beyond 500,000 families. So this is a large operation.

I want to focus on three main ideas in my presentation. First of all, I am convinced that you cannot and you should not avoid trade. I am sure there are temptations to cut trade, to cut exchange of products and services, and business conversations among people. But trade is basically about what we are as people because it is about relationship. If there is any personal conviction that I have most deeply and which I feel is shared by people here it is that as a person, I can mostly be defined by my relationships with others.

The wheel would not have been invented, or maybe it would have been invented but not used if trade did not exist. Cellular phones or the solar panels we have been talking about are in the same category. Yesterday and the day before we were talking about solar panels as a way to help self-help groups in villages and we do the same in some Danone community projects but solar panels are mostly made in China. The only reason there are enough for us to use is because they are mass produced in China. If you tried to build your own solar panel in your garden, you would find it difficult. So for me the essence is not about trying to avoid trade, the essence is about the balance of trade and respecting what is the essence of trade, namely, mutual benefit. There should be a mutual benefit in trade.

This explains for me why multinational companies are an issue. After twenty years experience I am convinced that the most critical danger to the mutual benefit balance is the relative size of the parties. If a multinational company is dealing with a small community and with villages, there is definitely the danger of a huge imbalance in the trade. But I can tell you this is true also when industrial companies based in India, for example, Mittal a famous steel company here acquires a European leader in steel production, the same thing applies. It is not a question of north to south, east to west, it is essentially a question of size.
So on this basis, I think that the best guarantee against an imbalance in size is the process of the trade itself. I believe that more justice can be gained if the process of the trade is carefully observed and redefined and approached with caution. This process means that on the side of communities there is a real need for consensus on what are the priorities for the trade. In the first workshop yesterday we saw how difficult it is to build this consensus, to decide what is essential and what is not, what is primary and what is secondary, what are the priorities. If communities are able to develop a consensus of how they want to live they will gradually be able to create a cohesion, a social link that will make individual decisions within the community much more aligned with what the group wants to achieve. This may lead to policy, this may lead to regulations.

Speaking of regulations, my company Danone has signed the global compact that was proposed by Kofi Annan. I fully agree that this is not enough. I fully agree that there is a lot of ‘greenwashing’ in this. But the point is to go beyond this to regulations. I think this issue of size and trade will become important on the day when CO² impact will directly impact the profit and loss accounts of multinational companies, the day that we have to report the negative values, the losses of the trade that we do. It will be obvious that we will have to gradually have to ‘re-localize’ the economy and food-mileage will gradually reduce. So I think that building this consensus within society by all us on what we want and don’t want is an essential part of the process.

The second part of the process is on the other side of the trade and concerns the multinational companies. Yes I think we can and should rely on regulations. Yes I think that the human rights regulations are critical and I agree with what has been said here that people must make sure that they are enforced because there are many occasions where they are not enforced and violated. This is a basis to work on enforcement of regulation. But I think this is not enough and I would like to talk about the third point which is self-regulation.

If we take a long term view of what a company relies on, I think the mission of a company is not to maximize shareholder value. Although we all have been told this since Milton Friedman and the Chicago School of Economics. It is mere simplicity and oversimplification. A company only exists, small or big, because it creates ‘social value’. If I stop paying my employees they will go somewhere else and my company is dead. If I raise my prices too much, consumers are going to buy something else. If I don’t pay the right price for milk, the milk producers will not sell to Danone. That means that a company can make business because it creates and shares social values with society as a
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whole. I think that it is now urgent that the governance of multinational companies—and the danger is with the biggest companies because of their very size—this governance should be with more stakeholders than the shareholders alone.

Shareholders are important but I have to say that instead of talking only always about financial markets, it would be worth noting that in Europe and in North America most of the elderly generation is relying on pension funds, life insurance companies and their only hope of being able to sustain the longer life expectancy that we have now (when they retire for legal reasons at fifty-five and live until eighty) is by the revenues generated by these pension funds. So you could say on the one side, that these are the financial market schemes and I agree they do not work properly, but ultimately they are generating revenue for our parents in Europe and the US. This doesn’t mean that it gives them all rights, but it does mean that they have to have a say in multinational companies. I would concur that employees have also to have a say there. I am absolutely conscious that none of our shareholders is tied and committed to the company more than one of our single factory workers. Factory workers have built their house and brought and settled their families around these factories. And when we have to close or open a factory, it has much more impact on employees than on shareholders. So there is no doubt that if we want to have this balance and consensus, these employees will have to have more of a say than they have today. Basically this applies to all stakeholders of a company.

The second aspect of governance for multinationals that would have an impact on how the trade balance is organized is the idea of consensus. We believe that time is money and as a result of that we make decisions very fast—either the ‘boss’ decides or we vote—that is the basis for the decision. Fifty percent plus one carries the day. I think that because of the complexities of what is at stake in a multinational company and what is around the multinational company cannot be decided by a vote. It is too complex for that. I think we need to go for this particular aspect of corporate strategy to a decision-making process that is consensus based.

I have attended the Belem World Social Forum last year and it was clear to me that consensus building takes much more time. But you do not go into a discussion about consensus in the same spirit as you do into one that is majority-based. If you know ahead of time that nobody is going to get out of this meeting until a consensus is achieved, you will have a different attitude to the process. It is completely different now—where you shout louder than the other side, because the only thing you need is ‘fifty plus one’. I think this would completely transform the way multinational companies deal with the strategic decisions. I am not talking about the everyday operations obviously. I also think
that this basically a process where ‘socio-cracy’ can bring something to the party and I think that this is how multinationals must adapt to the new situation in the world.
Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, better known as Mahatma Gandhi, is not only the Father of the Nation of India, but also the father of modern ‘Khadi’. In 1919, he formally launched the khadi programme in the country, but clearly differentiating between the charkha of medieval times and that of his vision, insofar as the former was a symbol of the exploitation and helplessness of spinners, while the latter was a symbol of revolution in thought and action, as well as an embodiment of non-violence.

Gandhiji firmly believed that charkha was his best gift to the nation, contributing to its all-sided development--economic, political, social and moral. Initially, Gandiji took up the khadi programme for economic and political reasons. During his tour to acquaint himself with the realities of Indian conditions, he was deeply distressed by the increasing pauperisation of the villages and widespread underemployment, especially unemployment of those engaged in agriculture. He came to the conclusion that the charkha was the only panacea of their miserable situation. “The entire foundation of the spinning wheel rests on the fact that there are crores of semi-employed people in India. And I should admit that, if there were none such, there would be no room for the spinning wheel. But as a matter of fact everybody, who has been to our villages knows that they have months of idleness, which may prove their ruin”. He further emphasised, “I have never suggested that those, who are more lucratively employed, should give up their lucrative employment and prefer spinning. I have said repeatedly that only those are expected and should be induced to spin who have no other paying employment, and that too only during the hours of unemployment”.

From the very inception of the khadi movement, Gandhiji was absolutely convinced that charkha was the embodiment of non-violence, through which alone Swaraj could be achieved, and the Congress had also accepted this proposition. However, his emphasis in the initial stage was on providing relief to poverty-stricken masses through supplementary gainful occupation to millions of agriculturists during the off-season. He went on hammering the basic aspect of charkha, whenever and wherever possible, but his emphasis on it became more pronounced from 1935 onward, when he got the proposal regarding minimum living wage accepted by AISA and began insisting on production of khadi mainly for the villagers’ own use. His imprisonment during 1942 movement provided him the opportunity to ponder over the matter deeply and he came out of prison with full determination to give a new turn to khadi, with a view to recognising it in full conformity with the concept of non-violence.
Khadi occupied a distinguished place in pre-independence political scene of India and Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru in his poetic expression called it the ‘livery of India’s freedom’. Gandhiji said that when one was wearing khadi one was wearing freedom. He clearly saw that by making the Indians economically strong and self-reliant, khadi was sure to hasten the achievement of political freedom. The sense of economic freedom instilled amongst the countrymen by khadi, gave them a new confidence and soon it become an emblem of rising patriotism.

Charkha aims at putting this vast human resource to productive use which is otherwise going waste. Richard B. Gregg, a western thinker contemporary to Gandh said, “We do not usually think of the charkha as a machine, but it really is so. It uses the available mechanical energy of a man, woman or child for producing material goods. The handloom does likewise. That mechanical energy is derived from the food eaten by the person. There are today great numbers of unemployed Indians. They are, in effect, engines kept running by fuel (food), but not attached to any machines of devices for producing goods. Mr. Gandhi proposes to hitch them to charkhas and thus save a vast existing waste of human energy. If we want to increase the use of mechanical power in India, this is the quickest and cheapest way”.

In late thirties, when Gandhiji started his Basic Education programme (Nai Talim) in a bid to reorient the educational system of India and with a view to making it responsive to the national needs, he found khadi, along with agriculture, to be an excellent medium of education. The aim of the basic education is the physical, intellectual and moral development of the children through the medium of a handicraft and khadi, being an easily accessible and universal industry by fulfilling a basic need of the people, could serve the purpose admirably. It bridged the gulf between the educated and uneducated. It could establish a bond of unity between classes and masses and help the children to grow into useful and responsible citizens of the country.

All the action and programmes of Gandhiji, economic, political and social, were the direct outcome of his deep religious faith and his philosophy of life, relevant to both the individual and the society.

Khadi thus aimed at abolition of the distinction between rich and poor, high and low, by making them equal participants in contributing to the society’s wealth and adopt willingly the principle of ‘simple living and high thinking’. It implied avoiding unnecessary multiplication of wants, or leading a luxurious life at the cost of fellow
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human beings. All this led to one’s identification with the poor and concentration on his moral and spiritual uplift.

It is amazing that despite the onslaughts of powerised, mechanised and organized textile mills, not to mention suppression and oppression by the British rulers, hand-spinning and hand-weaving of cotton fabrics survived and continued to play a significant role in all walks of India’s life, though in quite subdued form.

The fact that hand-spinning occupied a place of pride in the Indian economy is clear from the popular acceptance of hand-spun cotton yarn as the ‘storage of value’ and even ‘medium of exchange’. It was readily accepted as such in day to day life till even thirties in many parts of India. Richard B. Gregg wrote in his book “Economics of Khadi” in 1931, “These (village industries products) do not and cannot command the ready and permanent market, that yarn always does. Even today in parts of Bengal and Madras, the old tradition of yarn markets continues.” Under such circumstances it is no wonder that the cotton/khadi industry survived and continued to be a part of people’s life despite setbacks.

Gandhiji often said that India did not require mass production, but production by the masses. Of course, huge production derived from this method should also be meant mainly for producers, he advocated. This mechanism will not only contribute vastly to country’s production but will also automatically ensure distributive justice. “You cannot distribute wealth equally ‘after’ producing it. You won’t succeed in getting men to agree to it. But you can so produce wealth as to secure equable distribution ‘before’ producing it. That is khadi,” observed C. Rajgopalachari.

Another important economic aspect of khadi upon which Gandhiji insisted, was self-sufficiency of individuals, specially the producers, as well as the villages. Obviously, non-use of khadi by lakhs of producers was bound to affect their own interest adversely and leave them on the mercy of urban khadi consumers. Villages as economic units would also remain helplessly dependent on far off mills for fulfilling one of their basic needs, which will perpetuate their poverty.

Yet another fundamental thought ingrained in khadi programme was of decentralisation. Now-exploitation or minimal exploitation is sine qua non of a non-violent society. The former would be possible only when the power in all spheres, economic, political or social, was decentralised and the widest possible participation by the people was ensured in all walks of life. Gandhiji believed that the exploitation, hence violence was inevitable in a centralised system and as such it should be avoided as much as possible. In this context charkha, according to Gandhiji, stood for the decentralisation
of economic system, and as decentralisation could not be compartmentalized, it implied the decentralisation in political and social spheres also. In Gandhiji’s words, “The khadi mentality means decentralisation of the production and distribution of the necessities of life. Therefore the formula so far evolved is, every village to produce and use all its necessaries and in addition produce a certain percentage as its contribution to the requirements of the cities”. If this basic proportion is accepted, the khadi and village industries’ sector, in tiny sector no longer would remain a residual sector, but the most prominent one, contributing immensely to the economic prosperity of the rural areas. The strategy of our planning should be to produce, whatever you can in the tiny sector, and only those things, which cannot be produced by it, should be produced by small-scale sector. On the same analogy, large-scale sector should produce only whatever cannot be produced by the small-scale sector. Actually this idea seems to be implied in Article 39 of the Directive Principles.15

In the social sphere, Khadi has been found to be a unique instrument to promote communal harmony and religious tolerance amongst the artisans through close day-to-day interaction between them. Similarly, khadi was a ready medium to come closer to lakhs of Harijans (untouchables) and provide them succor through hand-spinning and hand-weaving. Likewise, charkha is an unparalleled means to provide gainful employment to the women, who constituted half of our population, at their doorsteps during their idle hours. This is bound to raise their social and economic status and ensure work to them with dignity and honor.

15° Editors note: “The Directive Principles of State Policy are guidelines to the central and state governments of India, to be kept in mind while framing laws and policies. These provisions, contained in Part IV of the Constitution of India, are not enforceable by any court, but the principles laid down therein are considered fundamental in the governance of the country, making it the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws to establish a just society in the country.”
For us as human beings, the economy is located in the field of vital, everyday realities; it is about eating, dressing, housing ourselves, caring for ourselves and educating ourselves. To connect the question of the non-violence with the economy, we really have to ask ourselves whether it too is one of these daily and vital human realities. In my view, the answer is yes, and for two reasons.

First, non-violence is an invitation to reflect on violence, to enumerate all the kinds of violence that are part of human reality and to see it as one of the most diverse realities, present in all areas and without doubt at all times to the extent that we see, there is no human reality without violence.

Second, non-violence is an encouragement to counter violence, to reduce its dominance, not only for moral reasons, or for idealistic aims, but for practical reasons grounded in the witness of common human experience: human life is not sustainable through violence.

So, nothing human exists without violence and no life is sustained through violence. If this tension is constitutive of the human condition, then, non-violence is the path that shows human how to live despite that, despite all the violence that is within them. Far from being reduced to the message of a person, non-violence becomes a fact of humanity.

If these hypotheses are accurate then the discussion can’t be reduced to an opposition between economical practicality on one side, and non-violent idealism on the other. On the contrary, to confront the practicalities of the economy with non-violence will lead us realize the very realism of the non-violent option.

By the same token, considering the question of a non-violent economy leads us to ask further questions:

Is it the economy as such that produces violence? Is violence essentially the result of certain economic agents (feudal lords, capitalists, mafiosoes…); or of the system itself, of its logic and presuppositions; or of the massive deprivations of poverty and hunger; or finally, of that mixture of fatal aggressions, injustices, humiliations and despairs?

Can the economy contribute to a reduction or a moderation or to a domestication of the inherently human violence?

**Reversing the rural exodus**
The question of the exodus from rural areas (urbanization) can provide a good point of departure for the tracing the concrete responses to these questions.

A first approach to this question would be to think as citizens and to connect and see the tension between the economy and justice in order to create a viable human city.

This approach would lead to putting the emphasis on the following:

- poverty and hunger as massive realities, and the principal causes of the exodus of rural people;

- developing sustainable subsistence models of agriculture as a pertinent response and a way of enlarging the field of application of non-violence to the environment, biodiversity, and natural resources;

- seeing the overall effects of a reversal of the rural exodus in urban overpopulation and the possibility of a more balanced distribution of population;

- the virtuous circle that is associated with the reduction of poverty, democratization of education and a reduction in the demographic pressure.

Another complementary approach consists in reasoning, simply as human beings, that by bringing into connection the economy and justice we will be able to preserve the vital direction of the human reality.

This kind of approach would be doubtful if it consisted in imposing an apriori model of humanity, a kind of ideal of human living. But this approach could become fruitful by opening itself fruitfully and critically to all branches of knowledge and wisdom.

In direct relation with the problem of the rural exodus, this approach would lead to putting the emphasis on a non-violent economy founded on

--the preservation of vital space

--the participation of everyone in the production of essentials

--and a interactive dialogue with all life forms.

If human violence is not a defect but rather the translation of a ‘living difficulty’, a difficulty of living spontaneously and being naturally at ease with life, then the companionship with the other life forms and the lessons and encouragement that they can
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give us—passed from one living being to another, can become fundamentally important
in the movement toward a non-violent economy.
Climate Change and Energy Justice in India, Ramapathy Kumar

I am going to speak primarily about India, but I realize that there are people from other countries so I will try my level best to give a picture about the current energy system in India and how we can move toward a better system.

The general energy scenario in India is that we are experiencing frequent power cuts, load-sharing, high voltage, low voltage. These are all regular occurrences for us especially in tier two and tier three cities and in fact, in many villages, they have no electricity at all. In such a scenario, the approach by the government is to invest more and more to fulfill the needs of the people who are living in the urban centres and also the needs of industry and people in the rural areas are basically facing the consequences. If you see the growth of energy since the few hundred megawatts we were generating at the time of Independence, you will see that today we are generating about 150,000 megawatts, mostly from coal-based power plants.

This source of coal is emitting huge amounts of carbon dioxide. India’s contribution to CO₂ emissions is huge. It is the fourth largest emitter in the world. CO₂ emissions are at about 1.182 tonnes per person. Fifty-eight percent of our carbon emissions come from the power sector and this coal-based generation. We are soon scheduled to become the third largest emitter in the world because of changes to the reporting system that will make it more accurate. In order to deal with this crisis, especially from the side of the developing countries, India has talked about the fact that ‘the responsibility is common but differentiated’. This means that all the countries in the world are in principle responsible but each has a particular responsibility. For example, the large and developed countries have a larger responsibility because of the larger size of their historical contributions. There is lesser responsibility for the developing country.

India’s argument here is that she is a poor and developing country in which 40 to 50 percent of people do not have access to electricity. Therefore, we need to continue to invest in conventional sources of energy and hence for an increase in carbon emissions. We are not considering what impact this will have on the poor and invulnerable in society.

The current integrated energy plan for India is to generate 800,000 megawatts of electricity by 2031. If you see the projection given by the Ministry of Power it shows that at the current level of growth we will not have even half of the resource to generate what
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we are planning. We will have to depend more and more on imported coal, which is already happening in any case, since our coal is of a lower quality and contains more ash. We are importing coal from Indonesia and Australia. In such a scenario, we don’t see that energy security or access to energy for everyone will happen even by 2050. So what is the solution?

We have to think about alternative sources and ways of providing equal access. If you look at the growth of energy consumption in India in the last fifty years, it is also identical with the story of the growth of energy injustice in this country. I have already said that forty percent of people do not have access to energy, yet at the more and more investment is being made in energy production for urban middle classes. A report entitled, “Hiding Behind the Poor” which Greenpeace released two years ago indicated that the average urban middle class family are generating 4.5 times more CO² than their rural counterpart and 3 times more than the average Indian. Thus the urban middle class are hiding their consumption behind the poor and the government is also using the fact the poor have such low access to energy to justify their increased investment in non-renewable energy. The question is not whether India has a right to grow, but whether India has a right to grow in an environmentally responsible way.

As I have mentioned a key factor in this energy scenario is the urban-rural divide. Despite the increased investment however, energy access is really not increasing. Energy injustice has happened also in a geographical pattern in India. In the eastern part of the country there are a great deal of mineral resources and coal mines but here, the electrification is at 40 percent. The resources have been taken from this eastern area to fulfill the energy needs of the western part of the country: Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu even Delhi. These areas have 100 percent electrification. The Delhi local government is now setting up a power plant in Jharkand (a very poor area). Karnataka is setting up a power plant in Chhatisgarrh. The people there are not getting any benefit from it. The rural electrification plan is based on a faulty approach and scheme.

In this scenario, the energy injustice in the country will only increase. All of these schemes have been recently merged into a central plan (the Rajiv Gandhi Gramin LPG Vitrak Yojna). But this scheme only deepens the injustice. It shows a real avoidance of the issue of justice. For example, this new scheme considers an area to be electrified if only ten percent of the houses in it have electricity. What about the rest? Why do they not qualify for electricity? Even in these areas only a single phase connection is being installed, which means a very low voltage and the time of supply is very limited. Farmers for example are receiving electricity in the night, but that is not the time they can use it for irrigation. Each farmer is investing about 20 or 30 rupees for their electrification—and that
is not for lighting. They are not really interested in electricity for lighting. They say, ‘we
have been living in darkness for the last 60 years. Why do we need lighting now?’ They
are interested in energy for their livelihood. But the government approach is only
focussed on lighting. In that sense it is not helping at all. In states like Karnataka and
Maharashtra the energy per unit is at about 600 watts. In a rural state, like Bihar it is 45
watts.

The situation then is very bad and it will get worse. The rural-urban divide is only
being accentuated by the current plan and investments of the government. At the same
time we continue to invest in dirty energy. I won’t go into the problem of inefficiency but
I assure you the level of efficiency is very low throughout the country. If this efficiency
could be improved, it would increase our energy production twenty to twenty-five percent
but effort is not being put into that.

We need to have a paradigm shift. We are basically working along a decentralized
approach and a focus on renewable energy. Renewable energy is more expensive but in
comparison to coal which is heavily subsidized all the way along the production chain. If
it were compared without the subsidy the whole focus would shift. India has a huge
potential for using solar energy, up to 5000 trillion kilowatts per unit. That is a hundred
percent more than we are currently producing. The financial investments of multinationals
in coal however, are really what is determining the government policy on this.

I want to give you the example of the solar water heater. Bangalore is the capital
of the solar water heater. Bangalore generates about 900 megawatts of energy in the
morning when the solar water heaters are on. It saves a lot of energy. That kind of
initiative should be taken at all levels.

Let me conclude by reminding you of Gandhi’s idea of the village based economy, Gram
Swaraj. This is high time for us to return to that idea if we are to achieve energy justice.
Non-Violence, Land Struggle and the Marginalised Sections in India, Dr. K. Gopal Iyer

Mahatma Gandhi through his non-violent movement was able to shake the foundation of British Empire and make them accept the demands of the Indigo Peasants exploited in Champaran District by European landlords. He also fought for the demands of the Kheda (Gujarat) Peasants through Satyagraha. Immediately after Independence, Vinoba Bhave, his principal disciple, raised the demand for equity on land issue by highlighting the cherished dream of ‘Sabai Bhumi Gopal Ki’. His appeal resonated in the hearts of some of the landlords imbued with humanitarian values which prompted many of them to donate lands for the landless in different parts of India but more so in States like Andhra Pradesh and Bihar.

Many disciples inspired by Gandhian ideology continued the land struggle for the weaker section in different parts of India. One of the dedicated Gandhians was Sh. Jagannathan from Tamilnadu who devoted himself to the cause of the downtrodden and Dalits in Tamilnadu immediately on the aftermath of Kilvermeni Massacre where 48 Scheduled Caste people were burnt alive including Children and Women. Sh. Jagannathan became a crusader not only to rehabilitate the uprooted family inflicted by the atrocity of the landlords but also kindled enormity of confidence among them by taking up the land question. One of the most successful struggles waged by him was the distribution of several hundred acres of benami lands to the genuine landless tenants by forcing the Landlord (Deskiar) to this effect. He was able to liberate the Dalits (landless and tenant) from the shackles of landlords in Tanjavur District.

Dring the 80s immediately after the launching of Economic Reforms, the Central Govt. in collaboration with Andhra Pradesh and Tamilnadu Govt. opened Aqua-culture farms to promote the export of prawn farming on the East Coast. This resulted in the pollution of the drinking water of scheduled castes and also in creating unemployment problem among landless labourers as vast extent of fertile agricultural lands were sold by landlords to Aqua-farm for prawn culture. Under the leadership of Sri Jagannathan the agricultural labourers, particularly women labourers, prevented the Aqua Culturists from continuing their Prawn cultivation. Later on the Supreme Court gave directives to all the States in the East Coast to stop conversion of Agricultural Land to Prawn Farms.

Another historic example is the struggle led by Chhatra Yuva Sangharsh Vahini in Bihar against Bodhgaya Mahant during 1978-1985 which resulted in the take over of 12,000 acres land under Land ceiling and its distribution to thousands of landless labourers in Bodhgaya region.

The continuity of the Non-Violent struggle is now launched by Ekta Parishad at an all India level under the able guidance and leadership of Sh. P.V. Rajgopal for last two
decades in which land struggles in a peaceful form has not only resulted in massive mobilization of the vulnerable sections throughout the country but also persuaded the government of India to appoint a Special Commission on Land Reforms under the leadership of Prime Minister of India. It is an unprecedented step of raising not only old issues of Land Reforms (Lands Ceiling, Tenancy Reforms, Distribution of Govt. Land) but also other major land issues like Forest Rights Act 2006, Amendment to Land Acquisition Act 1894, PESA Act 1996 and so on. The *Voice of vulnerable* raised by EKTA PARISHAD has also echoed and reverberated throughout the World (particularly Europe, Latin America, South Africa).
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Workshops Summary on Swadeshi, introduced by Jean-Joseph Boillot and YP Annan

Today, we are focusing on Swadeshi. *Swa* is atman, my self, the soul not the body only, and *desh* is more than country although that is how it is often translated. It means more my land, my home. Thus it means this is my territory, the territory of my soul. Sometimes this can be confused with a kind of chauvinism, in the sense that you say, this is *my* land, but swadeshi is much more than that. I can be only swaraj if I have a swadeshi. I am going to ask YP Annan to introduce this topic of swadeshi in the modern world.

**Swadeshi, YP Annan**

The Gandhian concept of swadeshi means to decentralize and relocalize the economy. In today’s context I think let us not pit swadeshi against globalization. Globalization is a fact of life. In itself, globalization cannot be called violent. Human society has been moving toward globalization from ancient times. The first phase of globalization was established when the British empire was established on the basis of violence, exploitation and mercantilism, colonialism. After the end of the second World War, it was Keynes who suggested the setting up of the IMF and the World Bank. Today the situation is that human society is getting out of its straightjacket of nation states and moving toward a more cohesive set of relations. We have to see that the swadeshi concept is even more valid today when the society is globalizing.

In this context, I give the following example. I am an individual, and I must look after myself, but I must do so in such a manner that it does not harm my family. I look after my family as well, but not at the cost of my neighbourhood. I look after my neighbourhood but not at the cost of next circle. So it is a series of concentric circles. We are reminded of what Gandhi said when he translated Ruskin’s book, *Unto this Last*. He said there are three principles. The first is the good of the individual is contained in the good of all. So how do we ensure the good of the individual, the good of the locality and the good of the community. So the basis of the world order has to be a decentralized socio-economic structure to the extent that this is possible. Only those activities go up to a higher level that cannot be done in the local level. Those activities which can be done locally are done locally and that is why it is a non-violent economy. It is a shared local economy. So the concept is that as far as possible I stay in the local community of sharing. If globalization were built on such circles of sharing then it would be non-violent.

This also makes us reflect on the question of measuring the good of the economy, what is commonly referred to as the GDP. Here some changes are necessary. For
example, I would say that we must measure the non-monetized aspects of the economy again. There is a tremendous amount of production which is not-monetized. This is the service economy and really that is the basis of swadeshi, the economy of service. What Kumarappa called the economy of permanence. He graded this into several levels from the parasitic, to the predatory, to the enterprise and then gregation and then service. The violence decreases as we pass through these levels to the level of service.

Another point is that in the GDP there are certain external costs, externalities as economists call them. These externalities whether they are social costs or the environmental costs, must also be included in the GDP calculation. India has just produced a million cars this year. China has produced three million. I can assure the biggest increase in GDP for both countries will be cars alone. The costs involved in the production and sale and use of cars includes a large number of these externalities, like pollution for example or the displacement of people for factories. These must be included in the GDP.

If these two factors—non-monetized production and externalities—were factored in to the GDP, then the concept of a local economy, swadeshi would be much clearer and convincing.

Workshop: Machines in the service of the Human Being. The use of technology. Report by Bharat Thakur and Mr. Balaji.

In group one, we had twenty people involved in this discussion. We identified a grim situation in which we depend more and more on machines. Technology is empowering us but also is making us dependent on machines. We had different points of view. We all agreed that machines help in food production but we thought their affect on children was more negative. Basically the feeling was that at a local level we have less need of machines. The local economy can be simpler and involve more use of people’s production. This leads us to the topic of mass production. This leads to the dumping of products. It is not need-based production but rather creates import-export conflicts. We felt that we need both mass production and production by the masses. This would help to localize our economic activities. The third topic was how to seek alternatives to heavy industries. Here in India, the problem of heavy industries is in their use of land and their taking of land from productive farmers. Moreover, the owners of these companies do not care for the local values and appreciation of nature. We felt that India has done much to
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create local micro-industries but we remain worried about multinationals in the area of mining. Finally we felt that we need to develop more ‘intermediate technology’, that is machines that come from a local need and that are developed locally.

2nd Workshop, Rural Exodus and Urbanization. Report by Yatish Mehta and Dr. B Ananthi

We had friends from Paraguay, Mexico, Malaysia, Nepal, and Sudan in our group. There were three questions: why are people moving to the city, how can we stop the influx, and how can we reverse this trend. On the first point, we found the following reasons for moving to the urban areas: better education, deprivation of livelihood resources, as a result of colonization, being unwilling to work on the farms, landlessness, social upheaval, loss of interest in agriculture because of insecurity with it as business. On the second question, we discussed the growth of slums and the fact that there is not adequate service in the cities for this. We felt that there was a need to create better conditions in the villages and better communication linking the rural villages with the cities to provide more opportunities for people. We also felt it was necessary to modernize agriculture and share the resources of land. There was also more need to modernize health care and education in the villages.


We had questions that should have been answered, ‘small is beautiful’. Now in fact we did not answer the contrary but in answering the questions we put itself in the context of globalization. Jerald Joseph, who was in our group really asked us to focus on the problem of globalization, on its good and bad sides. Multinationals are one of the main actors of globalization and many people are marginalized as a consequence. But our debate brought some hope that multinationals might be more ethical and that marginalized people might be able to take care of themselves. We felt that ethical considerations might help to modify the profit motive in multinationals. We discussed many examples of this. We also noted that modern technology can help to bypass intermediaries. We were given the example of fishermen from Tamil Nadu who sold their fish by mobile phone. At the end, we reflected on some values: balance between society and the environment, planning for the long-term future, finding the right balance between competition and cooperation.

Group Four, Confronting Peak Oil and the need for Renewable Energy. Report by Mr. Ramapathy and Richard Thomson Coon
The energy crisis is, I think, universal and as someone said in the workshop we should be more global in our approach. We discussed baseline energy, because each square meter of the planet. There we can imagine how much sun comes down, how much wind blows over, how much heat comes up from the earth. That is the basic energy budget of the planet and we need to know that when we are discussing a village sustainable eco-system. Diminishing oil is being displaced by nuclear renaissance. The multinational corporations control that renaissance with a kind of top down decision-making and it often in conflict with grassroots decision-making. To some extent therefore the renewable energy debate and the problem of sustainable development are being highjacked by the multinational corporations. India already has some 2000 small hydro projects working well. These give a model and encouragement. We also discussed the issue of energy justice. Really energy can’t be owned because as Einstein said, energy can’t be created or destroyed. There are indigenous knowledge systems and these produce wisdom about how to use energy. These often conflict with the Indian State’s use of energy and its plan. This is a real conflict and needs to be looked at clearly and non-violently. Indian people have the freedom to build their own energy generating units—that is not the case all over the world. But this needs to be developed.
I was invited to say a few words on how the ‘common good’ could ‘master’ the economy. Listening to what has been said over the last two days, I have the impression that there is a common agreement that our economic system has failed. It has failed because there are one billion people suffering from hunger. It has because there are increasing inequalities within countries and between countries. It failed because it is compromising the future, compromising bio-diversity, compromising our future because of pollution. Yes, I share this view, but I am wondering whether we should simply blame the economic system and say that it is because of the economic system that we have all these problems. I am obliged to say that it was men and women who have created this economy through an insatiable greediness, through the desire to have more—and worse, through the desire to have more than the neighbour. We are motivated by that—most of us—in our practical everyday life. In this perspective, you must say that the economic system works very well. Not only does it work, it increases the desire of people for more and for more than their neighbour.

If we want to subject the economic system to the common good then, we will have to convert people and to convert ourselves so that the common good becomes the centre of our desires. How do we change? We can listen to the wise men. We have heard a lot of them in the last few days. We can consider the fears for the future. We have also heard a lot of those as well. We can consult the philosophers. I think it is not possible to have progress alone. In economics people speak of the ‘free rider’; if I make an effort and the other person does not then nothing will change and I will lose out.

I would like to advocate that together in our communities, in cities or in villages, we need to ask ourselves—collectively—what is the common good? I also want to state that the common good is not a norm that we have to apply. It is something which has to be designed and defined by each community, each group. We have to organize this collective reflection on the common good. I think we have to start at the lowest possible level. We have to start in our family, in our community. It is extremely difficult to discuss with others if you yourself don’t know what you want.

There was recently a UNESCO conversation on the topic of dialogue between civilizations. It was a meeting between Christians and Muslims. It was the
recommendation that each group should first decide what they want themselves. So again I suggest that this process of consultation begin at the grassroots and move from there to the village, the region, the city, the national and the international levels. I would also like to suggest that civil society organizations have a key role to place. You have these organizations at all of these levels but I have never witnessed meetings about the fundamental issue of what is the common good. In doing this, we will come to discover that the others are really not that greedy and that they also value, ethical questions.

So my first would be that we should have this broad ranging consultation from the grassroots up about what is the common good. And secondly, look at experiences. If these two days of meetings was important for me it is because of the experiences of the expressed by all of you. What all that does is to give credibility to the idea that groups of people can work on the basis of the common good. That is extremely important, to see that it possible to move in a different direction than homo economicus. We demonstrate that to discuss the common good does not have to be a long and endless process. We can start immediately. There are good examples of this regarding the environment. The government is not very forthcoming about taking decisions about the environment but several cities have acting directly. In Switzerland it is very similar. Progress is made at the local level without waiting for a broader common agreement. This is why the experiences of others are so important because they are in incentive to go ahead.

I said that there is not a norm or a list of what is within the common good. We have some clear ideas: food, basic services, justice. In a meeting yesterday someone said, ‘beauty’, beauty of the landscape. So this reminds us that the common good is not simply a list of material things we all need to get. To quote the encyclical, Populorum Progressio, there is a formula which I found absolutely perfect: it is “the development of all people and of the whole human person”. I think this gives us a good inspiration for our exploration.

How do we make the common good a guide for the economy? The first thing is to be clear in our consensus about what is the common good for everyone. If you take this morning’s agenda you have elements of the answer, you have rules, guides, instruments to measure progress (GNP) and beyond that happiness.

Let me simply add that the common good is also important as norm for an impact assessment. Everyone who is concerned about the environment has proposed the idea of an impact assessment, something that will be undertaken whenever there is a big project that will have an impact on the environment. An environmental impact assessment could
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be the model for a common good assessment, that is an assessment that should be
undertaken whenever we proceed on some new economic strategy or proposal. We should
ask, will this increase the common good?
Trusteeship, Yogendra Parikh

Gandhiji was by training a lawyer while Vinoba Bhave was steeped in the background of Indian Culture. Both of them practiced two vows of the Panch Maha Vratas i.e. ahimsa-non-violence, satya-truth, asteya-nonstealing, brahmacharya-celibacy and asangraha-non-possession. These two vows of non-stealing and non-possession form the basis of the concept of Trusteeship. It can be explained as follows: the things which you do not need and still you go on keeping can be considered to be an act of stealing. According to this concept of trusteeship, you are not the owner of the articles which you do not need, but you are expected to pre-serve them for others as a trustee. The owner is the society as a whole or God.

The concept of trusteeship was never institutionalized during Gandhiji's life-time. However Shri Jamnalal Bajaj and Shri Ghanshyamdas Birla always helped Gandhiji and put into practice the trusteeship concept. Jamnalal Bajaj surrendered all his wealth whenever and wherever it was needed. Sewagaram and Brahma Vidyamandir were located on the land owned by Jamnalal Bajaj. Birla hosted Gandhiji whenever he was in the town and he looked after his needs and prayer-meetings. Rare attempts were made by Shri Himmatlal Khira and Shri Govindrao Deshpande in Poone. But it did not take any shape. Baker in London also tried but the model was not replicable. Vinoba himself was averse to the concept of trusteeship. He improved upon it and presented it in the form of "Descent of Five Forces"-Coordination of Panchshakti:
2. Sajjan Shakti-Power of Social Workers-First Finger which points the direction-Darshika.
4. Mahajan Shakti-Power of Prosperous People-Fourth Finger-Anaamika and
5. Sarakaari Shakti-Govt.'s Power-Fifth Finger-Kanishthika.

These five forces make a peaceful society. This concept was explained by Vinobaji in the conference of major important industrialists in Brahma Vidya Mandir. He believed that the Indian Culture has sustained for centuries due to the Mahajan Shakti (Power of Prosperous People). One can conveniently conclude that Vinobaji stood for coordination and not for confrontation. His ideal of life was to link people of diverse interests. His Land-gift Movement-Bhoodan Yagna, was the result of this ideology. It was
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a social experiment in the field of landless laborers and land-owners. Before the
beginning of Bhoodan he met the communist leaders in jail. He said that if he failed in the
application of non-violence, for the solution of land-problem, he would join them! During
the 14 years of his foot-march he received 4.5 million acres of land in donation. Out of
this movement were born the new concepts of Gramdaan, Udyogdaan, Sampatti-daan,
Shanti-Sena and Sarvodaya-Patra.

To-day we realize that government power has grown out of all proportions.
During the Nehru-period the concept of the Socialist Pattern became very important and
the Public Sector became dominant. But this experiment later proved that it is not the
panacea for social evils. Now there is a trend towards Privatization resulting in Special
Economic Zones (SEZ). Each new concept takes time to prove that it will succeed or
fail. No system is perfect and innovations in the structural change in the society keep on
coming from time to time.

We are now in the 21st century. Old Gandhi is going to take a new shape based on
the Indian Cultural Value-System. It is now our turn to improvise the Gandhian ideology
with an open mind by action-oriented research. We are now facing the challenging issues
of Environment and Globalization. If we want to make Gandhi relevant in the 21st
century, we need to think creatively and positively. Originally Trusteeship applied to the
individual. But now it should be converted into Community Trusteeship. This community
may be Gram-Sabha or any other legal entity. We shall have also to think in terms of
"Small is Beautiful". How small? The size of smallness should be sustainable. It should
be perceived in the context of Totality. Gandhiji's concepts of Trusteeship, Non-Violence,
Simplicity i.e. voluntary acceptance of poverty, should give a clear answer to seven
evils pervading the world to-day:

Wealth without Work
Pleasure without Conscience
Knowledge without Character
Commerce without Morality
Science without Humanity
Worship without Sacrifice
Politics without Principle.

And the eighth evil to be added is
Rights without Responsibility.

This ultimately means that we have to overhaul the whole educational set-up, frame new
guidelines for the social structure and set new goals for the spiritual uplift of all the nations of the world with full faith that a better world is possible.
I would like to speak first to the Indian people in this room. It’s the first time I’ve come to your country. I’m still under the shock of the contrast between the tremendous poverty here and the energy you are communicating, and I’m impressed by the presence of your spirituality.

I’m going to tell you very briefly a rather long story. Thirty years ago, some ten persons created a system of financial mutual help in France. It was created for beginning new initiatives which were alternative and marginal and which, very often, have been refused by the traditional French banking system. At that first moment, these marginal activities were for instance organic agriculture, other areas of the organic sector, citizen’s projects, cultural and social associations and also the first experimentation with renewable resources. Let’s say it briefly: those who had saved some money gave it to others who had good projects in mind.

That first banking activity was and is still called „La Nef“. In French that means the form of the body of a boat, as for instance of the ship used by Christopher Columbus in his quest to discover India (but he discovered America!). We didn’t think originally of a sort of Noah’s Arc because „La Nef“ can also be an acronym of the „New Brotherly Economy.“. Isn’t it a bit surprising to hear the word „brotherly“ in a banking context? No, because it’s on the base of a fraternal economy that we developed our banking system. We were convinced that we had to turn over, like a glove, the almost invisible hand of the
free market. We believed that the economic law of the market is not only selfish; there is
a rather different kind of law which Louis Campana proposed to us yesterday when he
said that his „happiness passes through the happiness of the others“. Let’s try to take these
simple words as a fundamental social law!

Twenty years ago, we were a hundred persons, and we have continued our project, but
at that moment with a official banking status, recognized by the French banking
authorities. We always followed the same values: the spirit of mutual help, the same
activities which have been continously increasing and which we continued to finance, but
always maintaining a maximal transparency (which was quite new in the banker’s
world!). That transparency is something we make really concrete by our annual
publications where we inform all our customers about all our lendings. An essential
reason why we think we are useful is our idea of constructing bridges that create mutual
solidarity.

Today, we are around 30,000 people and we continue to do exactly the same work.
The only difference is that in the last years, the enterprises aregrowing and developing
new needs. We have seen arrival as well of other marginalized people who have proposed
new initiatives to us. Today in France, you can meet these innovations in community-
housing, in group-living, in fair trade, in renewable resources and also in the major sector
of agricultural lands.

And tomorrow? In the future, we’ll be around 100,000 people working on a project
which will be a European ethical bank in the context of the merger of the French „La
Nef“ with alternative banks of our Italian and Spanish friends. For the creation of that
European bank, we first have worked out a common „Manifesto“ which will be the very
basis of our new bank. I’ll read only some key-sentences from it: „We try to support a
social and non-violent transformation in the development of the human being and also
the protection of our common goods in an equal society. In countries of both northern and
southern hemispheres, everyone should have the opportunity to satisfy their basic needs,
and develop completely their own capacities.“

Our invention of mutual financial help is not the idea of a genius! It’s simply an
organisation giving welcome to all the persons of the civil society who want to participate
in a non-violent transformation of the world. We fight for more equality among the
human beings and against the destruction of our planet. The number of our customers is
increasing, and they are really aware of their growing responsibility for common goods.
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On one hand, they are ready to put their savings into the bank „La Nef“, but on the other hand, they would also like to simplify radically the investment strategies for taking care of the ownership of the common goods. They are also willing to save money in a long term perspective, running moderate risks and without seeking fast speculative profits.

We are often asked to create new structures which can open the doors to new models for the ownership of common goods. Some examples of this are in the areas of renewable resources, cooperative housing or purchase of agricultural land. Let’s describe with some details the last issue. In France, every hour one farm is disappearing, and 60,000 hectares of land are disappearing each year under concrete and tar. That phenomenon has to be considered in a context of growing industrialisation and urbanisation. On the other hand, fifty percent of the organic products are imported into our country. So we have created a shareholder company with public shares. That company is buying land to keep it out of the hands of speculators and reserve it for organic farmers. These are often linked with consumer groups which are developing a local distribution for their organic products. In the last two years, 7000 people have bought shares for 15,000,000 euros. We can consider these initiatives as an act of civil resistance against the neo-liberal distribution system which concentrates the money only in the big companies and which is very often treating the farmers as slaves and the consumers as victims of a collective kidnapping.

This is only one initiative that I am happy to report to you. I would like to thank you for the energy you’ve communicated to me!
Karima Delli
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The Problem of Discrepancies in Wealth: Tax the Rich to Save the Rich, Karima Delli

I would like to start with a sentence of Mahatma Gandhi who said: „The world has enough for everyone’s need, but not enough for everyone’s greed.“ The majority of the world’s population is today suffering from a crisis: a global crisis, an ecological crisis, a social crisis, an economical crisis, a financial and a nutritional crisis. People have been driven out of their jobs and of their homes; social insecurity is reigning everywhere. In several areas, people have no other option than to leave their homes to go into big cities like Mumbai, Bogotá or Sao Paolo where they are living in slums and in absolutely inhuman conditions.

In terms of biodiversity, this year 2010 has been declared as an international year of biodiversity: however we are observing, helpless, a catastrophe which certain experts call the 6th biggest extinction of important species. So in terms of biodiversity, we are actually far away from fulfilling the objectives that have been set up by national and international bodies.

We are all aware of the failure of the Copenhagen summit in which the global leaders haven’t been able to work out a minimal common program. We probably have lost that battle, but take notice! It’s a failure only for the leaders of the big nations of our planet, because civil society around the globe is still very much alive and working hard to save the planet and to mobilize forces from the bottom and also to fight against global warming and other important ecological issues.

If we look around at that panorama of crisis, there is one word which characterizes it very well: inequality. The distribution of wealth is, for instance, completely unequal. The United Nation’s Program for Development (UNDP) has brought out a report according to which three persons in the world have earned more than the entire accumulated earnings of 48 poor countries of the world. Also, 225 individuals have amassed an wealth equivalent to 2.5 billion people around the world, and these 2.5 billions are living with less than two dollars a day and are totally excluded. This also shows how today everything is translated in terms of commercial value. But suddenly, we see on the other end of the chain, all these millionaires and billionaires who inspire me to ask a question: what function do they have when they are not fulfilling any social duty?

In fact, beyond a certain limit, this inequality in terms of revenue and fortune is leading to an asocial, uncivic and delinquent activity: these people are actually living
outside our planet, outside our world, totally disconnected from the reality, and their high
salaries are not giving them any right to justify their wealth (because they don’t know
neither the most concrete values of their own privileged situation: effort, merit and work).
Their large revenues are pushing them into immorality as well as into the destruction of
the very substance of our society which is solidarity, cooperation and sharing a good life.

According to an ancient director of the Central Bank of Belgium, 3200 billion dollars
are exchanged every day in the world’s stockmarkets out of which only 2.7 percents
correspond to the real amount in terms of economy. The rest of this money is spent for
speculation. What is the utility of spending such a huge amount of money for speculative
activities, and what is the utility of these 225 very rich people we’ve spoken about before?
These questions bring us back to the very centre of our subject: let’s come back to
Gandhi’s need – greed problematic.

All of us agree that our planet is suffering, and we try to work out short-term solutions
which are not going to help us very much. We have to fight all together for long-term
solutions for slowing down the effects of global warming. For the last 30 years, the salary
inequality has been growing constantly so that an individual can earn anywhere from 100
to 5000 times more than what he deserves, and the whole thing looks very normal. The
huge wealth which has been amassed is used for nothing else than for speculation, and it
is neither recyclable nor brought back to the real economy. As final result we have a
hyperinflation in which it is the poor who are paying the bill for the deeds of the rich.

What has happened recently in the subprime crisis in the United States? It was mainly
due to speculative investments in the real estate sector, where the credits were used for
developing real estate projects, which were totally disconnected from the normal revenues
of the average American family. And if the salaries of these people didn’t go up, but
rather down, it was also because certain shareholders of big national and multinational
companies wanted to get increasing dividends of their real state investments – today they
are earning a two-digit amount – and for getting that money, they asked the companies to
reduce the salaries of their employees. Therefore inequality and imbalance are at the very
bottom of this entire problem, and we have also seen the hypocrisy of the G-20 countries
and the benefits which have come out of such practices: all the benefits have gone to the
richest people of this world.

Turning back to India: as far as the latest statistics available by the World Bank
inform us about the poor in India, we have 390 million people who live with less than
two dollars a day. There are also thousands of farmers in India who, asphyxiated by debts,
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have decided to commit suicide because of modified seeds, chemical pesticides and other problems. In the state of Maharastra, there have been 4500 suicides recorded in 2004, which is five times more than the number available for 1999. Since 2002, on average, every thirty minute a farmer has committed suicide. In ten years, we had about 100’000 farmers who have committed suicide.

On the other side of the medal, and without talking about the Mittal-case (about whom we all know that he’s one of the richest billionaires of the world), we have a growing number of millionaires and billionaires in India like all over the world, and we have about one million Indian engineers who earn about 25’000 dollars annually. The number of millionaires and billionaires is steadily increasing in cities like Mumbai, Delhi, Bangalore, Kolkata and Chennai, as in international cities like New York, Tokyo and Paris.

These inequalities are not only immoral, but also dangerous, as my friend Hervé Kempf shows in his excellent book *How the rich are destroying the Earth* (2007). His argument is based on the hypothesis of a Swedish-American author called Thorstein Veblen who pretended in 1899 that the real motor of economic action wasn’t offer and demand, but ostentation. Each neighbour wants to get what his neighbour doesn’t have to show him afterwards with ostentation his own superiority. This creates illusionary needs and a general haste for an increasing collection of wealth. In this perspective, our daily life is a race after all the modes of consumption, and as soon as the basic needs (food, clothes and shelter) are fullfilled, we move into areas of amazing wealth and ostentation of it.

In fact, today the entire economic model is fashioned by the rich who are accumulating more and more wealth. In what kind of airplane I’m travelling, if I’m wearing a Rolex, if and where I have a yacht, if and where I have a country manor house, if and how I can get some more material wealth: these kind of questions illustrate Kempf’s ideas about economical ostentation and his conclusions about immoral amassing of wealth, about exploitation of the poors by the rich and about the growing destruction of our life sphere.

Can we therefore allow this whole generation of rich people to exploit us totally? They are not socially productive, they are not producing anything, they are just consuming, speculating and taking the whole wealth with them without any self-control. I’ll say just one thing: let us tax all of them! What we need today is a liberation and education of the richest people of the world. What we need is nothing less than cultural revolution by taxing them: that would bring them back to a Gandhian ambit of life in
which they should relearn how to share their lives and their wealth with the rest of the world. And we have already undertaken a such mission in Europe in preparation before the last elections in the European Parliament. We called it: “Sauvez les riches – Let’s save the rich!” which means: let’s offer them a new way of life, gandhian and non-violent, where they could share their wealth for not becoming anymore so obscenely rich as before. In fact, we are also working out a system by which we’ll postulate a maximum salary by determinating the maximal wealth which could be earned by the chairman of a big company. Keeping tabs of that, we’ll be pro-active: we’ll tax them and bring them back to a normal way of life.

I’m a member of the European Parliament, I’m young and I’m a joyful activist. I’ve a vision: I would like to organize joyful actions for putting a limit to the maximum earnings in Europe. As I know that this is a very difficult task, I’m glad that many friends are supporting me. Now some critical persons could say that if I reduce the salaries of the most rich Europeans, they’ll move immediately away to fiscal paradises. Yes, I would say: than we have to fight also against these infernal paradises! There are other issues where I would like to bring about changes, for instance, in the taxation of the multinationals: with the money coming out of these taxes, we could pay it back to the health sector, to the social housing sector and to other areas of social development. We need also to work on a transformation of the structures in the big companies so that the voice of each employee and of each worker could be heard in a proper way in view of a more just process of decision making. But at this moment, my most important target is the program: „Let’s tax the rich – Let’s save the rich!“
I would like to speak a little on the idea of human responsibility. In the last five days, I have heard the word ‘responsibility’ in almost every workshop. Assuming that all of us recognize the significance of responsibility along with human rights, I would like to elaborate on this responsibility perspective for a viable way forward.

Moving towards a non-violent economy, by moving away from the present overriding, inherently violent, hyper-masculine economy, is the means to realize our dream that a harmonious world is possible. We are aware of the long distance in the realization of this dream of ours. The dream is of a socially equitable, vibrant economy based the ethics of production, markets, investment and consumption—under the guidance of our first mother, mother earth. How and what are we doing now in order to reach our destination? How are we to sustain our non-violent path until we reach our goal?

We have seen the extraordinary crisis that faces us in every dimension of our life. In the name of development and progress, both exploitative markets and the state seem determined to destroy the fabric of our social, economic, cultural and ecological life—something that has never occurred before. Never before have human beings possessed so much knowledge and so much power to change their environment.

Yet despite all available knowledge and all the new possibilities, the responses to this crisis and the new challenges of the twenty-first century have been inefficient and ineffective. The pervasive power of international markets is still undermining the traditional role of states. The international economic institutions have failed to turn the rising tide of inequity and exploitation. The consumerist lifestyle promoted by market capitalism is endangering all aspects of human life and sustainability. This pattern we find in all the over-consuming classes of both the global north and global south. States have become abusers of human rights, instead of the protectors of them. Scientific and technical institutions and scientists, pursuing specialized interests, are less likely to confront the global issues which confront the survival of the human race. Institutions have not sufficiently fulfilled their role to provide responses to the emerging challenges faced by our society. Look at the destruction of the ecosystems. Look at the increased

16 Editor’s Note, see http://www.charter-human-responsibilities.net/spip.php?page=sommaire
discrimination based on caste, class, colour and gender. There is a moral responsibility for us to come together to face these challenges.

The key question is why are our responses ineffective. There is no simple answer and perhaps there are several answers. I think though, that we can identify a basic problem underlying the ineffective response and it is the emergence of a new ‘value’ system based on greed and selfishness which has replaced the universal ethical foundation on which people have learned to make meaningful choices for the self and the common good. The practice of the ethical and social values, such as the right to life and dignity, respect for all beings, respect for diversity, love, truthfulness, justice, equanimity, tolerance, compassionate sharing, solidarity, peace and harmony, preference for dialogue rather than confrontation and common interest above self-interest—all these values are gradually diminishing at all levels of our societies. Violence pervades our societies from bottom to top and influences directly and indirectly various forms of our cultures and entertainments. While more and more seem to be intoxicated by it, the great majority of prefer to practice the policy of the ostrich, having given up enquiring ‘whose fault is it’.

In the context of economics, ethics is what makes the economy humane, an enabling force and process that helps human beings and the environment flourish together. The world of ethics that the economy can perpetrate—greedy forces of dehumanization, commodification, exploitation, violence and war—is clearly evident in the neo-liberal economy that has divided men from their environment—and from women.

At the present juncture then, there is a need for a universal value that binds all human beings, belonging to all sections and classes of society, together—a value that can be applied consistently and universally to all human beings for addressing the current crisis sufficiently. A value from which action flows. I heard a delegate say, ‘human rights flows from the understanding of responsibility’. I certainly believe in that.

It took two world wars before nations joined to form the United Nations and then to sign two agreements that can be considered the two pillars of international life. One is the UN Charter for Peace and Development and the other is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They constitute the international reference points to which one can appeal. The irony is that of the two major human projects—human rights and the human attempt to reverse the natural flow of life by industrially converting every gift of nature into a commodity for human satisfaction—it is the latter that has made significant progress.
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Great humanists like Gandhi insisted that if each of us discharged our duties, then it would not be difficult for human rights to progress and succeed. Human life, nature and culture are most often in conflict with each other due to the existing scheme of things and traditional loyalties and backgrounds. Therefore the tendency to fight for our rights alone has become more common rather than to perform our responsibilities. The deeper understanding of responsibility as a key value is found in all indigenous wisdom which teaches us to be aware of the interconnection of all things in the universe. That is the reason that the human spirit always springs back from the worst situations.

It is on this bedrock of hope that James Robertson, a leading activist of the new economic movement (i.e., the *New Economics Foundation*) says that “twenty-first century economics will have to recognize that because human beings are moral beings, the basic pursuits of economic life are moral questions, such that economics would be system of rights and obligations. People have a capacity for moral responsibility and choice. They often act altruistically instead of mechanistically following the demands of the market and the state. In a world in which most of the ethical and humane values are being quickly discarded and lead to mindless violence, the notion of responsibility has to be re-emphasized, re-defined and re-contextualized with more clarity.”

Let me explain a little bit about responsibility. The basic meaning of responsibility is the capacity to respond adequately to the physical, psychological, social and spiritual requirements of life in general. This ‘response-ability’ is one of the core-most privileges of the human being in her or his interactions with the global environment, to the extent that when it is thoroughly assumed there is always a sense of the sacred about it. When we assume responsibility we always feel in harmony with justice and peace as well as the adulatory worldview that endures the interconnectedness of the mother and her children. Human responsibilities when put into action often imply taking risks and they may even sound revolutionary to conventionally accepted prejudices.

I say that rights and responsibilities are two sides of the same coin. Let us remember that freedom and responsibility are interdependent. Responsibility is a model quality that is a voluntary check on freedom. Freedom can never be exercised without limits. Although all people have an equal entitlement to human rights, their responsibilities are proportionate to possibilities open to them. In other words, the more freedom we enjoy, the greater the responsibility that we bear to others as well as to ourselves. The more talents we possess, the capabilities we are endowed with, the more areas we are in control of, the more responsibility we have to assume in accounting for our actions. In the future, our responsibility demands that we must act with great humility and caution. Political and religious leaders, scientists, corporate leaders and intellectuals
bear greater responsibility in terms of accountability, transparency, honest expressions of
truth, formulization and implementation of policies for the future of humankind and the
natural world. At the same time, the responsibility of the powerless is to unite together,
despite diverse backgrounds, to overcome voiceless conditions for collective action and
resistance.

A message of responsible solidarity and responsible compassion is crucial if we
expect economic, social and ecological justice to prevail. This should become the vital
texture behind the declaration of human rights. Unless the notion of human responsibility
is emphasized at all levels, including the highest levels where urgent issues must be given
a practical solution for the people who daily confront the worst forms of inequality and
injustice, there is little hope to enter a transformative process. Both women and men need
to develop a feminine side to enter this transformative process as a major characteristic of
feminine notion of responsibility goes toward the harmonious interaction of the
individual, collective and society at large. The feminine approach is always more
encompassing, always motivated by the hope for the transformation of society.

Gandhi was certainly a model of this responsibility in the largest sense of the
word. Whenever there was a situation that demanded courage and determination, he did it
with humility, wisdom and selflessness—with a little bit of authority also! With an
extraordinary conviction that truth cannot assert itself without the actual exercise of
responsibility, he enacted his responsibility by never deviating from his engagement with
non-violence.

It is high time to move away from the freedom of indifference to the freedom of
involvement, from the culture of silence to the culture of proactive action, from the
culture of violence to the culture of non-violence. The only way to do this is to realize that
only responsibility give flesh and bones to this ideal of freedom.

Returning to the issue of the non-violent economy, we can say that a responsible,
compassionate economy leads to a non-violent economy. Through economics, according
to Gandhi’s stance for justice and the dignity of all equally including the weakest and the
last, the local economy’s evolving social enterprise will empower democratic cooperation,
reciprocity, responsibility and compassionate competition. James Robertson calls these
dimension of the ‘SHE’ economy, that is, sane, humane and ecological, that is, as
opposed to the ‘HE’ economy, that is, hyper-expansionist.
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We have reached a stage in history where we need a further dimension to respond to current and future challenges through a framework of human responsibility and solidarity. In order to face the new challenges, the time has come to introduce the concept of human responsibility in addition to the concept of human rights. A Charter of Human Responsibility could be an additional reference point to reinforce the two existing agreements. I want suggest that a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities as an internationally recognized reference-point would be valuable for all of us who advocate for sustainable for a sustainable and non-violent society. Such a document could help to observe, question and reinforce obligations of the government and also as a parameter for one’s personal and social responsibilities and for civil societies as a guiding principle from which action flows. The guiding principles of the Charter of Human Responsibilities are an honest call for all of us to come together in solidarity, to overcome our feelings of powerlessness in the face of them major crisis of the future by transforming our pain and anger into compassionate confrontration for restoring the life of dignity and to take care of our mother earth. The charter is proposed as means for dialogue within the reach of everyone and as a reconsideration of essential meaning and place of responsibility in our society.

As a text the charter does not lay down rules, rather it proposes priorities and expresses commitments. The charter’s primary challenge is for us to be thoughtful and intentional in our responsibilities and practices.

Responsibility is a commitment. The challenge to assume responsibility remains at the crux of every contemporary issue and when there is such clear mandate for responsibility—as exemplified by Gandhi, then it is imperative to keep this flame burning.
The Citizen-Company and the Management of the Human Factor: Morocco at the Crossroads, A. Serouchni

The human factor is at the heart of all preoccupations, not to say that it is the sole factor able to secure the company a sustained growth:

“Should you treat a man as he is, he will remain as he is, but if you treated him as if he were what he could have been, he would become a better and greater man,” Goethe maintained.

For growth to be effective and real, and for Morocco to stay durably anchored at the forefront of international competition, it ought to win the battle concerning the quality of human relations. How so?

By giving men and women the means that will enable them to blossom, as it were, and from there to be get more motivated to always do better.

Is it not high time indeed to recreate opportunities of governance so that men and women be given again the means that will enable them to be themselves the creators of meaning, and to become actors?

Is it not high time to hold these adult men and women responsible for breaking away from the old-fashioned vision of the citizen-consumer who expects everything from up high?

At the heart of this inquiry about a new type of governance, there is first the question of the role and place of the company.

These different questions inspire four remarks:

First remark

For several years now, we have been witnessing the emergence of a number of concepts brought out by some people of thought and action: consensus – social pact, citizen company. . .

They seem to hit the target (to score a bull’s eye, as the expression goes)

But at what level?

It seems to us that this remains rather at the level of discourse than at the level of lived experience.
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We have the impression that these expressions are kept in the collective intellect, but remain distant from any real act of political consciousness; or any moral adherence to an ethically sound social project;

Also, we often have the impression that these ideas are recovered by the political sphere without being properly assimilated, or integrated within a clearly presented social project. This often stems from the fact that the existing leadership is often one of position, not ideas. Therefore, once an idea comes up on the surface, the ‘position’ politics grabs it only to misrepresent it. I have the same impression regarding how often the concept of a citizen-company is often dealt with. Obviously, the fact that this concept should enter the collective intellect is already a step forward. In all circumstances, sooner or later, what is presently thought of at the level of discourse will eventually emerge at the level of lived experience. The fact is that this will not happen very soon; some time will be needed in this direction.

Second remark

Independently from political exploitation, so to speak, we remain as a society not versatile enough, and quite approximate when it comes to certain ideas. We are capable of changing positions in a radical fashion, without even taking our time to understand the depths of anything. Yesterday, it was the nation-state; we were more State-oriented that the rest of the world, without seeking to freely have our situation under control; Today, the wind is blowing in the direction of liberalism; we have become more extremists than the extremists themselves. The best illustration herein is that of education; Obviously, there are dominant modes of thought and action, but the fact is that we don’t take enough time for reflection, and for the control of our destiny;

The same problem arises, it seems to me, in connection with the idea of citizen-company; There was a time when we would lay out, and in a positive manner so, the offensive, warlike, and playful at times, even unscrupulous, character of the company leader: it was somewhat of a Machiavellian vision of things; Today, some people have started lifting the company to an angel-like position through the idea of citizenship; In fact, I believe that the truth lies somewhere between the Machiavellian spirit and pure morals, and between the company and the social project.

Third remark:

In what way could a company be considered to be akin to a citizen, and for what purpose? In fact, everybody seems to tie the idea of citizenship with the moral and ethical dimension underpinning human relations; Indeed, the company is forcibly somewhat
selfish and aggressive, a fact which does not clearly always come from religious morals; Anyway, what we understand from now on by citizen-company is the fact of somewhere reconciling the less scrupulous side of the company with certain moral and ethical norms; In other words, ours is an attempt to detach the company from its business-minded image, in order to set it going along a more ethical path;

The question that arises therefore is the following:

Should we take this new orientation simply within a moral objective, or do we have to consider ethics as a new function of the company? In fact, the two reasons are to be retained here: The moral as well as religious revivals push in this same direction: the synthesis between materialism and spirituality; There are obviously some other considerations of a managerial nature, too: In the latter case, how can one link what is ethical with productivity, competitiveness, as well as to the well-being of all the human components of the company? As it is highlighted in the Preamble of the Charter on the citizen-company by CGEM\textsuperscript{17}, two series of explanatory factors are rightly set forth:

Two factors pertaining to the principles of general management:

The company becomes then more competitive under circumstances of fiscal transparency, fair competition, respect for social well-fare, total quality management, the protection of the environment, and such like. Obviously, these factors of quality will certainly contribute towards securing a better future, as well as quieting down the socio-economic climate in general.

A factor of human management:

The company later becomes more competitive if it motivates the principally concerned ones; namely, its own human resources. We come then to a crucial question. A determining one indeed, it is the human being, in addition to structures, who makes up an organisation therefore, he will be more involved if he is directly motivated, and will equally, though indirectly, be involved at the level of social projects. Moreover, beyond the idea of motivation, which is an essential factor of competitiveness, one can make reference to the following philosophical debate:

The company is the centre of an individual’s blossoming, through works and through esteem.

\textsuperscript{17} Editor’s Note. CGEM is the Federation of Moroccan Companies.
Many people speak about the citizen-company. I would prefer to speak about citizen-organisations.

- This idea of citizenship covers in fact three inter-related dimensions:
  
  An entrepreneurial dimension
  
  A national dimension
  
  An international dimension

At the national plane, the State, political parties, trade unions, as well as associations are all equally organisations:

Therefore, the moral sense implies the rights and obligations of a person;

And equally subsumes liberty and democracy

The last factors are themselves levers for general development, as well as a source of social trust and quiet.

The sense of ethics also implies the moralisation, so to say, of affairs, in addition to the development of a spirit of solidarity, which is an important factor of peace and economic prosperity.

General Conclusion

Today, it is quite normal that a company should be attuned to its environment, and should raise questions regarding its external responsibilities in connexion with its direct activity.

Hence the fashion effect: by privileging image over content or, worse still, over true permeation, a number of companies have had awful times venturing into operations that have no future, notably at the humanitarian plane, for they were rather into marketing, not into solidarity. A caution or an alibi, these actions have rarely been convincing, and above all have not resisted to announcing bad results of exploitation, in addition to being able of no more than digging the gap with internal social policy, which is incoherent in relation to its objectives. Oftentimes, the salaried and the syndicates deemed these expenditures to be lavish, even superfluous, especially when redundancies take place simultaneously.

To speak of citizenship distinguishes two registers of action:

To aim at reaching a minimal level that covers all the domains affecting the citizenship of
the company. The first characteristic of a citizen-company is that it is not capable of any anti-citizen behaviour. Thus, even if it should praise the efforts of a company to reduce the greenhouse effect gases, the public will not be willing to forgive the company the fact that it should hire its children in its factories.

To set more ambitious objectives in certain domains; to eliminate the risks of blunders does not suffice for a company to label itself a “citizen-company”. It has to show greater evidence of a true commitment. This is why it is imperative that some domains of excellence be selected, in accordance with three principal criteria: The stake has to be real important, the company ought to be susceptible of having a real impact, and the action has to be coherent with its long-term interests; or else it would be a lot less credible.
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When Business relies on Humanism and Peace Values, Christine Marsan

Context:

To speak of a non-violent economy means naturally speaking about that violence which can take many different forms, as we have already seen in the presentations of this congress. That is to say, the violence against earth, against peasants and against all kind of natural resources. What I want to focus on today is the fact that the completely deregulated economy hurts also those who work in it.

Everyone knows that businesses can shape or destroy the world: that’s why I’m especially interested in those who are creating them because they also belong to civil society; they are concerned by the big economical and environmental questions and they are asking themselves how to reconcile these paradoxes. Working with a business means having an internal and external effect on them. The more a conscience will develop within the business, the less there will be damage caused by it outside. I’m not dreaming and it’s not an utopian idea, but I try to act together with people in business in order to bring about the change we need.

At the same time, it must be recognized that the acts of violence within businesses are increasing: we passed have from stress to harassment, and now we are passing to suicide. This is happening not only to peasants, but also to engineers. Why? For different and often complicated reasons, but what seems important to me is the fact that the suffering of many people comes from the daily negotiation with some basic paradoxes: taking part in a society of wild consumption, cooperating in groups with activities which are in contradiction with the values and the commitments of the enterprise, losing the meaning of daily work or not being able to talk with one’s own children and so on.

If, on one hand, these stresses bring some people to the limit of their capacities, it is also true that there are a number of business trying to reconcile business values with humanist values.

Recalling my presentation of 2008:

In 2008, at the time of the first convention organised by Gandhi 2008, on the occasion of the anniversary of Gandhi’s death, I gave a lecture with the title 'Peace and Business'. In it, I presented different reasons why businesses should prefer values of peace in order
to reconcile profitability with a respect for the human being. In fact, most business organisations are operating on the pattern of economic competition and therefore on the basis of warlike values (competition, power struggle, domination). Yet the values of peace make cooperation easier, encourage creativity and innovation through emulation. They are also essential for taking up the challenges of globalization, as regards climate, environment, energy, resources or social issues. Deciding to base their activity on the values of peace means that a business will integrate itself into the non-violent economy and reinstate the human being at the center of all decisions and working on the basis of human values.

In this way, an business can develop a cooperative management and invent modalities of collective decision-taking which will have a better outcome, a stronger concept of strategy and a more extensive integration of the entire team. This can reduce significantly the occasions of conflict and help to develop social dialogue.

In the presentation of 2008, I outlined the principles of how to reconcile peace and business values. Since then, there have been some concrete changes. First, the conscience of an imminent change and the need to change economical strategies has become more urgent because the crash of 2008 illustrated clearly how delicate the liberal economic system, based on debts, really is. Second, the ecological mobilization has contributed to increase the level of the global conscience about the need for changing those daily practices through which we are destroying our planet. Third, in the occidental and European societies, the rising of stress and more generally of different forms of violence has forced enterprises, governments and private institutions to examine several reasons for these phenomena and in particular the disturbing effects in organisational patterns like certain forms of governance and styles of management.

**What’s new since 2008?**

**My personal actions** include the publication of several books explaining why the world is changing, what is the major turning point in the evolution of our society, which ways we have for analysing our disfunctions (acts of violence, psycho-social risks, management of crisis and conflicts), and how to find practical and concrete answers for changing the behaviour in the enterprises more easily:
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- **Gérer et surmonter les conflits.** 2ème édition, Dunod, 2010. Analysing, understanding, managing and anticipating the different kinds of conflicts in enterprises and presenting pragmatic answers for interpersonal problems as for conflicts in groups and organisations. Managing conflictive situations caused by change.

- **Communication d’influence. Décoder les manipulations et délivrer un message éthique dans une société en mutation.** Editions CFPJ, 2009. Decoding manipulations, identifying techniques of influence in order to establish an ethical and lasting communication. Analysis of social change, examining the reasons why our society can take up the challenges of globalisation and complexity only by choosing peace values (cooperation, solidarity): that kind of communication is based on authenticity and ethical behaviour.

- **Réussir le changement. Comment sortir des blocages individuels et collectifs.** Editions De Boeck, 2008. Understanding the internal structure of change and resistance in order to find out how to transform persons and organisations in the respect of sense, ethics and the natural rhythm of human beings.

The aim of these works is to show several axes:

1. analysing and understanding the reasons for our changing world
2. demonstrating the consequences on persons and organisations
3. giving pragmatic answers on the individual and collective level for managing conflicts and crisis, for calming social relations and for starting significant changes of human behaviour.

**My aims:**

To sensitize businesses on the need for change by showing them how to attain it and by placing emphasis on peace values and also on the transformations needed for accepting the challenges of economical globalisation and its human and climatic consequences. Here, I’ve just space for demonstrating the coherence of the observations and the corrective actions I’ve proposed.
Cooperative actions:

Belonging to some networks, I try together with my partners to identify businesses which function on the basis of peace values, giving to humanism the same importance as to profitability. We are collecting accounts of actions, concrete initiatives of enterprises, institutions or associations which succeed in reconciling sustainable economical success with the respect of the men and women working in the enterprise. Our aim is to make these real and concrete initiatives more visible in order to exert a significant influence on other small and big enterprises.

There is indeed talk of allowing the skeptical and hesitant businesses to initiate a major change, by creating contacts with similar organisations with which they can identify themselves and thereby learning from them resources, ideas and means for their own transformation. In light of this, we can mention here some accounts of different businesses that have developed a vision that could qualify as non-violent, businesses that put peace and human values in the center of their work and are reconciling the seeming paradoxes between profitability and respect of persons and environment.

Some testimony:

Guillaume Wehrlin, president of Entreprises Humaines:

M. Wehrlin is a member of this association from the beginning. He is the president and he restarts its dynamic evolution in particular by increasing partnerships and by creating new opportunities to exchange experiences. As director of the Tetra subsidiary in France, he’s running an enterprise of average size while depending on an international group and therefore on international directors and shareholders. Here is how he summarizes the qualities of a modern humanist manager. First the skills which have always been necessary to business success:

- Being visionary and understanding the market in order to put the business in the right position facing competition and to allow it to discover the customers’ „needs/wishes“.
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- Having communication skills that allow you to convey a message and to increase the worker’s involvement by sharing a common vision.

- Being really available to listen patiently to the employees when they have professional or personal problems so as to find a satisfactory solution. That’s implying a real capacity to adapt yourself both to persons as well as to permanent changes which allows the enterprise to be viable, durable, to reinforce its market position and to recover in case of a crisis.

Then the skills which apply to the more specific values of a humanist manager:

- Facing the pressure from shareholders, he goes on with change which makes sense, he asserts his convictions. He applies his values and knows how to defend them, resisting to pressures and manipulations.

- He demonstrates that a business that respects and considers its employees can increase significantly their well-being and by implication create a broader ability for change and flexibility. Because when workers and executives are cooperating in decision taking, they are obviously less resistant to the demands of the management.

- A humanist manager is somebody whose characteristics are courage and determination. He has also the internal force to know how many risks he can take and he feels responsible for his commitments.

Here are some concrete examples of companies run by humanist values:

**Actes Sud: An Activist Publisher:**

"Literature is threatened by commercialisation and by the massive proposition of always the same." (Hubert Nyssen). Since its creation in 1978, Actes Sud takes its position, literally and figuratively, as a different publisher: a place of unusual work, far away from the capital and from his monopoly of a certain intelligentsia. It makes an editorial choice directed towards the discovery of foreign works and a fierce will to remain independent. In 2003, an intervention in favour of independent booksellers led Actes Sud towards going to the European authorities in Brussels and protesting against the proposed merger of Hachette and Editis. As well, Actes Sud is involving itself in supporting the creation of independent libraries by sharing the effort of involvement always in a spirit of maintaining creation, publishing and distribution and favouring a
plurality of new publications instead of feeding the standardisation and immediate profitability. Finally „Actes Sud“ decided to associate themselves with small publishing firms out of concern for an editorial and intellectual widening, increasing of competences and egalitarian cooperation in order to defend a network of enterprises based on the same values. The integration of "Papiers", "Sindbad“ "Solin", of the "Rouergue", of Jacqueline Chambon, "Errance", "Photopoche“" Thierry Magnier and L‘Imprimerie Nationale, happened in a spirit of association, because that was the only possibility, by putting together all these energies, to make good progress.

Botanic Associated:

"Our commitment outside the enterprise can’t be separated from our strategy of sustainable development. We are supporting a certain number of associations, always in connection with our activity, in a sponsorship-logic (La bastide du parfumeur, the Champ des Cimes, the Jardins de Cocagne, the Rose Marie-Claire, Jardins pour tous...), but we are developing above all privileged partnerships with associations linked with different stakes of sustainable development which are concerning us (Terre vivante, the MDRGF, Tropical Forest trust...), and also locally with associations linked with ecological gardening („L’Ariena“ in Alsace). These partnerships allow us to reach top performances and to learn the point of view of the civil society about specific and sometimes quite complex problems (as for instance tropical wood, pesticides, working conditions on the transport...), and on our side, we can highlight these associations in our advertising mediums, supporting them financially or helping them in their development. Working in partnership with our external stakeholders is very instructive and comes within the scope of the spirit of lasting development."

Cari: 10 minute-meetings on building-sites:

"In our area of activities (Entreprise de BTP), the wage-earners come practically never to the head office. So we have started moving regularly to the field, going to the building-sites, meeting the teams and giving them all the informations in the matter of Human Resources: what’s going on, what’s being installed...The meetings often last much more than 10 minutes, because it’s also an opportunity to answer many questions concerning the management and the general health of the enterprise. It allows us to explain the changes against which, indeed, there are always some resistance. It’s a long and
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sometimes frustrating process because we don’t immediately appreciate all the positive
effects and because we are exposed to some dissatisfaction. But it’s a favorable moment
for forestalling future conflicts which always have hidden motives, often linked with
power."

**AB smelting works: teams solidarity:**

"After a crisis in our activity, the whole team took the decision to accept the proposal for
working less and like this reducing the salaries until 18% less for avoiding any dismissal.
In spite of the difficulties that reduction could cause to salaries near the minimum wage,
the collaborators have maintained their decision and I’ve myself reduced my salary from
3000 to 2500 euros. A common solidarity, confidence and sincerity have incited us to
accept that measure."

**Vellière Printery: monthly meetings:**

"We started a monthly meeting for allowing the wage-earners to get a vision of the future
of the enterprise. Respecting the monthly rhytm of the meetings is an important
cooperating-motive for all of us. It’s not always easy for each wage-earner to express his
ideas in front of the whole public during these meetings, but the temporal regularity helps
everybody to speak and to cooperate. The exchanges are always instructives and the first
operational result of these meetings has been the realisation of a form for a quality
control. Indeed, during our discussions, we noticed that nobody liked to do the work
again. Therefore we worked out a technical form which allows, at each part of the
creative process, to validate what’s done. That’s a big progress and we can decrease
considerably our errors. So we can win time energy and money, and what is more, there is
a real general satisfaction."

**A large bakery in Paris:**

Patrick Chassagne, a former private banker, bought the Big bakery of Paris where
about 50 persons are working. When he took over the business, he discovered 'deformed'
workers who had known the effects of the management done by a incompetent boss. They
had known two bankruptcies after which all confidence was lost, among the wage-earners
and among the executives. In the beginning, everybody came testing him by bringing him
cash money to see what he would do with it: but he always answered them stoically that
the whole money would be deposited in the bank leaving really a mark they could check in the accounts. This experience was repeated several times by many employees in order to test the reliability.

So the priority was to reconstruct confidence. Patrick endeavoured to demonstrate the conditions of gaining confidence.

1. Explaining clearly the vision and sharing it: "We want to be the leaders of the premium bread for collective catering in the Ile de France".

2. Then, there is talk of constructing together the way: Which choice to make? Which means are best for reaching our aims?

3. Identifying the means for reaching the aims.

4. Showing his confidence in the use of these means and punishing those who are misusing the system, eventually going until a dismissal if the person doesn't succeed in changing behaviour (especially in case of acknowledged stealing).

5. Reconstructing a new ethical culture: "When you have a good vision and you are doing hard work, you are allowed to succeed."

6. Rewarding the workers for progress and success: when the finances are good, there will be financial benefits for the wage-earners based on the success, which means convincing the shareholders of the importance to give back a part of the profits to those who contributed to the shareholder’s existence.

7. Encouraging the joy of success.

8. Reconciling personal wisdom and management: "fair thinking, fair words, fair actions." So the model character is demonstrated and confidence restored. The human beings are respected, wholesome rules are drawn up (justice and equity) and profitability is regained.

The example of a subsidiary of an international company: TNT Belgium:

Human management is possible even in a big international company. TNT is shipping parcels all around the world, and it is the world’s third important enterprise of mail-service. The manager of the Belgian center accepts the challenge of an ethical
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management and of respecting his teams while maintaining the wild working rhytm (a condition for maintaining competitiveness and profitability).

The wage-earners are essentially packers, their work is very repetitive. The activity-peak takes place in the night and the parcels have to be sent as fast as possible while respecting a very high quality-level. Consequently automatisation is the key to the profitability of this activity. Jean-Paul Scardin, director of TNT Belgium, favours the quality of human relations because he considers the importance of the well-being as function of the quality of service and work. For reaching this aim, there are different actions he has undertaken:

- Creation of a 'well-being cell' among human resources by developing prevention, especially against psycho-social risks and more generally against all kind of violence.

Moreover the whole team is aiming to increase the well-being conditions of the wage-earners.

- Installation of a quality-cell for optimizing security and material and human quality; risk-management, increase of the consciousness of the employees for maintaining themselves in good health and for preventing accidents.

- Taking into consideration the demands for improving communication: nomination of a responsible person for the heads of the sections of parcel-distribution who has a profile of a technical expert like that of a trainer in management-techniques and in personal development. He is regularly training the employees working in the warehouse in all kind of techniques of self-knowledge, communication, management as well as in the technical and structural aspects of their work.

- The canteen of the enterprise has been renewed and it offers a healthy and well-balanced alimentation for everybody in order to answer to the energetic and nutritional needs of the employees while reducing the excesses of fat and sugar.

- Regular cleaning of the hub so that every work station is clean, which satisfies quality demands and creates good and highlighting work conditions.

- Access to executive jobs only depends on personal merit and competences.

- The circulation of information: the head of the supervisory staff is supposed to make a daily walk through the hub and the director makes regular visits for meeting everybody and appreciating on the spot the real work done by every team.

- Search for coherence in actions and for transparency in communication in order to optimize the transparency of the head office and the management. Installation of a
system where information is given every week by each external team and where the head office is supposed to give an answer in a period of maximum one week.

What remains to be done in this branch is to find a solution for minimizing the turn-over of the managerial employees who are working day by day and often at night and on the weekend, and this with flexible working hours which make personal life very difficult.

There are hundreds of smaller and larger enterprises concerned about life-quality in the working-place. Certain executive managers try to give more meaning to their job by starting cooperative programs for gathering together their teams around lasting initiatives (internal and external ones) so that the social and environmental values of their wage-earners can express themselves through the enterprise which tries to reduce contradictions. In order that society can change and reach another economic pattern, it is very important to lean on those who are already on the way, realizing concrete projects for reconciling values, meaning, human beings and respect of life. Indeed, not all of them are working perfectly and nothing is irreversible, but I wanted, in this talk, to honour all those who are contributing to a transformation of human work.

In conclusion:

We can consider developing peaceful attitudes only if we give as much credit to others as to ourselves. Therefore, there aren’t ‘nasty’ bosses and ‘kind’ wage-earners; if we fall into the trap of prejudices and a prioris, then we are ourselves developing violence against the others. We can reach a peaceful or non-violent attitude already by not considering the others as enemies. For me, the main thing is to avoid judging and making guilty at all costs businesses and managers, because how can you open a social dialogue if the introduction is already full of conflicts? How can I attain an agreement if I’m scorning or rejecting my adversary? When I will never meet him, I can’t start to solve our conflict.

Because a person who is criticized will resist at all costs to have contact with his adversary, he doesn’t get to know him and is judging him as a different person. Human faults and qualities aren’t the prerogative of status and social class. When we succeed in welcoming a quite different person with kindness and correct treatment, then we open new possibilities of discovering how much wage-earners, managers, executive employees and directors are based, to a great extent, in the same values and how much they are conflicted by the contradictions between an excessively liberal economy and values of
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peace and humanism. Let’s look for opportunities to meet and exchange viewpoints, resources and solutions, and let’s consider all we can think about and construct a new enterprise-culture together.

Finally, let us remember Gandhi’s sentence: “We are the change that we wish to the world.” So it’s only with that internal and external coherence that we can get a real change. If we create conditions of confidence, consciousness and means of change, the latter will be possible and not remain an utopian idea.
Gross National Happiness, presentation from Bhutan

We live in a world today in which the purpose of life is to become rich – in which the role of the governments is to lead their countries to greater material prosperity. We therefore, unquestioningly accept the notion that GDP provides the truth about how well a country and its people are doing. It is indeed fascinating how the indicator GDP/GNP has shaped our way of life. However, this has clearly let the growth of circle of people in the world who see flaws in our materialist way of life and how it is structured, by design, to trap ourselves in an unending circle of desire, struggle for self gratification and self destruction.

Propelled by this yardstick, the world has changed and continues to change. Most of us have become richer economically and continue to aspire for more. It is thus, only natural and reasonable to assume that rich and develop countries should be in position to share with the lesser developed countries their knowledge and insight into the true nature of material success.

How much more happiness has wealth brought to the affluent, industrialized societies? Are they confident of continued growth, stability and sustained prosperity? Is there truth in the belief that to be wealthy is to be happy?

Such questions might compel honest introspection and may lead to the conclusion that supposed means to happiness have been mistaken for end itself. And having lost sight of happiness, we have committed ourselves to life of misguided labour in service of mindless growth. This journey without destination has set human society on a perilous path.

Under the dictum of GDP, the primary function in life is to be productive and to have increasing income in order to be able to spend more and consume more. With such aspirations, the nobler values of civilized society are being displaced by baser instincts that are within all of us. Relationships that form the very core and basis of society are collapsing and with it the dream of an enlightened society within which happiness is to be found. It’s ironic that the tapestry of our prosperous society, woven painstakingly over thousands of years, is shedding its colour and thread.

While billions live in hunger, inadequate shelter, disease and despair, millions more are getting wealthier. These gluttonous and comfort seeking section of society has become vulnerable to host of diseases. Their social circle and life is driven by better
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living and more wealth at the cost of being desolate and untouchable. We are confronted
with the paradox of prolonged winter of indignities and loneliness on the fringes of
society.

In our obsession with growth we are over-producing everything at the cost of the
over-utilization of natural resources. Like mindless creatures, we crave for and acquire far
beyond our basic needs. Thus, it results in the mountains of hazardous waste,
environmental pollution and rapid depletion of finite resources and loss of biodiversity.
These environmental degradations have given rise to conflicts within and among nations
for scarce resources which threaten to grow in scale and in number. In my country, the
rapid withdrawal of the Himalayan glaciers that feed many rivers is vivid sign of climate
change. The consequences of global warming at the current rate will bring irreparable
destruction to Himalayan Kingdom of Bhutan, Nepal, Indian Subcontinent, China and
Mekong Delta region. What if the great Ganges were to stop flowing just as many other
rivers around the world might? What then is our collective future? How can mankind
survive in a world without natural resources and environment that is poisonous and
inhospitable?

What will our legacy be for future generations? What kind of society and
environment will bequeath to posterity? Are there options?

Just as dark future will be of our making, it is within the genius of mankind to
make it bright and hopeful. What we need is wisdom. We need courage to face the truth
that our way of life is not sustainable and that it does not make us happier. The change
must, of necessity, be a fundamental departure from all that we have strived for and come
to live for. It will require social, economic, politic and cultural reorientation in order to
successfully provide an alternative to today’s development paradigm.

GNH: Is it an option for Change?

It is founded on the conviction of our philosopher King that the purpose of
development is happiness. GNH is a philosophical contribution to the global discourse on
development that promotes collective happiness as its ultimate value. It stresses that
legitimacy of a government must be depend on the belief that the realization of happiness
lies in the judicious balance between pursuing material and spiritual needs of the body,
GNH offers a holistic paradigm within which the mind receives equal attention. It is
important to note that GNH does not discard GDP completely. It considers it important to
measure the sum total of goods and services produced and consumed in a country. At the
same time, it assigns GDP to its rightful place as an indicator whose importance is to be
considered alongside several other indicators that comprise an evaluation of collective happiness.

GNH places a strong priority on the collective interest of the people. It is based not only on the obvious reality that the duty of the state to its citizens is through the collective but also on the fact that an individual’s interest is best protected and fulfilled through the means of society. This is somewhat antithetical to the norms of western society in which the individual interests are held sacrosanct often above that of the collective.

How then is the philosophy applied on the ground in Bhutan?

The responsibility of the state is two fold:

The first is to promote conscious pursuit and internalization of happiness by the people rather than allow the goal to remain in the deep recesses of the subconscious mind. (it must be realized that the two seemingly opposing interests of the body and mind will mutually strengthen and regulate each other to create a harmonious equilibrium of the physical and mental states giving rise to contentment and happiness).

The second is to create and maintain enabling conditions for the attainments and enjoyment of happiness. To this end, public policy and programmes must be directed to address the collective happiness of the people.

The Royal Government has adopted a four pronged strategy to fulfill its GNH responsibilities. These are popularly referred to as the four pillars of GNH and comprise the following:

Sustainable and equitable socio-economic development:

This pillar represents mainly these aspects of development that fall in the realm of the material which include both the real and imagined needs of the body in the broadest sense. It includes all the conventional development functions and responsibilities of the state such as health, education agriculture and economic activities. The establishment and delivery of these services and opportunities are to be guided and regulated by the two conditions of sustainability and equity.
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The first condition of sustainability prescribes that human development must be pursued as a process that benefits not only the present population but all future generations for all time. It is the moral responsibility of each generation to ensure that its comforts do not come at the cost of lesser opportunities and resources for the next generation. This consideration questions the nature and purpose of economic growth and support research findings which dispel the fallacious belief that having more after meeting basic needs results in more happiness. It urges moderation of consumption on basis of real need and cautions against the cancerous nature of mindless and limitless economic growth that is simply not sustainable.

The second condition of equity is followed just as seriously in Bhutan. Despite the forbidding features of our geography and the scattered nature of our population distribution and hence, the extremely high cost of socio economic service delivery, the benefits of development must be equity in a quantitative sense but also in terms of quality. As such while even the most difficult districts are accessible by motor roads, the quality of basic education, health, drinking water supply, agriculture support etc are no lesser in the remotest part of the country than that in the capital city.

Even though equity in Bhutan has to do with sharing the little we have, we are not unaware of the far less fortunate fellow beings elsewhere in the world. In the regard, we are in agreement with the view that material suffering in the world is not because of scarcity of food, shelter, clothing and medicine but because of lack of moral persuasion for equity and the will to share through an equitable distribution arrangement. In a globalizing world, there can be no separate compartment for rich and poor. Display creates feelings of deprivation and inequity and these in turn are the root causes of conflict, crime and social degeneration.

Cultural preservation and promotion:

In its widest sense, pillar holds up the spiritual needs of the individual and society. Seeing culture as a set of instruments that define our values, shape our identity and expressions and guide our behavior, relationships and practices- all the purpose of true human advancement – it is recognized that there are aspects of it which are timeless in their relevance and those that must yield to innovation. It is culture within which our psychological and emotional needs are addressed and the moral and ethical framework for our thoughts and corrosive effect of consumerist ethics as economic transactions supersede and transform moral values and social relations.
We in Bhutan have been fortunate to have begun our development process late and at a time when cultural revival was receiving some interest in the world. Going beyond the narrow bounds of religion, the purpose of pillar is to strengthen the time honored tradition and practices that promotes and sustain basic human values. These include the institutions of family and community, the spirit of voluntarism, tolerance and cooperation, the virtues of compassion, altruism, honour and dignity.

A unique practice that the government encourages and promotes in all state sponsored institutions and organization is ‘Drig lam Namzha’ which loosely translates as conscious practice of harmonious living. Striving against the social trends of family disintegration or nuclearization; the challenge of single parenting, and the shame of pushing out the old to fringes of society, we are determined to save revive and nourish the traditions and practices that bond families and keep communities resilient and thriving. By preserving local, regional and national festivals, the government seeks to provide a forum for maintaining social networks and promoting the conviviality of public culture.

Environment conservation:

The third pillar represents the dynamic space in which we live. It is within the natural environment that the mind and body receive nourishment to grow our way of life should thus be conditioned by nature it self, we have shown little respect for the laws of nature.

In essence, we ourselves are embodied of nature for without the four elements we have no form. The element within us draws their strength and vitality from those in the environment. When we pollute the environment and diminish the vitality of nature, we weaken ourselves and become frail of body and mind. Ancient spiritual masters understood this and the tradition of meditating in the serenity and remoteness of mountains and cave to do with nature’s positive energies that vitalize the element within us. The reward is in the clarity of mind and comfort of body for the realization of wisdom which is key to happiness.

For Bhutan, the health of environment is an everyday concern. The awe inspiring majesty of our mountains, the sublime beauty of our glacier fed lakes and torrential rivers that flow through valleys and narrow gorges command our respect and humility. Bhutan is blessed with an amazing range of bio diversity within its small territory. At the same time, we are extremely mindful of the fragility and vulnerability of our environment. Being located in the folds of high Himalayas, our geology itself is unstable compelling
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caution whenever any action that could alter physical environment is to be taken. These
include road construction, irrigation channels, and land conversion for agriculture or
urban development.

Unless right technology and measures and employed, nature reacts with wrathful
vengeance while being bountiful otherwise. For these reasons, the king established
stringent conservation policies long before environment advocacy became fashionable.
While hydropower generation in Bhutan actually promotes conservation and has become
our biggest foreign exchange earner, exploitation of our forest resources are carried out
with extreme care. Likewise, many mineral based industries have been prevented from
being established because of possible pollution dangers. As a result, Bhutan is among the
few countries where green cover is expanding against demographic growth and increasing
human activity.

Good governance:

The role of this pillar is pivotal. It is good governance that must ensure the
strength and capacity of the other three pillars and in turn be strengthen it self to hold up
the architecture of happiness

The success with which one pursues and finds happiness has much to do with the
political, social, security and other conditions that prevail. These are the functions of
political leaders which will be best served when citizens are responsible in exercising the
power of the vote to bring honest, competent and trustworthy leaders to public office.
The politicians must in turn deliver on promises made and expectation raised. Good
governance has to do with ensuring justice, equity and the prevalence of rule of law in a
peaceful and secure environment. For a small developing country, the ability of
government to maintain friendly relations and promote development cooperation is
particularly important.

The erection of this pillar has received the highest priority of His Majesty the King
since the time of His Coronation in 1974. Deeply convinced that the fate of Bhutan must
not depend on the accident of birth or providence, He has worked methodically against
popular will to transfer the absolute powers of the ruler to the people. In so doing, he
stands as a rare leader who has worked hard to distance and separate himself from the
centre and source of power.

Happiness Index:
In a world where quantity and measurements govern all aspects of life, an indeed decision making, there are many who argue that anything that cannot be measured is worthless. Further, where tax money is involved, politicians need to be able to explain what their voters have got or will receive for tax expenditures on happiness programmes. In fact, it is obvious that happiness was never taken seriously by academics, economists, and politicians because it did not yield to convenient measurement. Therefore, there is the danger that unless a set of indices are developed, GNH may be forgotten at the expense of human well being.

There is another argument. It is said that much has gone wrong with society, because it was after the wrong quantity. It is largely understand that while there are known and unknown conditions that cause happiness, the most of even those known, are not reliably quantifiable. There is the worry that any attempt to quantify a subjective or qualitative value concerning state of mind could be more misleading and therefore, potentially more dangerous than GDP. The opposition is also based on the stand that development and use of any kind of happiness index is nothing less than a futile attempt to reduce the sublime value to a competitive good.

In deference to the metric minded people, the Royal Government of Bhutan has now commissioned a research institute which developed GNH indicators and has already done a national survey. The several indicators have already been developed by GPI Atlantic of Nova Scotia in Canada to measure elements that effect quality of life. But an aggregate indicator for happiness has never been attempted. The indicators developed and used are:

- Living standard
- Population health
- Education
- Cultural vitality
- Time use and balance
- Emotional well being
- Community vitality
- Eco-system vitality and resilience
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Good governance

Together, these will form the Bhutan Development index. It will become the principle basis in planning, monitoring and evaluation processes.

Conclusion

GNH is a balanced and holistic approach to development. It is based on the conviction that man is bound by nature to search for happiness, that it is the single most desire of every citizen. The only difference between and others is that we do not dismiss it as a utopian quest.

Every nation that pursues GNH would be peace loving democracy, harmonious and united in noble ideals and guided by high principles. Its people would be trusting and trustworthy. They would be understanding and believe in dialogue and conciliation as the way to resolve problems. They would be tolerant and subscribe to the principles of coexistence, cooperation and good neighbourly relations. Such a country would not look for justifications to spend precious resources on weapons. It would neither face terrorism nor instability and would believe in the virtue of multilateralism. It would be mindful of and feel responsible for the well being of generation unborn. A GNH guided country would place the happiness of its people as the highest national priority.
Despite the appearance of the field generally known as “applied anthropology”, one of the least exploited resources for development studies, especially in its alternative or more radical forms, has been economic anthropology. Given that much of conventional development studies is fixated on economics this is odd, as economic anthropology is the empirical and theoretical study of actually existing alternative economic systems. Economic anthropology is neither science fiction nor utopianism; it does not purport to describe or create new forms of communal or intentional communities. It actually describes through ethnography and analyses through anthropological theory, real forms of economic practice and their relationship to their environment as well as the forms of social and cultural organization that are congruent with these modes of economic organization. As such economic anthropology is potentially a uniquely valuable resource not only for development practitioners seeking culturally viable ways of insinuating development policies, but perhaps even more importantly for those seeking alternatives to current forms of globalized capitalism, more ecologically responsible modes of being in the world and for forms of sociality that overcome the fragmentation and alienation of so much contemporary life. The whole question of alternative lifestyles would indeed be greatly enriched by dialogue with economic anthropology, while at a theoretical level the sub-discipline might well provide powerful tools for the critique of conventional neo-classical economic thought.

The starting point of this argument is that of the provisionality of neo-classical economic thought. Here I am referring not so much to theoretical critiques of conventional economic thought (by Marxists for example), as to its cultural provisionality. By this I mean, following Marshall Sahlins’ lead in his celebrated Sidney Mintz lecture (Sahlins 1996), that rather than describing a universally true set of processes and relationships, neo-classical economics is in fact an ideology and as such a key element in the cosmology of in particular the West and of capitalist societies in general. As such, it is a cornerstone of local conceptions of identity, value, progress and the nature of politics within that particular historically conditioned culture, which, for contingent reasons (colonialism, the spread of its technology and conceptions of science, and its ability to concentrate manufacturing processes being amongst the main ones), has become temporarily hegemonic. As I have often argued, globalization (as the latest and perhaps “highest” expression of the neo-liberal project and its political and intellectual fellow
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travelers) is paradoxical: it in principle throws open to all of us a huge range of local
knowledges and practices (social, cultural, sexual, aesthetic, architectural, scientific,
economic). In practice, however, these alternative modes of being/knowing are
subordinated to the hegemonic culture of capitalism and its commoditized practices and
social relations, driving out, destroying or relegating to the realms of fantasy the
possibility of alternatives. To question it, ideally requires not only theoretical critiques
and evidence of the environmental, social and psychic damage that it occasions, but also
an empirical point of reference – the existence that is, of alternative forms of economy
and attendant socio-cultural organization that actually call its premises into question and
suggest that, were it not for the certain turns of world history, things could have been, and
might again become, very different.

These issues have profound implications for the self-understanding of the West
and its increasingly shaky foundations given the accelerating environmental catastrophe
that is largely of its own making and (at the time of writing) the rapidly deepening
economic and financial crisis which again can be attributed directly to the dysfunctional
economic system. These issues bound up with the economic crisis are perhaps even more
critical, for “developing” societies though they did not invent or propagate this economic
system. These countries, seeking for ways out of poverty and dependency, are largely
forced, because of the absence of other available models, onto a path that actually creates
even greater problems of debt, resource depletion, ecological collapse, social inequality
and semi-integration into a highly unequal globalized system of trade and aid, on top of
the already fundamental problems that they are already facing. Many minds have of
course addressed these issues and many remedies have been suggested – reform of the
WTO, new theories of poverty alleviation, the socialist alternative, and import
substitution to name only a few. This paper will however not rehearse these proposals but
suggest another line of approach altogether – that there are in fact resources for rethinking
and re-theorizing economic life along radically non-neoliberal principles, and that two of
these resources exist in the form of economic anthropology on the one hand, and
alternative attempts to reconceptualize the economy amongst a small but profoundly
interesting group of contemporary socio-economic theorists on the other. In the course of
the paper we will also attempt to bring these two together, hopefully sparking an even
more potentially stimulating and alternative provoking dialogue.

Background to the Debate

There are many possible, and anthropologically actual, forms of economic life.
Exchange may be common to all of them, but the “market” as understood in neoliberal
terms is only one of them. It is obviously possible to have economies without markets,
and recent rethinking by sociologists and anthropologists as well as skeptical economists of the relationships, actual or potential, between economy and society have suggested many variations of the role that markets or marketized relationships might have (Friedland and Robertson 1990). Given the ethnographic variety of actual economic systems, this in itself provides an argument for the relevance of economic anthropology. But someone will immediately argue that these ethnographically known ‘alternatives’ can only work for very small scale societies and cannot possibly survive scaling up to larger or already industrialized ones. This line of argument however seems to me to represent a failure of the imagination rather than an empirically demonstrated position. The idea that alternatives a priori cannot work is itself an ideological viewpoint and, in assuming that the neoliberal model represents the only possible reality, overlooks the historical contingency of neo-classical economics and the economic system from which it derives and sustains and the fact that it was itself for a long time a contested and far from widely accepted theory even in the West, where it was far from certain for a long time that capitalism would eventually triumph (Hirschman 1981). It also overlooks the existence of extensive, historically deep and very efficient, but non-capitalist, systems of trade and exchange in Asia and North Africa long predating the current economic era (Gunder Frank 1998).

But most damagingly, in offering itself as the only realistic version of economic theory and practice (socialism being allegedly dead), neo-liberalism as a totalizing system cannot account for the problems, failures, crises and contradictions (and seen from the viewpoint of many of its victims, the downright injustices and absurdities) of the neo-liberal market model itself. The god has clearly failed, but the theological interpretation of this is merely the result of momentary lapses of attention and absent-mindedness, temporary readjustments in an otherwise perfectly functioning system, not an argument for atheism, or at least for changing one’s economic religion. This leaves the landscape of social possibilities extremely impoverished and barren and suggests that neo-liberalism is a ‘reality draining’ not a ‘reality enhancing’ system of thought, an actually totalitarian (alternative excluding) system promising, as such systems usually do, to enhance freedom. Yet the freedom offered in this case is in the last analysis simply the freedom to consume what the system itself produces while concealing the actual but hidden ecological and social costs of that (temporary) freedom.

So far then the manifest failures of the neo-liberal model have for the most part (except by Marxist critics) been dealt with by simply shifting around the elements within the model – interest rates, floating exchange rates, or seemingly radical, but actually intra-
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model suggestions such as the proposed “Tobin Tax” on international capital transactions. The so-called “Third Way” of Tony Blair and his intellectual mentor Anthony Giddens (Giddens 1998) is again only a reformist, neo-Fabian adjustment policy designed to offset some of the more socially damaging effects of the neo-liberal model in particular by attempting to retain the key social gains of the earlier welfare state model while retaining and actually advancing its capitalist core. In the development field, the sudden recent attempts by the World Bank to put a humane face on its entirely neo-liberal, pro-market structural adjustment policies represent another example of the attempt to maintain the dominant ideology while concealing its actual long term negative effects including ecological unsustainability and widening social inequalities. Any scientific paradigm subject to such failures would have long ago been abandoned as fatally flawed and consigned to the museum of historical curiosities. If the practice has been so damaging, its underlying explanatory framework – the academic discipline of economics – has fared little better, being inconsistent, non-predictive and only operative at all on the basis of a set of “assumptions”, including the exclusion of cultural factors such as choice, values and motivation, and the bracketing of “externalities” such as ecological resources and the actual costs of waste disposal and the effects of by-products.

Yet since the decline of socialism in the West and the rapid de facto marketization of the remaining formally socialist societies such as China and Vietnam, the assumption has become widespread that there is no viable economic alternative to capitalism of a neo-liberal kind and the forms of social, political and cultural life that it engenders. This view was indeed most vocally expressed by Mrs. Margaret Thatcher in her infamous statement to that effect – “There is no alternative”. But to claim this, leaving aside what it says about an extremely short term historical imagination, lack of comparative cultural awareness and blindness to the environmental consequences of continuing to pursue our present path, overlooks at least four other possibilities. First, there is the possibility and indeed reality of the revival of modified forms of socialism (for example, the German PDS, the former leader of which is at the time of writing Germany’s Chancellor, or of neo-socialism such as the eco-socialism of the European Green parties). Second, there is the possibility of forms of capitalism not following the neo-liberal model and underpinned by very different forms of social theory and cultural practice, such as the Japanese form and the “relationalism” that activates it and inspires much of its corporate practice (to the extent that some observers have even suggested that Japan is actually a socialist society hiding behind a facade of capitalism as suggested by such practices as over manning, lifetime employment, personnel transfer to subsidiaries rather than downsizing, and so forth). Third, there are the comparative lessons of economic anthropology, primarily that a huge range of economic formations are empirically possible and exist or have existed,
and that in understanding any total society the articulation of economic factors with social practices is vital, and the recognition of the fact that both are rooted in culture. Finally, there is a substantial body of existing social theory and theories of post-industrial society that present themselves specifically as alternatives to capitalism. Here I will focus primarily on the latter two, and on the potentially important although little explored relationships between them.

Alternative Economic Thinking

Although often described, in an uncomplimentary way, as “utopian”, it seems in fact evident that engagement with issues raised by authors who have attempted to articulate visions of possible worlds that do not correspond to the reality assumptions of the neo-liberal model are crucial for at least three reasons. One is that alternatives by their very nature stimulate the imagination and even critical reaction to them clarifies assumptions and ideological positions very vividly. It is for this reason that Russell Jacoby has bemoaned the decline of utopian thought (Jacoby 1999). A second is that examination of alternative proposals poses in very practical terms issues of workability, scaling-up, gaps in economic theory and above all the crucial question of mutually linking in positive (humane and ecology respecting) ways economy, culture and society. While these issues have been raised in the past by attempts to clarify anthropologically the notion of ‘political economy’ (Clammer 1985), they are raised afresh in very practical ways by those who would attempt to actually spell out socio-economic alternatives or to define what a post-capitalist society might look like (e.g. Korten 1999). Finally this alternative based thinking creates the possibility of an intellectually and potentially practically creative project – the forging of a dialogue between discussions of economic alternatives, whether in the form of “utopian”, culturally different or based in development studies forms on the one hand, and economic anthropology on the other. In what follows I will attempt to show how economic anthropology can prove to be a vital fertilizing element in fresh thinking about economic alternatives, and in turn can itself be revitalized by a more central concern with industrial/postindustrial societies, and by being forced to think more clearly about its own social purposes as being not merely ethnographic and academic, but also a potent platform for social transformation. Economic anthropology could in fact provide, if turned in that direction, a powerful tool for developing a culturally informed critique of the neo-liberal model from outside of the sphere of conventional economics as usually understood. By doing so, it could become a resource and database for the attempt to articulate post-capitalist alternatives that are rooted in actual ethnographic experience (for broader discussion of economic
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anthropology in general and its relationship to development in particular see, respectively

Empirically, there is a diversity of forms of economic life. These however derive
not only from purely material factors, or from the abstract working of economic “laws”,
but from social practices embedded in worldviews that are ontologies and cosmologies.
This can be seen clearly in the analysis of institutions: an institution is always the
embodiment of both ideological factors and particular economic forces ‘crystallized’ as it
were in that institution and its mode of social reproduction and this is as true of a lineage
as it is of a firm. An essential move is then to reexamine the possible links between social
practices and economic forms. For example, the conflation of economic life and market
exchange in mainstream Western economic theory creates a culturally specific language
of self understanding. While this may be conceptually valid within the terms of the
capitalist/consumerist system, it is inadequate within any bigger or more comparative
framework and cannot provide the foundation for thinking about alternatives or social
futures outside of the market paradigm. In particular, it makes any coherent or
theoretically based critique of globalization impossible. Not only does the apparently
‘common sense’ language of the conventional equating of market and society have to be
transcended, then, it also has to be shown how the moral language of critique of the neo-
liberal model and its main consequence – globalization – can be reframed in an alternative
economic language. These moves are essential if the pseudo-economics (or perhaps more
accurately the ideological economics) of the neo-liberal model is to be deconstructed and
supplanted, in part by showing how its assumptions about human beings are invalid as
well as by pointing to its practical consequences. This latter task is one at which
anthropology has (as Carrier and Miller (2000) rightly point out) largely failed, despite its
moral claims to speak for the cultural Other and of its existing ethnographic knowledge
about the existence of social practices that do not correspond to those assumed as
normative by the neo-liberals (such as gift giving and contexts in which consumption
can become resistance rather than a, quite literally, buying-in to the dominant order).

The neo-liberal model then is one historically specific and ideologically
motivated form of economic activity and mode of explanation of behavior in the world.
The reasons for its “success” can be analyzed historically and sociologically and have
little to do with its objective “truth”. Rather, it has largely created the reality that it
purports to represent (Carrier and Miller 1998). The possibility not only of critique, but
also of constructive alternatives, can however be sought in a number of other sources –
existing critiques of neo-liberalism, especially those tending towards a cultural,
ecological, or ethical point of view (for example Etzioni 1988, Friedland and Robertson
1990, Koval 2002), epistemological challenges coming from deep ecology, religious sources (liberation theologies, alternative Islamic economic thinking, engaged Buddhism), feminist perspectives (e.g. Ferber and Nelson 1993), new social movements, economic anthropology and articulated economic alternatives and finally, in what Boris Frankel calls the “Post-Industrial Utopians” (Frankel 1987).

But before examining some of these possibilities in more detail, let us first articulate a basic insight of anthropology: any number of a huge range of economic possibilities can work, provided that they are rooted in cultural practice, biological needs, a viable cosmology, create a real sense of self-worth and are ecologically sustainable. While the notion that economics *constitutes* culture largely through the process of commodification, as in the neo-liberal world view, would seem absurd to the members of many societies, the organic symbiosis between the economic and other aspects of culture is a critical constant in all societies. The key issues then become, first, theorizing the nature of this fit in societies actual or potential not based on the neo-liberal model, and second, the “scaling up” of small scale economic experiments not only of an anthropological nature, but also as found in the form of cooperatives, communes, innovative development schemes and the like. While I would certainly accept that there can be ‘resistance from within’ to neo-liberalism, either through such devices as malingering, petty theft, sabotage and other such deviant activities, or through certain patterns of consumption or non-consumption that may constitute at least partially counter-hegemonic definitions of an alternative identity, I would argue that such activities do not constitute a serious challenge to the neo-liberal system itself. Given the ecological and other dysfunctional problems of consumption as a lifestyle, it is not surprising that alternative conceptions of the economy almost always focus on low consumption, non-commodified consumption or post-materialist approaches on the grounds that ecological sustainability is the essential foundation, both physically and morally, of any “post-economics”.

In the light of these preliminary considerations, I would now like to turn to an examination of some aspects of alternative economic thinking, not in order to simply survey or catalogue such possibilities, but rather to identify the critical issues that they give rise to, and to link these to debates in economic anthropology. This should provide at least some preliminary pointers to what might be involved in attempting to generate an alternative economics, one that avoids the massive stresses that the neo-liberal model has imposed on the world, and which places the fulfillment of human needs and rights (culturally as well as materially) and ecological sustainability at its centre.
The anthropology of utopias is an almost non-existent field. So too relatively speaking are anthropologies of intentional communities and of social movements, a field that has largely been ceded to the sociologists. These are rather critical omissions, since the anthropological analysis of what might be (as distinct from simple futurology), based on a sound ethnographic analysis of what is and has been, would be a powerful tool for exploring what is possible. Of all the human sciences, anthropology is best suited for doing this by way of its inherent project of what Henrietta Moore calls a “critical politics of difference”, a space defined by anthropology’s engagement between itself and Others, a space that anthropology should never attempt to vacate because to do so “would be to give up on the possibility of a critical politics and a critical ethics linked to an understanding of the way the world currently is and to the multifarious ways in which people are living out their lives” (Moore 2000: 6). This critical anthropological space is different from the effects of the deconstructionist/postmodern project which, while having many positive results (the abolition of essentialism for example), has proved to be very weak in terms of articulating politically or economically constructive alternatives, and so by itself does not provide a vehicle for social transformation. In particular, its conflation of aesthetics and ethics has proved very unhelpful in hard pressed developing countries, however attractive it might sound in the yuppie salons of the intelligentsia of Western Europe. The centrality of ethics to the disciplinary practice of anthropology is rarely contested, but a simple return to responsible ethnography cannot be enough in a world in crisis. The question that builds on the issues that Moore raises is how to link anthropology to these existing or emerging issues without repeating the errors of postmodernism. If neither simple activism nor ethnographic quietism is the way, the answer must lie in translating critical politics and critical ethics into a concrete social programme.

In their discussion of the thesis that modern economics is built on the discovery of the paradoxical fact that private vices (greed and ambition for example) lead to public virtues (growth and competition for instance), Carrier and Miller suggest that “anthropology’s most important strength against economics is its claim that it can rearticulate models of economic processes with the lives of economic agents” (Carrier and Miller 2000: 25). This is located in the context of the argument, with which I fully agree, that contemporary Western subjectivities are shaped primarily by economic considerations (progress, happiness and satisfaction being all largely defined in economic terms), and that the discipline of economics (not economic life as such) is a “virtual science” – one that creates what it purports to describe rather than discovering it in the actual processes of social interaction and human/environment interaction. But their main
methodological move is then to suggest that the key question is the “articulation between the microscopic and the macroscopic (ibid. 27) leading to a way out of our current theoretical impasse since it is “for anthropologists to achieve what economists have not, a rearticulation of the private and the public through a clear understanding and portrayal of the consequences of each of these for the other” (ibid. 43). To keep the macro in mind when discussing the micro is an excellent idea, but I would suggest that this be done in ways rather different from those suggested by Carrier and Miller. To identify this difference is important because it clarifies a choice of directions that subsequent analysis can take.

The essential problem with the private/public distinction is that it assumes their separation and an identifiable boundary between them. Analytically, in any society this boundary is in practice difficult to find, and from a communitarian, socialist or most utopian perspectives, it is a distinction that is to be negated. It may indeed be that by assuming and reinforcing in numerous subtle ways just this distinction, neo-classical economics has generated a range of subjectivities highly functional to the neo-liberal model (it is in effect its “operating system”), and does in fact (although Carrier and Miller play this down) contain a theory of motivations, status seeking and consumption. It is, in other words, itself an “anthropology”, not the negation of what academic anthropologists think that they are doing. It is not then the public/private distinction that is important in itself, rather it is the uncovering of the anthropologies inherent in economic models and which shape patterns of subjectivity and social practice. The articulation of alternatives to this hegemonic model is not simply the creation of utopian or even science fiction versions, but the showing in concrete ways how possible reformulations of the mutual relationships between social practices and economic activity might eventuate in new economic models. Traditionally this issue has been approached from what is actually a philosophical anthropology – a language of “human nature” assuming that, from the neo-classical side, humans are basically greedy, selfish and lazy, but that these vices (which are not in fact private at all, but are universally distributed across society and determine the working of all institutions, not only economic ones), can be channeled by structural devices to benefit those who can manipulate these forces. From the “alternative” side (of which exemplars would be for example Herbert Marcuse or E. F. Schumacher) the assumption on the contrary is that human nature is essentially altruistic, cooperative and well intentioned, but has been distorted by the creation of false needs and the objective conditions of work – that is by alienation and false consciousness, to use Marxist language.
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The issue then is not the public and the private: it is the contrasting articulations in the two general models of the relationship between social practices and economic activity, both of which generate subjectivities, and the reformulation of their relationship in such ways that will make possible a more positive and sustainable lifestyle, and relational and psychic possibilities that humanize rather than dehumanize their subjects. The essential differences between the two models are: the nature of the desired outcome; the quite different analysis of the mechanisms through which institutions achieve or violate this; and the distribution of benefits from those outcomes. In the neo-liberal model, the outcome is presumably growth, absorbed via consumption by an increasingly large population, while profits accrue to relatively few and the distribution of the ability to consume is actually highly unequal. In the “alternative” model, the outcome is almost invariably (and we will turn to examples shortly) some vision of human satisfaction and fulfillment independent of consumption and leading to high levels of social equality, cultural access, equity in the distribution of goods and ecological responsibility and sustainability. The key then turns out to be the question of consumption and commoditization, and I will go on to suggest that it is this, not the question of communal labour characteristic of many alternative systems, that is the most important to address. This also suggests why people living under neo-liberalism often express resistance to the dehumanizing and calculative aspects of capitalism via the subversion of consumption and also poses what is perhaps the basic question at the root of economic anthropology as a whole –namely, the relationship of people to objects both with regard to the reasons they want things in the first place, and what they do with them when they have them. The problem for most alternative theorists, and a very practical question for those working in development, is how to have consumption without greed and unsustainable expansion of desires, and how to enhance consumption things, services and activities that are not commodities. The education of desire lies at the basis of all attempts to define an alternative to the neo-liberal growth model.

Objects do indeed embody and create patterns of social relations, as anthropologists have long known, although they did not always pursue the logic of this much beyond the theme of exchange into issues of production, use, disposal and embodied memory until the advent of Marxist inspired economic anthropologies (Clammer 1978), the interest by French social theorists in particular in the “system of objects” and the social meanings attaching to them (Baudrillard 1968, Barthes 1984) and finally the rather belated recognition by anthropologists of the significance of consumption and its relationship to the fundamental question of why people want goods (Douglas and Isherwood 1980). But the issue of people’s relationship to objects is a crucial one for any alternative economics. For while as Miller (1987) has pointed out, in a
capitalist system that is increasingly abstract and remote from immediate social relationships, people may turn to objects to attain a sense of identity and spatial and temporal continuity, this does not provide them with an alternative, but merely ameliorates through the cultural resources available, that same capitalist/commodified system. As a form of resistance, “subversive” consumption or decreasing consumption is inevitably partial, compromised and ambiguous, and does not in itself generate any serious counter theory.

But before we turn to more articulated alternatives in detail, we should consider several factors. The first of these is the need for a kind of “ethnography of the future” – a serious discussion of what might be in terms of social, cultural, economic and political forms, on the basis of the huge accumulation of anthropological data now available. Up until now this has been rarely attempted – the ethnographic present or the past providing a safe environment for anthropologists to ply their priestly rather than prophetic functions – as keepers of the knowledge rather than as adventurous speculators of what might be done with that knowledge given the range of social, economic and environmental crises that we have ourselves induced. Second, the entire debate needs to be framed within the context not simply of capitalism, but of its contemporary globalized expression and its many effects. This will help us to reveal both the kinds of linkages that exist between global sub-systems (economy/resources/environment/migration/debt/underdevelopment) and the scale on which these problems must now be approached. Thirdly, economics is to a great extent politics, not science, even as economics itself, especially in its “virtual” form, has almost entirely colonized politics to the exclusion of almost any other issues. In discussing both alternatives and the staying power of the neo-liberal model, the political dimension and the political interests involved need to be incorporated, just as much as any concern with the relationship between the micro and the macro. Anthropology suggests that there is no need to succumb to the hegemony of the economists in defining the structuring of the social field. If socialists and utopians have hitherto been the main generators of alternatives, it is now time for anthropologists to see that they too are in possession of a vast body of data and accumulated wisdom on ways of doing and being. This knowledge now needs to be turned to socially and environmentally constructive uses. I will attempt to show how this might be done by showing how anthropological knowledge can inform and modify the arguments of thinkers who have specifically attempted to articulate alternative economic principles to that of the neo-liberal model.

*Post-capitalism and Anthropology*
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Anthropological knowledge then needs to be related to the attempts of what Boris Frankel calls “The Post-Industrial Utopians” (Frankel 1987). By these he means primarily Rudolph Bahro, the German anti-capitalist, anti-industrialist Green thinker and writer, Andre Gorz, the author of works on post-industrial socialism, the Australian mixed-economy theorist and politician Barry Jones, and the well known futurologist Alvin Toffler. Frankel’s review of this group of different but related post-industrial economy positions is worth briefly reviewing. Frankel starts from the observation that the exhaustion of the traditional left requires that attention be paid to some of the emerging alternatives, including small-is-beautiful, Green and the huge variety of localist, small-scale and craft-based or communalist models and experiments that are available. In the light of the crises emerging from the unfettered application of the neo-liberal model, Frankel argues for some variety of “Eco-Socialism” and for learning generally from the new social movements, even when they have failed in achieving all their objectives, while at the same time avoiding buying into a simple futurism, especially a consumption-led one or one extolling uncritically the alleged virtues of technology (such as IT, GMO or cloning), as these just represent capitalism’s utopia, not true alternatives. In contrast to some post-industrial theorists, Frankel sees the problems of the future being continuing scarcity rather than some predicted abundance, lack of work, deskillling, a continuing rolling back of the social services, and persisting war and conflict. The key issue for the post-industrial utopians (his collective name for his four primary thinkers and a larger group of related ones such as Herbert Marcuse) is that of “revolutionizing work patterns and dominant forms of consumption” (Frankel 1987: 16) and generally harmonizing human objectives with social reality.

But having identified this as the basic issue, Frankel then finds all his selected theorists wanting in some crucial respects. Bahro’s model is based on ideas of radical and unilateral deindustrialization and the abandonment of high technology and high energy economic activities. Toffler, while a prophet of high technology solutions to current ills, fails to show how it would work in practice to have society based on localization and decentralizing utilizing such technology (the “electronic cottage”) and how his avowal of this localism fits with his equal enthusiasm for globalization. For Jones, the problem identified for his friendly-faced mixed economy is that of providing and funding non-oppressive social welfare systems in a post-industrial society. For Gorz the problem is seen as explaining how non-alienating work can be generated in a post-industrial socialist society in which labour is still necessary (and not all of it necessarily pleasant). In short, Frankel sees the problems of articulating a serious alternative to capitalism in toto, or even of conceiving of some greatly modified and socially more responsible form, to be threefold. The first is the lack of serious alternative economic theory that can in any way
rival mainstream and neo-liberal versions in sophistication. The second concerns a range of unresolved or unaddressed problems for any alternative model, including women’s issues and the problem of overcoming systematic discrimination in any future form of economic organization, military policy (to disarm or not?), North-South relations and explanations of underdevelopment after capitalism, ecological and energy issues, the provision of welfare services, a post-capitalist legal system, new forms of family relationships, the redefinition of the public/private spheres and their relationship, the continuing role (if any) of the state, the articulation of relationships between the local and the global, and the issues of political agency and structures and post-industrial political cultures and institutions. The third is the failure to spell out a politics of transition – of how to get from here to the desired future and a lack of imagination in describing what actual concrete alternatives might look like as opposed to literary utopias or science fiction ones in which basically anything is possible.

In practice these alternatives tend to fall into one of several rather predictable categories: decentralized, small-scale, non-market, craft-based village republics of a communitarian nature, low in resource use, low energy consumption and de-industrialized (Bahro). Another possibility is mixed economies in which the state will still have a major role and in which technology will be central (Jones and Toffler). Or yet again, socialist with centralized planning, but decentralized production based on egalitarian communities employing low energy but labour saving technology (Gorz). While the first group are mostly opposed to globalization or higher levels of integration, the second group are globalizers – the globalization being understood to be shorn of the negative effects of the current system, while the last group appear to vote for international connections with other societies while retaining local democratic and economic control, the connections being presumably for mutual trade and cultural exchanges. A politics of self-sufficiency, localism and some level of autarky tends to dominate the alternative models, especially the first and third varieties, the more radical of which are also seen as de-monetarized and are implicitly anti-urban and are almost always strongly ecologically oriented. There are also splits within the alternative camp, Gorz for example seeing communal autarky as impoverishing and limiting, while Bahro sees it as providing the basis for human fulfillment. Frankel’s own solution is to argue for what he calls “semi-autarky” with the claim that “small-scale social institutions have the best chance of thriving inside the boundaries of nation states themselves democratically organized, along lines that aim at self-sufficiency” (Frankel 1987: 250).
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Where and how does economic anthropology speak to these issues? I will suggest a number of lines which I will now sketch out schematically.

1. Economic anthropology begins by demonstrating that the range of historical or actually existing economic systems is rather greater than that imagined by the post-industrial utopians, whose models are curiously myopic in their cultural range or actual possibilities. The ethnographic data reveals a huge amount of experience of economic arrangements, ecological adaptation, the management of scarcity and abundance, of culturally defined notions of poverty and wealth, and social arrangements including kinship and political arrangements for managing a large range of environmental and economic conditions.

2. Although the anthropology of work is a rather underdeveloped field (see however Wallman 1979) the analyses currently available suggest many pointers for culturally differing attitudes to work, to the merging or separation of work and leisure, creating non-alienating work, creating cooperative and communally based projects, resource sharing, efficiency and culturally conditioned notions of productivity, output, sharing, saving and egalitarian uses of the resources (game, fish, fruit, crops) generated by work.

3. Curiously, none of the post-industrial utopians appears to have any underlying theory of the ideological unity that anthropological and sociological studies of communitarian movements have shown to be essential to the social sustainability and longevity of such experiments (Kanter 1973, Moore and Myerhoff 1975). Whether these ideologies be religious or secular, anthropology does suggest that a rich, shared symbolic and ritual life is a basis for communal continuity. Yet the post-industrial utopians, perhaps driven by a modernistic secularized frame of thinking, discount entirely this crucial aspect of social and cultural organization. In fact a common weakness of all the examples discussed by Frankel is that their analysis of culture and of cultural life after the transition to post-industrialism is absent. In this respect, they too, like the neo-liberal model that they explicitly oppose, credit primary explanatory power to the economy, assuming culture to be epiphenomenal. Although political economy tends to be concerned primarily with the relationships between the economic, the social and the political, the absence of the cultural dimension is a serious omission. 4. Although technology plays a significant role in all the post-industrial models (either pro- or anti-), it is neither theorized nor problematized in any of them. Anthropology, especially the anthropology of development, has accumulated a great deal of information on the impact of technology, the incorporation of appropriate technology, indigenous building methods and architecture, and ecologically efficient technologies. Such knowledge of the actual socio-
cultural effects of technology and technological innovation is of direct relevance to issues of technology planning in any future society.

5. Amongst the critical questions for any future economics are those of how to achieve satisfaction (psychic as well as material) given the resources to hand and without destructive over-consumption, and how to distribute resources equitably in the new economy without exploitation and without introducing or perpetuating sources of social inequality. These are both issues widely addressed in practice by many societies known to ethnography.

6. Anthropology does not deal only with the apparently static, but of necessity with processes of socio-cultural change. This has important theoretical implications for the anthropological analysis of the current industrial system and its associated patterns of consumption and within which there is a relative move from the production of goods to the production of services and towards information and information based economies (Lash and Urry 1994). In this context, in “advanced” economies material things/production become relatively less central and new subjectivities arise accordingly, and as they do so the meaning of the “social” itself undergoes transformation as the configuration of the relationships between ‘the family’, ‘the economy’ and ‘the state’ has changed. This calls into question the continuity of the assumed relationship between these zones or fields of social life, along with others such as ‘the political’.

Where the post-industrial utopian models tend to be weakest is not in the sincerity of their visions, but in their lack of rooting in any kind of ethnographic reality. This is important because whereas proponents of the neo-liberal model (and paradoxically older forms of Marxism too) tend to characterize non-Marxist socialist (e.g. Gandhian, cf. Rao 1970) and other alternative attempts at defining a different reality as negatively utopian, anthropology might suggest that it is actually the neo-liberal model itself, and perhaps the whole system of capitalism itself, that is actually absurd in comparative terms and in terms of its assumptions about need and satisfactions on which it is based, and because of the extraordinary poverty of its social vision – restricted largely to the idea that satisfaction, happiness and fulfillment are defined as ever expanding consumption to meet equally ever expanding “needs” generated by the system itself, and with little higher conception of what human life might involve or be like. Against this impoverished vision, anthropology by its very existence, raises a huge variety of alternatives, many of which have been swept away not because of their non-viability, but because of the voracious
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expansion of the neo-liberal model itself and its “one dimensional man” understanding of
the range of human possibilities.

Most utopian theorists operate at a level of abstraction that has little place for the
ethnographic. Krishnan Kumar suggests rightly that utopianism is a form of social theory
– “all the more effective for looking at familiar problems from an unfamiliar angle and in
a different light” (Kumar 1991: vii), while also recognizing that most utopian projects are
weak on concrete descriptions of the economic arrangements that would actually sustain
them. But Kumar, although a sociologist, stops short of suggesting that the real power of
utopias is in their critique of existing circumstances and institutions, rather than as
constituting alternative models as such (e.g. Kumar 1991:87-8). Yet Fred Polak, one of
the most perceptive commentators on utopian thought, both argues that classical
economics is the great enemy of the social utopia, and also, uniquely as far as I am aware
amongst the major surveyors of utopian thinking, specifically relates such utopian thought
to anthropology (Polak 1973). In an important section of his book titled “Utopianism and
Cultural Anthropology”, Polak relates utopianism to comparative ideas in ideology, myth,
politics, ethics and science, all of which he claims are best illustrated by the data of
anthropology rather than treated as abstract categories by philosophy, although
surprisingly he does not include economics in his list.

Yet in every major attempt at sketching a utopia, the economy is necessarily vital.
Marcuse for example, while not a utopian in a systematic way, and coming rather from a
neo-Marxist perspective, argues that “The theory of society is an economic, not a
philosophical system. There are two basic elements linking materialism to correct social
theory: concern with human happiness, and the conviction that it can be obtained only
through a transformation of the material forms of existence (Marcuse 1968: 135). While
clearly drawing on Marx, Marcuse’s position however agrees with the neo-liberal model
in one important respect – the very Western idea that the economy is basic to the
definition of human subjectivity. Where he begins to suggest the outlines of an account
transcending this is in his theory of needs, the “education of desire” and the replacement
of false needs with true ones. For Marcuse the goal is human happiness, something
primarily to be achieved by abolishing restrictive material conditions of existence through
non-alienating labour and the abolition of scarcity. Scarcity, Marcuse suggests, is an
historical condition, not a natural one, and so can be overcome, in part at least, by the
liberating potentialities of technology and also by the containment of wants. Scarcity can
be reduced if not totally overcome if sufficiency and not surplus is the principle. While
there are unclear elements within Marcuse’s underlying theory of needs and of the ability
to distinguish real from false need, he does pose the interesting anthropological problem
of the ways in which this very issue is resolved, or at least constantly addressed, in a range of very different actual human societies. In recognizing that the power of capitalism is its ability to satisfy in large part the (false) needs that it itself has created, Marcuse succeeds in raising not only classical questions of false consciousness, but also puts his finger on another essential issue – not that of labour and its conditions, but of wants and the ways in which these are alternatively defined in a variety of cultures, and so might, drawing on this bank of human cultural experience, be redefined in an actual possible future society.

It is a weakness in addressing precisely this problem, and of also failing to give it any cultural grounding, that besets one of the areas in which such issues are far from being only of theoretical interest – notably development studies. Much of the work characterized as “alternative development”, or even more radically as “post development” (e.g. Rahnema and Bawtree 2003), has as its basis a programme very similar to that of the post-industrial utopians, but using a different discourse. In his discussion of varieties of development theory, Jan Nederveen Pieterse suggests that although many of the specific critiques and recommendations of alternative development have been incorporated creatively into mainstream development thinking and practices (for example the importance of grassroots participation, the significant role of NGOs, people-centred development, sustainability), it has “failed to develop a clear perspective on micro-macro relations, an alternative macro approach, and a coherent theoretical position (Nederveen Pieterse 2001: 74), and while being successful in introducing a language of participation, is weak in explaining agency – who will, and how they will – transform the dominant development paradigm “from below”. But while Nederveen Pieterse, again like Carrier and Miller, sees a key to the main issues lying in the realm of the relationship between the micro and the macro, he also intuits that an equally major challenge for alternative development is not in that relationship per se, but in the reconceptualization (or reimagining perhaps) of the macro itself since post-development positions, while passionate in their critiques of the mainstream, are frequently very weak (unlike the post-industrial utopians who at least offer a vision of an alternative future) at the constructive task of actually defining what that future might look like. It is also true that although anthropologists are increasingly involved in development activities, neither alternative nor post-development discourses make more than the most cursory use of anthropological data or insights.

This is an oversight since what alternative development sees as being its critique of the general discourse of developmentalism, is in fact essentially identical to post-
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industrial utopian critiques of the neo-liberal model and its social consequences. While rightly, in my view, arguing for a redefinition of development as social transformation (the enhancement of human possibilities) rather than as growth, alternative development, like the post-industrial utopians, fails also to develop an adequate theory of globalization. Yet such a theory is vital as a thorough theory of globalization (many varieties of which are now available in the literature) uncovers the essential characteristics of the neo-liberal model in action as a practice, and by identifying the social consequences of globalization also uncovers the crucial areas on which an alternative or post-development paradigm needs to concentrate. An adequate theory of globalization is, in the contemporary context, the necessary condition for a fuller theory of social transformation. Likewise with rare exceptions alternative approaches to development have not learnt much from the ideas of Pierre Bourdieu who does imply the expansion of the concept of capital from its purely economic usage to a much wider set of references including social capital, cultural capital and symbolic capital, and the connections of all of these to conceptions of social justice and inequality (Bourdieu 2000). For in suggesting that economics is not a science but politics in disguise, alternative development both begins to identify the seed from which a full-scale critique of the neo-liberal model might grow, and suggests that the key concept of “capital” cannot, even within that model, be consistently understood in purely economic terms. If, in post-development theory, the solutions to such pressing issues as poverty are seen to be found outside of market mechanisms, then they too will not only have to address the question of culture, a good starting point for which is obviously anthropology, with its considerable expertise in this area and experience of societies and economies outside of the market in its neo-liberal sense.

Nederveen Pieterse concludes his book by suggesting that “The challenge facing development is to retrieve hope from the collapse of progress” (Nederveen Pieterse 2001:163) and that an approach that is capable of doing this must be a reflexive one, one aware of complexity and the fact that in the North societies are moving from scarcity to risk, while in the South societies experience both scarcity and risk, and must be concerned with reconstruction emerging from the necessary, but purely preliminary, step of critique. Ernst Bloch wrote years ago about the task of the human sciences to be that of “reclaiming the future”. He was I think correct, and it has been a major failure of social and cultural theory that it has largely relinquished this task to futurologists and science fiction writers and has pushed alternative discourses to the margins of the social sciences. While we at first sight seem to live in an age of dystopias rather than utopias, in fact alternative thinking flourishes beyond, and often beyond the ken, of conventional social theory – in Christian liberation theologies, in Islamic economic thinking, in engaged Buddhism, in some sectors of the New Age movement, in social movements, amongst
artists, amongst communards and the creators of intentional communities, in community revival and self-help movements, in Gandhian and countless other experiments in the South, in organic farming, in cooperatives and feminism in the West and in Japan, in new religions and post-religious spiritualities, in the deep ecology movement, in post-socialist and post-New Left circles, in populist political movements, and in intellectual resistance, often allied with contemporary forms of the labour movement (e.g. Bourdieu 2000), in peasant and farmers movements, and in any number of artistic, literary, theatrical and even architectural innovations (the literature is vast: for a good survey however see Hawken 2007).

Despite this luxuriant variety there are a number of common themes to most of these approaches, the sheer variety of which and the far from complete or uniform penetration of globalization, reassures one that the hegemony of the neo-liberal model is far from complete. And while these movements do not represent a united front, they do form the seed bed of a stronger opposition to the ecologically, socially and culturally destructive consequences of the unchecked expansion and psychic colonization of the neo-liberal capitalist system, in part by defining the key issues to be addressed – the articulation of the micro and the macro, the problem of scarcity, the achievement of un-alienated work, including the issue of domestic labour and child care, the “education of desire” and its embodiment in forms other than consumption, the articulation of the relationship between oppositional struggles in the cultural sphere, now rightly seen by many as a major site of political struggle, and the economic sphere, and an analysis between local level struggles and the global. So while with Marx and Marcuse we might not want, or be able, to preempt history by stating in final terms what the alternative(s) would be like, not to do so at all is to fail to see the possible in concrete terms, represents a failure of oppositional imagination, and is to refuse to concretize the directions in which alternative theories logically lead. It is in fact to succumb to the hegemony of the present and of its currently existing structures and institutions, when history is in fact open and waiting to be made according to new patterns if we are willing to discover or invent them and then to apply them. There are many steps that might be made in that direction, and here I am simply suggesting one simple methodological step – the bringing into dialogue with one another the largely separated discourses of anthropology (the true science of the possible), post-industrial utopian thinking, and the struggles of alternative and post-development theory against the anti-human and anti-nature ravages of “progress”. This step, together with the imaginative but wholly possible operation of putting the social and the cultural back at the centre of debates about human identity, necessarily means
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challenging not economics as such, but its distorted and ideological varieties that stand
that identity on its head. This is not only to avoid the colonization of the social and the
cultural by the economic, but to rethink the nature of the economic itself, including
reexamining the interfaces between the spheres of total social life, spheres separated by
Western disciplinary discourse, but found bound together in quite different configurations
than the limited and limiting model that neo-liberal economics seeks to impose on all of
us.

Mapping the Future

The current conjunction of environmental crisis, financial and economic chaos and
the visible inequities of unrestrained globalization have triggered a significant upsurge of
new literature confronting the issues that have been raised in this chapter. Some have
drawn on slightly older investigations of the desire for a people (and nature) centred
economics – works such as E.F. Schumacher’s celebrated Small is Beautiful (Schumacher
1979) and his less well known Good Work (Schumacher 1982), or Erich Fromm’s To
Have or To Be? (Fromm 1982). Others represent the thinking of social movements such
as PROUT - the Progressive Utilization Theory movement of Indian origin, but now
worldwide (Maheshvarananda 2003), while others have taken the form of either literary
utopias directly addressing our multiple crisis, especially its environmental aspects and
the forms that an ecologically sustainable and socially equitable and non-alienating
economy might take (Callenbach 2004), or of in depth analyses of possible future and
community based economies, amongst the most significant of which is Bill McKibben’s
Deep Economy (McKibben 2007). Others have systematically addressed what a post-
capitalist economy might actually look like and how it might work (Theobald 1999,
Korten 1999). In each case at least two moves are evident – a critique of the current forms
of economic theory and activity that have led us into the systemic and mutually self-
reinforcing multi-dimensional crisis in which we now find ourselves, and an attempt to
define what economic activity, work, social policy, communities, politics and technology
might look like, in Bill McKibben’s words, “after growth”. The thrust of this paper has
actually been quite simple – to suggest that there is already a vast body of data available
on actually existing and historical “alternative economies” that provide innumerable
pointers to how possible sustainable futures might be shaped, this being the largely
untapped resource of anthropology. But slowly the recognition has been dawning that,
initially in the development field (Gladwin 1994), but now with a much wider application
to the issue of post-industrial futures and the creation of sustainable post-crisis societies in
general, that anthropology, and in particular economic anthropology, provides a rich and
still unexplored way of relating not only economies and societies, but to the pressing
question of creating a sustainable future for all inhabitants of the Earth, both humans in the overdeveloped North and those in the still struggling South, and the rest of the biotic community upon which we are all ultimately dependent.
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I want to try to give a summary of the discussions for the last three days at least on the theme of our vision of a non-violent economy. I will focus on our three themes of swaraj, swadeshi and trusteeship.

Let me start with a statement that might shock you: today's world is much less violent than the world before. This is a fact in absolute terms. There is less war; and there are two reasons for that. First, the market economy has provided a non-violent way for providing resources for many people. Violence itself was previously one of the economic tools. In that sense, the market economy can be seen as step forward. Secondly, without democracy, that market economy could have been much worse than it is. We introduced democracy to regulate the market economy. In the long run, then, the economy of today is much less violent than those in the past and much less violent than it could have been without democracy--but it is still much less acceptable. To see inequalities, to see the unsustainability of this kind of capitalism--this is the paradox which we have to recognize.

Yesterday people said I was pessimistic and I am pessimistic in a certain sense. Yet what I am saying is that because democracy and equality have become the norm we are able to see how unacceptable this economy is and we have to be the pioneers for the further progress that is now necessary.

About the three concepts that we have reflected on--swaraj, swadeshi and trusteeship, let me summarize some points of agreement.

First about swaraj. Swaraj is connected with a need for basic human rights. As an economist, I know that very few economists use the word 'rights'. If you look at an economic textbook, it will not mention rights. This is why Amartya Sen has worked so much on that, on a theory of justice and economy as a freedom. But most economists regard him as a philosopher or an ideologue rather than an economist. Minimum socio-economic rights and the idea of minimum or a maximum wage--this is the language of rights, nothing to do with traditional economics. Now the rights that we consider basic are really obvious: food, shelter, clothing, education, health, recreation, livelihood and dignity. These exist in our constitutions but most of the time they are not applied in practice. In France, two years ago, the National Assembly established the right to shelter, but no one has implemented that right. In India, you also know this, you have the right of universal primary education but it is so difficult to implement that. I think we are the ones
who consider that these basic rights must be enshrined in the constitution and then, must be really implemented.

Also key about the idea of swaraj is that there must be local ownership of resources and systems. This is one of the major fights on the planet today. To whom do these resources belong? You know better than me about the struggle around mining in India for example—but this is going on everywhere in the world. We have highlighted that point. It appeared to me as an economist, that it makes sense but it has not yet been recognized clearly. It matters a lot, especially for basic goods, like water for example.

Here too, we saw the idea of decentralization and devolution and there is a basic link between these and the question of basic needs. Its true that we have connected this to the financial crisis and it is one of the keys to that. One of the reasons for the crisis, is that a huge superpower (not the US) but the global, multinational companies and the system they require had to be rescued because it was too big to fail. Most of the big companies know this too well, that they are too big to fail and that governments will rescue them because there is no alternative. And they act on this: if I am too big to fail then I can take risks I otherwise wouldn’t have taken. The burden of the crisis then always will fail back to governments and to the ‘common person’ as taxpayer. Decentralization is crucial then, as a way to transform the system.

Corruption was also an issue. In my opinion, corruption has decreased in the last twenty years. Yesterday in the newspaper, one of the political parties said that corruption was the biggest problem in India. It is not only in India. How is the US economy ruled? You know the lobby system, it is what drives the decision making process and it is a kind of corruption really, an official corruption. You pay for the senators’ votes. We have not found the way to tackle corruption but it is essential to create swaraj.

Finally, one other aspect. People have to organize themselves to campaign for their rights. Self-organization is crucial.

On the second principle—swadeshi. It was introduced by noting that the principle of swadeshi, local control is not in opposition to globalization. Not everyone agrees, I think. But we might say that we are not against globalization but against a certain type of globalization.

Human societies—not economies but societies—are moving toward a global world. Knowledge is becoming a global reality. This is really what swadeshi means in our world: the world is our planet, our home. What happens anywhere is my issue.

There were three issues involved in the discussion of swadeshi. The first was technology. There was a consensus that we have become dependent on machines for everyday life. The question is empowerment with regard to technology. Thus it is linked
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to education. Education most of them has been about ‘how to read’ but now it must
become a teaching about these technologies. I think the Gandhian tradition has always put
the emphasis on a practical and a technical education; but one of the problems is that the
intellectuals who conceive of the curricula are not focussing on this at all. But this is a
priority that I think we need.

The second issue had to do with rural to urban migration. It is not against cities as
such but this trend in both developed and developing world toward the megalopolis, is
really affecting the balance in our everyday life. It is also affecting the balance between
nature and the human being. So the solution to this is to provide better opportunities in the
villages, providing better infrastructure, better agricultural security, modernization, and
redistribution of resources. And this really applies everywhere in the world, not just in
India. The only exception may be the US but you know the US history was very different
because of the immigration and as a result you don’t have as strong of a rural tradition,
rather the roots are in the cities. The same has happened in China. The main problem is to
develop and help the rural villages. With regard to values, it was mentioned that there is
no swadeshi without values. So we have to make clear that behind our action we have
values.

Thirdly, it was important to focus on maintaining the balance between economy,
society and environment. There is a wonderful book written by an Indian writer called, A
Fine Balance.* I think the image of balance is very important, a balance between the
economy and humanity. Someone mentioned the story from the Panchatantra about the
mango tree. We have lost that experience. We must think about the long term future and
this is a common value we have together.

Finally, on the question of trusteeship. This raises the question of ethics in relation
to the market and as I said that is not normally done. I just want to summarize our
discussion on this issue by referring to a text on ethics in business. It is put in the
framework of logic but I think you will find it helpful. The first point is this:

“Consider person a who becomes happy by doing action x. That affects another
person b. If a becomes happy also by the same action, when the action x is done to a by b,
then x is an ethical action.”

The market is not ethical for this kind of reason of simple reciprocity, however.
The market is based on self-interest. I look for my interest, you look for your interest. We
try to find the balance. In a pure theory this idea might work, but the fact is that the
market is not pure. All the markets are impure. The market is about power. I am always
looking for market power and that is why we have large companies, economy of scale and

so on. The market mechanism is useful but cannot satisfy these kinds of ethical conditions.

Let me quote the second point which is more pertinent, I think:
“Consider an action ‘y’ taken by ‘a’ to make himself happy, that affects the entire group. If all in that society were to take that same action ‘y’, will all in that society be happy?” For example, we have been to the Union Carbide site and we traveled in three wheelers. If all the people in Bhopal travelled in three wheelers would they be happy? That is an ‘externality’ that is hard to determine, but the question continues: “If yes, then the action is ethical, but will the society continue to function in the long run?” This is what we always have to ask ourselves: if the action which is a win-win is also sustainable in the long-run. So this helps to summarize our discussions at least with regard to the issues of swaraj, swadeshi and trusteeship.
The Framework and Plan for Jansatyagraha 2012, Rajagopal, PV

We are going to speak about some action and one action that I want to propose is going to take place in India in 2012. The action is already beginning in fact and it will continue until 2012.

The philosophical framework in which this action is going to be put begins with a strong faith in the power of the poor. It begins with the fact that poor people can really make a change. If we believe in that and then start looking at the so-called weaknesses of the poor as strengths. This is important: to convert the so-called weaknesses into strengths so that we realize that the poor are in fact powerful, power enough to make a real change. The core of this philosophy, then, is that we need to organize the poor of this world to bring about a change. We have to have faith that they can bring a change. When I say poor, of course, I mean men and women.

The second part of the philosophical framework is our strong faith in the young people of the world, that young men in women can also bring about a change.

So faith in young people and in the poor can be the basis for building a strong national and international movement to challenge the present paradigm of corruption and injustice.

We must understand that indifference is not going to bring about any change at all. The majority of people are in fact indifferent and they say to themselves, ‘The world is
going the way it is going and what can I do? I can’t change it.’ What I want to say is that between this indifference and the violence that is at the other extreme, there is an option: active nonviolence. Use nonviolence effectively and don’t assume that nonviolence cannot work. Nonviolence can work if it is used effectively.

A society based on Sarvodaya—the well-being of all, is not going to happen just because we wish it. It has to begin somewhere and I tell you that it has to begin with the well-being of the least, Antyodaya (as Gandhi called it).

The last aspect of the philosophical framework is this: change demands a certain amount of sacrifice. And this is where we must struggle with our indifference and our fear: we don’t want to be in prison, or between up or just standing out in the cold. As long as we are not willing to sacrifice a bit our comfort, our resources, our time, no change is going to take place. Change demands an amount of sacrifice from those of us who want to achieve change.

In 2007, twenty-five thousand people walked for a month and achieved something, a small victory. And now we want to use what we learned and to scale it up for Jansatyagraha 2012. So what I am going to tell you is basically the action plan for 2012.

First, we want to train six thousand young people as leaders. That is a big scaling-up. Last time we had 1500 youth to lead 25000 people and this time we want to train 6000 young people in the next two years. That means organizing sixty youth training programs (in each training program there will be a hundred youth). So that is one program in which we need to collaborate.

Let me tell you about the training program. It will be divided into three parts or three days. Day one we will be discussing why it is that after 65 years of independence in India we are still facing so many problems. The idea is that it is like a doctor looking at a patient and trying to diagnose what is wrong. Then the treatment can begin. Identifying problems is day one. So after the small group discussion they will come into the large group so that each group can present their report and debate. There will be a debate about those issues that each group is debating. People develop the skill to argue and counter-argue. For example, you might on the first day identify the need for education—but that is the first day’s answer and on the next day that will go deeper and there will be a discussion about what kind of education it should be. Because if it is not the right kind of education then nothing will change, it will just support the status quo.
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That really leads to the next step, and that is the second day. Then the questions are about how we address the issues, issues like landlessness, like poverty, like exploitation.

The third day will focus on how to build a movement to address these issues together, not just as individuals but as a larger group together.

So there are three days and three processes in this training. Group discussions, larger plenary and then in the night, theatre—theatre used to articulate the understanding of poverty. Then these 100 people are going to walk through the villages for three days, to interact with people, understand their problems and motivate more people to join the social movement.

Let me return to the plans for Jansatyagraha. Last time we had 25,000 letters to the Prime Minister of India from people around the globe. This time we would like to scale that up as well, so that we receive 100,000 letters. So that everyday there will be hundreds of letters from people saying, ‘we know that everyday so many people are walking for justice. Why is your government not listening to their voices?’

Last time we were more Eurocentric, in the sense that much of the international solidarity came from Europe. This time we would like to expand so that the solidarity will come from southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa, Europe and North America. It has to be a global action. That is what we should discuss today.

This is a global action that is taking place in India but how do we create pressure in other parts of the world on the same issue. And I mean not only acting in solidarity with action in India but also so that people raise their own local issues. Then we can act together. It will be like moving from a global social forum to global action.

This time we need to have an international commission with representatives from every country. This representative should write letters and speak about 2012 and also organize action within the country, so that 2012 becomes an international action. Last time, we had a very small advisory committee with well-known people. This time we would also like to have a committee of well-known people so that governments will hear them and address the issue of people and their control over livelihood resources. So then we can create a climate where these people because of their moral power will be able to put a certain amount of pressure on governments.

The slogan will be ‘Do or die’. It is an old slogan, we took it from the freedom struggle of India. It is not because there is a desire to die but we want to say, this is not just a protest, a march to hand in a petition. In 2007, we walked to Delhi and gave an
order, a ‘desh’. We said to government, ‘now you must start acting in the interests of the poor people of the country and of the world.’ So it was Janadesh.

This time it is Jansatyagraha. Jansatyagraha is not one action, it is an ongoing action. It is a fight for truth. We are also saying, ‘look, you have made our life difficult so we are also going to make your life difficult’. Not by violence but by being there, simply by being there. The milk man will not be able to come to your door, nor will the newspaper because there are so many adivasis sitting there. Your children will not be able to go to school in a big Ambassador car because the road is blocked. You will feel uncomfortable and then you will understand what it means to live in discomfort.

We are also saying, ‘we walk into cities, because you are not giving us space to live in villages’. We have no interest to go to cities really, we don’t like them. But because you don’t allow us to stay in the villages, because you take our land, our forest, our water, and left us no option to live there, we have decided to walk to the cities. Really, we are saying ‘keep your cities but give us our villages back.’

There are ten policies that we are planning to challenge, because these are the ten policies that are affecting village life and the poor very seriously. Let me just mention them. The first is related to land, land given to the multinational companies and not to the poor people. The second policy concerns water, water being privatized and not given to the farmer. Another is forest resources being controlled by the government and not open to the tribal people to make their livelihood. Agriculture is becoming more corporate rather than people-centred. Mining is undertaken by large multinationals with the support of the government that displaces large numbers of aboriginal people. Industrialization is based on grabbing the land and water and mineral resources of the poor people. Tourism is carried out at the expense of poor people, by setting up five star hotels and stealing their resources. Land acquisition which is carried out illegally at the expense of the poor. Special Economic Zones that are being created in many parts of the country. And finally, the policy of liquor which has a devasting affect on village life.

So these are the ten policies and there will be ten committees set up to address these issues and to suggest what concrete changes are to be made in those policies to make the lives of ordinary people better.

This is only an announcement of what we are planning in India but in consultation with people around the globe. Ekta Europe is involved and the SAPA, South Asia Peace Alliance and many other friends. What we need however, is critical mass, to bring about
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change. And that is what I want to ask you to discuss: how do we make this a world level action? So that the media and the politicians will listen and move with us. How do you draw good people from the political and bureaucratic and economic fields? Let us not think that this is only an Indian action; we hope that it will trigger action across the globe.

So when Louis Campana and our friends in Gandhi International proposed this conference in Bhopal and then a series of consultations across the world, we welcomed it. I am very glad that all you people are here and I welcome you. I hope that we will be able to do something to bring about a change. Otherwise, I think, history will not forgive us. We can’t just live in past history. Our generation has a responsibility to act today, otherwise people in the future will not forgive us. Thank you.
Final Motion of Conference: Objective 2012

At the invitation of the French association Gandhi International and the Indian movement Ekta Parishad, 120 people from 20 countries met at Bhopal (India), from 30th January to 3rd February 2010, during an international conference on the theme of “Towards a non-violent economy”.

Current situation

Whereas half the inhabitants of our world are farmers, 3/4 of them, in the countries of the South, still toil with their hands by preserving the environment and without contributing to the global warming. Many of them do not have property titles, and their rights are often threatened by projects run by governments or mining companies, agribusiness enterprises, companies which exploit forest resources, tourism business, etc.

However, whereas projects of this type can give rise to negative effects, there is, in law, a principle of free, prior and informed consent by local communities and indigenous people, recognized by several texts of the UN, the ILO, and by Article 22 of the Rio declaration adopted in June 1992.

Further, markets of the South are flooded with agricultural products from the North, produced with huge machines, and subsidized by the public authorities. As a result, cultivation of food crops and local cottage level production are ruined by this competition and eliminated from the economy.

In the western countries also, farmers find it difficult to have access to land.

Commitments

We have a deep faith in the strength of the poorest and we wish to recognize the Peoples in their dignity, their know-how and their culture.

We commit ourselves to ensure that people have the right to access to natural resources (land, water, forest, seeds, minerals, etc) with a view to bringing about a new type of harmonious development which will respect Man and Nature.

We urge that, in international law, the right to food sovereignty be recognized as
Enough for Everyone’s Need superior to the rights to trade.

Action

The political actions that we are proposing rely on concrete realizations and they are the premises of a non-violent economy and society.

A march called Jansatyagraha (“people’s non-violent march”) of 100 000 people will be organized by Ekta Parishad, in 2012, to ensure respect of these rights. The climax of this mobilization will be between 2nd October (International Day of Non-violence) and 17th October 2012 (International Day Against Misery).

This march is in line with vital stakes at the global level: access to natural resources, food sovereignty, plight of the deprived in our societies, place of women in the society, as also participative democracy, role of multinational companies, international economic system and development model.

This is why we wish to support this Indian march and reaffirm the rights to access to natural resources and food sovereignty by organizing, in 2012, in several continents, simultaneous and concerted non-violent actions: marches, sit-ins, human chains, observing silence, etc.

Human beings not only have rights, but also responsibilities, as defined for instance in the Charter of Human Responsibilities.

We appeal to the responsibility of all individuals and groups concerned with justice throughout the world so that the 2012 mobilization has the greatest possible impact.

Bhopal, 3rd February 2010.

Signed by delegates from Algeria, Bangladesh, Burma, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Great Britain, India, Japan, Malaysia, Morocco, Mexico, Nepal, Paraguay, Senegal, Sudan, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, and Thailand.
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Biographes of Participants:

**Rajagopal, PV** is an activist and President of the grassroots people’s movement Ekta Parishad. In 2007, he lead 25,000 landless peasants on a 28 day march (the Janadesh padayatra) from Gwalior to Delhi to pressure the government for land rights. He has been working as a trainer in the villages of central India steadily for the last twenty-five years, training local youth in non-violent action, organizing women's self-help groups and mobilizing villagers to resist the incursions of the economy of violence into their sustainable life. Out of that work, the movement that is Ekta Parishad has slowly evolved and, with Janadesh, taken a national form as a people’s movement. Since Janadesh, this has taken form in a series of well-articulated positions on land reform and the protection of livelihood resources (water, forest, minerals) from industrialization, tourism and corporate agriculture. To bring these issues to the table, Rajagopal is planning to walk through India for a year beginning at the ocean in Kerala on October 2011 and arriving with 100,000 people in Delhi in October 2012.

**Louis Campana**, the President and founder of Gandhi International, was awarded the 2008 Bajaj Foundation prize (Mumbai, India) for promoting Gandhian values outside India. He has been a member of the community of the Ark founded by Lanza Del Vasto and a life long activist for non-violence. Gandhi International brings together people active in various nonviolent organisations working for social change in the cause of justice and peace. Among them are: Lanza del Vasto's Communities of the Ark, Université Terre du ciel, Pax Christi International, the association Shanti, the Movement for a Nonviolent Alternative (MAN), the Institut de Recherche pour une Résolution Non-violente des Conflits (IRNC), Church and Peace, Femmes Internationales – Murs Brisés, Génération Non-violente, the Colibri network, Terre et Humanisme, as well as a group of motivated individuals. Its aim is to promote renewed interest in Gandhian thought and action throughout Europe and other continents, by organising cultural events, conferences and symbolic acts.

**Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan** has been the Chief Minister of the Indian state of Madhya Pradesh since 2005 and a member of the state assembly since 1990. He has been actively engaged in justice issues all his life and has worked to create a state of social justice among the adivasis of Madhya Pradesh.

**Sh. Subha Rao**, joined India's freedom struggle through the Quit India Movement as a young schoolboy. Inspired by Gandhi's principles, he dedicated his life inspiring youth to constructively participate in development. Often referred as 'the dacoit man', Rao organised an historical event in 1972 where 189 dacoits surrendered to Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan at Mahatma Gandhi Seva Ashram, Chambal. Since then Rao became involved in the rehabilitation of dacoits and their families after they served their terms in prison. His rehabilitation process has been so successful that former rebels work with him to inspire other dacoits in Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan to change their lives.

**Étienne Godinot** has worked for fifteen years as human resources profession in the private sector. He has been an activist since his youth with organizations that work for non-violent conflict resolution: Mouvement pour une Alternative Non-violente -/MAN, /Institut de recherche sur la Résolution Non-violente des Conflits/ - IRNC, revue /Alternatives non-violentes/). As the co-founder of Gandhi International, he has been the main administrator of this organization since 2009. He was very involved in the evolution of the conference, especially in its intellectual framework.

**Amit Kumar** was brought up and lived in Gandhian ashram. He runs an organisation called the "Kumarappa Institute of Gram Swaraj" which was founded by his father Dr.
Awadh Prasad, Sh. Siddharaj Dhadda, Sh Jawahirlal Janin and other Gandhians of Rajasthan. He is an economist and management graduate.

**Dr. Satish Kumar Jain** is a professor of economics at the Center for Economic Studies and Planning, Jawaharlal Nehru University, specializing in social choice theory, law and economics, and methodology and philosophy of economics. He is the editor of Contemporary Ideas and Issues in Social Sciences, an online journal, and has authored a number of papers on the issues relating to theories and practices of democracy, human rights and environment.

**N. Vasudevan** is the Director of the Gandhi Media Centre in New Delhi and a prominent Gandhian writer.

**Aye Aye Win**, a correspondent for the Associated Press in Myanmar, has been the director of Dignity Internatinal, an international human rights organization. One of the only women journalists in Myanmar, Win, 54, works under the repressive military junta in her country. Her movements are closely monitored by authorities; her house is periodically stalked out by plainclothes police or military intelligence agents, and her telephone is often tapped. Win has been called "the axe-handle of the foreign press" by other media outlets in Myanmar because she has helped open the door for foreign journalists to report on the country.

**Sebastien Perez Vasquez** is a founding member of Las Abejas, or "The Bees," a Christian pacifist civil society group of Tzotzil Maya formed in Chenalhu, Chiapas in 1992. When the Zapatista Army of National Liberation uprising took place in 1994, Las Abejas stood in solidarity with the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional's (EZLN) ends and principles, but not their violent means. They paid a high price for their support however, when on December 22nd, 1997, forty-five of their members were massacred while praying in a church, in what's come to be known as the Acteal Massacre.

**Light Wilson Aganwa** is the director of the Sudanese organization, SODAN, the Sudanese Organization for Non-violence and Development. He is a peace activist and international trainer in non-violence.

**Bernard Dangeard** is a member of the Community of the Ark, the Gandhian Community of Non-violence established by Lanza Del Vasto in St. Antoine, France.

**A. T. Ariyaratne** is the founder and President of the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement in Sri Lanka. He received the Ramon Magsaysay Award for Community Leadership in 1969, the Gandhi Peace Prize from the government of India in 1996, the Niwano Peace Prize in 1992, the King Beaudoin Award and other international honors for his work in peace making and village development. In 2006, he received the Acharya Sushil Kumar International Peace Award for the year 2005. Other recipients of this award include John Polanyi and then in 2004, his Holiness, the 14th Dalai Lama. In 2007 Ariyaratne received the Sri Lankabhimanya, the highest National Honour of Sri Lanka.

Ariyaratne, a strong believer in Gandhian principles of non-violence, rural development and self-sacrifice, has shaped the Sarvodaya Movement in ways that forged a significant link between secular principles of development and Buddhist ideals of selflessness and compassion. As a devout Buddhist, he has led tens of thousands of “family gatherings” and meditations with millions of people throughout Sri Lanka and other parts of the world.

**Lilianne Esther Alfonso** is a coordinator of women’s self-help farm groups in rural Paraguay. She is an advocate of traditional farming and indigenous culture.
Enough for Everyone’s Need

Amitabh Behar is the National Campaign Conveyor of Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, a national campaign to hold the government accountable to its promise to end Poverty, Social Exclusion & Discrimination. Wada Na Todo Abhiyan emerged from the consensus among human rights activists and social action groups who were part of the World Social Forum 2004 (Mumbai) on the need for a forceful, focused and concerted effort to make a difference to the fact that one-fourth of the world's poor live in India, and continue to experience intense deprivation from opportunities to learn, live and work in dignity.

Ziad Medoukh, a Palestinian, is a professor of French at Al Aqsa in Gaza and coordinator of the Centre for Peace in Gaza.

B. Mishra is the Managing Trustee AVARD Foundation for Rural Development, New Delhi

Rajiv Vora, writer, speaker and educator, is a preeminent interpreter of Gandhi's works and in particular his root text, Hind Swaraj. He is frequently interviewed in national and international press and is known for his lucid, fresh, insightful, and unorthodox interpretation of Mahatma Gandhi's thought and practice.

K.N. Govindacharya is an Hindu activist, environmental activist, Social activist, thinker. He was formerly associated with BJP. He is the founder of Bharat Vikas Sangam an organization that is working for needed model of economic development directed towards swadeshi and decentralisation.

Yves Berthelot is a French economist, formerly associated with the UN who is now the president of the French section of CFDI, the Committee for International Solidarity and the Centre for International Development. He is the author of several books, most recently, Unity and Diversity of Development: the UN Regional Commissions Perspective, Indiana University Press, 2003. He is a member of the French Legion of Honour.

Emmanuel Faber, Emmanuel Faber has served as a director of Ryanair since September 2002. He holds the title of Co-Chief Operating Officer for Group Danone and also serves as a director of a number of French public companies.

Anupama Patel

Jean Pierre Dardaud is the former president of the NGO Freres des Hommes current secretary of JINOV-International, a funding organization for youth initiative in development and non-violence.

Ramapathy Kumar is a Climate and Energy Campaigner for Greenpeace India.

K. Gopal Iyer is a retired Professor of Sociology at Punjab University and the author of many books on development issues in India, most recently Distressed Migrant Labour in India: Key Human Rights Issues.

Jacky Blanc is a long director of the micro-credit bank, La NEF in France.

Karima Delli is a French politician and Member of the European Parliament elected in the 2009 European election for the Île-de-France constituency. Delli is a member of The Greens. In the 2009 European elections, she was the fourth candidate on the Europe Ecologie list in the East region, and was elected to the European Parliament. She is the second-youngest French MEP.

Sudha Sreenivasa Reddy is a Gandhian Activist and supporter of the Charter for Human Responsibility. She founded an NGO ‘Grama Swaraj Samithi’ (GSS) which literally means ‘Village Self Rule Council’. GSS works with poor communities through participatory and holistic approach for self-dignity and self reliance. She is also involved
with SAHAJEEVAN, an organization that is concerned with cultural pluralism, sustainable agriculture, gender, governance, indigenous habitats and earth spirituality. Sahajeevan has been striving for holistic development of primitive tribe, ‘Chenchus’ living in deep forests of Nalamala Hills in south India. It has also actively promoted biodiversity and wildlife conservation.

A. Serouchni is involved with training of management students in Morocco.

Christine Marsan is a psychotherapist, counsellor and author in France. Her interest is in developing human values in the climate of the economy.

John Clammer is Professor of Sociology and Asian Studies at Sophia University, Tokyo and has previously worked at a number of universities and research institutions in the UK, Singapore, Japan and Australia. His work to a great extent involves a dialogue between Western social theory and the realities of Asian societies, mostly in the context of Japan and Southeast Asia. Amongst his recent publications on these themes are Japan and Its Others: Globalization, Difference and the Critique of Modernity (Melbourne 2001) and Contemporary Urban Japan: A Sociology of Consumption (Oxford 1997) a Japanese version of which has just been published in Kyoto by Minerva Shobo.

Jean-Joseph Boillot is Professor of Social Sciences and hold a PhD in Development Economics. He spent most of the 1980s following the economic reforms in India and China with CEPII, an Institute attached to the Prime Minister office in France. After 1990, he has been Economic Advisor with the French Ministry of Finance on the main challenging regions of the world: Eastern Europe, Russia and CIS, East Asia and India where he joined the French Treasury as Financial Advisor for South Asia, based. Author of more than 20 books, of which Europe after Enlargement, economic challenges for EU and India (Academic Foundation, New Delhi) and of many articles on International and Development Economics, particularly India and China, Dr. Boillot is co-Founder of the Euro-India Economic & Business Group, and Member of various institutions of which the editorial committee of the Monthly Alternatives Economiques, the Association France-Union Indienne (AFUI), the EurolIndia Center and Confrontation Europe. He is married and has two daughters.
APPENDIX 1: PLAN OF THE CONFERENCE

January 30th - Opening
9.30 - 11.00: Ceremonial and prayers for the commemoration of Gandhi martyrdom
(In the presence of the Honourable Governor of Madhya Pradesh and of the
Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh)
11.00 - 12.30: Registration of the delegates
12.30 – 14: Lunch
15.00: Inauguration of the exhibition on non-violent handicrafts: presentation by Karima Delli.

Conference Objectives
Rajagopal Ji (President, Ekta Parishad)
Louis Campana (President, Gandhi International)

Key Message
Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh – Mr Shiv Raj Singh Chauhan
French General Consulate – Mr François Pujolas - France

Key Note Address
Dr Subba Rao Ji (Senior Gandhian Leader)
18.00 - 18.30: tea break
18.30 – 20.00: Concert
Players: Paul Grant, santoor - Nayan Gosh, tablas

15.30 – 18.00: Inauguration Session
Welcome greetings: Ramesh Sharma / Christophe Grigri
Invitation to the stage
Chair person: Aye Aye Win (Dignity International)
Chief Guest: Dr Subba Rao Ji (Senior Gandhian Leader)
Worldwide representation:
America: Sebastian Pérez Vazquez (community leader - Mexico)
Africa: Light Aganwa (Director of SONAD, Sudan)
Europe: Yves Berthelot (President of the World Organisation against Torture
– France)
Song “Jai Jagat” led by Subba Rao Ji
Introductions of participants
Jill Carr-Harris

January 31st - To satisfy true individual and collective needs (“Swaraj”)
9.00 - 12.30: Plenary session (Tea/coffee/networking break at 10.45)
Key note address:
Dr. Satish Jain (Economist, GNU University – India)
Aye-Aye Win (President of Dignity International – Myanmar)

Presentations:
Dr. Arjun Krishnaratne (Sarvodaya Shramadana movement - Sri-Lanka)
To identify basic human needs and the means to fulfil them.
To ensure self-sufficiency of every village, region and country in meeting basic needs.
Lilian Esther Alfonso (Coordinator of women farmers groups – Paraguay)
To prioritize organic and food-producing agriculture as a basis of a viable economy and society (with emphasis on food, health, land maintenance and man’s relationship to nature).
Bernard Dangeard (Arche de Lanza del Vasto International – France)
To reassert the value of manual work and craftsmanship which develops strengths, talent and intelligence and is as noble as intellectual work.
Dominique Hays (Director of Le Chênelet – France)
To respond to the needs of the most deprived through ecology: to create activities with local resources and employing all the available working force; to build healthy and comfortable eco-friendly social housing; to give back each person access to food.
Vandana Mishra (President of the Social Welfare Society – India)
To provide opportunities for work for people facing physical, mental or psychological challenges.
Amitabh Behar (Global Campaign against Poverty – India)/K.G. Jagadeeshan (Secretary of the Kerala Gandhi Smaraka Grama Sewa Kendram – India)
Through economic activity, to develop social cohesion and the fight against exclusion.
Ziad Medoukh (Coordinator of the Gaza Center of Peace – Palestine / contribution read by Louis Campana)
How, in a time of war or foreign occupation, to survive economically?

12.30 – 14.00: Lunch

14.00-16.30: Workshops

**Workshop 1**
*Facilitators*: Dr. B.B. Mishra (AWARD – Delhi) / Shisir Khanal (Sarvodaya – Nepal)
- To identify basic human needs and the means to fulfil them.
- To ensure self-sufficiency of every village, region and country in meeting basic needs.

**Workshop 2**
*Facilitators*: D.K. Giri (Shumacher Foundation – Delhi) / Jean-Pierre Dardaud (JINOV – France)
- To prioritize organic and food-producing agriculture as a basis of a viable economy and society (with emphasis on food, health, land maintenance and man’s relationship to nature).
- To reassert the value of manual work and craftsmanship which develops strengths, talent and intelligence and is as noble as intellectual work.
- To aim at the durability of goods and the simplicity of their creation and use.

**Workshop 3**
*Facilitators*: Mrs. Putul (Social activist and trade unionist – Bihar) / Christine Marsan (Psychologist – France)
- Through economic activity, to develop social cohesion and the fight against exclusion.
- To provide opportunities for work for people facing physical, mental or psychological challenges.

**Workshop 4**
*Facilitators*: Dr. Amit Kumar (Kumarappa Institute – Delhi) / Thayaparam (Peace and Community Action – Sri-Lanka)
- How, in a time of war or foreign occupation, to survive economically?

16.30 - 17.00: Tea/coffee/networking break

17.00 – 18.30: Plenary session

*Facilitator:*
Jean-Joseph Boillot (co-chairman of the Euro-India Economic & Business Group, founding member of the magazine Alternatives Economiques, France)
- Feed-back from the workshop groups
- Sum up of the day
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**19.00 - 20.30: Cultural Program** (Drama on “Santh Kabeer” by Rangh Shrish)

**20.30 Onwards: Dinner**

**14.00-16.30: Workshops**

**Workshop 1**
**Facilitators:** Bharat Thakur (Social Movement Leader in Orissa, India) / Mr Balaji (Social Activist, India).
- To put machines in the service of man and thus so man not become slave to machines.
- To avoid mass production and promote production by the masses.
- To seek alternatives to heavy industry and large industrial producers.

**Workshop 2**
**Facilitators:** Yatish Mehta (Social activist - Mumbai) / Jagat Basnet (*land rights movement for the landless and tenant farmers fight CSRC – Nepal*)
- To reverse rural exodus, eliminate slums and marginalized neighbourhoods, to encourage the return to rural areas where labour will be needed.

**Workshop 3**
**Facilitators:** Ms Archana Gaur (Senior Quaker Activist, India) / Yves Berthelot (President of the *French Committee for International Solidarity – France*)
- To simplify commerce and trade by limiting intermediaries (wholesalers, brokers, agents) and avoiding unnecessary transport of materials and merchandise.
- To prioritize small producers (agriculture, artisans, industries and services) and to protect existing micro-economic structures.

**Workshop 4**
**Facilitators:** Ramapathy (*Greenpeace Climate and Energy Campaigner – India*) / Richard Thompson Coon (Chairman of *Gulf of Finland Environment Society*, Finland)
- To anticipate and confront diminishing petroleum resources and develop renewable energy.

**16.30-17.00: Tea/coffee/networking break**

**17.00 – 18.30:** Plenary session
**Facilitators:**
Jean-Joseph Boillot (co-chairman of the *Euro-India Economic & Business Group*, founding member of the magazine *Alternatives Economiques*, France)
Dr N. Radhakrishnan (Indian Council of Gandhian Studies)
- Feed-back from the workshop groups
- Sum up of the day

**19.00 – 20.00:** Cultural programme

**20.00 – 21.00:** Dinner

**February 2nd - Economic activity to be guided by the ethics of the common good (“Trusteeship”)**

**9-12.30:** Plenary session *(Tea/coffee/networking break at 10.45)*

**Key note address:**
Yogendra Pareik (*Senior Gandhian – India*)
Yves Berthelot (President of the *French Committee for International Solidarity / President of the World Organisation against Torture – France*)

**Presentations:**
Karima Delli (Elected member of the European Parliament - France)
For a fairer planet, against income discrepancies, to establish a maximum income limitation.
Subhash Lomte (Convenor if National Campaign Committee on Rural Workers - India)
To ensure equal opportunity and eliminate disparities through education and
lifelong training (general, manual, technical, moral and civic).
Christine Marsan (Psychologist, France) / Ali Serhrouchni (Director of the Institute of High Studies in Management, Rabat, Morocco)
When business relies on humanism and peace valuers.
Citizen friendly companies and human factor: Morocco at crossroads.
Jerald Joseph (Dignity International – Malaysia)
To promote a non-competitive culture of cooperation, especially in universities.
To encourage stimulation and exchange of knowledge, know-how and conduct.
Jacky Blanc (Director of La NEF, Cooperative of united finances – France)
To put finance in the service of the common good, notably the poorest, and to favour alternative forms of savings and credit.
Bharat Thakur (Senior social activist from Orissa - India)
To limit the concentration of economic power.
To ensure that private ownership of property does not jeopardize the common good.
To organize the right of oversight and control by civil society and political powers of investments by large corporations, notably oversees.
12.30 - 13.30: Lunch

13.30 - 15.00: Visit to Union Carbide
15.00 - 16.30: Workshop in plenary session
Facilitators: John Clammer (co-Director of the Institute for Sustainability and Peace, United Nations University, Japan)
Kanakmal Gandhi (Eminent Gandhian from Sewagram Ashram)
To eradicate extreme poverty by providing work for everyone.
To ensure equal opportunity and eliminate disparities through education and lifelong training (general, manual, technical, moral and civic).
To cap wealth and denounce greed and speculation through education and law.
To reduce disparities of revenue.
To ensure that private ownership of property does not jeopardize the common good.
To promote a non-competitive culture of cooperation, especially in universities.
To encourage stimulation and exchange of knowledge, know-how and conduct.
To put finance in the service of the common good, notably the poorest, and to favour alternative forms of savings and credit.
To limit the concentration of economic power.
To organize the right of oversight and control by civil society and political powers of investments by large corporations, notably oversees.
16.30-17.00: Tea/coffee/networking break

17.00 - 18.30: Plenary session
Facilitators:
Jean-Joseph Boillot (co-chairman of the Euro-India Economic & Business Group, founding member of the magazine Alternatives Economiques, France) / Aye-Aye Win
(Director of Dignity International, Myanmar)
- Synthesising the three days of interactions
- Drawing out the themes that could assist with strategie follow up

19.00 - 20.00: Cultural program
20.00 - 21.00: Dinner
February 3rd - Congress part: Concrete actions for the future

8.30 - 12.00: Plenary session (Tea/coffee/networking break at 10.30)
- Presentation of the « Jansatyagraha 2012 » by Ekta Parishad
- Presentation of the upcoming actions in Latin America by the SERPAJ
- Presentation of the upcoming actions « Objective 2012 » in Europe by Gandhi International
- Presentation of the upcoming actions « Objective 2012 » in Africa by Camille-Joseph Gomis and Light Aganwa
- Talks to define common objectives for the actions which will be held in several continents
- Link to be made with the Charter of Human Responsibilities presented by Sudha S.
- Talks on the creation of the Intercontinental Committee of Orientation and Support
- Agreement for a motion

12.00 – 13.00: Lunch

13.00 - 14.00: March for the Dignity (way to New Market central square)

14.00 - 15.30: Speeches/Prayers

15.30 - 16.00: Back to Gandhi Bhavan

16.00 - 18.00: Concluding Session

18.30 - 20.00: Dinner