Redefining Sustainable Development

Dr. Gurudutta P Japee¹, Dr. Preeti Oza ²

¹ University School of Commerce, Gujarat University
² St Andrew’s College, University of Mumbai

ABSTRACT

Millions of papers have been published and the same amounts of discussions have been made on the topic of Sustainable Development. Despite that, the situation is getting worsen day by day, not even meager progress has been reported. The culture, which is developed in society wherein, dead are worshipped and living people are crushed under the legs of power politics. It has stolen humanity from humans the structured society has created an institutional crisis and emotional crisis. People are suffering from dark emotions irrespective of any group of age. Instead of debating about the topic, we should start nudging society for sustainable development at the micro-level. Working at the Macro level for sustainable development without talking about the micro-level is not only futility but also wasting of resources. The ubiquitous three monkeys of Mahatma Gandhi depicting moral gestures see no evil, speak no evil, and hear no evil are the ardent requirement of the 21st Century as it talks about emotions at the micro-level as it talks about how socially communicability is needed in society.

It is noteworthy that the small three monkey figurine was among the few belongings of Mahatma Gandhi that always remained with him. However, “A photograph of the few personal possessions which Mahatma Gandhi has left to the world and spoons appear in the picture along with his favorite book of songs and the figurine of the three monkeys whom he used to call his gurus. The Monkeys symbolize the injunctions to speak no evil, to see no evil, and to hear no evil.” In this paper, an attempt has been made to establish a trinity model of Gandhi, Buddha, and Dark Emotions which can help society to think positive to irradiate dark emotions which in turns helps in sustainable development.
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Introduction

Development is fundamentally an empowering process, and thus power can be used to preserve and enrich the environment, and not only to decimate it. We must not, therefore, think of the environment exclusively in terms of conserving pre-existing natural conditions since the environment can also include the results of human creation. E.g. purification of water is a part of improving the environment in which we live. The elimination of epidemics contributes both to development and environmental enhancement. (Sen, A, 2009) The idea of using reason to identify and promote better and more acceptable societies has powerfully moved people in the past and continues to do so now. Aristotle agreed with Agathon that even God Could not change the past. But he also thought that the future was ours to make. This could be done by basing our choices on the development. For this we need an appropriate evaluative framework; we also need institutions that work to promote our goals and valuational commitments, and most importantly we need behavioral norms and reasoning that allow us to achieve what we try to achieve. (Sen, A, 2019)

Sustainable Development as a Concept:

According to the Brundtland Report “Sustainable Development means meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generation to meet their own needs: Sustainable development is a central concept of our age. It is both a way of understanding e world and a method for solving global problems. The world population continues to rise rapidly by around 75millions per year. Soon enough there will be 9 billion populations by the end of 2040. (SDSN 2013a, 2, 5). These billions of people are looking for their foothold in the world economy. The poor are struggling to find the food, safe water, health care, and shelter they need for mere survival. People above the poverty line are looking for improved prosperity and a brighter future for their children. The high-level income group is hoping that technological advances will offer them and their families’ higher levels of wellbeing. And of course, super-rich jostle for their place in the world’s rankings of the richest people. Sustainable development envisions four
basic objectives of a good society: economic prosperity, social inclusion and cohesion, environmental sustainability, and good governance by major social actors, government and business houses, and industrialists. The aforesaid objectives of a good society are yet not achieved as it is required to start from the trickle-down approach. The dark emotions of every living human on the are Mother Earth should be cured for which Gandhian and Buddha model should be used rigorously and religiously.

**Why do we need it?**
The changing environment today, which is symbolized by the cross-border flow of capital, technology, and products, has broadened the dimensions of accountability and responsibility. Increasing awareness of issues like ecological, economic, and social sustainability has made it imperative for everyone to adapt itself to a substantive role in creating and enabling such development which does not impair the future. Sustainability permeates many aspects of human and non-human activities. Especially in human activities, the most important aspect which has given the least importance is the moral and emotional dimension; unfortunately, both are an inevitable issue in the theory and practice of sustainable development. In the history of economic thought, the moral dimension of economic theory and practice was not only a product of the great challenges such as global crises (as is the case today) or destructive wars or global climate changes. Most major economic scientists from the past of economic theory such as Samuelson, Galbraith, Marshall, Keynes, Marx previously, and Adam Smith to some extent, in many reflections, stated their own opinions about moral beliefs and the principles that govern should govern the economic behavior of humans. Simply put, the moral dimension of a human individual and social action cannot be separated from his/her economic activity (Djukic 2008: 105-108). It is understood that the ethical component of the economy had to be thoroughly searched by economists who, after the sixties, began systematically to be occupied with a field of economics of environmental protection and natural resources. During the sixties and seventies worked economists who have begun to treat pollution and congestion also economically i. e. economic aspects of the environment and natural resources. Of these, more than others, in this area, were engaged in unconventional “green-minded” authors Mishan, Knees, and Boulding (Djukic 2011c: 10, 11).

The anatomy of development depends on four elements. The functionality of the below-mentioned agents has not been performing or working properly as they are expected to perform
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**Figure 1 Agents of Development**
In addition to geography, culture, poverty, etc., we must include politics, economists, entrepreneurs, and the labor force. Politics in form of government is responsible for HDI, Health, Education, Well-being, and other economic measurements. The role of Government is also vital for the rule of law, it is very certain without government; there will be anarchy and violence. If the government itself is massively corrupt, other institutions such as the banking sector will operate in a lawless environment and are doomed to fail. The government also has to regulate key sectors of the economy. The government has a major role in ensuring that even children from poor families have a chance of social and economic mobility. Politicians exercise popular sovereignty of power. They create truth with this power. An economist is expected to be fair and transparent and to disclose what is true and fair. However, they authenticate the truth which is created by power. Power should not become a non-negotiable absolute, it ought to be negotiable. Power must have a quality framework. Economist and their policies have become the scapegoat of power. Entrepreneurs are expected to contribute ethically and for the interest of society. However, self-interest is more important for them, they seek only for self-interest they are not interested in sustainability, and what they show, or practice is merely a reflection of action and not unpretentious. They are not
immoral but amoral. Labors and the entire workforce are also working for self-interest. This functional cartography of sustainable development leads to a crisis. Rationality, motivation, and legitimacy adoring order results in a crisis. Collectively it creates an institutional and emotional crisis.

Why and how the legitimacy of policy and functionality both have succumbed. It is a question of whether the policy itself is legitimate or not. The policy cannot be run by political motivation. Politicians cannot decide the legitimacy of the principle e.g. to wave the loan of farmers. The claim of legitimation must be exercised. Agency should also keep in mind the health of the nation. The responsibility of citizens has played the biggest role. They should not play as dumb individuals but as rationally negotiable, discipline, and conscious. Power, institutions, and people of the nation must be compatible not for emotional negotiation but rational negotiations. To create or develop this compatibility nudging plays a vital role. The nation must nudge itself. One must nudge himself. Self-nudging is required.

We must demand a self-nudging society. One should think with care irrespective of agent and time. We live in an anti-ecological time pedagogical absolutism not possible. The proper distinction should be made between collective choice and selective choice.

**Crisis of Sustainable Development**

Sustainability cannot be worked out unless critical inquiry into the failure of sustainability is addressed

What are the causes of the crisis?

**Structure**

**Function**

Or any basic excavation to be made for the betterment of stable substance

What you draw is only a structure

What you draw is only a system

What is the role of the Human scale for sustainability?

The primary responsible reason for treating man only as an instrument, functional category that is the reason why rethinking about sustainable development program is inevitable

Micro-level qualitative changes are required to make sustainable development possible else it will become an ideology or metaphor or idiom of expression

---

**What is required for Sustainable Development?**

**Figure 2 Concept of Redefining Sustainable Development**

**Mahatma Gandhi’s approach to the concept of Sustainable Development:**

In 2015, the global leaders assembled in New York and signed up for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable development which comprised 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). One of the most important taglines of these agendas is, “Leave No One Behind”. Gandhiji viewed that, “Progress of a society should be determined by the state of the most vulnerable and the weakest ones.” To establish the continued relevance of Gandhian development thoughts, it will be interesting to explore how much this agenda is aligned with Gandhian outlook and reinforce each other. The idea of a sustainable way of development was an integral part of Gandhi’s life. He believed that sustainable development is a cycle in society, and it will not be completed until the impact reached the ‘end-user’ or the last strata of society. His model of ‘Gram Swaraj’ was based on the ideology of ‘contained the development of the current generation without affecting the needs of future generations’. In his own words, “Earth provides enough to satisfy every man’s need but not any man’s greed.” There are two ideologies of Gandhi with which we can discuss and analyze his ideas of sustainable development:
Sarvodaya
Gram-Swaraj

Today our lives are completely based on the availability of natural resources but unfortunately, they are not equally divided amongst the developing and developed countries. Most of the developed countries are mindlessly exploiting the resources of the others without concerns and understanding of how to exploit and when to exploit. This imbalance is badly affecting the lives of people and the integrity of the planet. If correct balanced is a strike between the usage of resources and availability of resources then the lives of people and the integrity of the planet could be managed well. However, when life is turned into excessive luxury and comfort this balance could break. The concept of sustainable development is multi-dimensional and multi-modal. “Use and Throw” is not fit for sustainable development while Reduce- Recycle-Reuse is the best concept of sustainable development as it refers to balancing of needs and usage. This is the time to think of environmental development instead of economic development. Before any type of development, we should check for ecology and environmental impact, good buildings might not be good development every time. There should be environmental, social, moral, and spiritual balance without all these values development is an unperfected proxy for progress. (Gupta, 2015)

Gandhi’s approach to sustainable development was always future-centric and never present-centric. He once said: "I will give you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you. Apply the following test. Recall the face of the poorest and the weakest man, whom you have seen and ask yourself: If the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he be able to gain anything by it? Will it restore to him control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to Swaraj for hungry and spiritually starving millions? Then you will find your doubts and your self-melts away”. This approach is observed and reflected in his ideology of total value-shift in production, consumption, habits, and political systems. They were always proposed by him on moral grounds and never on personal, social, national, and universal grounds. Gandhi always puts man at the center in any scheme of development. The objective should not be to build the islands of prosperity in the ocean of poverty, but to raise the level of standard of living and to combat poverty. Gandhi’s concept of ‘Sarvodaya’ (Development for all) explains this very well. This community-centered approach towards sustainability is a model to take us to; the betterment of human life and ‘fulfilling basic needs of all human beings’. The welfare of human beings being the ultimate goal by avoiding all sorts of exploitations, Gandhi felt that human dignity needs to be established. Prof Herbert Girardet in his book, "Surviving the Century: Facing the Climate Chaos' gives the concept of 'Earth community'. He draws heavily from Mahatma's words: "Earth has enough resources for everybody's needs and not for anybody's greed." Time magazine in 2007 came out with 51 Global Warming Survival Guides. The 51st guide is/ sharing more and consuming less for a simplified life. We can learn to live simply so that others can simply live. Instead of asking the question, why should I, let us ask the question, why should I not? (Girardet,2012).

Mahatma Gandhi gave an idea of the last man. The rights of the last man of society should not suffer by deeds and decisions of government, businessmen, or politicians.

Buddhist Concept of Sustainable Development:
Gautam Buddha’s argument, presented in Sutta Nipata becomes directly and immediately relevant since we are enormously more powerful than other species; we have some responsibility towards them that links with this asymmetry of power. We can have many reasons for our conservational efforts – not all of which parasitic on our living standards and some of which turn precisely on our sense of values and our acknowledgment of our fiduciary responsibility. (Sen, 2008)

The Buddhist approach to development affirms the core elements of sustainable development. According to Buddhist Philosophy, everything has its origination and its cessation- beginning and end. But in between these two ends, life goes through three worldly phenomena- impermanence, suffering, and finally nirvana (Non-self). According to this philosophy, suffering comes out of clinging to material possession and greed. The ‘Development Myth’ of the western world is unreasonably copied by many nations today which have become the main source of suffering. Sustainable development for a Buddhist implies rather an inner spiritual quality that must be
realized by ongoing practice of virtues, wisdom, and meditation. The “unlimited growth” myth of the profit-led Western culture was collapsed finally in the middle of the 20th century. From that time, the conception of “sustainable development” has taken over its place. It makes a barrier for the globalized economy as it defines duties and aims for economic agents. (Covacs, 2011)

The Buddhist philosophy never differentiates between economic or material existence and inner spiritual development. The appropriate balancing is achieved by a decent material background is only the basis of inner development – an ongoing spiritual perfection towards the eradication of suffering. A decent material background is a necessity for sustainable inner development. To achieve this, the Buddhist economic practice, which is based on the virtues and the philosophy of the teachings of the Buddha is suitable.

Buddhism ascertains that sustainability doesn’t mean sustainable development in the modern sense. Rather it is the ensuring of the appropriate material wellbeing, the accomplishment of non-harming in economic activities, and the realization of the inner freedom from suffering.

The Buddhist concept of development is never solitary or isolated from the cumulative societal development which starts from the individual’s inner development. As Paul Baran (Baran, 1957) described the development as ‘a far-reaching transformation of society’s economic, social and political structure, of the dominant organization of production, distribution, and consumption’.

Buddhism provides a connecting link to sustainable development at all levels – individual, community, national, or international. We can begin from anywhere and we can make a man happier by making him a center of all developments.

Buddhism is based on the ethical teachings of Buddha who have asked us to purify the mind to control our desires. When human beings start being greedy and want to take as much as possible from the earth and the environment, it creates a permanent devaluation and an irreparable loss to future generations. Any kind of devaluation of other creatures, and rating them at lower levels than human beings, empathetically disconnect us from the harmonious principle of nature and lead us to harm to others as well as to ourselves.

It also reflects very well in the four core principles (four boundless states) of Buddhism:

- Loving-kindness (metta)
- Compassion (karuna)
- Sympathetic joy (mudita)
- Equanimity (upekkha).

This practice of ‘metta’ or universal love, begins by suffusing one’s mind with universal love (metta) and then pervading it to one’s family, then to the neighbors, then to the village, country, and the four corners of the Universe.

The concept of sustainable development and Buddhism sometimes emphasizes different dimensions of sustainability and it is at times supplementary to each other. While the idea and implementation of sustainable development rely heavily on the policy-making and scientific measures of achievable indicators, Buddhist philosophy focuses more on attaining moral and spiritual awareness. But we need to see both the dimensions to make it truly free and sustainable life and the universe.

This philosophy is turned gradually into a new approach and concept of Buddhist Sustainable Development (BSD) it is a human-centered sustainable development, driven by inner happiness (happiness at the mind and wisdom levels). The BSD concept emphasizes an understanding of the interdependence of all beings and nature and caring for nature for humanity’s wellbeing (Kittiprapas, 2016). By focusing on the analysis of human happiness, BSD extends the conventional widely used sustainable development framework by dealing with the root causes of sustainable development problems arising from human behavior.

Role of Dark Emotions in the Nexus of Facts v/s Reality in Sustainable Development:

The ubiquitous three monkeys of Mahatma Gandhi depicting moral gestures see no evil, speak no evil, and hear no evil seems to have lost in the practice. The Monkeys symbolize the bans to speak on evil, to see on the evil and the hear no evil.” These monkeys have come to resemble actions or observation, listening, and speaking of all the stakeholders of the nation, but very few people know that the genesis of the three monkeys he chose to spread the message is in the 17th century Japan.”. The three monkeys are Mizaru, covering his eyes, who sees no evil; Kikazaru, covering his ears, who hears no evil; and Iwazaru, covering his mouth, who speaks no evil.
What we do (speak, listen, see) is an act of how we think and what we feel. So, the job of these two monkeys was to make the task of Mizaru, Kikazaru, and Iwazaru; effortless, natural, and authentic. What we think, feel, and actions become the core of what we consider our strengths. Alex Linley and Susan Harrington defined them as an existing capacity for feeling, thinking, and behaving in a way that allows optimal functioning (authentic and energizing to the user) in the pursuit of valued performance and developmental outcomes.

Every individual should act with the existing capacity for feeling, thinking, and behaving in a way that allows optimal in the pursuit of valued performance and sustainable development outcomes.

The interplay of thoughts and emotions that form our character strengths emotions do matter as far as sustainable development is concerned. Work with positive thought processes to form actions and in return gives positive outcomes. To change the outcome, we need to change the emotion and the thought process simultaneously. The fact is that even Gandhi would have felt pain, anguish, and frustration when he saw his fellow citizens take up weapons. He must have felt a sense of despair at Dandi, Jallianwala Bagh, and Chauri Chaura. He must have felt immense grief, watching his wife and best friend, breathe her last, in his arms. It is fascinating that the dark emotions like fear and despair he felt helped him discover his values. Gandhiji borrowed from the Bible (Luke 6:29) and the Quran (Chapter 41, Verse 34-35) “You must show courage – be willing to take a blow – several blows – to show you will not strike back – nor will you be turned aside . . . And when – you do that it calls upon something in human nature – something that makes his hate for you diminish and his respect increase. I think Christ grasped that and I – I have seen it work.” From the script of Gandhi. Dark emotions hold crucial mission-critical information. But one should interpret the following way the way Gandhi did.

Feeling no evil is not about shunning negative emotions. Feeling no evil is about not formulating an evil emotional response. - Anger denotes that something of value is being taken away or that an injustice has occurred. You want to seek reparation. If you are angry, it is about the appropriate expression of the anger, through meaningful conversations and change is what matters. - Fear is a sign that something you value is at grave risk. It is a signal to seek adequate protection. - Envy is a signal that you desire a skill or object that someone else possesses. If you are envious, sulking about fairness might seem an appropriate response, but ultimately you might want to consider the pathways of exerting more energy and effort or even learning from the person. - Frustration is an emotion that you have when you encounter obstacles placed in your path. If you face frustration, you might want to use your creativity to explore alternate pathways.

Anxiety is an emotion that surfaces when you believe that the challenge you face is far higher than the resources and skills you possess. If you are faced with anxiety or stress, you might want to evaluate some resources that you could use, or even recall how you have resolved similar problems in the past.

On the other end, boredom is an emotion when the challenge is far lower than your skill. It's time to raise your ambition. When left to function, your mind transformed the “evil monkeys” or evil stimulus with a positive and growth mindset. Being associated with anxiety, stress, anger, sadness, fear, binge-drinking, and aggression, it is the prime driver of the freeze, fight, or flight response. The amygdala has the power to metaphorically over-ride Gandhi’s “balance of power” to the “power of balance” The key to hearing no evil, seeing no evil, and speaking no evil; is in thinking no evil and feeling no evil. We need the five monkeys, more than ever to overcome dark emotions.

**Nudging for Sustainable Development**

The approach has been popularized by Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein in a book titled “Nudge”, which has been highly influential and practiced by many organizations. (Southerton & Ulph, 2014) The important aspect of the nudge is that it provides the platform for policymakers to free themselves from past policies and achieve behavior change among citizens and consumers, drawing on accumulated insights from academic research. Nudge offers a framework for changing the choice architecture of citizens to achieve alterations in their behavior which constitute improvements for them and society as a whole. Nudges are about framing our choices as individuals. We live in a complex world with
competing signals about what is the best thing to do from a practical ad and ethical perspective. People use social cues to help themselves to decide what to do. What other citizens are doing and what we or individuals should do, or should we follow? How much effort will it take to change an individual’s behavior? Nudging, its advocates suggest, helps to reduce this complexity by simplifying choices, reducing the transaction costs of making decisions, and guiding people towards certain options. (Stoker, 2014)

The authors identify five broad areas of changing social behavior and pushing it in a positive direction.

- An understanding of choice architecture should lead policymakers to understand that citizens often have a default option that they revert to in the absence of other strong signals.
- Policymakers should expect error and design systems so that citizens learn immediately and effectively about mistakes that they will inevitably make.
- It is important to give feedback in a timely and effective way so that people understand the implications of their actions.
- Policymakers could support citizens by paying more attention to the way they construct mind maps when making decisions and encourage the adoption of mind maps that facilitate better decisions.
- Policymakers could provide opportunities for collective filtering so that people can learn from others about what works or what choices might suit them as a person.

Nudge advocates need to find a range of partners for the delivery of interventions that lessen the threat to legitimacy created by top-down approaches. The range of supporters and backers for the use of nudge insights needs to be extended to ward off the limitations of beauracratic politics. The above concept is a game-changer through which the government can operate better decisions, and can make policies. The government can execute policies through nudging where freedom of choice and can manage libertarian paternalism with caring and tenderness. Policies become more viable through nudging. (Japee & Oza, 2020)

**Agnotology- A Missing Term to Describe Development of Ignorance**

According to Thomas Pynchon, 1984, we are often unaware of the scope and structure of our ignorance. Ignorance is not just a blank space on a person’s mental map. It has contours and coherence, and for all, I know of operations as well. So as a corollary to writing about what we know, maybe we should add getting familiar with our ignorance. The causes of ignorance are multiple and diverse, ignorance is more than “not yet known”. Nations need to know about the conscious, unconscious, and structural production of ignorance. Its diverse causes and conformations, whether brought about by neglect, forgetfulness, myopia, extinction, secrecy, or suppression. (Proctor, 2014)

Anglophonia is conventionally derived from Greek. Ignorance in Greek has two forms: *agnosia*, meaning “want of perception or knowledge,” and *agnosia*, meaning a state of ignorance or not knowing, both from gnosis meaning “Knowledge” with the privative a-prefix. Alternative term for the study of ignorance could have been agnosiology, or agnarology, or even agnoskology, designating more properly a study of the unwillingness or inability to learn, Latin crafted agnotology from among these possible options.

There must be many kinds of ignorance as of knowledge – perhaps more, given how scant is our knowledge compared to the vastness of ignorance. There can be many other ways to classify ignorance but majorly ignorance can be classified into three categories

- Ignorance as the native state (or Resource)
- Ignorance a lost realm (or Selective Choice)
- Ignorance as a deliberately engineered (Strategic Ploy or Active Construct)

There are many other reasons people might not want to have all knowledge omnipresent all the time. Not everyone wants to know what kinds of genetic diseases they may be harboring in their genomes. Archaeologists deliberately don’t publish the location of certain excavation sites, fearing looting, and some ethnographers are publishing knowledge of certain biopharmaceuticals in “indigenous” languages to give locals an edge against multinationals. Access
to all kinds of information is limited – ignorance is deliberately created for more reasons than the moon has cratered.

There are lots of ways to think about ignorance – as tragedy, like crime, as a provocation, like a strategy, as stimulus, as excess or deprivation, as a handicap as a defense mechanism or obstruction, as an opportunity, as a guarantor of judicial neutrality, as pernicious evil, as wondrous innocence, like inequality or relief, as the best defense of the weak or the common excuse of the powerful, and so forth. There are sure as many ways to think about ignorance of knowledge, with the sociology just as intricate in both instances. There are lots of different kinds of ignorance, and lots of different reasons to expose it, undo it, deplore it, or seek it. (Proctor, 2014)

- What other kinds of work does ignorance do?
- How else it is created?
- What other kinds of intention, disinterest, calculation, resistance, tradition, or distraction?
- When does knowledge create ignorance?

We tend to think of ignorance as something negative, but when can it become a virtue? Or an imperative? Agnotology could be a challenge to hubris, if there is modesty in learning how deeply ignorant, we are. Think of the countless different ways it is generated. Think of ignorance generated by failures of the body, or failures to fund education or free access to bogus information, or practices and policies that enlarge secrecy or prevarication or compartmentalization. People have extracted very different things from different kinds of unknowns, and will no doubt if it continues for a few more years then it will have a big threat to sustainable development or even development too. “Reports that say that something has not happened are always interesting to me because as we know, there are known knowns; there are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns; that is to say, we know there are some things we don’t know. But there are also unknown unknowns – the ones we don’t know we don’t know. And if one looks throughout the history of our country and other free countries, it is the latter category that tends to be the difficult ones.”- Donald Rumsfeld, Department of Défense news briefing, February/12/2002.

**The creation of the Precautionary Principle** (Magnus, 2014) In the realm of environmental policy and sustainable development, and risk assessment and management determine whether an activity is safe and are seen as “Scientific” and “Systematic approaches” to risk evaluation. For government regulators trying to decide, for example, whether they should allow ships to discharge their ballast in their ports, the starting point would be a systematic review of the environmental impact of such activities on the port. This is only a starting point, as a value-based assessment of whether the degree of risk is worth the potential benefit of action involved weighing many factors, including economic and public benefits against risks. The general goal is to reduce risk and to find eliminating any harm that occurs when risks are identified. This approach can be characterized as “we know what we know and we ignore what we don’t know”. Taking this approach is difficult in the absence of good information about risks, and in a sense, it invites agenogenesis since creating uncertainty about the existence of impetus to manage those risks. Activities which are likely to cause irreversible damage to nature shall be avoided and activities which are likely to pose a significant risk to nature shall be preceded by an exhaustive examination; their proponents shall demonstrate that expected benefits outweigh the potential damage to nature, and where potential adverse effects are not fully understood, the activities should not proceed. This construction of ignorance in the realm of values has led to a clash between how regulators assess and the public experiences risks. If the concept of agnotology is practiced by the stakeholders then chances of sustainable development may be achieved.

**Conclusion:**

As we have discussed in the paper, the concept of ‘Sustainable development’ needs to be discussed from a fresh perspective. All the older references to older contexts are no more relevant today. The importance of human lives lies not merely in our living standard and need fulfillment, but also in the freedom that we enjoy, then the idea of sustainable development must be correspondingly reformulated. There is cogency in thinking not just about sustaining the fulfillment of our needs, but more broadly about sustaining or extending our freedom. Thus recharacterized, sustainable freedom can be broadened from the formulations...
proposed in this article. To use a medieval distinction, we are not only patients whose needs deserve consideration, but a bit also agents whose freedom to decide what to value and how to pursue what we value can extend far beyond our interest and needs. The significance of our lives cannot be put into the little box of our living standards or our need for fulfillment. The manifest needs of the patient, important as they are, cannot eclipse the momentous relevance of the agent’s reasoned values. (Durant. W, & A, )

Education has spread, but intelligence is perpetually retarded by the fertility of the simple. A cynic remarked that “you mustn’t enthrone ignorance just because there is so much of it.” However, ignorance is not long enthroned, for it lends itself to manipulation by the forces that mold public opinion. It may be true, that “you can’t fool all the people all the time”, but you can fool enough of them to rule a large country.

References


[22] Southerton, Dale, & Ulph Alistair (2014), Sustainable Consumption, Multidisciplinary perspectives in honour of Professor Sir Parth Dasgupta, Oxford University Press, UK.


Web Resources:
- https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/acfe/86df438d94ef807b0dce2c086a9e564affcd.pdf
- https://www.dnaindia.com/authors/birender-ahluwalia