



# INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

( Peer-reviewed, Refereed, Indexed & Open Access Journal )

DOI : 03.2021-11278686

ISSN : 2582-8568

IMPACT FACTOR : 5.71 (SJIF 2021)

## An analysis of Sustainable Development pathway for a balanced growth

**Shri. Venkatesh Sharma**

Research Scholar

Department of Economics,

Faculty of Social Sciences,

Mohan Lal Sukhadia University, Udaipur (Rajasthan)

Email: [venkatacademics68@gmail.com](mailto:venkatacademics68@gmail.com)

DOI No. **03.2021-11278686** DOI Link :: <https://doi-ds.org/doilink/09.2021-36373882/IRJHIS2109008>

### **Abstract:**

*The sustainable development pathway chartered by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development is defined in terms of 17 Sustainable Development Goals and their 169 associated targets. These goals and targets comprehensively cover all aspects of our social, economic and environmental wellbeing based on the triple bottom-line approach. However, their interdependencies and mutual interactions make the approach more complex and complicated than it appears. This is aggravated by the lack of weightage to any specific sector of development making it all the more disoriented. The limitations placed by the practical approach towards these goals by countries based on their own needs, aspirations and requirements play an important role in implementation of this approach towards sustainable development. It is now almost clear that the current pattern of economic growth is having a big adverse impact of the natural resource and various the constituents of ecology. And there is a distinct need to shift to better development pathway that is consistent with the principles of environmental conservation and encourages sustainable use of natural resources along with marked improvements the overall wellbeing and prosperity of the mankind. In this context, this paper is an attempt to understand, examine various aspects and components of Sustainable Development approach as regards their viability, feasibility, effectiveness and efficacy in addressing the complex economic, social and environmental issues facing the planet given the very limited timespan available for course correction.*

**Keywords:** Sustainable development, balanced growth, green growth

### **Introduction:**

Despite the focus of global community on addressing the social and environmental dimension of developmental activities in form of adherence to the framework of Sustainable Development, (United Nations, 2015) during more than three decades, studies reveal that the major risks to the planet and its inhabitants, in terms of likelihood are extreme weather conditions, Climate action failure, Natural disasters, Biodiversity loss and human made environmental disasters and climate action failure, biodiversity loss and extreme weather conditions in terms of impact on the planet and human survival. (World Economic Forum (WEF), 2020) The 'Humanity's Ecological

Footprint' in form of exponential growth in global trade, the rapidly increasing population(World Economic Forum (WEF), 2020) and patterns of consumption and production has resulted into 'overusing of Earth's biocapacity by at least 56%. (WWF, 2020). Besides this, the dire ominous indication of 'global warming likely to reach 1.5°C between 2030 and 2052' due to human activities is a good enough warning for the humanity to sit up, take note, be proactive and expeditiously adopt climate resilient development pathways. (IPCC, 2018) The studies on food security(IFPRI, 2018), wealth and income Inequality (Oxfam, 2018) and shared prosperity (World Bank , 2018)also reveal that there is lot to be done in these aspects as well.

The dichotomy and the divergence of outcome between the approach of Sustainable Development and the results of human activity on the planet is overwhelming and very clearly reveal a gross mismatch between what is expected and what is being done. The pathways adopted for Sustainable Development do not seem to be in sync with the grim realities of development activities and the scale and intensity of their impact on the carrying capacity of the Planet. Neither does the timeline seem to be in coherence. It may be too late before we realise that the present approach of Sustainable Development would not render the expected benefits in the time window available to us. However, the possibility of bending the curve of ecological degradation is still very much achievable. It needs 'increased efforts...consistent with broader sustainability agenda.....of unprecedented ambition and coordination' is the call of the hour. (Leclère, Obersteiner, Young, & al, 2020)

Another approach that has been in lot of global discussion during the post Rio period is the 'Green Growth' approach. This was triggered by the adoption of Agenda 21 in the Rio Earth Summit of 1992 that called for development strategies incorporating integration of environmental concerns with economic activity, making economic instruments effective in addressing environmental concerns. (United Nations, 1992). Green Growth can be understood as "*fostering economic growth and development, while ensuring that natural assets continue to provide the resources and environmental services on which our well-being relies*".(OECD, 2011). The need to bring about drastic change in the patterns of production and consumption has been spelt out earlier as well (United Nations, 1987)

### **Objective:**

While the practicing framework of Sustainable development is woven around economic growth, the concept of Green Growth is more biocentric in approach. It is now almost clear that the current pattern of economic growth is having a big adverse impact of the natural resource and various the constituents of ecology. And there is a distinct need to shift to better development pathway that is consistent with the principles of environmental conservation and encourages sustainable use of natural resources along with marked improvements the overall wellbeing and

prosperity of the mankind. In this context, this paper is an attempt to understand, examine various aspects and components of Sustainable Development approach as regards their viability, feasibility, effectiveness and efficacy in addressing the complex economic, social and environmental issues facing the planet given the very limited timespan available for course correction.

### **Sustainable Development Approach:**

If one were to look at sustainable development as the practice of living in harmony with nature or according due regard to natural forces in life, then the idea of sustainable development is as old as the human civilization itself. All ancient and even medieval civilizations not only revered nature and natural forces in their daily life and rituals but also accorded it due primacy as well. (Sharma, Agarwal, & Kumar, 2014) Civilizations have realised the interdependence of humans with other elements of nature and have considered themselves part of the community of species within the ecology.(Hughes, 2009). However, abrupt climatic changes and the overstretching of these civilisations beyond the capacity of the natural environment only amplified the effects of climate change and caused their collapse. (Fleming, 2019) The world is probably going through that repeated cycle of climate change presently and laxity may prove costly.

Interestingly the modern-day discourse on sustainability of our development processes also owes its genesis to the concern over increasing degradation of environment and nature due to the increased industrialisation post the industrial revolution in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century and beyond. The ‘Club of Rome’ project that resulted into the seminal work of ‘Limits to Growth’ drew the attention of the world and initiated a meaningful discussion on our path of development. (Meadows, Meadows, Randers, & Behrens, 1972). Key works that also highlighted this thinking include Rachel Carson's Silent Spring (1962),(Carson, 1962) Garret Hardin's Tragedy of the Commons (1968) (Hardins, 1962)and the Blueprint for Survival(Goldsmith, et al., 1972) by the Ecologist magazine (1972). These studies, and the debates they started, are arguably the real beginning of the great sustainability discourse that the global community has been involved into for the last four decades.

About fifteen years after the Club of Rome’s publication came another large step forward in this movement, at least according to most mainstream sources. The World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) was tasked by the Secretary General of the UN, in 1983, to “re-examine critical environmental and development problems around the world and formulate realistic proposals to address them.”This culminated in the 1987 Brundtland Report’s publication of “Our Common Future”, which established a suggested path for sustainable development on a global level and served to bring the concept of sustainability into the foreground on an international level. The most frequently cited definition of sustainability came to be included in *Our Common Future*, the 1987 UN-commissioned study known as the Brundtland Report: “*Humanity has the ability to make development sustainable to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising*

*the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.*" (United Nations, 1987)

A ground-breaking step came in 1992 with the first UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also popularly known as '*The Earth Summit*', in Rio de Janeiro. At this conference, an agenda called Agenda 21 was adopted, which "recognized each nation's right to pursue social and economic progress and assigned to States the responsibility of adopting a model of sustainable development." The Secretary General of UNCED regarded Agenda 21 as a "*program of action for a tolerable future for the human family and an initial step toward making sure the world will change into a more just, secure and wealthy habitat for all humanity.*"

The UN Commission on Sustainable Development was formed as a result of the Earth Summit and has since coordinated the UN sustainable development activity. In 1994, John Elkington coined the term "*triple bottom line*" to clarify sustainability as the integration of social, economic, and environmental value. Major events have been held in Johannesburg in 2002 (the World Summit on Sustainable Development) and more recently the Rio + 20 event, again in Rio de Janeiro (United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development). The ensuing report is called "*The future we want*". (United Nations, 2012)

In year 2000, through the UN Millennium Declaration the global comity of nations chartered on a new pathway of balanced development by way of endorsing and committing to reduce extreme poverty and set out a series of eight-time bound targets to be met by 2015, popularly known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It was committed to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, achieve universal primary education, promote gender equality and empower women, reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases, ensure environmental sustainability and develop global partnership for development. The review of the achievement of these targets paint a fairly successful picture claiming to be most successful anti-poverty movement in history. The concerted efforts, targeted interventions, sound strategies, adequate resources and political will was at display during this period. (United Nations, 2015)

In Rio, Member States decided to launch a process to develop a set of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which will build upon the Millennium Development Goals and converge with the post 2015 development agenda. This formed the basis of UN resolution number "A/RES/70/1 - Transforming the World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" which describes itself as "*a plan of action for people, planet and prosperity*". It contains mutually agreed 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 169 Targets which are framed in such a way so as to "*balance the three dimensions sustainable development –economic, social and environmental.*" (United Nations, 2015)

The 17 SDGs and associated 169 targets are expected to provide a guiding framework for the governments, global institutions and even businesses to work towards addressing the most pressing

challenges that the humanity and the planet is facing. Having been appreciated and accepted across the globe by most of the countries, the uniformity is expected to develop synergy in thought, policy and action thereby increasing the performance and outcome by balancing the three dimensions of sustainability at least in context of a country. The integrated and interlinked nature of the SDGs with interdependencies and interactions make it more complex and complicated than it may appear at the onset.

The SDGs very clearly envisages that economic growth would further social development. The environmental aspect would probably be taken care of by the technological progress that would minimise adverse environmental impacts while promoting efficiency and optimisation at the same time. However, economic development activity by definition is suicidal in nature that thrives on self-consumption of resources and focuses on optimal utilisation and maximizing gain. It is limited by time, space and resource availability. It also ignores its effect on the surrounding environment and consequently on the activity itself. The cyclical nature of cause and effect in any economic activity therefore ignores a very vital phenomenon that has lasting influence on itself. The concept of sustainable development can be interpreted in many different ways, but at its core is an approach to development that looks to balance different, and often competing, needs against an awareness of the environmental, social and economic limitations we face as a society.

From a careful reading and understanding of the various resolutions and commitments made by world leaders at various global fora and also the slew of documents that had emanated on the issue of framing global perception and policy on sustainable development, the following clearly emerge:

1. Human well-being through sustained economic growth is the focus.
2. Inter-generational equity in terms of ensuring that the future generations are not deprived of the benefits of the natural resources is one of the guiding principles.
3. The concerns of ecology or environment are subsidiary to economic development.
4. Advancements in science and technology would be able to take care of the ecological or environmental concerns arising out of human activity.

#### **The Alternative Pathway:**

The concept of sustainable development from a theoretical point of view is paradoxical in nature. While 'sustainability' characterizes continued state of delivery of benefits and life, 'development' involves disrupting environmental and ecological constituents of nature and exhausting natural resources. It renders a societal perspective to any activity and deemphasizes environmental concerns. However, the concept does hold out an optimistic note for arriving at a solution that accommodates both the conflicting ideas. Economy and ecology or environment no longer seem to be at loggerheads. Rather, it appears that through practical application of this concept

of sustainable development, a pathway, capable of coping up with the ecological crises arising out of economic activity without compromising on the benefits of economic growth, can be carved out.

The idea of sustainability as living in harmony with nature or respecting nature and its primary role in sustaining life on the planet is not new one if it is taken in terms of coexistence of humans and other elements of nature. Even in the pre-industrial and post-industrial era, communities have been and are still deeply involved in protecting and conserving natural elements that surround them. The sources of food, fuelwood, water, and other livelihood needs still attract due attention from the local indigenous population. Various practices of communities clearly reflect this tendency. Built into this understanding is the fact of interdependence of resilience of human life with that of the resilience of components of natural ecosystems and those natural ecosystems need time to restore to their reusable potential.

Living within our environmental limits is one of the central principles of sustainable development. One implication of not doing so is climate change. But the focus of sustainable development is far broader than just the environment. It's also about ensuring a strong, healthy and just society. This means meeting the diverse needs of all people in existing and future communities, promoting personal wellbeing, social cohesion and inclusion, and creating equal opportunity. Sustainable development is about finding better ways of doing things, both for the future and the present. We might need to change the way we work and live now, but this doesn't mean our quality of life will be reduced.

The need to understand 'sustainability' in all its facets is therefore pivotal to understanding "sustainable development". 'Sustainability' of a process or an activity can be understood primarily in terms of the discipline in which we are trying to look into. We can be looking at economic sustainability or environmental sustainability or even social sustainability of any process of activity and accordingly the emphasis would change. However, it can be very well appreciated that 'sustainability' of any process or activity in one discipline does not necessarily mean sustainability in the others. More often, a parallel comparative scientific analysis of any process or activity in two or more disciplines would lead into contradicting or conflicting results, making it difficult to reach any definitive conclusion about the overall sustainability of the process or activity.

Further, human life is inextricably linked to all other life forms and ecological systems of nature. Any action that does not take into account his very fragile relationship, which has not yet been fully understood by humanity despite all the scientific and technological advancements, can cause profound and at time irreparable disturbance for not only the humanity but also other life forms. Available literature is filled up with examples of such instances and the pinch is now being felt by one and all in form of impacts of climate change. Such decisions, often taken on economic or political considerations do not produce immediate effects but over time, these become manifest and

threaten human survival. The depletion of ozone layer, the rising sea levels, increasing occurrences of floods, drought, extreme weather conditions, melting of ice shelf, reducing marine ecology, global warming, climate change impact are all such case in point. Sustainability is therefore a very complex and 'textured idea that is multidimensional and elusive to define'. The complexity therefore underscores the need of interdisciplinary approach and to incorporate cross boundary understandings from natural sciences and social sciences in addition to application of pure science.

With the entry of the idea of 'sustainability' in the global political and economic agenda in terms of 'Sustainable Development', the focus of human effort strongly centrifuged toward human well-being and equity; equity for both present and future generations. For strong sustainability, this natural capital should not decrease over time so that the opportunities of the future generations to generate wealth and well-being are not endangered. The natural capital should remain constant. Ecological economics strives to keep the scale of human activity within sustainable limits for it considers natural capital to be non-substitutable. This principle links economic system to the ecological systems. Economic activity that ignores the aspect of environmental good would not prove to be viable in the long run. Similarly, an environmental solution that does not have a bearing on social improvement and economic health would lead to increased poverty which would lead to environmental degradation.

The vision envisaged in Agenda 2030 is not only very ambitious, grandiose and highly optimistic, it is more inclined towards an ideal and almost utopian world order. While understanding the challenges being faced the world over in terms of poverty, unemployment, inequality, gender discrimination, natural resource depletion, threat to environment, exacerbated by phenomenon like climate change and its adverse impacts that are undermining the ability to become a sustainable world order, the opportunity rendered by significant economic and social progress, immense scientific and technological advancement, increased global interconnectedness and development of a 'knowledge society' is not missed over.

Banking on the innate human ability to surmount all obstacles in its will to survive and progress, the agenda seeks to establish over time a new 'transformational' world order 'free of poverty, hunger, want, and diseases; with universal access to resources and opportunities; with just, equitable, tolerant and inclusive society; which enjoys sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth; in which consumption and production and use of natural resources is sustainable; and in which humanity lives in harmony with nature and wildlife; Nothing can be better and probably, it would rather be impossible for the world leaders to modify or amend this vision anytime in future.

This is an era where economic growth is being driven by fast paced technological innovation and increased resource productivity that has changed the very basis of current economic models. Newer and unusual job opportunities with greater competitive market are being seen. Rapid

urbanization, increased globalization, more emphasis on service led growth and increased automation is bringing about a transformational shift with a clear opportunity to transit into low carbon footprint economy that can deliver equitable and prosperous growth. Accelerating investment in sustainable infrastructure is the need of the hour. Clean and affordable energy systems based on technological and scientific advancement can provide better living conditions to millions hitherto deprived. Increased targeted investment into conserving natural ecosystems and agriculture can provide greater food security, greater rural prosperity, and increased resilience to climate change impacts combined with valuable ecosystem services. Higher productivity, better technology, increased resource efficiency, circular use of resources with sustainability at its core can provide more just, equitable and inclusive growth that is envisaged under the Agenda 2030.

### **Conclusion:**

While sustained economic growth and its positive impacts on life of people seems increase human prosperity and standard of living, many social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development are presenting a cause for concern. It is clear that we are far from achieving basic objectives of a decent living that the agenda for sustainable development envisages. Poverty, hunger, malnutrition, inequality, wealth disparity provision of safe drinking water, sanitation, health and hygiene are all areas that still require lot of concerted effort and attention and for fulfillment of human potential through educational, socio-cultural and economic opportunities. Many of these have roots in traditional socio-economic inequities and discrimination which get compounded with pressure of modern day economic and social practicalities.

In addition, natural ecosystems are under stress and decline in their health and status is visible. Water bodies, hills, biodiversity areas, critical wildlife habitats, wetlands, rivers and streams, etc are all facing existential threat from development activities. All this is compounded by pollution of all the elements of environment- air, water and soil. Reports suggest that India's resource use is already more than its bio capacity and that too has declined over years due to decline in natural capital. Climate change impacts are worsening the situation.

An integrated and holistic view on all these social, economic and environmental aspect is therefore necessary to charter a pathway to sustainable development as envisaged in the 2030 Agenda. Moving towards a comprehensive framework of sustainable development encompassing human values of equity, justice and opportunity for all and also ensuring environmental and ecological well-being is all but easier said than done.

Knowledge and understanding of the ecological dynamics of various constituents of nature is still very limited and elementary. There is a huge gap between what we perceive and what actually is. Although, traditional knowledge and learning, that humanity accumulated through experience and observation is valuable, there is need to undertake more and more scientific research and exercises to



clearly foresee and forecast natural phenomena. There is a dire need and also urgency to enhance our understanding and the capacity to deal with ecological and environmental problems

The complexity of a system with a multitude of institutions and stakeholders with diverse aim and competencies has to be taken into account while formulating the sustainable development framework for a diverse nation as India. The members of the civil society organizations, academicians, the progressive leaders, the community leaders, the teachers and educators, therefore, have a very crucial role to play to create a mass movement towards sustainable way of life.

### **Bibliography:**

1. Agyeman, J., Bukkard, R. d., & Evans, B. (2002). Exploring the nexus: Bringing together sustainability. *Space & Polity*, 77-90.
2. Andrews, R. N. (1997). National environmental policies: A comparative study of capacity building. In M. Jaenicke, & H. J. Weidner, *National environmental policies: The United States* (pp. 25-43). New York: Springer Verlag.
3. ARAVALI. (2002). *Aajeevika- Livelihoods in Rajasthan : Status, Constraints and Strategies for Sustainable Change* . Human Development Resiurce Centre, United Nations Development Programme.
4. Barooah, V. K., Diwakar, D., Mishra, V. K., Naik, A. K., & Sabharwal, N. S. (2014). Caste, Inequality and Poverty in India : A Reassessment. *Development Studies Research*, 1(1), 279-294.
5. Baumann, P., & Sinha, S. (2001). Linking Development with Democratic Porcesses in India : Political Capital and Sustainable Livelihoods Analysis. *Natural Resource Perspectives*(68).
6. Berke, P. r., & Kartez, J. (1995). Sustainable development as a guide to land use policy. *Cambridge,MA: Research Paper, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy*.
7. Biedenweg, K. (2012). A Framework for Evaluating Forest Conservation Implications of Community- Based Capacity Building : Experiences from the Northern Bolivian Amazon. *Conservation and Society*, 10(3), 259-69.
8. Boyce, J. K., Klemer, A. R., Templet, P. H., & Willis, C. E. (1999). Power distribution, the environment, and public health: A state-level analysis. *Ecological Economics*, 127-140.
9. Burke, P. R., & Conroy, M. (2000). Are we planning for sustainable development? *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 21-33.
10. Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spings* . Houghton Mifflin Company .
11. Cornia, G. A. (2004). *Inequality , Growth and Poverty in an Era of Liberalisation and Globalization*. (W. I. Research, Ed.) London: Oxford University Press.
12. Cucurachi, S., & Suh, S. (2017). Cause-effect for Sustainable Development Policy. *Economic Reviews*.

13. Das, T. (2019). Does Credit Access lead to expansion of Income and Multidimensional Poverty? A study of Rural Assam. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 46(2), 252-270.
14. Dasgupta, P. (2013, December). The nature of economic development and the economic development of nature. *Economic and Political Weekly*, pp. 38-51.
15. Delzeit, R., Zabel, F., Mayer, C., & Vaclavik, T. (2017). Addressing future tradeoffs between biodiversity and cropland expansion to improve food security. *Regional Environmental Change*, 17(5), 1429-1441.
16. Department of economic and social affairs . (2012). *Back to our common future; Sustainable development in 21st century projects*. New York: United Nations.
17. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2013). *World economic and social survey 2013 : Sustainable Development Challenges*. New York: United Nations.
18. Du, W. H. (2013). Comparative study on BRIC carbon dioxide emissions: Econometric empirical test based on cross country time series data. *2nd International Conference on Energy, Environment and Sustainable Development* (pp. 1512-1515). Switzerland: Transtech Publications.
19. Durana, C. D., Luminita, A. A., Gogana, M., & Duran, V. (2015). The Objectives of Sustainable Development: Ways to Achieve Welfare. *Procedia Economics and Finance* (pp. 812-817). 4th World Conference on Business, Economics and Management WCBEM.
20. Editorial. (2002, September). Accepting Responsibilities . *Economic and Political Weekly* , pp. 3687-88.
21. Fan, S., Hazell, P., & Thorat, S. (1999). *Linkages Between Government Spending , Growth and Poverty in Rural India*. International Food Policy Research Institute.
22. Fleming, S. (2019, March 29). *World Economic Forum*. Retrieved from <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/03/our-turn-next-a-brief-history-of-civilizations-that-fell-because-of-climate-change/>
23. Gaiha, R. (2000). Do Anti-Poverty Programmes reach the Rural Poor in India ? *Oxford Development Studies*, 28(1), 71-95.
24. Garnett, S. T., Sayer, J., & Toit, J. D. (2007). Improving the Effectiveness of Interventions to Balance Conservation and Development : A Conceptual Framework. *Ecology and Society*, 12(1).
25. Geisinger, A. (1999). Sustainable development and the domination of nature: Spreading the seed of the western ideology of nature. *Environmental Affairs law Review*, 43-74.
26. Ghate, R., Ghate, S., & Ostrom, E. (2013, February 23). Can Communities Plan, Grow, and Sustainably Harvest from Forests? *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII(8), pp. 59-67.

27. Ghosh, M. (2013). *Liberalization, Growth and Regional Disparities in India*. Springer India.
28. Goldsmith, E., Allen, R., Davull, J., Ecologist, T., Allaby, M., & Lawrence, S. (1972). *Blueprint for Survival*. Houghton Mifflin.
29. Gubbi, S., & MacMillan, D. C. (2008). Can Non-timber Forest Products Solve Livelihood Problems? A case study from Periyar Tiger Reserve, India. *Oryx*, 42(2), 222-228. Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.cambridge.org/core>: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030605308071111>
30. Hardins, G. (1962). The Tragedy of Commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243-1248.
31. Hegde, R., Suryaprakash, S., Achoth, L., & Bawa, K. S. (1996). Extraction of Non-Timber Forest Products in the Forests of Biligiri Rangan Hills, India: Contribution to Rural Income. *Economic Botany*, 50(3), 243-251.
32. Howarth, R. B., & Farber, S. (2002). Accounting for the Value of Ecosystem Services. *Ecological Economics special Issue on The Dynamics and Value of Ecosystem services : Integrating Economic and Ecological Perspectives*, 41, 421-429.
33. Hughes, J. D. (2009). *An Environmental History of the World : Humankind's changing role in the community of life*. London: Routledge.
34. IFPRI. (2018). *Global Food Policy Report 2018*. Washington, USA: International Food Policy Research Institute.
35. Ioannis, A., Fylantzopoulou, D., & Nikandrou, K. (2014). Examining Linkages between GDP Growth and Sustainable Development in the Eurozone. *Journal of Economics and Business*, XVII(2).
36. Ionescu, R. V., Zlati, M., Valentin, M. A., & Silviu, S. (2018). Reduced Inequalities as factor of Sustainable Development : The Analysis Under Econometric Models. *Sustainability*, 10, 3523.
37. IPCC. (2018). *Global Warming of 1.5 deg C: Summary for Policymakers*. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
38. IUCN; UNEP;WWF. (1980). *World Conservation Strategy : Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development*. IUCN.
39. Jabareen, Y. (2006). A new conceptual framework for sustainable development. *Online Journal springer*.
40. Jha, R., & Shankar, R. G. (2010). National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme in ANDhra Pradesh and rajasthan : Some recent Evidence. *Contemporary South Asia*, 18(2), 201-213.
41. Kanjilal, K., & Ghosh, S. (2013). Environmental Kuznets Curve for India : Evidence from tests for co-integration with unknown structural breaks. *Energy Policy*, 56, 509-515.

42. Kitchen, L., & Marsden, T. (2009, July). Creating Sustainable Rural Development through Stimulating the Ecco-Economy : Beyond the Eco-Economic Paradox. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 49(3).
43. Kochar, A. (2008). The Effectiveness of Indias Anti-Poverty Programmes. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 44(9), 1289-1308.
44. Kothari, A. (2013, July 27). Development and Ecological sustainability in India : Possibilities for a post 2015 framework. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII(30), pp. 144-154.
45. Kothari, R. (1990). Environment, technology and ethics. In J. R. Engel, & J. G. Engel, *Ethics of Environment and Development—Global Challenge, International Response* (pp. 27-49). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
46. Kumar, K. S. (2016, January 16). Economics of sustainable development . *Economic and Political Weekly*, pp. 34-36.
47. Leclère, D., Obersteiner, M., Young, L., & al, e. (2020). Bending the curve of terrestrial biodiversity needs an integrated strategy. *Nature*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2705-y>
48. Mabrouki, M. (2016). The Sense of Causality Between Growth and Economic Development : An essay of VAR Modeling in the Case of Tunisia. *Munich Personal RePEc Archive*.
49. Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W. (1972). *The Limits to Growth : A Report for THE CLUB OF ROME'S Project on the Predicament of Mankind*. Washington DC: Potomac Associates.
50. Meadows, D., Randers, J., & Meadows, D. (2005). *Limits to Growth : The 30 Year Update*. London: Earthscan.
51. Mittal, S., & Kumar, P. (2000). Literacy, Techonology Adoption , Factor Demand and Productivity : An Econometric Analysis. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 55(3), 490-499.
52. Montalvo, J. G., & Ravallion, M. (2010). The Pattern of Growth and Poverty Reduction in China. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 38(1), 2-16.
53. Mukhopadhyay, P., Sinha, M., & Sengupta, P. P. (2017). Importance of Sustainable Rural Development through Agrarian Reforms : An Indian Scenario. In *Social, Health and Environmental Infrastructrres for Economic Growth* (pp. 290-306). IGI Global.
54. Nathan, H. S., & Reddy, B. S. (2008). *A conceptual framework for developemnt of sustainable development indicators*. Mumbai: Indira Gandhi Insitute of Development Research.

55. Nathan, H. S., & Reddy, B. S. (2008). A Conceptual Framework for Development of Sustainable Development Indicators . *Indira Gandhi Institute of Deelopment Research, Mumbai*.
56. Neumayer, E. (2001). The human development index and sustainability. A constructive proposal. *Ecological Economics*, 101-114.
57. OECD. (2011). *Towards Green Growth*. Paris: OECD Publishing. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264111318-2-en>
58. Oxfam. (2018). *Reward Work, Not Wealth*. Oxford, UK: Oxfam GB.
59. Pandya, M., & Bhatt, K. (2010). Impact of Irrigation on AGricultural Growth and Poverty Alleviation in India. *International Journal of Agricultural and Statistical Sciences*, 6(2), 493-497.
60. Pattanayak, S. K., Poulos, K. C., Young, J. C., & Patil, S. (2010). How valuable are environmental health interventions? Evaluation of water and sanitation programmes in India. *Bulletin of World Health Organisation* , 88(7), pp. 535-542.
61. Pearce, D., & Turner, R. K. (1990). *Economics of natural resources and the environment*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
62. Pearce, D., Barbier, E., & Markandya, A. (1990). *Sustainable development: Economics and environment in the third world*. London: Earthscan Publications.
63. Rajasthan, F. D. (2019). *Adminstrative Report 2018-19*. Jaipur: Government of Rajasthan.
64. Reardon, T., & Vosti, S. A. (1995). Link Between Rural Poverty and the Environment in Developing COuntries: Asset Categories and Investment Poverty. *World Development*, 23(9), 1495-1506.
65. Reddy, D. N., Reddy, A. A., & Bantilan, M. C. (2014). The Impact of Mahatama Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) of Rural Labor Market and Agriculture. *India Review*, 13(3), 251-273.
66. Reddy, V. R. (1998). User Valuation of Renewable Natural resources: Some Methodological Issues. *Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture*, 37(1), 43-71.
67. Repetto, R. (1985). *The global possible: Resources, development, and the new century*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
68. Robinson, N. (2006). Developing criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management in Arrow Forest District. *BC Journal of Ecosystems and Management*, 7(1), 50-56. Retrieved from [http:// www.forrex.org/publications/jem/ISS34/vol7\\_no1\\_art2.pdf](http://www.forrex.org/publications/jem/ISS34/vol7_no1_art2.pdf)
69. Roseland, M. (2000). Sustainable community development: Integrating environmental, economic, and social objectives. *Progress in Planning*, 73-132.

70. Saleth, R. M., Namara, R. E., & Samad, M. (2003). Dynamics of Irrigation-Poverty linkages in rural India : Analytical Framework and Empirical Analysis. *Water Policy*, 56(5), 459-473.
71. Santana, N. B., Aparecida, D., Reblatto, D. N., Perico, A. E., & Mariano, E. B. (2014). Sustainable Development in the BRICS Countries : An Efficiency Analysis by Data Envelopment. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 21(3), 259-272.
72. Santana, N. B., DA, R., E, P. A., HF, M., & Filho, W. L. (2015). Technological innovation for sustainable development: An Analysis of different types of impacts for countries in the BRICs and G& groups. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 22(5), 425-436.
73. Satterwaite, D. (1996). For better living. *Down to Earth*, pp. 31-35.
74. Schick, A., Hobson, P. R., & Ibisch, P. L. (2017). Conservation and Sustainable Development in the VUCA world: The need for a systemic and ecosystem based approach. *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability*.
75. Sehrawat, M., & Giri, A. K. (2014). The Relationship Between financial development Indicators and Human Development in India. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 41(12), 1194-1208.
76. Sharma, R., Agarwal, N., & Kumar, S. (2014). Ecological Sustainability in India through the Ages. *International Research Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 3(1), 70-73.
77. Sheina, S., & Fedorovskaya, A. (2018). *Conceptual Framework for Sustainable Development of Rural Areas : Environmental Issues*. Retrieved from MATEC Web of Conferences : <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/201819301012>
78. Singh, R. K., Murthy, H. R., Gupta, S. K., & Dikshit, A. K. (2008). An Overview of Sustainability Assessment Methodologies. *Science Direct*, 191-210.
79. Sirisha C Naidu, P. T. (2010, July). Primary accumulation, Capitalist nature and Sustainability. *Economic and Political Weekly*, pp. 39-45.
80. Solow, R. (1991). Sustainability: An economist's perspective. *The Eighteenth J. Seward Johnson*. Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.
81. Times, E. (2018, July 23). *The Economic Times* . Retrieved 2019, from [economictimes.indiatimes.com](http://economictimes.indiatimes.com): <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/world-news/asia-pacific-may-meet-only-one-out-of-17-sdgs-warns-un-official/printarticle>
82. UNDP. (2018). *Human Development Indices and Indicators : 2018 Statistical Update*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

83. UNEP. (2015). *Multiple Pathways to Sustainable Development: Initial Findings from the Global South*. Switzerland: United Nations Environment Programme.
84. United Nations. (1973). *The report of the United Nations Conference on Human Environment (the Stockholm Conference of 1972)*. New York: United Nations.
85. United Nations. (1987). *The report of World Commission on environment and Development: Our Common future (the Brundtland Commission report)*. New York: United Nations.
86. United Nations. (1992). *Agenda 21*. Rio De janeiro, Brazil: United Nations.
87. United Nations. (2012). *The future we want*. New York: United Nations.
88. United Nations. (2015). *Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development*. New York: United Nations Department of economic and Social Affairs.
89. United Nations. (2015). *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015*. New York: United Nations .
90. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. UNITED NATIONS.
91. Wagale, M., Singh, A. P., & Sarkar, A. K. (2019). Impact of Rural Road CONstruction on Local Livelihood DIversification : Evidence from Pradhan mantri Gram Sadak Yojana in Jhunjhunu District, India . *Geo Journal* .
92. World Bank . (2018). *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2018: Piecing Together the Poverty Puzzle*. Washington, USA: The World Bank Group .
93. World Economic Forum (WEF). (2020). *The Global Risks Report 2020*. World Economic Forum .
94. WWF. (2020). *Living Planet Report 2020: Bending the curve of biodiversity loss*. Gland, Switzerland: World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).
95. Yale University of Environmental Law and Policy. (2018). *Global metrics for the Environment: Ranking country performance on high priority environmental issues*. World Economic Forum.
96. Yeung, S. M. (2015). A Mindset of Entrepreneurship for Sustainability. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 797-811.
97. Zhuang, J., & Ali, I. (2010). Poverty, Inequality and Inclusive Growth in Asia . In *Poverty, Inequality and Inclusive Growth in Asia* (pp. 1-31). Anthem Press.
98. Zhuge, R., & Tidsell, C. (1999). Sustainability Issues and Socio-economic change in the Jingpo COMMunities of China. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 26(1-3), 21-45.