

INDIA AND GROSS NATIONAL HAPPINESS (GNH) : A GEOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

BY

Dr. Ram Pravesh Yadav

Associate Professor

University Deptt. of Geography

B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur (Bihar)

Abstract :

Gross national happiness (GNH) is the true parameter of development. Quantitative indicators indicate a quantity or magnitude. The quantity can be expressed in terms of pure number, an index, ratio or percentage. These are widely used in development programmes as they give a very clear measurement of growth or development and are also comparable. Performances or achievements of two or more nation's programmes may easily be compared. Qualitative indicators do not show numeric measures as such. They only depict the status of something in more or less in qualitative terms. Sometimes, qualitative terms do not seem appealing but it is also true that something is better captured by qualitative indicators than a quantitative one. For example, how much a poor community is empowered may not be measurable in strict quantitative terms. But they can be ranked or graded based on qualitative findings. Whether a body is properly functioning or not can be assessed only in qualitative terms and then it can be ranked. There is neither comparison nor competition between qualitative and quantitative approach. Both have their respective values and their respective significance. We should not strive to find 'which one is better' rather we should strive to find which one is more suited for which purpose. Good programme thinking does not involve 'quantitative or qualitative' aspect instead it involves 'quantitative and qualitative' aspects.

Keywords :

Gross National Happiness, Psycho-geographical indicators, Sustainability, Qualitative development, Quantitative development, Per capita income,

Introduction :

Growth or development based on indicators is currently central concept to many local, city- wide, national and international sustainability initiatives. The quantitative basis of development means that achieving sustainability through counting or measuring or weighing approach that includes the size, scope and sheer number of indicators. The

techno- scientific ‘edge’ inherent in them tends to blur the possibilities for bringing into question, the structures of power and criteria by which values are translated into practice. The present research paper discusses some of the methodological issues that arise when setting out to develop and implement qualitative indicators of sustainability that incorporate some quantitative metrics. This alternative approach involves people in actively learning and negotiating over how best to put sustainability into practice. The aim of such a research method is to engage citizens in the job of achieving sustainability as a task of itself, undertaken on terms acceptable to them in the context of the communities in which they live.

▪ **Geographical Perspective:**

India is a developing country and its economy mostly depends on agriculture. The country experiences monsoon climate that is completely indefinite. The northern part of the country is represented by lofty Himalayan mountain range while the southern part is known as peninsular plateau. Only the great central plain of India is fertile having dense population but some of its parts having mineral contents have been industrialized. Infra-structural facility of development is somewhat satisfactory in plain region of India in comparison to mountain and plateau regions. The assessment of gross national happiness was designed in an attempt to define an indicator and concept that measures quality of life or social progress in more holistic and Psycho-geographical terms than only the economic indicator of gross domestic product (GDP). GNH has only been officially used in Bhutan, where a Gross National Happiness Commission is charged reviewing policy decisions and allocation of resources. In 2013, with a new administration, the country shifted the focus from spreading GNH globally to the well-being of people within Bhutan. [2] This shift has been interpreted by some as an abandonment of GNH in favour of more standard development initiatives.[3]

▪ **Hypothesis:**

- 1) Sufficient fulfilment of qualitative and quantitative indicators of development may lead a country towards gross national happiness.
- 2) Gross regional happiness is an inseparable part of gross national happiness.
- 3) Regions with alluvial soil and higher mineral contents are running fast towards GNH.
- 4) Regions with better communicational and electric facility are running fast towards GNH.

▪ **Objectives :**

India is the country of second highest population in the world hence required a lot of agricultural products to serve its people. To know about the status of happiness of Indian people is the major objectives of the present research paper. Tpepxw

▪ **Methods applied :**

‘Social mapping’, as a method, has been used in the present research paper that is based on the available secondary data. Comparison has been done between the status of India and other countries of the world as per need. It also involves asking people to plot out where they see the boundaries of their locale, their community or communities, and their

responses to process of interchange that cross that space. This is used to refine understandings of space, community, polity and place. It involves walking with and talking to people as they move through defined spaces, and seeing how their understandings and shaping of their world is informed via their interactions and movements. Social mapping in the first instance is geared towards the overall project objectives, and then related with the social themes. These are interpreted in terms of a series of layers of social analysis that draw upon the theoretical levels of the applied research methodology and research thus, moving from the empirical to the abstract and back again in a constant journey of return, testing each level against the others.

▪ **Sources of data:**

The secondary data obtained from various sources have been used and analysed in the present research paper in order to find out the position of India towards gross national happiness. Parameters for GNH have also been selected on international approach. On various parameters of gross national happiness, status of different Indian states have also been attempted to find out.

▪ **Origin, meaning and concept :**

The term "Gross National Happiness" was coined in 1972 by Bhutan's fourth Dragon King, JigmeSingyeWangchuck, who opened Bhutan to the age of modernization soon after the demise of his father, JigmeDorjiWangchuk. He used this phrase to signal his commitment to build up an economy that would serve Bhutan's unique culture based on Buddhist spiritual values. At first, he offered as a casual, offhand remark, the concept was taken seriously, as the Centre for Bhutan studies, under the leadership of Karma Ura, developed a sophisticated survey instrument to measure the population's general level of well-being.[1] Two Canadians, Michael and Martha Pennock played a major role in developing the Bhutanese survey, which took a six to seven-hour interview to complete. They developed a shorter international version of the survey which has been used in their home region of Victoria BC as well as in Brazil. The Pennocks also collaborated with Ura in the production of a policy lens which is used by the Bhutanese GNH Commission for anticipating the impact of policy initiatives upon the levels of GNH in Bhutan[2]

Like many psychological and social indicators, GNH is somewhat easier to state than to define with mathematical precision. Nonetheless, it serves as a unifying vision for Bhutan's five-year planning process and all the derived planning documents that guide the economic and development plans of the country. Proposed policies in Bhutan must pass a GNH review based on a GNH impact statement that is similar in nature to the Environmental Impact Statement required for development in the U.S. At present, we are stealing the future, selling it in the present, and calling it GDP. (—Paul Hawken) [3]

The Bhutanese grounding in Buddhist ideals suggests that beneficial development of human society takes place when material and spiritual development occur side by side to complement and reinforce each other.

The four pillars of GNH are the promotion of sustainable development, preservation and promotion of cultural values, conservation of the natural, and establishment of good governance. At this level of generality, the concept of GNH is transcultural—a nation need not be Buddhist to value sustainable development, cultural integrity, ecosystem conservation, and good governance. Through collaboration with an international group of scholars and empirical researchers the Centre for Bhutan Studies further defined these four pillars with greater specificity into eight general contributors to happiness—physical, mental and spiritual health; time-balance; social and community vitality; cultural vitality; education; living standards; good governance; and ecological vitality. Although the GNH framework reflects its Buddhist origins, it is solidly based upon the empirical research literature of happiness, positive psychology and well-being.

In 2013, the President of Singapore Dr Tony Tan proposed that in addition to building up substantial financial reserves, Singapore also needed to focus on building up its "social reserves", a concept that appears to have parallels to GNH.[4]

▪ **Common indicators of developments :**

- 1) Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
- 2) Gross National Product (GNP)
- 3) GNP per capita
- 4) Birth and death rates
- 5) Human Development index (HDI)
- 6) Infant mortality rate
- 7) Literacy rate
- 8) Life expectancy
- 9) Global Hunger Index
1. Basic parameters of social developments :
 - 1) Education
 - 2) Health
 - 3) Gender equity
 - 4) Poverty
 - 5) Population
 - 6) Social cohesion
 - 7) Rate of employment and unemployment
2. Quantitative and Qualitative indicators of development :

There is no exact quantitative definition of GNH but elements that contribute to GNH are subject to quantitative measurement. Low rates of infant mortality, for instance, correlate positively with subjective expressions of well-being or happiness within a country. The practice of social science has long been directed toward transforming

subjective expression of large numbers of people into meaningful quantitative data; there is no major difference between asking people "how confident are you in the economy?" and "how satisfied are you with your job?" GNH, like the Genuine Progress Indicator, refers to the concept of a quantitative measurement of well-being and happiness. The two measures are both motivated by the notion that subjective measures like well-being are more relevant and important than more objective measures like consumption. It is not measured directly, but only the factors which are believed to lead to it. According to Daniel Kahneman, a Princeton University Economist, happiness can be measured using the day reconstruction method, which consists in recollecting memories of the previous working day by writing a short diary.[6]

A second-generation GNH concept, treating happiness as a socio-economic development metric, was proposed in 2006 by Med Jones, the President of International Institute of Management. The metric measures socio-economic development by tracking seven development areas including the nation's mental and emotional health.[7] GNH value is proposed to be an index function of the total average per capita of the following measures:

1. **Economic Wellness:** Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of economic metrics such as consumer debt, average income to consumer price index ratio and income distribution
2. **Environmental Wellness:** Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of environmental metrics such as pollution, noise and traffic etc.
3. **Physical Wellness:** Indicated via statistical measurement of physical health metrics such as severe illnesses.
4. **Mental Wellness:** Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of mental health metrics such as usage of anti-depressants and rise or decline of psycho-therapy patients.
5. **Workplace Wellness:** Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of labour metrics such as jobless claims, job change, workplace complaints and lawsuits.
6. **Social Wellness:** Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of social metrics such as discrimination, safety, divorce rates, complaints of domestic conflicts and family lawsuits, public lawsuits, crime rates
7. **Political Wellness:** Indicated via direct survey and statistical measurement of political metrics such as the quality of local democracy, individual freedom, and foreign conflicts.
8. The above seven metrics were incorporated into the first Global GNH Survey.^[8] Ed Diener, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has developed a scale referred to as subjective well-being, a concept related to happiness and quality of life, which has been used to compare nations to each other on this construct.[9] This study found that "high income, individualism, human rights, and social equality correlated strongly with each other and with SWB" (p. 851, abstract).

9. Adam Kramer, a psychologist from the University of Oregon, has developed a behavioural model of "Gross National Happiness" based on the use of positive and negative words in social network status updates, resulting in a quantitative GNH metric.[10]

Per Capita Income,2019:

Per Capita Income is a measure of the amount of money earned per person in a nation or geographic region. Per capita income for a nation is calculated by dividing the country's national income by its population. It is used to determine the average per person income for an area and to evaluate the standard of living and quality of life of the population. The per capita income is a crude indicator of prosperity of a country. The India's per capita income is estimated to have raised by 10% to Rs. 10534 a month during the financial year ended March, 2019 government data on national income. In 2017-18, the monthly per capita income stood at Rs. 9580. Following table shows the recent position of India in context to per capita income :

Table - 01

Position of India in monthly Per Capita Income

| Sl. No. | Year | Position of India |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | 2017-18 | 9579.83 |
| 2 | 2018-19 | 10533.83 |

Source :The Global Hunger Index is a peer reviewed Annual Report jointly published by Ireland's Concern World wide and Germany's Welthungerhilfe, 2019.

World literacy rate and India,2019:

Over the past several decades, global literacy rate have significantly increased. The main reason for such an upward trend stems from the evolution of educational system of many developing countries. An increased acknowledgement of the significance of education in the developing societies became so much helpful in increasing the literacy rate among people. Developed nations as a whole have literacy rate of 99.2%. The world atlas source has published the following table showing the recent position of India in context to world literacy rate :

Table - 02

Position of India in monthly world literacy rate

| Sl. No. | %age of literacy | No. of countries | Name of important Countries |
|---------|------------------|------------------|---|
| 1-26 | 100% | 26 | North Korea, Norway, Finland, Poland, Ukraine, Cuba, Russian federation, Latvia, Georgia etc. |
| 27 - 55 | 99% | 29 | Italy, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Japan, Iceland, Sweden, etc. |
| 56 - 70 | 98% | 14 | Spain, Israel, Austria, Argentina, Uruguay, Bulgaria, Maldives, Serbia etc. |
| 71 - 70 | 98% | 14 | Spain, Israel, Austria, Argentina, Uruguay, Bulgaria, Maldives, Serbia etc. |
| | | | |
| 159 | 74.04% | | India |

Source :World Atlas, 2019.

Literacy in India is key for socio-economic progress and the literacy rate in India has grown to 74.04%. The 2011 census indicated a 2001 - 2011 decadal literacy growth of 9.2% which is slower than the growth seen during the previous decade. There is wider gender disparity in the literacy rate of India.

▪ **Human Development Index and India, 2019:**

Human development index is a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development : a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and have a decent standard of living. The HDI is a geometric mean of normalized indices for each of three dimensions. Human development index is a process of enlarging the range of people's choices, increasing their opportunities for education, health care, income and empowerment and covering the full range of human choices from a sound physical environment to the socio-economic and political freedom. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has developed a composite index known as Human Development Index (HDI). In India, is a freedom? Development is a qualitative growth or change which becomes always positive. In other words, development occurs when positive growth takes place. Positive growth does not always lead to development. Developments occur when there becomes a positive change in quality. For example, if a population of a city grows from five to ten lakhs during a certain period, we say city has grown. But if the basic facilities of life such as housing, supply of drinking water, transport, sewerage etc. remain the same and do not grow in proportion to population growth, then the growth has not been accompanied by development.

In India, development is a mixture of opportunities as well as neglect and deprivation. A few people in urban areas are enjoying all the facilities of modern life while

on the other hand, a number of people living in rural areas and urban slums do not have even the basic amenities of life. People belonging to scheduled castes and scheduled tribe, landless agricultural labourers, poor farmers, slum dwellers etc. are worst sufferers. The condition of female population is more pathetic. These factors pose adverse effects of the quality of human life and human development. As compared to pre-independence days, India has done well in development in general. As per HDI Reports published annually by UNDP, India has consistently improved on human development front or index and is grouped among the countries with medium human development. The following table shows human development index of India in different years:

Table :03

Status of India in HDI

| Sl.No. | Year | Status Point | Increase (\pm) |
|--------|------|--------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 1980 | 0.344 | |
| 2 | 1990 | 0.410 | 0.066 |
| 3 | 1995 | 0.460 | 0.050 |
| 4 | 2000 | 0.461 | 0.051 |
| 5 | 2005 | 0.504 | 0.043 |
| 6 | 2009 | 0.535 | 0.031 |
| 7 | 2010 | 0.542 | 0.007 |
| 8 | 2011 | 0.547 | 0.005 |
| 9 | 2015 | 0.624 | 0.077 |
| 10 | 2018 | 0.640 | 0.016 |

Source : HDR, May, 2018

India climbed one spot to rank at 130 out of 189 countries in the latest Human Development Index (HDI) released by human development programme. India's HDI value for 2018 moved to 0.640 up from 0.624 in 2015. India has shown a steady increase of nearly 50% in HDI between 1980 and 2018 which is driven by the changes in health, education and income.

▪ **HDI Ranking among Indian States on different indices :**

Table :04

Status of Indian states in HDI, 2018

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Index | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 | Kerala | 0.784 | 1 |
| 2 | Goa | 0.764 | 2 |
| 3 | Punjab | 0.721 | 3 |
| 4 | Himachal Pradesh | 0.720 | 4 |
| 5 | Sikkim | 0.716 | 5 |
| 29 | Bihar | 0.566 | 29 |

Table :05

First five Indian states in Economy, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Telangana | 1 |
| 2 | Haryana | 2 |
| 3 | Gujarat | 3 |
| 4 | Uttarakhand | 4 |
| 5 | Himachal Pradesh | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 16 |

Table :06

First five Indian states in Infrastructure, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Himachal Pradesh | 1 |
| 2 | Gujarat | 2 |
| 3 | Andhra Pradesh | 3 |
| 4 | Tamilnadu | 4 |
| 5 | Maharashtra | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 21 |

Table :07

First five Indian states in Agriculture, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 1 |
| 2 | Madhya Pradesh | 2 |
| 3 | Chhattisgarh | 3 |
| 4 | Karnataka | 4 |
| 5 | Orissa | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 21 |

Table :08

First five Indian states in Education, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Himachal Pradesh | 1 |
| 2 | Uttarakhand | 2 |
| 3 | Haryana | 3 |
| 4 | Rajasthan | 4 |
| 5 | West Bengal | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 6 |

Table:09

First five Indian states in Health, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Himachal Pradesh | 1 |
| 2 | Gujarat | 2 |
| 3 | Karnataka | 3 |
| 4 | Maharashtra | 4 |
| 5 | Jammu & Kashmir | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 21 |

Table :10

First five Indian states in Law and Order, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|-----------------|-------------|
| 1 | Tamilnadu | 1 |
| 2 | Kerala | 2 |
| 3 | Jammu & Kashmir | 3 |
| 4 | Uttarakhand | 4 |
| 5 | Gujarat | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 20 |

Table :11

First five Indian states in Governance, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Kerala | 1 |
| 2 | Chhattisgarh | 2 |
| 3 | Madhya Pradesh | 3 |
| 4 | Andhra Pradesh | 4 |
| 5 | Himachal Pradesh | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 19 |

Table :12

First five Indian states in 'Inclusive Development', 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | Telangana | 1 |
| 2 | Karnataka | 2 |
| 3 | Punjab | 3 |
| 4 | Andhra Pradesh | 4 |
| 5 | Uttarakhand | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 19 |

Table :13

First five Indian states in Environment, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Kerala | 1 |
| 2 | Himachal Pradesh | 2 |
| 3 | Karnataka | 3 |
| 4 | Andhra Pradesh | 4 |
| 5 | Telangana | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 18 |

Table :14
First five Indian states in Cleanliness, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Kerala | 1 |
| 2 | Punjab | 2 |
| 3 | Haryana | 3 |
| 4 | Tamilnadu | 4 |
| 5 | Himachal Pradesh | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 18 |

▪ Tourism in India :

Tourism in India is very important for the country's economy and is growing rapidly. The World Travel and Tourism Council calculated that tourism generated 16.91 lakh crore rupees or 9.2% of India's GDP IN 2018 and supported 42.7 million jobs ie. 8.1 of its total employment. The sector is predicted to grow at an annual rate of 6.9% to 32.05 lakh crores by 2028. Above 10 million foreign tourists arrived India in 2017 as compared to 8.89million foreign tourists in 2016 representing a growth of 15.6% India improved its ranking by 6 places over the 2017 report which was the greatest improvement among the 25% of countries ranked. The following table shows first five states in tourism development along with the position of Bihar :

Table :15
First five Indian states in Tourism development, 2017

| Sl. No. | Name of States | HDI Ranking |
|---------|------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Tamilnadu | 1 |
| 2 | Himachal Pradesh | 2 |
| 3 | Uttar Pradesh | 3 |
| 4 | Assam | 4 |
| 5 | Madhya Pradesh | 5 |
| 6 | Bihar | 18 |

All the above mentioned indicators show the development status among Indian states in which the position of Bihar is far behind. Whatever is the position of Indian states, India has not obtained a praiseworthy position amongst the countries of the world. In each and every sector of assessment for HDI, India has to perform better and better in coming future so as to get the better position on the world platform in the direction of the development so as to increase its step towards better gross national happiness.

- **Gross National Income :**

India's per capita gross national income (GNI) has gone up by a staggering 2.6 to 6.6 per cent between 1980 and 2018.

- **Life Expectancy :**

Between 1980 and 2018, India's life expectancy at birth also increased by nearly 11 years. School aged children in the country can expect to stay in school for 4.7 years longer than what they did in 1990. According to the latest WHO data published in 2018 life expectancy in India is : Male - 67.4, Female - 70.3, Total life expectancy in India is 68.8 which gives India a world life expectancy ranking of - 125. The following table shows the report of life expectancy schedule of India in different years:

Table :16

India : Life Expectancy at birth by sex

| Year | Male | Female | Difference (Fem. -Male) |
|---------|------|--------|-----------------------------|
| 1970-75 | 50.5 | 49.0 | -1.5 |
| 1991-95 | 59.7 | 60.9 | +0.3 |
| 2001-06 | 63.8 | 66.1 | +2.3 |
| 2006-11 | 65.8 | 68.1 | +2.3 |
| 2011-16 | 67.3 | 69.6 | +2.3 |
| 2016-21 | 68.8 | 71.1 | +2.3 |
| 2021-26 | 69.8 | 72.3 | +2.5 |

Source: (i) Premi M.K. and Das, D.N. (2012), Population of India, 2011, p. 47.

(ii) Bose, Ashish (2010), India's Quest for population stabilization, p.89.

Due to improvement in health and sanitation services, the life expectancy at birth in India has improved considerably during the last over four decades as is expressed in above mentioned table. The difference between male and female life expectancy has been in favour of males in 1970-75 where after it becomes in favour of females and is still going on. Again, urban life expectancy is higher than that of the rural life expectancy.

- **Crude birth and death rate :**

India is the second most populous country in the world with nearly one fifth of the world's population. According to 1917 revision of the world's population prospects, population stood at 1324171354.. And the birth rate was recorded as 19.3 births / 1000 and death rate 7.3 deaths / 1000 while the life expectancy was recorded as 68.89.

According to National Family Health Survey (NFHS) - IV, 2015-16, International Institute for Population Sciences, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Govt. of India, 2016, the fertility rate was recorded as 2.2 children per woman.

Table :17

India : Crude birth and death Rate

| No. | Year | CBR / 1000 | CDR / 1000 |
|-----|---------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 1950-55 | 43.3 | 25.5 |
| 2 | 1960-65 | 40.4 | 19.8 |
| 3 | 1970-75 | 37.5 | 15.0 |
| 4 | 1980-85 | 34.5 | 11.8 |
| 5 | 1990-95 | 30.0 | 10.2 |
| 6 | 2000-05 | 25.3 | 8.4 |
| 7 | 2010-15 | 20.4 | 7.4 |
| 8 | 2016-17 | 20.2 | 6.3 |

Source : (i) ORGI, Census of India, Sample Registration System Bulletin. (ii) National Family Health Survey (NFHS) - IV, 2015-16, International Institute for Population Sciences, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Govt. of India, 2017.

▪ **Rate of Unemployment :**

The rate of employment and unemployment also becomes helpful in determining the human development index. India's unemployment rate stood at 6.1% in financial year 2017-18. The Periodic Labour Force Survey of the national sample survey office released unemployment status report according to which unemployment rate in rural areas of the country was at 5.3% and 7.8% in urban India resulting in over all unemployment rate of 6.1% in 2018. The following table represents somewhat detail:

Table : 18

First five Indian states in Rate of Unemployment, 2017-18

| Rank Sl. No. | Name of States | % age of Unemployment Rate | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|
| | | Rural | Urban | Total |
| 1 | Meghalaya | 0.6 | 6.7 | 1.5 |
| 2 | Chhatisgarh | 2.5 | 7.5 | 3.3 |
| 3 | Sikkim | 2.7 | 5.8 | 3.5 |
| 4 | Andhra Pradesh & M.P. | 3.6 | 6.6 | 4.5 |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|
| 5 | West Bengal | 3.8 | 6.5 | 4.6 |
| 15 | Bihar | 7.0 | 9.0 | 7.2 |
| 25 | Nagaland | 21.6 | 21.1 | 21.4 |

Source: Periodic Labour Force Survey, 2017-18, Ministry of labour and employment, p. 212

The state of Meghalaya has the least unemployment rate among the Indian states as is expressed through the above mentioned table. Bihar has been placed on 15th rank while Nagaland has the highest unemployment rate. Higher rank represents lower unemployment among the population. National average stands at 6.1 percent.

▪ **Global Hunger Index, 2019 :**

The Global Hunger Index or GHI scores countries on a 100 point ‘Severity Scale’ where zero is the best score (no hunger) and 100 is the worst. India scored 102 out of 117 countries while Pakistan is at 94, Bangladesh 88 and Nepal at 73. India is behind its neighbouring countries Nepal, Pakistan and Bangladesh. In a list of 117 countries that tracks hunger and malnutrition non-profits that work for humanitarian aid. India fell from 55 out of 76 nations in 2014 to 100 out of 119 countries 102 in 2019.

Table -19

Position of India in Global Hunger Index

| Sl. No. | Year | Position of India | Among the total no. of nations | India's position in 100 |
|---------|------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2014 | 55 | 76 | 72.4 |
| 2 | 2017 | 100 | 119 | 84.0 |
| 3 | 2018 | 103 | 119 | 87.6 |
| 4 | 2019 | 102 | 117 | 87.2 |

Source : The Global Hunger Index is a peer reviewed Annual Report jointly published by Ireland's Concern World-wide and Germany's Welthungerhilfe, 2019.

As according to the above mentioned table, India's global position appears to be fluctuating. In 2014, India in the global hunger index was placed on the position of 72.4 out of 100 while its position decreased to 84th in 2017 and 87.6th in 2018. But in March, 2019, its position in global hunger index improved slightly to 87.2.

▪ **Conclusion:**

- India's scenario is far behind on the way of gross national happiness .
- From an economic perspective, GNH in India which depends on a series of subjective judgments about human well-being is lagging behind and our government is not able to define GNH in a way that suits their interests.
- Economics professor Deirdre McCloskey criticizes such measurements as unscientific, saying that "Recording the percentage of people who say they are happy will tell you. Just how people use words," making the analogy that society could not "base physics on asking people whether today was 'hot, nice, or cold'".
- McCloskey also criticizes the anti-consumerism of the movement to base government policy on happiness, asserting that "High culture has in fact always flourished in eras of lively commerce, from fifth-century Greece through Song China and Renaissance Italy down to the Dutch Golden Age.
- Other critics say that international comparison of human well-being will be difficult on this model; proponents maintain that each country can define its own measure of GNH as it chooses, and that comparisons over time between nations will have validity.
- GDP provides a convenient, international scale. Research demonstrates that markers of social and individual well-being are remarkably transcultural: people generally report greater subjective life satisfaction if they have strong and frequent social ties, live in healthy ecosystems, experience good governance, etc. Nevertheless, it remains true that reliance on national measures of GNH would render international comparisons of relative well-being more problematic, since there is not and is not likely ever to be a common.
- Alternative indicators of emotion as an analogy to economic progress have also been supported by a number of NGOs such as the UK's New Economics Foundation, and are employed in some governments notably in Europe and Canada.

References ---

- 1) "9th Five Year Plan (2002–2007)". Royal Government of Bhutan. 2002. Retrieved 22 August 2011.
- 2) "National Portal of Bhutan"s Department of Information Technology, Bhutan. Archived from the original on 23 April 2012. Retrieved 22 August 2011.
- 3) "Bhutan Population clock". Countrymeters.info. 2012. Retrieved 22 October 2012.
- 4) "Population and Housing Census of Bhutan — 2005" (PPT). UN. 2005. Retrieved 5 January 2010.
- 5) "Bhutan". International Monetary Fund. Retrieved 17 April 2012.
- 6) "Gini Index". World Bank. Retrieved 2 March 2011.
- 7) "Human Development Report Summary". United Nations Development Programme. 2014. pp. 21–25. Retrieved 27 July 2014.

- 8) "Treaty Bodies Database – Document – Summary Record – Bhutan". Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNHCHR). 5 June 2001. Retrieved 23 April 2009.
- 9) "World Population Prospects". United Nations. 2008. Archived from the original on 7 January 2010. Retrieved 4 December 2009.
- 10) B. Larmer, Brook (March 2008). "Bhutan's Enlightened Experiment". National Geographic. ISSN 0027-9358. Retrieved 19 June 2010.
- 11) "The World's Happiest Countries". Business Week. 11 October 2006. Archived from the original on 26 April 2009. Retrieved 23 April 2009.
- 12) "8th Five Year Plan (1997–2002)" (PDF). Government of Bhutan. 1997. Retrieved 22 August 2011.
- 13) "Bhutan." World Almanac & Book Of Facts (2008): 752–753. Academic Search Premier. Web. 8 December 2011.
