

Trusteeship: Gandhian Approach to Reconceptualize Social Responsibility and Sustainability



Sudarshan Iyengar and Babita Bhatt

1 Introduction

Addressing the grand challenges of poverty, inequality, and climate change are the key objectives of global policy on sustainable development goals (SDGs) (Qureshi et al., 2018b, 2021d, 2023). The SDGs show a commitment towards inclusive development and identify equity, inclusion, and environmental governance as three areas of critical importance (Bansal et al., 2014; Bhatt, 2022; Bhatt et al., 2013, 2022; Ghatak et al., [this volume](#); Mahajan & Qureshi, [this volume](#)). Businesses are expected to be key stakeholders in implementing and achieving the SDGs through contributing resources, technological innovation, and sharing knowledge and expertise (Rashed & Shah, 2021; Scheyvens et al., 2016). Concurrently, SDGs also provide a guideline for businesses to shape, manage, and communicate their corporate social responsibility (CSR) strategies (Berrone et al., 2023; McKinsey, 2019). However, the role of businesses in achieving the SDGs has been increasingly scrutinized (De Bakker et al., 2020; Qureshi et al., 2021a; Wickert, 2021). Particularly in the light of repeated scandals, mistreatments of workers, environmental exploitation, and massive tax evasion, is it even possible to achieve the SDGs without the transformation of businesses and the economic system within which they operate?

In management research, the role and responsibility of businesses in addressing grand challenges have been studied within the domain of CSR. The term CSR suggests that businesses have a responsibility towards improving socio-ecological

S. Iyengar

Action Research in Community Health and Development (ARCH), Gujarat, India

B. Bhatt (✉)

Research School of Management, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

e-mail: babita.bhatt@anu.edu.au

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2023

B. Bhatt et al. (eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship and Gandhian Thoughts in the Post-COVID World*, India Studies in Business and Economics, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-4008-0_2

conditions and creating welfare for the broader society (Bansal et al., 2014; Medina-Muñoz & Medina-Muñoz, 2020; Wang et al., 2022). However, in practice, the nature and scope of CSR are predominantly framed through a business-centric approach, which considers it as a strategic tool to increase a firm's reputation, competitive position, and financial performance (Wickert, 2021). In this approach, CSR is described as a voluntary, strategic response to save capitalism by avoiding state interference and preventing regulation from the free market (De Bakker et al., 2020). Critics argue that the close connection between CSR and capitalism inherently limits its potential to address the challenges of poverty, inequality, and climate change, as these are essentially the result of a capitalist economic system (De Bakker et al., 2020; Schneider, 2020; Wickert, 2021; cf. Kistruck et al., 2008, 2013a, b; Qureshi et al., 2022b). Relatedly, De Bakker et al. (2020) discuss how

the dominant neoliberal capitalist system poses important constraints on corporate actions that make negative social, environmental, and ethical externalities of business conduct unavoidable, or might even systematically encourage them. (p. 1296)

The frailty and underlying inequality of the current development system were severely exposed during the global pandemic, COVID-19 (Qureshi et al., 2020, 2022a). The efficiency-driven centralized production model based on the exploitation of cheap labor and consumption of fossil fuel for the supply and distribution network was severely disrupted during the lockdown (Shen & Sun, 2021). The impacts were deeply and broadly felt. For example, emerging research shows that the disruption of the global supply chain, the loss of employment, and the lack of social security have pushed over a billion people into extreme poverty (United Nations, 2020). It has threatened the livelihood of approximately two billion workers in the informal economy (ILO, 2020) and created acute food insecurity for the poor and marginalized groups (WFP, 2020). While the global economy shrank by approximately 3% in the first year of the pandemic and global poverty increased for the first time in a generation (World Bank, 2022), many businesses, driven by the capitalist principles of self-interest and opportunism, attempted profiteering and price gauging and engaged in financial speculation and paying bonuses to CEOs (Bapuji et al., 2020; Phillips et al., 2021).

The profound impact of COVID on all walks of life provides an opportunity to rethink the development and its connections with the environment, business, and society. As noted above, questions are increasingly raised about the effectiveness of the industrial mode of production in advancing societal welfare (Banerjee et al., 2021; Bhatt, 2017, 2022; Bhatt et al., 2021, 2023; Hota et al., 2023; Peredo et al., 2022). There is also a growing realization that the business model based on incessant growth and profit maximization at the cost of depleting natural resources and increasing inequality is neither environmentally nor socially tenable (Bhatt et al., 2022; Klitgaard & Krall, 2012; Pandey et al., 2021; Perkins, 2018; Sutter et al., 2023). Thus, scholars in organization studies, management, and information systems are exploring new models of responsible businesses (Bansal et al., 2014; Parth et al., 2021), social enterprises (Hota et al., 2021; Kistruck et al., 2013a, b; Qiu

et al., 2021 Qureshi et al., 2016, [this volume](#)), social infomediaries (Parthiban et al., 2020a, b, 2021; Qureshi et al., 2018a; Zainuddin et al., 2022), sharing economy at the base of the pyramid (Pillai et al., 2021a, b; Qiu et al., 2021; Qureshi et al., 2021b, c), and technoficing (Qureshi et al., 2021d, 2022b, 2023, [this volume](#)) to nurture the resilient communities (Bhatt et al., [this volume-a](#)) and find a way forward to cultivate self-reliant communities (Bhatt et al., [this volume-b](#)). However, most of these models are still rooted in the dominant economic paradigm under which most businesses and entrepreneurial initiatives function.

Given the intricate interdependence between the environment, business, and society has been widely acknowledged (Wiebers & Feigin, 2020), a comprehensive approach to development is essential. This chapter is a response to the recent call for the exploration of alternative models of development and the role and obligations of businesses in this context, with a particular focus on the Gandhian concept of Trusteeship. The chapter is structured in three sections. In the first section, we delve into the historical development of the idea of Trusteeship as a moral and political tool for promoting equality and fostering nation-building. We highlight the evolution of this concept, its historical and philosophical foundations, and its relevance in contemporary times. In the second section, we examine the key features of Trusteeship, highlighting its emphasis on the ethical and moral responsibilities of business leaders. We also discuss how Trusteeship seeks to establish a symbiotic relationship between the stakeholders of an organization, including shareholders, employees, customers, and the broader community. This section also examines how Trusteeship serves as a model for socially responsible business practices. Finally, in the third section, we explore the significance of Trusteeship in the contemporary world. We demonstrate how it provides an alternative perspective on development, emphasizing the importance of social responsibility and ethical leadership in achieving sustainable development. This section also highlights the potential of Trusteeship as a means of promoting social justice, reducing inequality, and fostering inclusive economic growth.

2 Role of Spirituality in Gandhian Thought

In this section, we highlight the importance of recognizing the spiritual element in Gandhi's persona and his leadership style, which can be categorized as *Antyodaya* leadership (Javeri et al., [this volume](#)) – a leadership driven by the upliftment of the most marginalized. Gandhi's economic thought emphasizes the importance of ethical and spiritual values as core values and advocates for trusteeship as an economic system that stands on nonviolence. Subsequent sections contrast Gandhi's concept of trusteeship with communism and suggest that incorporating his thought perspective into management education can lead to a non-violent and harmonious society. Overall, Gandhi's life and thoughts provide valuable insights for leadership and self-improvement, and his trusteeship concept encourages everyone to earn whatever they need to survive and share whatever surplus they have. It also encourages

entrepreneurs to consider laborers as co-partners of wealth and to attend to their needs before claiming profit or surplus.

2.1 Spirituality in Economics and Business in West

The crisis of spirituality in economics and business in the *West* is increasingly becoming evident. Protestant Ethics once upheld honesty, hard work, and material wealth as divine and believed that a harmonious and prosperous society would result from such values. However, as capitalism flourished, these values gave way to gluttony, pride, selfishness, and greed, leading to undesired results (Giddens, 2005). The focus on quantifying and measuring the welfare of human beings through indicators such as GDP and per capita income has further reinforced this materialistic approach. Despite this, there is a growing effort to re-establish the values of Protestant Ethics and bring spirituality into mainstream economics through initiatives such as the European **S**pirituality in **E**conomics and **S**ociety (SPES) Forum (Bouckaert & Zsolnai, 2007). However, it is important to avoid treating spirituality as a market commodity within the reductionist framework of economics. Instead, it should be considered a public good that can serve the common good of nature, future generations, and society. Treating spirituality as a private good limits the external benefits that it can provide to society (Bouckaert & Zsolnai, 2007, 2011). Spirituality has characteristics of indivisibility and external effects, which can be both negative and positive (Cavanagh & Bandsuch, 2002). In the absence of addressing spiritual well-being and only considering material well-being leads to, at its best, a welfare state created by liberal democracy discourse that remains hollow from within. While the welfare state promotes material well-being, it fails to address issues such as depression, stress, suicide, violence, and breakdown of social values. The relational nature of happiness cannot be achieved through instrumental rationality, and humanity needs to move beyond profit maximization, greed, and consumerism to promote equal conditions for all people. The interconnectedness of spirituality makes it a public good and has the potential to overcome the problems created by rampant capitalism.

2.2 Why Business Ethics Alone Would Not Suffice?

The integration of business ethics as a core course in management schools since the 1980s indicates that economics and business have not ignored ethical considerations. However, this alone is not a complete solution, as ethics in business is often used as instrumental rationality to achieve external goals such as reputation, profitability, and less regulation. Intrinsic ethics, on the other hand, emphasizes individual behavior based on values such as love, trust, friendship, and reciprocity, leading to spirituality. Critics argue that a focus on spirituality in economics may lead to

excessive individual subjective feelings rather than social and institutional conditions. Moreover, Western ethical theories tend to emphasize abstract models to be applied by moral agents rather than motivation, which is the main problem for ethical behavior. Therefore, although ethics is important, it is not sufficient, as it requires motivation based on universal values such as love, compassion, and empathy for all sentient beings.

2.3 Spirituality and Ethics in Management: The Indian Context

Some business schools are trying to bring spirituality and ethics into their management education. It argues that India's ancient traditions, such as Vedanta and Shastras, provide a holistic approach to business and economics that emphasizes spirituality and ethics. However, we note that in modern times, corruption and unethical behavior have become commonplace in the business community, and this can be attributed to the compartmentalization of economic affairs and the artificial separation of *Dharma* and *Artha*. Despite this, the traditional Indian approach to business and economics remains relevant and can be incorporated through the education of spirituality and ethics into management practices.

2.4 Gandhi and Conceptual Foundations of Trusteeship

The management community has shown interest in Mahatma Gandhi, as he was a successful leader who managed a large body of "human resources" (masses) and led "an enterprise" (freedom movement) to a successful mission (of liberating India). However, to study Gandhi from a management education perspective, it is necessary to acknowledge the element of spirituality in his persona. Gandhi's quest for truth was primarily spiritual, and his pursuit of self-realization was the driving force behind his actions in the public and social arenas. His leadership can be categorized as *Antyodaya* leadership, where he created an enterprise of the utmost efficiency and rejected untruth, intolerance, and violence. Studying Gandhi as a person from a management education perspective requires accepting the spiritual element in his persona rather than simply evaluating his ethical behavior as a leader. Gandhi's transformation into a Mahatma began at an early age with his regard for service, which ultimately turned him into a servant-leader of humanity.

Gandhi advocated for truth, honesty, nonviolence, and self-regulation. The young Gandhi learned the value of self-improvement through acknowledgment, repentance, and accepting punishment for wrongdoing, and he practiced self-discipline throughout his life. Gandhi fought for India's independence using nonviolent protest and believed that self-discipline (Swaraj) was essential for serving society and

its causes and forming a healthy and harmonious society. Gandhi's economic thought was deeply influenced by what he saw in England and the impact of British policies on natives and immigrants in South Africa and India. He advocated for building a spiritual nation and living according to high moral values rather than material wealth. His economic thought was based on renunciation, moral values, and self-reliance. Overall, Gandhi's life and thoughts provide valuable insights for leadership and self-improvement.

In his economic thought, Gandhi emphasizes the importance of ethics and spirituality and draws from this holistic approach to examine human behavior. As we describe below, he advocates for trusteeship as an economic system that stands in opposition to capitalism and communism. The basic argument is that for a sustainable society, trusteeship stands a better chance at the theoretical level, with the assumption that the trustee is honest and truthful. Despite criticism that trusteeship is not operational, Gandhi's idea is based on the value of *Aparigraha*, the non-acquisitive nature of the human being that has to be developed. Gandhi departs from conventional economists by emphasizing the multi-utility concept of *Aparigraha*, which takes into consideration the satisfaction of family members, relatives, the neighborhood, society at large, and the whole world by one's actions rather than focusing only on individual economic utility. If this normative nature of *Aparigraha* is accepted in mainstream economic analysis, cultivating an *Aparigrahi* individual becomes a major task.

Contrasting Gandhi's concept of trusteeship and communism, we elaborate on how Trusteeship is based on the principles of Ahimsa (nonviolence) and *Satyagraha* (non-violent resistance) and promotes the voluntary sharing of wealth by the wealthy and capitalists with the less fortunate. Gandhi believed that wealth creation and distribution based on violence were unethical. He viewed trusteeship as a system of possessing and creating wealth that is not against the principles of possession and creation. The state's role in the process is temporary and focused on inculcating personal moral values in society. Gandhi's trusteeship concept encourages entrepreneurs to consider laborers as co-partners of wealth and to attend to their needs before claiming profit or surplus.

3 Trusteeship: A Resource-Centric Account¹

Gandhi's theory of Trusteeship is a social and economic philosophy that aims to create an equitable distribution of wealth and consumption of resources based on nonviolence and nonpossession (Dasgupta, 1996). It outlines the reciprocal

¹We would like to acknowledge that Trusteeship has much broader implications and can be seen in various realms of societal relationships. Given the context of this book, we felt it would be most appropriate to look at the role of Trusteeship in the sustainable use of resources. We provide commoning as one example because the disciplines such as development studies, organization studies, and sociology are increasingly looking at commoning as a way to manage commons. It is impor-

obligations of business stakeholders to use all available resources for the common interest and welfare of society rather than for self-interest (Balakrishnan et al., 2017). The origins of Gandhi's theory are rooted in many ideas in both Western and Indian sources, including John Ruskin's "Unto This Last," the Bhagwat Gita, Jainism's *Aparigraha* (nonpossession), and *Ahimsa* (nonviolence) (Rao, 2021). Thus, Gandhi's views on Trusteeship were shaped by his reading of Western work (specifically Ruskin and Carnegie) and non-Western sources (such as the Bhagavad Gita and Upanishads) (Chakrabarty, 2015). Chakrabarty (2015) suggests that Gandhi may have also been influenced by Andrew Carnegie's "The Gospel of Wealth" (1906).² This work offers an alternative to socialism within capitalism by urging the wealthy to adopt the principle of Trusteeship, which 'is held to be the duty of the man of wealth'. Carnegie viewed capital as a useful tool to combat poverty and recommended that the rich should spend their surplus wealth on serving the poor by providing various services, such as building education institutions and hospitals. These influences notwithstanding, scholars suggest that Gandhi's theory of Trusteeship was a unique Gandhian conceptualization, which served as both a moral philosophical device and an essential political tool for consolidating a multi-class alliance for nation-building in the twentieth century (Chakrabarty, 2015; Vidaković, 2022).

Gandhi was also deeply influenced by John Ruskin's essays "Unto This Last". He summarized the three teachings of this book in his biography:

- I. That the good of the individual is contained in the good of all.
- II. That a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's inasmuch as all have the same right of earning their livelihood from their work.
- III. That a life of labor, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman, is the life worth living (Gandhi, 1983, p. 158).

Gandhi became eager to put these learnings from Ruskin's *Unto This Last* into practice and produced a Gujarati version and titled it *Sarvodya* (*upliftment of all*) (Vettickal, 1999, see also Kumar et al., [this volume](#)). As we discussed in later sections, *Sarvodya* (*upliftment of all*) is intrinsically connected to Trusteeship.

tant to note, however, that commoning is not only about resources, it also incorporates cultural practices that reflect the values, traditions, and knowledge of a particular community, and shapes their relationship to the natural and built environment. In other words, it is a way of organizing social relations around shared resources, which seeks to foster community participation, democratic decision-making, and mutual benefit.

²Originally published in 1889.

3.1 *Trusteeship: A Middle Path to Capitalism and Communism*

Trusteeship aims to create an equitable society by eradicating the “unbridgeable gulf that exists between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots’” (Gandhi 1928, 1932). Gandhi proposed his theory of Trusteeship as an alternative to capitalism and communism, as he found these two dominant economic systems morally unacceptable (Dasgupta, 1996; Waghmore, 2004). Gandhi rejected capitalism for its morally problematic view of human nature and private property. Capitalism is an economic system where individuals are allowed to accumulate wealth and control the use of their property to maximize their own self-interest. Further, in capitalism, “the invisible hand of the pricing mechanism coordinates supply and demand in markets in a way that is automatically in the best interests of society” (Scott, 2006, p. 1). These tenets of capitalism, i.e., the right to own private property, the pursuit of self-interest, and economic rationality, which benefit the entire society, date back to Adam Smith (1776) and are seen as the foundation of modern economics. Gandhi viewed these tenets of modern economics as deeply “disturbing” for deepening greed and aggressive materialistic competition and for compromising the moral, social, and environmental dimensions of human existence. He proposed Trusteeship to create a moral economy based on cooperation (over competition) and the common good and shared responsibilities (over self-interest) to overcome the negative consequence of capitalism (Vidaković, 2022).

Gandhi (1921) highlighted the importance of morality in economics by stating that:

The economics that disregards moral and sentimental considerations are like wax works that being life-like still lack the life of the living flesh. At every crucial moment, these new-fangled economic laws have broken down in practice. And nations or individuals who accept them as guiding maxims must perish. (p. 344)

While Gandhi was appreciative of the communist and socialist ideals of social equality, he found the use of force (and violence) to achieve an equitable society morally unacceptable. Gandhi believed in the means-end equivalence, which describes a belief that instead of the *end* justifying the *means*, the *means* must be consistent with that of the *end* (Calhoun, 2013; Maeckelbergh, 2011). So, if the end goal is to achieve a peaceful, just society, then a means to achieve that cannot depend on violence (Gandhi, 1932). Further, Gandhi also found a greater threat to human dignity and self-respect in the political and economic power given to the state in communism (Waghmore 2004). Gandhi said:

I look upon an increase of the power of the state with the greatest fear because, although, while apparently doing good by minimizing exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress. (Fischer, 1962, p. 304)

His doctrine of Trusteeship was based on non-violence and voluntary abdication of wealth to create a just and equitable society.

4 Trusteeship a Means to Achieve *Sarvodaya* (Upliftment of All)

Gandhi's theory of Trusteeship is deeply influenced by his spiritual, religious, and moral philosophy and is intrinsically connected to his principles of *Sarvodaya* (upliftment of all) through *Antyodaya* (upliftment of the most marginalized) (Javeri et al., [this volume](#); Kumar et al., [this volume](#)), which are relevant today as they were during his time, as extreme poverty, discrimination, and marginalization continue to plague the world (Bhardwaj et al., 2021; Bhatt et al., 2019; Escobedo et al., 2021; Hota et al., 2019; Maurer & Qureshi, 2021, Qureshi et al., 2016, 2017, 2023; Riaz & Qureshi, 2017).

4.1 *Sarvodaya and Trusteeship*

Gandhi's Trusteeship is motivated by the belief that the purpose of development is to uplift all (i.e., *Sarvodaya*) through uplifting the most marginalized in society (i.e., *Antyodaya*) (Vettickal, 1999). It rejects the utilitarian maxim that the purpose of development is to "maximize the happiness of the maximum number of people" (Balganesh 2013). Utilitarianism assumes human nature as pleasure-seeking and pain-avoiding and concludes that individuals should be free to follow their nature for utility maximization through exchanges in the market (Aydin 2011). Gandhi argues that in utilitarianism, happiness is conceptualized exclusively as material prosperity and physical happiness, and this has resulted in overconsumption and unlimited wants (Appadorai, 1969). Utilitarianism also does not distinguish between specific actions that bring about those outcomes or the morality of those actions (Balganesh, 2013). In this approach, the purpose is to maximize happiness, and "if the laws of morality are broken in the pursuit of happiness, it does not matter very much" (Gandhi, 1954, p. 7).

Furthermore, Gandhi also criticized utilitarianism for overlooking distributive questions and for sacrificing the interests of the minority for the benefit of the majority (Appadorai, 1969). He described it as an act of violence against the minority (Dasgupta, 1996). Instead of utilitarianism, Gandhi proposed *Sarvodaya* as a development maxim, which is based on the recognition that "the good of the individual is contained in the good of all" (Gandhi, 1983, p. 158).

Trusteeship connects *Sarvodaya* to a moral theory of action and is rooted in Gandhi's moral vision of an economy (Balganesh, 2013; Kumar et al., [this volume](#)). Through these concepts, Gandhi not only highlights the importance of individual actions but also prescribes how individual behavior and action should be channeled in society (Gandhi, 1954). For Gandhi, individual actions are morally right when they work for the betterment of society, as individual and social welfare is intricately connected to each other (Vettickal, 1999). Therefore, Gandhi believed that the goal of *Sarvodaya* will become reality when individuals would use their

resources (physical, financial, and skills) for the upliftment of others (Gopinath, 2005; Kumar et al., [this volume](#)).

Relatedly, Gandhi believed that Trusteeship could neither be implemented in a top-down or coercive manner (violent means) nor through market incentives; instead, it will be achieved through individuals' self-realization of their virtues (Dalton, 2012). He found the acceptance of a trusteeship a deeply personal act and highlighted the importance of social responsibilities, *Aparigraha*, and *Swaraj* in its achievement (Balakrishnan et al., 2017; Balganes, 2013).

4.2 Key Characteristics of Trusteeship

Social Responsibilities over Self-Interest Trusteeship challenges the fundamental assumption of capitalism that individuals are self-interested, rational individuals that aim to maximize their gains. Instead, Gandhi's theory of Trusteeship is based on the assumption that individuals not only have a duty to themselves but also have the responsibility to serve others (Gandhi, 1942). He believed, "If I do my duty, that is, serve myself, I shall be able to serve others" (Gandhi, 1954). Accordingly, Gandhi suggested that each member of the society should utilize their resources (i.e., mental, moral, physical, and material resources) for the common interest and welfare of the society and not for maximizing their own self-interest (Prabhu & Rao, 1967).

In his moral vision, economic equality can be achieved by using non-violent ways of production and behaving as a "trustee" (instead of the owner) of the wealth created (Dasgupta, 1996). Gandhi explained:

I am inviting those people who consider themselves as owners today to act as trustees, i.e., owners, not in their own right, but owners in the right of those whom they have exploited... Supposing I have come by a fair amount of wealth—either by way of legacy, or by means of trade and industry—I must know that all that wealth does not belong to me; what belongs to me is the right to an honourable livelihood, no better than that enjoyed by millions of others. The rest of my wealth belongs to the community and must be used for the welfare of the community. (Gandhi quoted in Prabhu & Rao, 1967, pp. 258–59)

Gandhi developed this theory of Trusteeship based on his knowledge of the Law of Trusts (Balganes, 2013). Under the conception of Trusteeship, business owners were not forced to renounce their wealth or assets for others. Instead, they were to remain in possession of their wealth and were able to use it for their personal needs. However, they were expected to act as trustees over the rest and to use it for the welfare of society (Chakrabarty, 2015).

Interestingly, Trusteeship does not reject private property, which Gandhi saw as a necessary social evil. In summarizing Trusteeship, Gandhi observed that

[i]t does not recognize any right of private ownership of property, except in as much as it may be permitted by society for its own welfare. (Gandhi as quoted in Hingorani, 1970, p. 102)

While Gandhi did not reject private property, he rejected the notion of “absolute property” as a natural right. Gandhi argues that the sense of entitlement associated with private property is dangerous as it undermines the duties and obligations of social actors (Balganesh, 2013). Gandhi asserts that “[T]he right to perform one’s duties is the only right that is worth living for and dying for” (Gandhi quoted in Dasgupta, 1996, p. 46).

Through Trusteeship, Gandhi defines the rights and reciprocal obligations of business stakeholders (Balakrishnan et al., 2017). For businesses, Gandhi stated that

What I expect of you, therefore, is that you should hold all your riches as a trust to be used solely in the interests of those who sweat for you and to whose industry and labor you owe all your position and property. I want you to make your labourers co-partners of your wealth. (Gandhi, 1928, p. 145)

In addition, Gandhi also believed that labor plays an important role in generating wealth for the capitalists and, therefore, deserves various rights such as the right decent minimum living wage, a clean working environment, and other facilities such as health care, nutritious food, and elementary education for their children (Dasgupta 1996; Balakrishnan et al., 2017). For labor, Gandhi asked them “to regard themselves as trustees for the nation for which they are laboring” Gandhi (1928, p. 250). Thus, Gandhi argued that Trusteeship would lead to cooperative industrial relations, as

Capital and labor will be mutual trustees and both will be trustees of consumers...each believes his own interest is safeguarded by safeguarding the interest of the other. (Gandhi 1938, p. 162)

However, moving from a market-based transactional system to a transformative system prescribed by Trusteeship requires strong moral commitments (Balakrishnan et al., 2017), and therefore, Gandhi proposed *Aparigraha* and *Swaraj* as two core elements of Trusteeship (Dasgupta, 1996).

b) *Aparigraha* (nonpossession): Gandhi founded the idea of Trusteeship on the traditional Indian cultural practices of *Aparigraha* (nonpossession). He used *Aparigraha* to explain his views on individual preferences and wants. Contrary to the utilitarian principle of maximizing material happiness, Gandhi argued that Trusteeship ought to be rooted in the principle of nonpossession or *Aparigraha* because

the selfish grasping for possessions of any kind not only violates the deeper purposes of our human odyssey but eventually breeds possessiveness and greed, exploitation and revenge. (Gandhi, quoted in Iyer, 1986, p. 9)

Ajit Dasgupta, a leading scholar of Gandhi’s economic ideas, observes that

Self-indulgence and the ceaseless multiplication of wants hamper one’s growth because they are erosive of contentment, personal autonomy, self-respect and peace of mind... [I]t is from these that one’s long-run happiness can be found, not just from obtaining what one likes at the moment.” (Dasgupta as quoted in Balganesh, 2013, p.1716)

Gandhi believed in preference limitation or contentment as the source of happiness. He argues that such happiness does not result from the maximization of wants and

preferences but rather from the limitation of them. Explaining the concept, Aparigraha Gandhi stated,

If by abundance you mean everyone having plenty to eat and drink and to clothe himself [themselves] with, enough to keep his [their] mind trained and educated, I should be satisfied. But I should not like to pack more stuff in my belly than I can digest and more things than I can every usefully use. But neither do I want poverty, penury, misery, dirt and dust in India. (Gandhi, 1938, p. 2)

Aparigraha is closely related to the concepts of “Bread labor” and “*Asteya*” – non-stealing. Through bread labor, Gandhi emphasizes an individual’s duty to earn bread through physical labor (Balakrishnan et al., 2017). Bread labor (or earning with your own hands) was an alternative to mass economic production, which Gandhi found violent and exclusionary. Contrary to mass production, he saw bread labor as a non-violent and natural act (Vidaković, 2022). Relatedly, on many occasions, he suggested physical work as a duty that is imposed by nature and argued that it cannot be substituted by intellectual labor (Gandhi, 1962). Gandhi also found bread labor as a great equalizer and as a means to increase individual productivity (Dasgupta, 1996).

Asteya means non-stealing or not taking anything more than what we need. While articulating his view of Trusteeship, Gandhi argued:

If I take anything that I do not need for [my] own immediate use, [and]keep it, I thieve it from somebody else. I venture to suggest that it is the fundamental law of Nature, without exception, that Nature produces enough for our wants from day-to-day, and if only everybody took enough for himself [themselves] and nothing more, there would be no pauperism in this world, there would[be] no man [individual] dying of starvation in this world. But so long as we have got this inequality so long we are thieving. (1960, p. 3)

According to Gandhi, the practices of *Asteya* and *Aparigraha* require *Swaraj* or self-rule/ self-restraint. As noted above, Gandhi’s theory of Trusteeship could neither be implemented through coercion nor through market mechanisms. Instead, it is based on *Swaraj*, or self-rule, where individuals are guided by their own inner moral compass (Vidaković, 2022).

5 Relevance of Trusteeship in Contemporary Society

Trusteeship provides an alternative way to conceptualize economic development and the role and responsibility of business. Gandhi’s work on Trusteeship has been influential in inspiring many streams of research, particularly, the ethical issues in businesses (Bhatt, 2022; Hota et al., 2023), sustainable consumption and production (Gruzalski, 2002; Parth et al., 2021), and degrowth (Hickel, 2020; Kallis, 2011). Trusteeship cultivates responsible behavior towards self, society, and nature and has influenced the way resources are used to address poverty (Sutter et al., 2023).

Influenced by Trusteeship, various studies have identified commoning as a strategy for collectivizing and reproducing resources for alternative organizing. The

issue of commodification of commons is a concern for sustainability as it directly affects individual and collective fulfillment (Dardot and Laval, 2014; Mattei, 2013). Commoning is the process of de-commodifying the commons, and therefore, it presents an ideological alternative to neoliberal organizing that is based on individual property ownership and waged labor (Bollier & Helfrich, 2014). While commoning does not represent a complete ban on commercial activity or individual consumption of common resources, it acknowledges the need to establish rules that govern the sale and consumption of common resources (Mattei, 2013). Commoning involves cultivating a mindset that allows communities to see themselves as trustees of those resources (Gandhi, 1945, cf. Bhatt & Qureshi, [this volume](#)). In this system, the community enforces rules around the care, responsibility, and use of the commons (Bhatt et al., 2023, [this volume-a](#); Bollier & Helfrich, 2014; Qureshi et al., 2022b). Increasingly, there are many examples of self-organized and pro-social communities, inspired by the Gandhian model of Trusteeship, that have been engaged in a deliberate strategy of creating commons. For example, collective ownership of land and the building of grain banks provide an alternative way of generating resources for the common good (Bhatt et al., 2023, [this volume-a](#); Qureshi et al. 2022b). Thus, Trusteeship has the potential to inform how the grand challenges of poverty, inequalities, and climate change could be tackled holistically through non-violence and shared use of resources.

6 Conclusion

Gandhi's theory of trusteeship is a social and economic philosophy aimed at ensuring equitable distribution of wealth and consumption resources through the principles of nonviolence and nonpossession, with reciprocal obligations for stakeholders to serve the common interest of society. Trusteeship is proposed as an alternative to capitalism and communism, which Gandhi considered morally unacceptable. Gandhi's theory of Trusteeship is motivated by his spiritual, religious, and moral philosophy and is intrinsically connected to his principles of *Sarvodaya* through *Antyodaya*, which seek to uplift all by uplifting the most marginalized in society. Trusteeship seeks to create a moral economy based on cooperation and the common good, overcoming the negative consequences of capitalism. Trusteeship has broader implications and can be seen in various realms of societal relationships, including the sustainable use of resources through commoning.

The concept of Trusteeship, as introduced by Gandhi, has provided an alternative way to conceptualize economic development and the role and responsibility of businesses. It has influenced research in various areas, including ethical issues in businesses, sustainable consumption and production, and degrowth. Trusteeship promotes responsible behavior towards oneself, society, and nature and has inspired the way resources are used to address poverty. Commoning provides a framework for collective ownership and management of resources, which can reduce inequalities and address environmental concerns. However, the issue of commodification of

commons remains a concern for sustainability as it directly affects individual and collective fulfillment. Commoning needs to be complemented by policies and regulations that ensure fair access to and use of common resources. These policies should take into account the diversity of communities and their needs and aspirations and ensure that the rules are transparent and participatory. A balance needs to be struck between commercial activities and the protection of common resources so that the resources can be used for the common good while allowing for individual fulfillment.

We also note the underlying spiritual tenets of the Gandhian notion of Trusteeship. We argue that spirituality is a crucial element that has been backgrounded in *Western* economics and business activities. The reductionist approach to measuring the welfare of human beings through materialistic indicators such as GDP and per capita income reinforces this materialistic approach, leading to undesirable outcomes. The relational nature of happiness cannot be achieved through instrumental rationality, and humanity needs to move beyond profit maximization, greed, and consumerism to promote equal conditions for all people. Gandhi's economic thought underpinning Trusteeship emphasizes ethical and spiritual values as its core as he advocates for Trusteeship as an economic system based on nonviolence. Incorporating Gandhi's thought perspective into management education can lead to a non-violent and harmonious society. The Trusteeship concept encourages individuals to earn what they need to survive and share whatever surplus they have, treating laborers as co-partners of wealth and attending to their needs before claiming profit or surplus.

In summary, this chapter underscores the significance of Trusteeship as an alternative model for sustainable development, providing a comprehensive framework for promoting social responsibility and ethical leadership in business. Through the exploration of the historical development of Trusteeship, its key features, and its contemporary relevance, this chapter contributes to the ongoing debate on the role and obligations of individuals and businesses in fostering sustainable development.

References

- Appadorai, A. (1969). Gandhi's contribution to social theory. *The Review of Politics*, 31(3), 312–328.
- Aydin, N. (2011). The 2008 financial crisis: A moral crisis of capitalism. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(22), 8697–8706.
- Balakrishnan, J., Malhotra, A., & Falkenberg, L. (2017). Multi-level corporate responsibility: A comparison of Gandhi's trusteeship with stakeholder and stewardship frameworks. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 141, 133–150.
- Balganesh, S. (2013). Gandhi and copyright pragmatism. *California Law Review*, 101(6), 1705–1762.
- Banerjee, S. B., Jermier, J. M., Peredo, A. M., Perey, R., & Reichel, A. (2021). Theoretical perspectives on organizations and organizing in a post-growth era. *Organization*, 28(3), 337–357.
- Bansal, P., Gao, J., & Qureshi, I. (2014). The extensiveness of corporate social and environmental commitment across firms over time. *Organization Studies*, 35(7), 949–966.

- Bapuji, H., Patel, C., Ertug, G., & Allen, D. G. (2020). Corona crisis and inequality: Why management research needs a societal turn. *Journal of Management*, 46(7), 1205–1222.
- Berrone, P., Rousseau, H. E., Ricart, J. E., Brito, E., & Giuliadori, A. (2023). How can research contribute to the implementation of sustainable development goals? An interpretive review of SDG literature in management. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(2), 318–339.
- Bhardwaj, A., Mishra, S. K., Qureshi, I., Kumar, K. K., Konrad, A. M., Seidel, M. D. L., & Bhatt, B. (2021). Bridging caste divides: Middle-status ambivalence, elite closure, and lower-status social withdrawal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(8), 2111–2136.
- Bhatt, B. (2017). *The role of social enterprises in building inclusive social capital: Evidences from multi-case, qualitative field study*. Doctoral dissertation, Carleton University.
- Bhatt, B. (2022). Ethical complexity of social change: Negotiated actions of a social enterprise. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 177(4), 743–762.
- Bhatt, B., & Qureshi, I. (this volume). Chapter 3: Navigating power relations in community-driven-development: An exploration of constructive work. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.
- Bhatt, B., Abdelnour, S., & Qureshi, I. (2013). *Economic ideals: Gandhian and neoliberal logics in India*. UNRISD. Available at <https://www.unrisd.org/es/library/blog-posts/economic-ideals-gandhian-and-neoliberal-logics-in-india>
- Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I., & Riaz, S. (2019). Social entrepreneurship in non-munificent institutional environments and implications for institutional work: Insights from China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 154(3), 605–630.
- Bhatt, B., Dembek, K., Hota, P. K., & Qureshi, I. (2021). Sharing economy model for the base of the pyramid: An ecosystem approach. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 319–336). Springer.
- Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I., & Sutter, C. (2022). How do intermediaries build inclusive markets? The role of the social context. *Journal of Management Studies*.
- Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I., Shukla, D. M., Hota, P. K. (2023). Prefiguring alternative organizing: Confronting marginalization through projective cultural adjustments and tempered autonomy. *Organization Studies* (Forthcoming).
- Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I., Shukla, D. M., & Pillai, V. (this volume-a). Chapter 1: Nurturing resilient communities: An overview. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.
- Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I., Shukla, D. M., & Pillai, V. (this volume-b). Chapter 16: Resilient communities: A way forward. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.
- Bollier, D., & Helfrich, S. (Eds.). (2014). *The wealth of the commons: A world beyond market and state*. Levellers Press.
- Bouckaert, L., & Zsolnai, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Spirituality as a public good* (Vol. 1). Garant.
- Bouckaert, L., & Zsolnai, L. (2011). *Spirituality and business* (pp. 3–8). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Calhoun, C. (2013). Occupy Wall Street in perspective. *British Journal of Sociology*, 64, 26–38.
- Carnegie, A. (1906). The gospel of wealth. *The North American Review*, 183(599), 526–537.
- Cavanagh, G. F., & Bandsuch, M. R. (2002). Virtue as a benchmark for spirituality in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 38, 109–117.
- Chakrabarty, B. (2015). Universal benefit: Gandhi's doctrine of trusteeship: A review article. *Modern Asian Studies*, 49(2), 572–608.
- Dalton, D. (2012). *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent power in action*. Columbia University Press.
- Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2014). *The new way of the world: On neoliberal society*. Verso Trade.
- Dasgupta, A. (1996). *Gandhi's economic thought*. Routledge.
- De Bakker, F. G., Matten, D., Spence, L. J., & Wickert, C. (2020). The elephant in the room: The nascent research agenda on corporations, social responsibility, and capitalism. *Business & Society*, 59(7), 1295–1302.

- Escobedo, M. B., Zheng, Z., & Bhatt, B. (2021). Socially oriented sharing economy platform in regional Australia: A Polanyian analysis. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 53–73). Springer.
- Fischer, L. (1962). *The essential Gandhi*. Vintage Books.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1921). The secret of it. *Young India*, III(43), 344.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1928). *Satyagraha in South Africa*. Navajivan Publishing House. 2008 reprint.
- Gandhi, M.K. (1932) *From Yeravda Mandir* (Translated by Valji Govinji Desai), Navajivan Publishing House. 2005 reprint.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1938). Interpretation of Wardha education scheme. *Harijan*, VI, (1), 2.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1942). Theory of trusteeship. *Harijan*, IX(13), 116.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1954). *Sarvodaya*. Navajivan Publishing House, Ahmedabad.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1960). *Trusteeship*. Navajivan Trust.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1962). *Towards non-violent socialism*. Reprint. Navajivan Publishing House.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1983). *Autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth*. Courier Corporation.
- Ghatak, A., Alam, A., & Qureshi, I. (this volume). Chapter 12: Cultivating women entrepreneurship: A case study of SEWA. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.
- Giddens, A. (2005). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. Polity Press.
- Gopinath, C. (2005). Trusteeship as a moral foundation for business. *Business and Society Review*, 110(3), 331–344.
- Gruzalski, B. (2002). Gandhi's contributions to environmental thought and action. *Environmental Ethics*, 24(3), 227–242.
- Hickel, J. (2020). *Less is more: How degrowth will save the world*. Random House.
- Hingorani, A. T. (1970). *MK Gandhi: My theory of trusteeship*. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
- Hota, P. K., Mitra, S., & Qureshi, I. (2019). Adopting bricolage to overcome resource constraints: The case of social enterprises in rural India. *Management and Organization Review*, 15(2), 371–402.
- Hota, P. K., Qiu, S., & Bhatt, B. (2021). Ethitrade: Countering challenges of sharing economy at the base of the pyramid using technology. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 283–299). Springer.
- Hota, P. K., Bhatt, B., & Qureshi, I. (2023). Institutional work to navigate ethical dilemmas: Evidence from a social enterprise. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 38(1), 106269.
- ILO. (2020). *COVID-19 crisis and the informal economy Immediate responses and policy challenges*. Geneva.
- Iyer, R. (1986). Gandhian trusteeship in theory and practice. In J. D. Sethi (Ed.), *Trusteeship: The Gandhian alternative* (p. 9). Gandhi Peace Foundation.
- Javeri, S., Harish, H., & Bhatt, B. (this volume). Chapter 13: Balancing equity, ecology and economy through Antyodaya leadership: A case study of SELCO. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.
- Kallis, G. (2011). In defence of degrowth. *Ecological Economics*, 70(5), 873–880.
- Kistruck, G. M., Qureshi, I., & Beamish, P. W. (2008). NGOs as multinationals: The implications of diversification. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2008(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2008.33650245>
- Kistruck, G. M., Beamish, P. W., Qureshi, I., & Sutter, C. J. (2013a). Social intermediation in base-of-the-pyramid markets. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(1), 31–66.
- Kistruck, G. M., Qureshi, I., & Beamish, P. W. (2013b). Geographic and product diversification in charitable organizations. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), 496–530.
- Klitgaard, K. A., & Krall, L. (2012). Ecological economics, degrowth, and institutional change. *Ecological Economics*, 84, 247–253.
- Kumar, L., Pillai, V., & Qureshi, I. (this volume). Chapter 6: Sarvodaya to nurture peace communities: A case study of ASSEFA. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.

- Maeckelbergh, M. (2011). Doing is believing: Prefiguration as strategic practice in the Alterglobalization movement. *Social Movement Studies*, 10, 1–20.
- Mahajan, V., & Qureshi, I. (this volume). Chapter 8: Basix social enterprise group: Inclusive development. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.
- Mattei, U. (2013). Protecting the commons: Water, culture, and nature: The commons movement in the Italian struggle against neoliberal governance. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 112(2), 366–376.
- Maurer, C. C., & Qureshi, I. (2021). Not just good for her: A temporal analysis of the dynamic relationship between representation of women and collective employee turnover. *Organization Studies*, 42(1), 85–107.
- McKinsey. (2019). *SDG guide for business leaders: A practical guide for business leaders to working with the SDGs as a competitive factor*. McKinsey.
- Medina-Muñoz, R. D., & Medina-Muñoz, D. R. (2020). Corporate social responsibility for poverty alleviation: An integrated research framework. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 29(1), 3–19.
- Pandey, M., Bhati, M., Shukla, D. M., & Qureshi, I. (2021). Resourcing and value creation: A case of sharing economy model at the base of the pyramid. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 197–218). Springer.
- Parth, S., Manoharan, B., Parthiban, R., Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., & Rakshit, K. (2021). Digital technology-enabled transformative consumer responsabilization: A case study. *European Journal of Marketing*, 55(9), 2538–2565.
- Parthiban, R., Qureshi, I., Bandyopadhyay, S., Bhatt, B., & Jaikumar, S. (2020a). Leveraging ICT to overcome complementary institutional voids: Insights from institutional work by a social enterprise to help marginalized. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 22(3), 633–653.
- Parthiban, R., Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., & Bandyopadhyay, S. (2020b). Cultural bricolage as a tool to mainstream the marginalized. In *Academy of management proceedings* (Vol. 2020, No. 1, p. 18880). Academy of Management.
- Parthiban, R., Qureshi, I., Bandyopadhyay, S., & Jaikumar, S. (2021). Digitally mediated value creation for non-commodity base of the pyramid producers. *International Journal of Information Management*, 56, 102256.
- Peredo, A. M., Abdelnour, S., Adler, P., Banerjee, B., Bapuji, H., Calas, M., Chertkovskaya, E., Colbourne, R., Contu, A., Crane, A., Evans, M., Hirsch, P., Osorio, A. E., Ozkazanc-Pan, B., Smircich, L., & Weber, G. (2022). We are boiling: Management scholars speaking out on COVID-19 and social justice. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 31(4), 339–357.
- Perkins, P. E. (2018). Climate justice, gender and intersectionality. In *Routledge handbook of climate justice* (pp. 349–358). Routledge.
- Phillips, T., Vargas, C., Graham, M., Couch, D., & Gleeson, D. (2021). The victims, villains and heroes of ‘panic buying’: News media attribution of responsibility for COVID-19 stockpiling. *Journal of Sociology*, 14407833211057310.
- Pillai, V., Pandey, M., & Bhatt, B. (2021a). Social sustainability at the BOP through building inclusive social capital: A case study of Drishtee. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 301–318). Springer.
- Pillai, V., Shukla, D. M., & Qureshi, I. (2021b). Social intermediation using sharing economy in India: A case study of Farmizen. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 101–124). Springer.
- Prabhu, R. K., & Rao, U. R. (1967). *The mind of Mahatma Gandhi* (pp. 258–59).
- Qiu, S., Xu, Z., & Bhatt, B. (2021). The sharing economy platforms in rural China: Bridging institutional voids through institutional entrepreneurship. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 75–99). Springer.
- Qureshi, I., Kistruck, G. M., & Bhatt, B. (2016). The enabling and constraining effects of social ties in the process of institutional entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*, 37(3), 425–447.

- Qureshi, I., Riaz, M. S., & Ruebottom, T. (2017). Power and reflexivity in boundary work: Addressing inequality through distributed social ownership. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2017(1), 13114. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2017.13114abstract>
- Qureshi, I., Fang, Y., Haggerty, N., Compeau, D. R., & Zhang, X. (2018a). IT-mediated social interactions and knowledge sharing: Role of competence-based trust and background heterogeneity. *Information Systems Journal*, 28(5), 929–955.
- Qureshi, I., Sutter, C., & Bhatt, B. (2018b). The transformative power of knowledge sharing in settings of poverty and social inequality. *Organization Studies*, 39(11), 1575–1599.
- Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., Gupta, S., & Tiwari, A. A. (2020). Causes, Symptoms and consequences of social media induced polarization (SMIP). *Information Systems Journal*.
- Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., & Shukla, D. M. (2021a). *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid*. Springer.
- Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., & Shukla, D. M. (2021b). Overview of sharing economy at the base of the pyramid. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 1–23). Springer.
- Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., & Shukla, D. M. (2021c). Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid-research framework and future directions. In *Sharing economy at the base of the pyramid* (pp. 337–349). Springer.
- Qureshi, I., Pan, S. L., & Zheng, Y. (2021d). Digital social innovation: An overview and research framework. *Information Systems Journal*, 31(5), 647–671.
- Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., Gupta, S., & Tiwari, A. A. (2022a). Introduction to the role of information and communication Technologies in Polarization. In *Causes and symptoms of socio-cultural polarization* (pp. 1–23). Springer.
- Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., Parthiban, R., Sun, R., Shukla, D. M., Hota, P. K., & Xu, Z. (2022b). Knowledge commoning: Scaffolding and technoficing to overcome challenges of knowledge curation. *Information and Organization*, 32(2), 100410.
- Qureshi, I., Bhatt, B., Sutter, C., & Shukla, D. M. (2023). Social entrepreneurship and intersectionality: Mitigating extreme exclusion. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 38(2), 106283.
- Qureshi, I., Pandey, M., Shukla, D. M., & Pillai, V. (this volume). Chapter 9: Technoficing: Reinterpretation of Gandhian perspectives on technology. In B. Bhatt, I. Qureshi, D. M. Shukla, & V. Pillai (Eds.), *Social entrepreneurship: Gandhian perspectives in the post-COVID world*. Springer.
- Rao, J. (2021). *Economist Gandhi: The roots and the relevance of the political economy of the mahatma*. Penguin Random House India Private Limited.
- Rashed, A. H., & Shah, A. (2021). The role of private sector in the implementation of sustainable development goals. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 23, 2931–2948.
- Riaz, S., & Qureshi, I. (2017). Emergence of a new institutional logic: Shaping the institutionally complex field of community radio in India. *Emergence*, 50, 383–418.
- Scheyvens, R., Banks, G., & Hughes, E. (2016). The private sector and the SDGs: The need to move beyond ‘business as usual’. *Sustainable Development*, 24(6), 371–382.
- Schneider, A. (2020). Bound to fail? Exploring the systemic pathologies of CSR and their implications for CSR research. *Business & Society*, 59(7), 1303–1338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650319856616>
- Scott, B. R. (2006). *The political economy of capitalism*. <http://www.hbs.edu/research/pdf/07-037.pdf>
- Shen, Z. M., & Sun, Y. (2021). Strengthening supply chain resilience during COVID-19: A case study of JD.com. *Journal of Operations Management*, 69(3), 359–383.
- Smith, A. (1776). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations: Volume One*. London: printed for W. Strahan; and T. Cadell, 1776.
- Sutter, C., Bhatt, B., & Qureshi, I. (2023). What makes resource provision an effective means of poverty alleviation? A resourcing perspective. *Organization Science*, 34(1), 223–245.
- United Nations. (2020). *Everyone included: Social impact of COVID-19*. United Nations.
- Vettickal, T. V. (1999). *Sarvodaya of Mahatma Gandhi, realistic utopia* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto]. National Library of Canada.

- Vidaković, M. (2022). Gandhi: The non-violent socialist is trusteeship the only viable sustainable economic model? *European Journal of Law and Political Science*, 1(2), 6–14.
- Waghmore, S. (2004). Gandhi's thoughts on development: A critical appraisal. *Journal of International & Comparative Social Welfare*, 20(2), 55–70.
- Wang, C., Qureshi, I., Guo, F., & Zhang, Q. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and disruptive innovation: The moderating effects of environmental turbulence. *Journal of Business Research*, 139, 1435–1450.
- WFP (World Food Programme). (2020). *2020 Global report on food crises*.
- Wickert, C. (2021). Corporate social responsibility research in the Journal of Management Studies: A shift from a business-centric to a society-centric focus. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(8), E1–E17.
- Wiebers, D. O., & Feigin, V. L. (2020). What the COVID-19 crisis is telling humanity. *Neuroepidemiology*, 54(4), 283–286.
- World Bank. (2022). *World development report 2022: Finance for an equitable recovery*. The World Bank.
- Zainuddin, M., Bhatt, B., & Qureshi, I. (2022). Orchestrated intervention to address multifaceted farmer poverty: Cases of digital social innovation. In *Academy of management proceedings* (Vol. 2022, No. 1, p. 17918). Academy of Management.

Sudarshan Iyengar is a Ph.D. in Economics, former Vice Chancellor of Gujarat Vidyapith, Ahmedabad, founded by Mahatma Gandhi; former Director, Centre for Social Studies, Surat (2004–05); and Gujarat Institute of Development Research, Ahmedabad (1999–2004). Also, Chair Professor, Gandhian Philosophy at the Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai (2016–18). His areas of work include Gandhian thoughts and practice, civil society institutions, rehabilitation of indigenous communities displaced in the Narmada Dam Project (the 1990s), and in the relief and rehabilitation of earthquake-affected people in Kachchh, Gujarat (2001). He was also associated with voluntary agencies as a board member and worked in various state and central government committees. He has also authored or co-authored over 70 research articles and 9 books.

Babita Bhatt is a senior lecturer in the Research School of Management at the Australian National University. Her research focuses on the role of social and community enterprises, sharing economy organizations, and place-based communities in addressing societal challenges. Her work on ethical and social issues in management has been published in leading scholarly journals such as *Organization Studies*, *Organization Science*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, and *Journal of Business Ethics*. She has also edited two books and written eleven book chapters on topics related to the sharing economy, polarization, and social exclusion. She is currently a co-guest editor in the *Information System Journal (ISJ)* and *Journal of Business and Society*.