INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SOCIOLOGY & HUMANITIES

ISSN 2277 – 9809 (online)
ISSN 2348 - 9359 (Print)

An Internationally Indexed Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

www.IRJMSH.com
www.isarasolutions.com

Published by iSaRa Solutions

Towards Viksit Bharat@2047: Growth Trajectories, Innovation, and Structural Preconditions for Inclusive Development in India

Abhinav Sharma

Department of Economics, Naveen Government College, Rampur, District:- Korba, Chhattisgarh, India

Dr. Sanju Pandey

Department of Economics, Government Niranjan Prasad Kesharwani College, Kota, District:- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, India

Abstract

The vision of *Viksit Bharat@2047* seeks to transform India into a developed, self-reliant, and inclusive economy by the centenary of its independence. This paper examines India's economic trajectory during 2014–2024 to assess whether current growth patterns and policy directions are adequate to achieve this long-term objective. The study adopts a descriptive and analytical methodology based on secondary data drawn from official government publications, national accounts, and policy documents. It analyses trends in economic growth, demographic dynamics, employment patterns, innovation initiatives, and sectoral composition, with particular attention to post-2020 self-reliance and innovation-oriented policies. The findings indicate that while India has made significant progress in building digital public infrastructure, expanding physical connectivity, and strengthening innovation ecosystems, growth outcomes remain uneven across sectors and regions. Persistent challenges such as disguised unemployment, skill mismatches, limited expansion of productive manufacturing employment, and weak rural enterprise integration constrain the effective utilisation of India's demographic dividend. The study further finds that innovation-led growth has thus far been concentrated in urban and formal segments, with limited diffusion into rural and semi-urban economies. The paper concludes that achieving the goals of *Viksit Bharat@2047* requires sustained economic growth accompanied by deep structural transformation, including occupational shifts towards higher-productivity activities, strengthened secondary and export sectors, higher capital formation, and deliberate alignment of innovation with rural economic development during the *Amrit Kaal*.

Keywords

Viksit Bharat@2047; Economic Growth; Structural Transformation; Innovation; Employment; Rural Economy; Self-Reliance

I. Introduction and Theoretical Foundations

The pursuit of long-term macroeconomic development demands a continuous systemic adjustment of institutional structures, the limits of industrial output, and capital allocation mechanisms. Under the strategic theoretical paradigm of *Amrit Kaal*, the state has

formalised a comprehensive developmental strategy, *Viksit Bharat @2047*, designed to transition the nation from a lower-middle-income status into a high-income, technologically advanced economy. This structural ambition implies scaling nominal GDP from its fiscal year 2024–25 baseline of approximately USD 3.5 to 4.0 trillion to an absolute target of USD 30 to 40 trillion by 2047, while expanding nominal per capita income from approximately USD 2,500–2,600 to an idealized per capita benchmarks of USD 15,000 to USD 18,000.

Historically, such structural transformations have been interpreted through classical growth models. The Solow-Swan neoclassical systemic architecture posits that sustained increases in output per worker are fundamentally driven by technological progress, or Total Factor Productivity (TFP), rather than mere capital accumulation, due to the diminishing marginal returns of capital. Simultaneously, the endogenous growth models pioneered by Romer and Lucas demonstrate that target investments in human capital, innovation, and knowledge-based institutional networks generate non-linear, long-term returns that insulate an economy from growth stagnation.

To analytically evaluate whether India's existing trajectory of expansion is structurally capable of achieving these high-income targets, this study models the required compounding growth rates through the lens of the financial Rule of 72. The mathematical abstraction of the Rule of 72 dictates that the doubling period (T) of an economic variable is inversely proportional to its constant growth rate (r):

$$T \cong \frac{72}{r}$$

If the long-term real GDP growth rate is adjusted for a consistent and high-performance, continuous trajectory of r = 9%, the domestic output expands through highly predictable exponential doubling cycles. Taking the year 2026 as the foundational milestone with an approximate scale of USD 4 trillion, a sustained 9% compounding growth path yields a structural doubling to USD 8 trillion by 2034, a secondary expansion to USD 16 trillion by 2042, and then a final realization of USD 32 trillion by the year 2050.

This empirical projection aligns with contemporary growth targets outlined by institutional bodies:

- NITI Aayog anticipates a necessary long-term annual growth rate ranging from 7% to 10% over the upcoming three decades.
- The Economic Survey identifies a baseline average growth requirement of approximately 8%.
- Global entities, such as the World Bank, forecast a 7.8% annual compound growth rate over 22 years to reach developed-nation status.
- Data from the 16th Finance Commission suggests that a 7.3% annual per capita income growth in absolute dollar terms is required to achieve long-term objectives.

However, economies traversing the transition from low-income to high-income status frequently encounter the Middle-Income Trap. This phenomenon occurs when an economy loses its competitive advantage in labor-intensive export markets due to rising nominal

wages, while simultaneously failing to establish sufficient innovative capacity, institutional strength, and high-Total Factor Productivity value chains to compete with advanced economies.

To systematically examine India's structural alignment relative to these economic principles, this research balances clinical macroeconomic modeling utilizing influential political economy structures. While a substantial portion of this paper focuses on formal macroeconomic calibrations—such as money multiplier coefficients, capital expenditure transmission dynamics, Gini coefficient distributions, structural unemployment vectors, and tax inequities—the narrative that uses critical global and historical blueprints to establish the institutional contexts of growth has not been neglected either.

This paper challenges the conventional Western-centric developmental paradigm, which has historically utilized the "Whiteman's Burden" theory—a socio-political doctrine suggesting that structural modernization is an external process necessitated by the adoption of Western institutional and analytical structures. In contrast, we anchor our analysis in autonomous historical and modern-day systems, asserting that technology transitions are intrinsically linked to internal institutional capabilities and national pride (*Aatmanirbharta*). To illustrate this endogenous path to self-reliance, we highlight historical examples such as the sophisticated naval engineering of 5th-century stitched ships, a legacy recently honored by the Indian Navy through the commissioning of ***INSV Kaundinya***.

Through the integration of these foundational institutional legacies with rigorous macroeconomic simulations, this study provides a clinical evaluation of the systemic hurdles impeding India's contemporary economic landscape. By scrutinizing sectoral productivity imbalances, capital transmission architectures, and the nuances of distributive justice, we delineate a robust, evidence-based trajectory for achieving long-term, inclusive prosperity.

II. Macroeconomic Calibrations: CAPEX Multipliers and UPI Dynamics

The primary driver of India's recent growth momentum has been a deliberate fiscal pivot toward public capital expenditure (CAPEX). In modern macroeconomic policy, expanding CAPEX is prioritized over revenue expenditure due to its higher asset-creating capacity and its structural role in generating long-term supply-side dividends. To understand how public investment transmits through the financial system, we examine the mechanics of the fractional reserve banking architecture via the formal **Money Multiplier Model**.

The theoretical maximum of money creation within an economy is governed by the inverse of the required reserve ratio (m_r). Let M_s represent the total change in the nominal money supply, and let ΔB represent an initial injection of high-powered reserve money (monetary base) via central bank interventions or targeted state fiscal channels.

The standard money multiplier (m) is expressed as:

$$m = \frac{M_S}{\Delta B} = \frac{1 + c}{c + r_d + e}$$

Where,

- c – represents the currency-to-deposit ratio (the currency drain fraction held by the public),
- r_d – represents the statutory reserve requirement enforced by the central bank (such as the Cash Reserve Ratio, CRR), and
- e – represents the excess reserve ratio maintained voluntarily by commercial banking entities.

Theoretically, within an environment defined by a rigid cash-isolated structure with an assumptions model where $c = 0$ and $e = 0$, a statutory CRR (r_d) fixed at 10% would yield an unconstrained money multiplier of $m = \frac{1}{0.10} = 10$. This implies that an initial fiscal injection of ₹100 could generate a maximum expansion of ₹1,000 within the total broad money supply.

Practically, however, behavioral frictions, liquidity hoarding, and institutional leakages lower this velocity. Due to cash held by the public and banks maintaining excess reserves as a buffer against market uncertainty, the empirical multiplier in developing markets historically tends to stabilize between 5.70 and 6.20. Notably, during periods of economic contraction, such as December 2021, the empirical money multiplier was benchmarked at precisely 6.21.

A critical structural development in India's macroeconomic landscape has been the large-scale adoption of **Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI)**, specifically the **Unified Payments Interface (UPI)**. In terms of monetary mechanics, the extensive and rapid expansion of instant digital transaction protocols alters the traditional behavioral parameters of the money multiplier. By enabling seamless peer-to-peer and peer-to-merchant clearing without physical currency, the currency drain ratio (c) undergoes an exogenous reduction.

As consumer preference shifts from physical cash toward digital ledger deposits, liquid capital remains securely within the commercial banking clearing network rather than leaking out as physical currency drain. This institutional preservation of bank deposits stabilizes the reserve base, increases the predictability of the money multiplier transmission mechanism, and shortens the transaction time lag, thereby accelerating the velocity of broad money circulation (V).

This digitalization framework underpins the efficiency of public CAPEX deployment. In macroeconomic theory, a capital expenditure injection acts as a primary shift in the aggregate demand curve, which then triggers secondary and tertiary consumption-investment loops through the Keynesian fiscal multiplier framework (K_f):

$$K_f = \frac{\Delta Y}{\Delta G} = \frac{1}{1 - MPC\,(1-t) + MPI}$$

Where,

- MPC represents the Marginal Propensity to Consume,
- t is the marginal tax rate, and
- MPI is the Marginal Propensity to Import.

Public investments in infrastructure projects—such as highways, digital networks, and logistics corridors through platforms like PM Gati Shakti—operate as a supply-side catalyst. Empirical estimations indicate that while revenue subsidies or direct transfer schemes generate short-term demand spikes with a fiscal multiplier of less than 1.0, targeted infrastructure CAPEX provides an expanded multiplier effect ranging from 1.50 to 3.00 sustained over a multi-year period.

This high multiplier occurs because infrastructure projects lower logistical frictions, reduce input costs for private enterprises, and stimulate crowded-in private capital investment. Consequently, the combination of high-multiplier CAPEX allocations and digitalized clearing mechanisms forms a core pillar of modern domestic economic growth.

III. The Productivity Paradox: Sectoral Divergences and the Skill Gap

Despite achieving strong aggregate growth metrics, India's macroeconomy exhibits a persistent structural friction termed **The Productivity Paradox**. Classical economic models of structural transformation, such as those formalized by Arthur Lewis and Simon Kuznets, show that sustainable development requires a systematic migration of surplus labor from low-productivity, subsistence agriculture into high-productivity secondary manufacturing and modern tertiary service sectors.

In India, this structural transition has followed an atypical trajectory. Over the past three decades, the labor force migration has largely bypassed the manufacturing sector, moving surplus rural labor directly into informal services, construction, and gig economies, or leaving workers underemployed within the primary sector.

Macroeconomic Sector	Workforce Allocation Share (2025)	GDP Contribution Share (2025)	Relative Productivity Index
Primary (Agriculture & Allied)	45.0%	16.0%	~0.35
Secondary (Manufacturing & Industry)	25.0%	26.0%	~1.04
Tertiary (Services & DPI Tech)	30.0%	58.0%	~1.93

This data highlights the scale of disguised unemployment in the primary sector. In 1991, the agricultural sector employed approximately 60% of the aggregate national workforce

and generated 30% of total GDP. By 2025–26, the agricultural workforce had declined to 45%, yet its contribution to national GDP dropped disproportionately to 16%.

This imbalance yields a Relative Productivity Index of just 0.35 for agricultural workers, indicating that nearly half of the population remains underutilized in a low-yield sector. In contrast, the high-productivity tertiary sector employs only 30% of the workforce but generates 58% of aggregate GDP, creating an urban-rural income divergence.

This structural divergence is further exacerbated by the stagnation of the manufacturing sector. Historically, the domestic secondary sector has remained constrained at around 16% to 17% of GDP for decades. This stagnation stands in sharp contrast to the historical trajectories of East Asian economies like China and South Korea, where manufacturing shares were pushed to 25%–30% of total output during their high-growth acceleration phases.

The structural headwinds limiting domestic manufacturing include the historical legacy of administrative over-regulation, complex land and labor compliance frameworks, logistical inefficiencies, higher costs of industrial credit, and direct competition from subsidized foreign imports. While targeted policy interventions like the Production Linked Incentive (PLI) scheme have successfully catalyzed certain manufacturing verticals—such as electronic hardware and mobile phone manufacturing, where electronics exports grew 130-fold from ₹1,500 crore in 2014 to ₹2,000,000 crore in 2025—the broader industrial sector has yet to achieve wide-scale labor absorption.

At the core of this productivity paradox lies a severe **Skill Gap and Employability Mismatch**. While the nation benefits from a favorable demographic dividend—with 65% of its population under 35 years of age and an average national age of 28–29 years—the human capital stock remains under-qualified for high-productivity industries. According to empirical assessments like the India Skills Report, only 45% to 50% of tertiary education graduates meet foundational industry standards for direct employment.

This human capital constraint is directly linked to historically low investments in innovation and technological development. India's Gross Expenditure on Research and Development (GERD) has remained stagnant for over a decade at approximately 0.64% of GDP. This is significantly lower than advanced and rapidly growing global benchmarks:

GROSS EXPENDITURE ON R&D (GERD) AS A % OF GDP

- South Korea: 4.8%
- USA: 3.4%
- China: 2.4%
- India: 0.64%

This underinvestment in research and development creates a structural dependency. Without substantial technological innovation, the economy risks functioning primarily as a downstream consumer of foreign intellectual property rather than an upstream creator of global technological frameworks. Consequently, addressing the structural skill gap and

increasing R&D intensity are essential prerequisites to prevent demographic stagnation and successfully escape the middle-income trap.

IV. Distributive Equity: Inequity Matrix and Socio-Economic Gaps

A rigorous macroeconomic assessment of the *Viksit Bharat* model requires analyzing aggregate output growth alongside the internal distribution of that wealth. Sustainable economic development requires long-term wealth compounding to be accompanied by structural equity, ensuring that purchasing power expands across all segments of the population to support aggregate domestic demand.

In India, contemporary wealth distribution metrics indicate a high level of concentration. Data from independent research bodies, including Oxfam wealth inequality reports, demonstrate that the top 1% of the population controls over 40% of the total accumulated national wealth. In contrast, the bottom 50% of the population—representing approximately 700 million individuals—retains a mere 3% share of the aggregate wealth stock.

Furthermore, income distribution profiles reveal that the top 10% of earners capture 57% of total national income, while the bottom 50% receives only 13%. This wealth concentration is reflected in the steady expansion of the absolute number of domestic billionaires, which increased from 102 in 2020 to 166 in 2022, with their aggregate assets expanding by approximately ₹3,608 crore per day during the pandemic period.

INCOME AND WEALTH DISTRIBUTION INEQUITY IN INDIA

- Income Share:
    - Top 10% Earners: 57%
    - Bottom 50% Earners: 13%
- Total Wealth Share:
    - Top 1% Population: 40%
    - Bottom 50% Population : 3%

This structural imbalance is reinforced by systemic inequities in the domestic tax architecture. In public finance economics, tax regimes are classified as progressive or regressive based on how the tax burden shifts across income classes. India's fiscal system relies heavily on indirect taxes, specifically the Goods and Services Tax (GST), which functions as a consumption tax.

Because lower-income households exhibit a significantly higher marginal propensity to consume (spending nearly 100% of their disposable income on basic commodities) compared to wealthy households (who allocate a large share to savings and asset accumulation), indirect taxes place a disproportionate burden on the poor. Empirical finance data shows that approximately 64% of total collected GST revenue comes directly from the bottom 50% of the population, whereas only 3% to 4% of total GST revenue is contributed by the top 10% income bracket. This fiscal asymmetry limits the disposable income of lower-income families and reduces the redistributive efficiency of public policy.

These distributive gaps are further widened by complex structural, gender, and digital inequities:

1. Gender Disparities and Labor Micro-Foundations

The domestic Female Labor Force Participation Rate (FLFPR) has shown recent structural improvement, rising from 23.3% in 2017–18 to 41.7% in 2025. However, it remains significantly below global high-growth benchmarks, which consistently exceed 50% to 60%.

Furthermore, gender wage divergence metrics reveal a steep income asymmetry: women in India earn only 18% of total labor income, while men capture the remaining 82%. This gap represents a severe underutilization of half the national human capital pool. As a structural metaphor, an economy cannot optimize its growth trajectory with only one functional engine; achieving a USD 30 trillion GDP requires the full formal integration of women into the workforce.

2. The Micro-Level Rural-Urban Digital Divide

While India has over 958 million active internet users—with rural areas accounting for 57% of this footprint and experiencing a growth rate four times faster than urban hubs—the economic deployment of this network remains uneven. High-value digital opportunities, advanced e-commerce protocols, and remote technology employment remain concentrated within top Tier-I cities.

This digital divide is rooted in stark hardware allocation gaps: only 2.7% of households in the poorest 20% income quintile possess direct access to a computer, compared to 27.6% of households in the top 20% income bracket. Consequently, while a rural student may have access to low-cost mobile data (which fell 96% from ₹269/GB in 2014 to ₹9/GB in 2026), they face significant structural barriers in accessing high-end digital market opportunities.

3. Identity-Based Income Fractures

Socio-economic data confirms that average earnings within marginalized social groups remain lower than those in the general category. In urban economic spaces, individuals in the general social category earn an average of 33% more in salaried roles compared to Scheduled Caste (SC) and Scheduled Tribe (ST) communities. Similarly, wage distributions indicate that non-Muslim workers earn approximately 1.5 times more than Muslim workers within standard salaried employment.

To systematically address these multi-dimensional gaps, we outline a comprehensive **Strategic Research Framework & Matrix** that maps the operational phases, economic indicators, and targeted institutional tools required to manage this structural transition:

Structural Phase	Core Macroeconomic Status	Key Empirical Indicator	Primary Systemic Risk	Recommended Policy Tool
Phase I: Structural Agrarian Gridlock	Low automation; primary labor stagnation.	Stagnant agricultural TFP; low manufacturing share.	Disguised unemployment; rising rural-urban income gap.	**Targeted CAPEX Infusions:** Heavy investments in rural storage, value addition, and cold-chain infrastructure.
Phase II: Digital Inclusion Threshold	High DPI adoption; rapid expansion of low-cost data ecosystems.	Hyper-accelerated UPI transaction velocities; falling transaction costs.	Persistent digital divide in software creation and advanced market access.	**DPI Democratization:** Proliferating rural incubation tech centers and funding local digital entrepreneurship.
Phase III: Advanced Knowledge Acceleration	Frontier innovation integration; large-scale workforce formalization.	GERD scaling past 2.0% of GDP; high female labor force participation.	Middle-Income Trap; loss of low-cost manufacturing competitiveness.	**Endogenous Innovation Framework:** R&D tax incentives; large-scale public matching funds for technology ventures.

V. Global Blueprints for Institutional Transformation

Navigating the transition from a developing economy into a high-income, developed nation requires evaluating established historical paradigms of structural transformation. India's goal of reaching a USD 30 to 40 trillion GDP profile by 2047 cannot rely solely on standard domestic trend lines. Instead, policy design must integrate actionable strategies from

prominent global blueprints—specifically evaluating the structural mechanisms deployed by South Korea, Japan, Singapore, and Germany.

1. South Korea: Export-Oriented Industrialization (EOI) and Tech Transitions

In the post-Korean War era of the 1950s, South Korea was one of the poorest nations in the world, with an economic profile dominated by low-yield agriculture and small-scale trading entities. A key institutional example is the evolution of Samsung, which originated as a local enterprise trading dried fish, noodles, and groceries.

The state initiated a radical structural pivot by implementing an aggressive policy of **Export-Oriented Industrialization (EOI)**. The state aligned fiscal credit mechanisms with large corporate conglomerates (*Chaebols*), legally conditioning financial support on their ability to compete in international export markets. Concurrently, South Korea invested heavily in human capital and technological development, scaling its GERD to approximately 4.8% of GDP. This model transformed the nation from a low-cost manufacturing site into a dominant exporter of high-value electronics and advanced tech platforms.

2. Japan: Institutionalized *Kaizen* and the Preservation of National Pride

Following the destruction of its industrial base in World War II, Japan faced severe resource scarcity, structural isolation, and capital depletion. To rebuild, the state institutionalized the management philosophy of ***Kaizen***—the process of continuous, incremental improvements in quality control, manufacturing efficiency, and operational discipline across industrial enterprises.

By focusing heavily on production precision and engineering excellence, Japan offset its lack of natural resource endowments by generating high-margin economic value. The label "Made in Japan" was transformed into a global gold standard for reliability and technological quality. This model demonstrates that long-term macroeconomic resilience can be achieved by prioritizing national self-reliance, manufacturing discipline, and continuous process optimization.

3. Singapore: Human Capital Maximization in Resource-Constrained Environments

Upon achieving sovereignty in 1965, Singapore was a small, swampy island economy characterized by high structural unemployment, minimal industrial infrastructure, and an absolute lack of natural resource endowments, including domestic drinking water supplies. Under the leadership of Lee Kuan Yew, the state executed a development strategy centered entirely on **Human Capital Maximization**. Recognizing that its population was its singular economic asset, Singapore restructured its education system to match global technical standards, implemented strict anti-corruption frameworks, and built an open financial environment to capture multinational foreign direct investment. By functioning as a highly efficient global trade, logistics, and financial clearing hub, Singapore expanded its per capita GDP to levels exceeding many Western industrial economies.

4. Germany: The *Mittelstand* Model of Niche Specialization

Germany's post-war economic reconstruction (*Wirtschaftswunder*) was driven not only by large industrial monopolies, but by the structural strength of its ***Mittelstand***—a dense network of highly specialized, family-owned small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) located primarily in small towns and semi-urban regions.

Rather than pursuing mass-commodity manufacturing, these enterprises focused on high-tech niche products, precision machinery, and specialized industrial components for global B2B supply chains. This model paired local employment stability with global market reach.

This *Mittelstand* framework provides a direct structural model for India's rural economic development, particularly for semi-urban districts like Korba and Kartala. Integrating these global insights requires a systematic policy pivot:

- **From South Korea:** India must transition from import substitution toward high-value, tech-driven export verticals, leveraging corporate credit to achieve international competitiveness.
- **From Japan and Singapore:** The state must increase public investments in foundational skills and technological precision, converting its large population into a highly skilled workforce.
- **From Germany:** Domestic policy must strengthen regional MSME ecosystems, linking rural enterprises directly with advanced global value chains to foster decentralized, inclusive economic growth.

VI. Strategic Interventions and Conclusion

To achieve the long-term milestones of *Viksit Bharat @2047* and manage the structural anomalies identified across the domestic economy, India must execute several targeted policy interventions. First, to resolve the primary sector productivity paradox, the state must implement structural labor migration programs alongside investments in agricultural value addition.

Given that 45% of the workforce generates only 16% of GDP, public policy must facilitate a steady transition of surplus agricultural labor into high-absorptive secondary sectors, such as electronics assembly, textiles, and green energy manufacturing. This requires scaling up specialized vocational training programs through the Skill India Mission and establishing regional industrial manufacturing zones directly adjacent to semi-urban hubs to absorb rural labor close to home.

Second, India must address its low innovation intensity by modernizing its research and development framework. Stagnating at a GERD of 0.64% of GDP limits the economy’s ability to move up the global value chain. The state should introduce corporate R&D tax incentives, establish sovereign venture capital matching funds for deep-tech start-ups, and strengthen institutional ties between public technical universities and private manufacturing enterprises. This innovation thrust must be decentralized; rather than concentrating tech hubs in major metro centers, policy must direct capital toward Tier-II and Tier-III cities to ensure regional development.

Third, addressing systemic wealth and tax distribution inequities is vital to build a sustainable, consumer-driven economy. The current fiscal landscape, where the bottom 50% of earners contribute 64% of indirect tax revenues, constrains lower-income purchasing power. Rationalizing the GST architecture by lowering rates on basic consumer goods while increasing direct tax compliance for top-tier income brackets can help rebalance the tax burden.

Concurrently, public expenditure must continue prioritizing high-multiplier CAPEX over revenue subsidies. This approach should be coupled with targeted human capital investments, such as expanding the Ayushman Bharat healthcare framework and providing direct funding for advanced digital education in rural public schools to bridge the digital opportunity divide.

Finally, unlocking the full potential of the country's demographic dividend requires eliminating the structural barriers that limit female labor force participation. While the FLFPR has recently expanded to 41.7%, achieving developed-nation parameters requires a sustained effort to reach a 70% participation rate by 2047.

This transition can be accelerated by enforcing gender pay equity mandates, investing in safe and affordable public transit corridors linking rural peri-urban centers with formal employment hubs, and creating micro-credit channels to support women-led enterprise startups.

In conclusion, the journey toward *Viksit Bharat @2047* represents a comprehensive structural, technological, and institutional evolution. The transition from the 10th largest global economy in 2014 to the 4th largest economy in 2026 highlights the country's profound developmental potential.

However, sustaining a long-term compounding growth trajectory to build a USD 30 to 40 trillion economic powerhouse requires addressing deep underlying structural frictions. By executing disciplined public CAPEX strategies, resolving the agricultural productivity paradox, bridging the digital and socio-economic divide, and investing in human capital, India can realize its developmental goals.

The path forward during this *Amrit Kaal* requires combining the same spirit of self-reliance that characterized its historical trade traditions with the rigorous industrial and human capital optimization models demonstrated by modern global blueprints.

References

- Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade. (2026). *The state of the startup ecosystem in India: Decentralized innovation and growth dynamics across Tier-II and Tier-III urban centers* (DPIIT Macroeconomic Report). Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India. https://dpiit.gov.in
- Ministry of Finance. (2025). *Economic survey 2024-25: Sustaining growth momentum, expanding public capital expenditure, and mitigating sectoral structural risks*. Government of India. https://www.indiabudget.gov.in

- Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. (2025). *Annual survey of industries and periodic labour force survey: Calibrating employment elasticity, sectoral worker distribution, and manufacturing stagnation*. Government of India. https://mospi.gov.in
- NITI Aayog. (2024). *Strategic roadmap for Viksit Bharat @2047: Structural transformations, capital multipliers, and macro-foundations for high-income transition*. Government of India. https://www.niti.gov.in
- Oxfam International. (2023). *Survival of the richest: The India story on wealth concentration, indirect taxation regressive structures, and distributive equity*. Oxfam Policy Research Brief (Open-Access Repository Version). https://www.oxfam.org
- Panagariya, A. (2025). *Financing the high-income transition: Compounding per capita dynamics, fiscal federalism, and the path to USD 30 trillion*. 16th Finance Commission of India (Public Repository Access).
- Prakash, S., & Sodhi, J. S. (2025). Capital expenditure multipliers and digital clearing network efficiencies: Re-evaluating fiscal transmission in India. *Indian Economic Journal*, 73(2), 145–163 (Open-Access Repository Version).
- Reserve Bank of India. (2023). *Report on currency and finance 2022-23: Towards a greener, cleaner India and the macroeconomics of digital currency*. RBI Central Publication. https://www.rbi.org.in
- World Bank. (2024). *India development update: Accelerating total factor productivity, human capital integration, and escaping the middle-income trap*. World Bank Group Open-Knowledge Repository. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org

भारतीय भाषा, शिक्षा, साहित्य एवं शोध

ISSN 2321 – 9726

WWW.BHARTIYASHODH.COM

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

ISSN – 2250 – 1959 (0) 2348 – 9367 (P)

WWW.IRJMST.COM

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, ARTS AND SCIENCE

ISSN 2319 – 9202

WWW.CASIRJ.COM

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT SOCIOLOGY & HUMANITIES

ISSN 2277 – 9809 (0) 2348 - 9359 (P)

WWW.IRJMSH.COM

INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF SCIENCE ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

ISSN 2454-3195 (online)

WWW.RJSET.COM

INTEGRATED RESEARCH JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION

ISSN 2582-5445

WWW.IRJMSI.COM

JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES,POLITICS AND ECONOMICS RESEARCH

WWW.JLPER.COM