



Research Paper

Decoding the Integral Humanism Philosophy of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay

Surinder Singh

Abstract

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay's philosophy of integral humanism is an indigenous socio-economic viewpoint, based on Bharatiya cultural values, which is focused on overall development of human beings. Integral humanism reestablishes the man's place in the right perspective and tries to develop his complete personality. The idea of integral humanism ensures the dignified life for every human being, to support sustainable consumption of natural resources, to enhance political, economic and social democracy and freedom, and to promote diversity. To achieve the above said objectives, the philosophy of integral humanism laid stress on three principles i.e. supremacy of whole, supremacy of dharma and autonomy of society. After independence, Deendayal argued that India should develop our own model of development instead of blindly following the western model of development. He said that we should analyse our-self which is associated with our culture. He describes that Bharatiya culture focuses on the development of human's body, mind, intellect and soul which is called integrated humanism.

Keywords: Humanism, Deendayal Upadhyay, Bharatiya Culture, Development, Dharma

Received 01 July, 2022; Revised 08 July, 2022; Accepted 10 July, 2022 © The author(s) 2022.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. Introduction

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay was a great philosopher, sociologist, economist and politician. His idealistic personality inspired the politicians to stand on a healthy foundation of purity and humanity. He has achieved the status as a great-man, by his deeds, which was appreciated by his followers and opponents. He was a great thinker. His intellect was inclined towards the serious topics of Indian society, like individual and society, dharma and state, culture and civilization, at a very young age. He was published a number of books i.e. *The Two Plans*, *Political Diary*, *Devaluation*, *Integral humanism*, *Rasther Chintan*, *Bharatiya Arthniti*, *Rashter Jivan Ki Disha*, *Akhandh Bharat Aur Muslim Samasya*, *Hindu Sanskriti ki Visechta*, and *Samrat Chandergupta* etc. (Dharamsenan S., 2017: 31; see also Nain, 2019: 223). Therefore, he was well known as a modern interpreter of the ancient thoughts which enabled *Bharatiya* society to overcome various paradoxes. He wanted to formulate such a political philosophy which must be in tune with nature and *Bharatiya* culture, and can ensure all round development of the nation (Upadhyay, 2018: 172). As a result of this, he coined the term integral humanism in the Gwalior session of the *Jan Sangh* in 1964. However, the same was duly accepted in Vijayawada session of *Jan Sang* on 23rd April 1965 (Upadhyay, 1968: 6).¹ In his address, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay argued that after 17 years of independence India has still to choose in which direction it should go and what type of philosophy should adopt to realize our cherished dream of multifaceted development in the lives of Indian people. As per him, generally, people do not think about the above said question (ibid: 20). Largely, they conceive their day to day problems; either be it economic and political or social in nature. At that time people could be segregated on the basis either to adopt the modern way of life or ancient way of life. There were some people who suggested that India should go back to the position where it was conquered by foreign rulers. We should proceed from there. On the other hand, some people assume that western philosophy and way of life are the best for progress and development. They disregard all that has originated in India. Though be it a socio-spiritual philosophy or political or economic philosophy (ibid: 20-21). Deendayal Upadhyay describes that both lines of thought (modern versus ancient) are incorrect because they represent the partial truth. However, it will not be proper to discard them altogether.

¹ Later on the speech of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay was published in the book form by *Bharatiya Jan Sang* in 1968.

II. Decoding the Philosophy of Integral Humanism

Integral humanism philosophy of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay begins with the discourse that after freedom from British rule whether the Jawaharlal Nehru's government or Indian government has adopted the right model for socio-economic and political development? Should India adopt the modern development model (which is based on western or foreign ideologies) or ancient (to proceed from the position when Bharat lost its independence to foreign invaders) or should India develop its indigenous socio-economic and political model for development. Deendayal Upadhyay preferred to formulate India's indigenous model for development i.e. Integral humanism. He rejected both the western or foreign and ancient model of development on the reasonable basis. About the ancient model, he argued that forget that whether it may or may not be desirable, to adopt it is definitely impossible. The flow of time cannot be reversed. He said that Indians should attempt to reshape their life as required to face the new situations (ibid: 21). Therefore, he gave a new model of development or philosophy which is based on ancient *Bharatiya* cultural values.

Deendayal disapproves of western or foreign ideologies. He said that foreign ideologies "are not necessarily universal. They cannot be free from the limitations of the particular people and their culture which gave birth to these isms. Besides, many of these ideas are already out-of-date" (ibid: 21). For him, western political philosophy has accepted democracy, nationalism, socialism or equality and universal unity as its ideals. In practice, all these ideals have proved to be incomplete and mutually opposing. Such as nationalism led to conflict between nations which led in turn to global conflict. However, world unity and nationalism conflict with each other. World unity advocates the suppression of nationalism for universal brotherhood. Whereas, supporters of nationalism regard world unity as a utopian ideal and emphasize national interest to the utmost. In the same way, difficulty arises in reconciling socialism and democracy. Democracy grants individual liberty but the same is used by capitalist systems for exploitation and monopoly. Socialism was brought to end the exploitation but it destroyed freedom and dignity of the individual (ibid: 23). He also expresses Marxism as a reactionary approach rather than scientific and pragmatic for solving the problems facing our country. Thus, human beings are confused and are unable to decide what the correct path is for future progress. The west is not in a position to state with confidence that only western philosophy, no other, is the right path (Upadhyay, 2017). It is itself groping. Therefore, simply to follow the western world is an instance of a blind being led by another.

Deendayal further stated that every country has its own peculiar historical, social and economic situation. Therefore, their leaders should decide the remedies for the ills that beset the country from time to time taking into consideration its background. It is irrational to think that remedies which the leaders of one country decide to endeavor for their problems are likely to be effective as in all other countries. Therefore, it is neither possible nor wise to adopt foreign isms in India in the original form too. Although Deendayal preferred to indigenous knowledge and wisdom to solve the problems, simultaneously he stated that we can adopt the wisdom of others in particular circumstances. He, further, describes that "we must absorb the knowledge and gains of the entire humanity so far as eternal principles and truths are concerned" (ibid: 23). Those which originated in our society must be adapted to changed times and those that we receive from other societies have to be adapted to our conditions. For him, with the help of *Bharatiya* culture we can reconcile the various ideals of the western political thought, which will be an added advantage for us.

Deendayal Upadhyay underlines the need of *Bharatiya* culture because it has an integrated viewpoint. It looks upon life as an integrated whole. According to him, confusion in the west arises primarily from its tendency to think of life in sections and then to attempt to put them together by patch-work. We do admit that there is diversity and plurality in life, but we have always attempted to discover the unity behind them. Indian culture is perceived as the basic unity of all life. Even the dualists have believed nature and spirit to be complementary underlying the diversity. The unity in seed finds expression in various forms—the roots, the trunk, the branches, the leaves, the flowers and the fruits of the tree. All these have different forms and colours and even to some extent different properties. Still we recognize their relation of unity with each other through the seeds. Unity in diversity and the expression of unity in various forms have remained the central thought of Indian culture. If this through is whole-heartedly accepted then there will not exist any cause for conflict among various powers. Conflict is not a sign of culture or nature; rather it is a symptom of perversion. The law of the jungle 'survival of the fittest' which the west discovered in recent years was known to our philosophers. Thus, our philosophers have recognized lust, anger etc., among the six inferior tendencies of human nature, but we did not use them as the foundation or the basis of civilized life or culture. It is essential to save ourselves and the society from these elements. We cannot consider them as our ideals or standards of human behavior. Survival of the fittest is the law of the jungle. Civilizations have developed not on the basis of the law of jungle but by consideration of how the operation of this law could be reduced to the minimum in human life. If we wish to progress, we have to keep this history of civilization before our minds.

Deendayal further stated that in this world mutual cooperation is also obtained in abundance just as conflict and competition. Like vegetation and animal life keep each other alive. Similarly, human beings get oxygen supply with the help of vegetation, whereas they provide carbon-dioxide that is necessary for the growth

of vegetable life. This mutual cooperation maintains life on the earth. The recognition of this element of mutual livelihood among diverse forms of life and taking that as the base of an endeavor to build human life mutually sustaining is the major feature of civilization. He described that to form the nature to attain the social aspirations is culture but when this nature directs to social conflict it is called perversion. Thus, culture never ignores nor denies nature. Rather, culture develops those elements in nature which are supportive in sustaining life in this universe. Moreover, it makes nature richer and curbs other constituents which obstruct or destroy life. For instance animals as like human beings have a similar type of social relationship but they forget their natural relationship. Whereas, man uses these natural relationships as a source to build a more harmonious order in life, in order to interlace the whole society in a single entity of co-operation. As a result a variety of values and traditions are formed. Thus, on the basis of these values, the standards of good and bad are determined in society accordingly. Those principles that help to sustain human life can be selected for a civilized life in the society.

Furthermore, Deendayal stated that human nature has two types of tendencies, anger and greed on the one hand and love and sacrifice on the other. All these tendencies are present in human nature. Anger, greed etc., are natural to man and beasts alike. So, if man makes anger a basis of his life and arrange his efforts accordingly then the result will be a lack of harmony in his life. Therefore, the exhortation, “do not yield to anger”. Even when anger arises in one’s mind one can exercise control over it and one should do so. Thus control becomes a standard of our life and not anger. There are certain principles of human relations which are not framed but discovered. Such principles are followed by their usefulness. For example if someone feels anger then he/she must keep it under control. Or do not tell a lie to one another. These principles of ethics form dharma or law of life in Bharatiya society (ibid: 29). The principles which carry about harmony, peace and progress in the life of mankind are included in this term dharma. On the basis of dharma, then, human beings must proceed with analysis of life as an integral whole. When nature is channelized according to the principles of dharma, human beings have culture and civilization. It is indeed this culture which will enable humans to sustain and sublimate the life of mankind. Dharma is translated here as law. For Deendayal Upadhyay the word religion is not the correct translation for dharma. Thus, an integrated life is not only the basis and the underlying principle of Bharatiya culture, but also its aims and ideals (ibid. 29-30).

Moreover, Deendayal described that accretion of the body, soul, intelligence and mind —makes up an individual. These elements are integrated and cannot be separate from each other. While, in the west each and every aspects of human being have treated independently. Therefore, in the country like America people are puzzled and disturbed. There is no calm and no pleasures (ibid: 30). The reason is that they have not believed in the integrated human being. In Bharat, people have stated that progress of man denote simultaneous progress of the body, soul, mind, and intellect of man. Often, it has been said that Bharatiya culture focus only of salvation of the soul. It does not bother about the rest which is wrong. Attention to soul is unique characteristic of Bharatiya culture. With the passage of time, this created an impression that Indians are concerned only with the soul and not with other facets of human being (ibid:31).

According to Deendayal Bharatiya traditions do not disregard the body while giving attention to the soul. The Upanishads, even, announce that a physically weak person cannot realize the self. Body is truly the most significant device to execute the responsibilities that enjoins with *Dharma*. There is fundamental disparity between Bharatiya and western way of life. The western philosophy’s aim is to satisfy the worldly needs and desires of the body. However, Bharatiya viewpoint regard the body as a mechanism to achieve the aims. The satisfaction of bodily needs is necessary but Bharatiya philosophy does not believe this to be the sole aim. As per Bharatiya culture a person is performed the fourfold responsibilities of catering to the desires of body, intellect, mind, and soul with a view to achieve the integrated progress of man. There are four kinds of *purushartha* (viz. *Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha*) which means efforts that befit man. The yearning for *Dharma, Artha, Kama* and *Moksha* are innate in man. However, the satisfaction of these gives joys. Of these four efforts, Bharatiya viewpoint has thought in an integrated way. Even though, *Moksha* has been considered the greatest of these *purusharthas* but endeavors for *Moksha* alone are not considered to take advantage to the soul. On the other hand, a person who is performing actions, while staying free to its fruits, is said to realize *Moksha* very soon. *Artha* comprises the political and economic policies. According to the ancients, it used to include the Justice and punishment as well as economics. *Kama* is related to the satisfaction of various natural desires. *Dharma* comprises all the rules, fundamental principles and ethical codes in accordance with which all the activities in respect of *Artha* and *Kama* are to be performed on and all the objectives thereof to be achieved. It only will make sure development in an integrated and harmonious manner and ultimately will lead to *Moksha*.

As said by Deendayal *Dharma, Artha* and *Kama* are interrelated and mutually complementary. *Dharma* helps to achieve *Artha*. Even in business one requires *Dharma*. Without *dharma* one cannot earn money. It must be confessed that *Dharma* is a key device in attaining *artha* and *kama*. He stated that Bharatiya people believe in *Dharma* not just because it is an instrument in acquiring *Artha* but because it is a primary principle of civilized life. *Kama* can also be attained only through *Dharma*. *Dharma* helps in restricting the natural tendencies of man, whereby he is capable to decide what is valuable to him, apart from what is pleasant. Hence, *Dharma* is given

the leading place in our culture. It is not possible to practice Dharma in the absence of Artha. There is a saying “What sin will not be committed by one who is starving? Those who have lost everything become ruthless” (ibid: 33). Therefore, it determines that enough wealth also strengthens Dharma. In the same way, the government has to uphold law and order and also prevent chaos which certainly destroys Dharma. At the time of chaos, the law of jungle prevails where the physically powerful feed upon the weak. Therefore stability in the state is also necessary for the prevalence of Dharma.

Deendayal further stated that both the absence and influence of Artha leads to destruction. In a society or in an individual, if, Artha becomes goal instead of means than all powers are acquired through Artha only. Therefore, in the influence of Artha various sins are committed to accumulate Artha. The possibility of being comfortable always remains of the person who owns surplus money. The Artha’s influence prevails when a person does not understand the proper utilization of Artha. The influence of Artha also exists where secondary Artha i.e. the currency and the productive goods to be used in consumer materials are in excess. Such type of influences of Artha should be kept away from. So as to avoid the influence of Artha one should build character, spread of idealism, education, and suitable economic structures is also necessary (ibid: 34). For him, Artha is a comprehensive term which comprises the political aspects of life as well. Danda-niti (political aspect of life) describes that too much power of the state is hazardous for Dharma. The evil of State’s power prevails when it usurps the appropriate rightful place of Dharma. Therefore, Dharma suffers and declines in a ruthless State which acquires all powers (both political and economic). In this scenario, the society looks towards the State for everything. Consequently, State should not be allowed to get hold of Dharma and society (ibid: 34). Kama also has been considered on the same lines as of Artha and Dharma by Deendayal. He stated that for the growth of Dharma we should neither the physical needs are neglected nor and the desires entirely suppressed. Dharma cannot be practiced if people have no food to eat. The civilizing influence on people will be lost if the fine arts, which gratify the mind, are altogether stopped. The mind will become vicious and Dharma will neglect. Therefore, Kama too must be engaged in consonance with Dharma.

III. Conclusion

This paper establishes that the integral humanism philosophy of Deendayal Upadhyay focuses on the human being should be the core of the social, economic and political model of development. His philosophy demands to formulate an indigenous development model rather than borrow any development model from West or East. In this indigenous model of development human beings should be the centre and the life of an individual considered in an integrated manner. Where, people set the aim of developing body, mind, intellect as well as soul in a balanced way. Human beings have attempted to satisfy the manifold desires of man, taking care that endeavors to please two different aspirations are not commonly conflicting. This is the integrated representation of all the fourfold ambitions of an individual. This notion of a complete human being, an integrated human being, is both an objective as well as our path. In a way, his thoughts can be said not just as a political one but as a conclusion of socio-economic and political perspectives with Bharathiya—Indianness to make a synthesis in human life with the society, state, and nation function as complementary to each other rather than being contradictory elements.

Acknowledgement:

Surinder Singh presently working as Assistant Professor of Political Science at Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib. His email id is singhsurinder333@gmail.com.

References

- [1]. Dharamsenan S. (2017), *Political Philosophy of Deendayal Upadhyay: With Special Reference to His Integral Humanism*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Philosophy, University of Madras.
- [2]. Nain, Ansuiya (2019), “Life and Works of Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhyay”, *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, LXXX(2), 221-226.
- [3]. Upadhyay, Deendayal, *Integral Humanism*, Jagriti Prakashan, Noida.
- [4]. Upadhyay, Deendayal, *Rastra Chintan*, accessed from <http://library.bjp.org/jspui/handle/123456789/439> , accessed on 01-06-2022.
- [5]. Upadhyay, Dr. Manjula (2018), “Economic Thought of Deen Dayal Upadhyay”, *International Journal of Innovative Social Science & Humanity Research*, 5(1), 172-177.