

## **Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism: The Economic Dimension**

**Dr. Sanjeet Singh**

*Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Vallabh Govt. P.G College Mandi H.P*

One of the aspirations of man is economic well being. He aspires for all sorts of comforts and luxuries, and endeavours to exploit and increase the resources for this end. To get this urge materialised, science and technology discovering and inventing new potentialities to harvest maximum of the available resources in order to enrich man and society. To Lord Robbins political economy is a branch of the science, having two distinct objects: first to provide a plentiful revenue or subsistence for the people, or more properly to enable them to provide such a revenue or subsistence for themselves; and secondly, to supply the state or commonwealth with a revenue sufficient for public services. It proposes to enrich both the people and the sovereign.

Various thinkers have propounded different economic theories to utilize and achieve the maximum advantage of the available resources for the benefit of man. Liberalism continued to dominate the world scene for long. This philosophy was based on the principle of Laissez-faire, which provided man with unlimited freedom in all the spheres of life. Consequently, man went to the extent of governing the entire economic system. The state was considered as a necessary evil. On the other hand, in the second decade of twentieth century, there emerged a new political system, the socialist system of governance on the basis of communist ideology. Under this system, the state took over all the means of production and controlled the economic system. In retrospect the experiences of both the systems reveal their inherent shortcomings and lopsidedness. For example, the countries which followed the free trade and open market economy suffered from the problems of increasing economic and social inequalities resulting into wide variations in the standards of living of the people, unemployment, poverty, social alienation, etc. Likewise, the state controlled socialist system not only denied political and economic freedoms to man but also remained plagued with economic disparities, regional imbalances and other problems. Hence, both the systems proved inadequate to secure wellbeing of man at large. A modified version of liberalism with Welfare state started influencing the consciousness of people throughout the world. But it is deplorable that today the world is facing a great calamity, despite economic prosperity, abundance of production and all sorts of comforts and luxuries. The problems are multiplying and becoming more complex and crystallized. Even the countries, which have attained economic prosperity are facing numerous problems and are also caught in a whirlpool of maladies. Incidence and proportion of murders, divorces, disintegration of family systems, consuming of pills for sleep, addiction to intoxicating drugs and suicide rates are increasing in all the countries. Further, the scientific discoveries have brought comforts for men but it has also led to the excessive exploitation of natural resources, which consequently has led to ecological imbalances.

Deendayal Upadhyaya enunciates his economic ideas in his philosophy of Integral Humanism, which are being discussed in the present paper. Deendayal Upadhyaya lays the blame for the economic malaise together with the psychological mess and degeneration of human values at the door of the existing economic theories. He says, 'The economic theories of the past few centuries and the structure of society based on these theories, have resulted in a thorough devaluation of the human being. He observes that Capitalist economy recognises only an economic man', whose all decisions are based entirely on calculations of gain and loss, in terms of material wealth. Technology and heavy mechanization in its wake are used for making maximum production and drawing maximum profit. He says, 'In the capitalist system the industrialist creates capital with the help of (the) surplus value.' The maximum production helps to realise more profit. For raising production new desires are induced for the consumption of manufactured products. According to Deendayal, 'The Western societies consider it most essential and even desirable to go on continuously and systematically increasing the desires and needs of man. There is no upper limit in this context. Normally desire precedes the effort at producing the things desired. But now the position is reverse. People are induced to desire and use the things that have been and are being produced. Instead of producing to meet the demand, the search is on for markets for the goods already produced; if the demand does not exist, systematic efforts are made to create demand. This has become the chief characteristic of the western economic movement.'

Deendayal believes that material value is the most important and central position in the capitalist system. All decisions are taken on the consideration of gain and loss in terms of material wealth. He argues that

the philosophy based entirely on such considerations is incomplete, unethical and inhuman as it results in a thorough devaluation of the human beings. Such a system, to him, is socially untenable because the production is done to maximise profit, and not to meet the needs of the people. Also, the system gives priority to the selfish ends of individuals over the interest of the society. Deendayal considers the above economic system not only socially untenable but also dangerous for the entire nature. It leads to imbalance in the nature. The ruthless and blatant exploitation of the limited natural resources for raising production devastates the nature. To quote him: The present economic system and system of production are fast disturbing this equilibrium of nature. As a result, on the one hand new products are manufactured for satisfying ever increasing desires, on the other hand new problems arise everyday, threatening the very existence of the entire humanity and civilization.

Further, to Deendayal, the very purpose of machine as an assistant of man is, to decrease the content of physical labour and to increase productivity. However, he deplores that the purpose of machine is defied in the capitalist system, where machine becomes a competitor of human being and human labour is considered as a commodity to be purchased with money. Deendayal emphasizes, The principal drawback of the capitalist viewpoint lies in the fact that by making the machine a competitor of human labour and thereby displacing and subjecting human beings to privations, the very purpose of creating machine has been defied. Such a system not only subjugates the man to machine but also leads to rampant inequalities and the neglect of\_ the weak in a fierce competition for material gains. Deendayal holds that capitalist system is free enterprise. It holds all other restrictions and regulations unjust ... In the race no one is prepared to stop and give a helping hand to the weak who is left behind; nay, elimination of the weak is considered just and natural. He is un-economic, marginal unit, not fit to exist. This is what it advocates. By the elimination of such marginal units, the economic power accumulates in the hands of a few ... Even as regards the consumer's need, the capitalist is guided not by the necessities and desires of the consumer, but by his purchasing power. The needs of the wealthy and the well fed are attended to rather than those of the poor and the hungry. Therefore, like socialists, Deendayal strongly repudiates capitalism because it breeds and deepens inequalities in the society because the means of production and wealth are concentrated only in a few hands. Deendayal was against such a development model, which breeds inequalities in the society. He strongly remarks, What good is it to the Samaj if a certain individual happens to achieve greatness for himself? It is rather a harmful development. It is good for the body as a whole to register all-round growth but if the legs alone were to grow fat while the rest of the body remains thin and lean it would lead to the disease called elephantiasis. Further, he is of the view that the capitalist system, which espouses to provide freedom and individuality to man has failed to do so. On the contrary it has led to the destruction of individuality. He writes, The system which boasts of giving highest importance to the individual has ironically destroyed all individuality. Clearly, the capitalist system is incapable of helping the development of an integral human being.

Similarly some modern Indian thinkers like Radhakrishnan, Aurobindo and Gandhi also talk about the weaknesses of the capitalist system. While condemning capitalism, Radhakrishnan writes, The capitalist system of society does not foster healthy relations among human beings. When a few people own all the means of production the others, though they may be nominally free in the sense that they are neither slaves nor serfs, have to sell their labour under conditions imposed on them. He adds, "The emphasis of capitalism on the supreme importance of material wealth, the intensity of its appeal to the acquisitive instincts, its worship of economic power, its subordination of human beings to the exigencies of an economic system, its exploitation of them to the limits of endurance, its concentration on the largest profit rather than on maximum production, its acceptance of divisions in the human family based on differences, not of personal quality and social function but of income and economic circumstance, all these are injurious to human dignity. Sri Aurobindo also condemns the economic system, which puts an individual on monetary terms of profit and loss to attain selfish ends. He says, The opulent plutocrat and the successful mammoth capitalist and organizer of industry are the supermen of the commercial age and the true, if often occult rulers of its society. The essential barbarism of all this is its pursuit of vital success, satisfaction, productiveness, accumulation, possession, enjoyment, comfort, convenience for their own sake. Gandhi too rejects the system, which inculcates and culminates in Mammon worship and facilitates the strong to grab or amass wealth by exploiting the weak. Such a notion also finds reference in Jsa Upanishad in the principle Do not covet other person's wealth.

Deendayal is also opposed to the socialist system. He writes, Socialism arose as a reaction to capitalism. But even socialism failed to establish the importance of the human being. Socialists contented themselves by merely transferring the ownership of capital in the hands of the State. But the State is even more of an impersonal institution. All the business of the State is conducted by rigid rules and regulations. Generally, there is no place for individual discretion and even where such discretion is allowed, the slightest laxity in the sense of duty and social responsibility on the part of the administrator's results in corruption and favouritism. D.B. Thengadi emphasizes, Marx, under the influence of the then prevailing objective conditions, treated man as an economic being. In fact, Marx was against the power of money, against the sense of possession. He wanted man to be liberated from the lust for wealth and the bondage of economic factors. But, in practice, he

emphasized mainly the economic aspect of human existence. While criticising communism, Radh-akrishnan says, In communism there is little of the pursuit of truth, no passion for individual integrity, and spiritual perfection, no faith in the inwardness of human life. Vinoba also asserts that it is a soulless ideology (which) has no place for the freedom of individual.

According to Deendayal both socialists and capitalists believe in Western technology and machinery. Moreover in the both the systems the distribution is not equitable. To quote him, Socialists, of whichever hue, have implicit faith in the efficacy of western technology. Their struggle is not against machines, but their owner. They are content with vesting the State with the ownership of the machines. According to him, In the capitalist system the industrialist creates capital with the help of (the) surplus value. In a socialist system, the state undertakes this task. In both the systems, the entire production is not distributed among the workers. He emphasizes, In the Western economies, whether it is capitalist or socialist, value has the most important and central position. All economic theories centre around value. It may be that the analysis of value is very important from the point of view of the economist but, those social philosophies which are based entirely on value are far incomplete, inhuman and to some extent unethical. He adds, 'The capitalist system thought merely of the economic man, but left him free in other fields where he could exercise his individuality. The socialist system went much further thinking only of the abstract man. After that, there was no scope for the development of the individual personality based on diverse tastes and abilities. The needs and preferences of individuals have as much importance in the socialist system as in a prison manual. There is no such thing as individual freedom in the socialist system. Therefore, Deendayal emphatically says, Both these systems, capitalist as well as communist, have failed to take account of the Integral Man, his true and complete personality and his aspirations. One considers him a mere selfish being lingering after money, having only one law, the law of fierce competition, in essence the law of the jungle; whereas the other has viewed him as a feeble lifeless cog in the whole scheme of things, regulated by rigid rules, and incapable of any good unless directed. The centralisation of power, economic and political, is implied in both. Both, therefore, result in dehumanisation of man.

According to Deendayal, neither the capitalist nor the socialist system is competent to evolve a social order for the benefit of man and society. For him both these systems fall short of establishing society on humanistic values. He says, We want neither capitalism nor socialism ... The protagonists of the two systems fight with Man' on the stake. Both of them do not understand man, nor do they care for his interests. Therefore, according to him there is a need of such an economic system, which helps in the development of our human qualities or civilization. He emphasizes, The Indian system calls for a blend of the two ... We are individualists and also stand for the societies. In accordance with Indian philosophy we look to the interest of society even while not ignoring the individual. Because we care for society we are socialist' in that sense, and because we do not ignore the individual, we are also individualists. Because we do not consider the individual to be supreme it is said that we are not individualists. On the other hand we also do not think that society should rob the individual of all his freedoms and peculiarities. We are against the individual being used as a part of a machine and in that sense we are not socialists. It is our conviction that society cannot be thought of without the individual, nor can an individual have any value without society. Hence we want a synthesis of the two. He emphatically exhorts, The answer to the problems of the world is Hinduism. This is the only philosophy of life which considers life as a whole, not in compartments.

Man is of central concern in Deendayal's economic thinking. He wanted to bring all round development of man. He writes, Man, the highest creation of God, is losing his own identity. We must re-establish him in his rightful position, bring him the realisation of his greatness, reawaken his abilities and encourage ,him to exert for attaining divine heights of his latent personality ... We aim at the progress and happiness of Man', the Integral Man. He emphasizes the integrated and coordinated development of all the constituents of human personality. He believes that the fulfilment of all the aspirations of man is necessary, however, Deendayal makes Dharma as the basis of the fulfilment of other aspirations. Therefore, in respect of material prosperity, Deendayal emphasizes to attain Artha in consonance with Dharma.

While enumerating his economic views, Deendayal reminds us of India's age-old heritage of man's conception. He says that our culture and tradition tells us that man is not merely a repository of material desires and needs. Instead, he is a mighty spiritual being who has assumed a material body. Comparing man's body with the temple and his soul with the idol placed therein, he asserts that the identification is with the idol, an emblem infused with divinity. The adoring of the idol and offerings of articles of worship are because of the divinity inherent in the idol. If one forgets the divine imaged in the building while maintaining the temple, then our efforts will go waste. His emphasis is on the simultaneous development of body as well as soul. In other words he craves for the harmonisation of materialism and spiritualism. Jsha Upanishad strongly affirms this view, In darkness are they who worship only the world, but in greater darkness are they who worship the infinite alone. He who accepts both saves himself from death by his knowledge of the one, and attains immortality by his knowledge of the other. For Deendayal Upadhyaya, materialism and spiritualism are not mutually antagonistic,

by no means separate realities or emotive locales." D.B. Thegadi writes, The Hindu culture evolved a coordinated system of materialistic as well as non-materialistic values of life which together served as an incentive for individual development. As is well known, the Artha and Kama constituted the materialistic values which were blended finely with the non-materialistic values of the Dharma and Moksha. The material aspect was neither ignored nor glorified.

While expressing his economic ideas Deendayal emphasizes, Economic system must achieve the production of all the basic things essential for the maintenance and development of people as well as the protection and development of the Nation. According to him, Any economic system must provide for the minimum basic necessities of human life to everyone. Food, clothing and shelter constitute, broadly speaking, these basic necessities. He further adds that economic system must enable the individual to carry out his obligations to the society and also in the event of an individual falling prey to any disease, society must arrange for his treatment and maintenance. Deendayal asserts, If a government provides these minimum requirements, then only it is a rule of Dharma. Otherwise, it is a rule of Adharma.

In the scheme of his economic system he upholds, the guarantee of work to every able bodied member of the society, should be the aim of our economic system. Deendayal emphatically says, If a vote for everyone is the touch-stone of political democracy, work for everyone is a measure of economic democracy. This right to work does not mean slave labour as in communist countries. Work should not only give a means of livelihood to a person but it should be of the choice of that person. If for doing that work the worker does not get a proper share in the national income, he would be considered unemployed. From this point of view a minimum wage, a just system of distribution and some sort of social security are necessary. It may be referred here that Harold Laski also asserts: A man has not only the right to work. He has the right also to be paid an adequate wage for his labour. By the work that he performs he must be able to secure a return capable of purchasing the standard of living without which creative citizenship is impossible.

While favouring right of ownership for workers Deendayal writes, It is a matter of surprise that today a share-holder in joint stock company, who has no other connection with the companies except a share in its profit, should be able to exercise ownership rights while the worker who works in an industry, sets its machine into motion and depends upon it for his livelihood should experience a feeling of being a stranger to it. This feeling is not proper. It is therefore necessary that along with the shareholder the worker should be given ownership rights and a share in its management and profit.

However, it may be noted that Deendayal gives importance not only to rights but also to duties. According to him both are needed for the development of man because Man has stomach as well as hands. If he has no work for his hands, he will not get happiness even if he gets food to satisfy his hunger. His progress will be obstructed. Just as a barren woman experiences emptiness in life and consequent dissatisfaction, so does a man without work. Therefore, Deendayal emphasises that where a right to a guaranteed minimum is recognised, any individual who does not share in the efforts to produce is a burden to the society. The Tattiriya Upanishad teaches one to perform one's duty towards society. Deendayal's concern for performance of duties towards society is clearly expressed when he asserts: Land to the tiller who cares for the land. Further, his belief is that one must earn his bread and feed others also. He says, he who earns will feed and every person will have enough to eat... in a society even those who do not earn must have food. The children and the old, the diseased and the invalids, all must be cared for by society. Every society generally fulfils this responsibility. The social and cultural progress of mankind lies in the readiness to fulfil this responsibility. He emphasizes on equitable distribution and believes that 'A family represents the ideal form every man according to his capacity and to every man according to his needs.' Tradition has helped to inculcate this feeling amongst the members... No training classes have been, and need be, organised to train him how best to discharge his responsibilities. He does it indistinctively, following the ways his forefathers had followed. He further writes, The joint family is the practical unit in this country in which we seek to preserve the social sense in the individual, in which every individual has the right to earn, but the right of ownership vests in the family. Wealth is used for the benefit of the family. It is this Indian principle of Trusteeship.<sup>o</sup> Deendayal's idea of Trusteeship has its basis in a joint family system where some of the family members earn, however, the earning is used for the benefit of all the members of family according to their needs and requirement. It may be pointed out that this principle holds good to a family where all its members live in good understanding and harmony. It seems to be more idealistic than pragmatic in the society because it is difficult to achieve understanding, cohesiveness and harmony among the members of society like that of family. Further, in a heterogeneous society like India, its applicability becomes more difficult.

The principle of Trusteeship also finds expression in the philosophy of Manatma Gandhi, which believes in voluntary cooperation and surrendering a part of personal belongings to the society. It exalts the virtue of selfabnegation, and motivates the rich to voluntarily give up their claim to their surplus wealth. The Bhoodan (landgift) or Sampattidan (gift of wealth) is also based on this notion. The idea behind the demand according to Vinoba, is that all wealth, even though we may acquire it with our individual effort and skill, is not

for us alone, but has been granted to us by God for all of us. This concept is rooted in spiritual considerations impelled by ancient Indian ethical and moral ideas of renunciation and nonattachment to the worldly things. Gita's doctrine of renunciation and liberation through non-attachment refers to this. Besides the fact that this is an ancient spiritual view, the focus of this view is to bridge the gulf between the rich and the poor and to set up an egalitarian social order. Marxists are in favour of using the authority of the state during the phase of dictatorship of proletariat in Marxian terminology, to this end. All the means of production are centred in state. However, the above mentioned Indian thinkers do not use state as an instrument to achieve the destination in this context, but talk about enlightened anarchy, spiritual reform, voluntary cooperation, etc.

Besides, Deendayal's ideas are also geared to promote national development. Making the nation self-reliant in every field is his motto. He says that we will not like to lose our independence on any condition, under any circumstance. The foremost thrust of planning should be to protect and safeguard political independence, -to develop capacities therein in all respects." He adds that in the economic field it is necessary that we should become self-reliant and independent. The dependence is detrimental and disastrous for any nation. Deendayal asserts that dependence on other countries destroys the freedom of the dependent nation. He states, If the fulfilment of our programmes depends upon foreign aid it will certainly be a restraint, whether direct or indirect, upon us. We would be pulled into the sphere of economic influence of the aid-giving countries. In order to save our economic plans from difficulties we may have to many times keep quiet. A country which acquires the habit of depending upon others loses its self-respect. Such a nation can never assess the value of its independence. For a nation to be self-sufficient, strong and bright, Deendayal rejects the inadvertent aping and imitation of foreign economic ideals. He argues, Not only because of different ideals of life but also because of different conditions in terms of time and place the way of our economic development will have to be different from that of the West.

For the development of India, he says, "Swadeshi and Decentralization are the two words which can briefly summarise the economic policy suitable for the present circumstances. For him Swadeshi is of utmost importance which should be made as the cornerstone of reconstruction of our economy.

During our independence movement, our leaders used Swadeshi as an awakening symbol against the foreign domination. Dadabai Naoroji (1825-1917) in his book. *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India* (1901), exposed the blatant 177 exploitation of Indians by the British rule. The remedial measures for improving the worsening condition of India were adopted through Swadeshi movement by Indian National Congress. For Deendayal Upadhyaya, Swadeshi is not just producing indigenous goods, but it also involves using indigenous pattern of development as a whole. However, he passionately says, We proudly use foreign articles. We have grown over-dependent upon foreign aid in everything from thinking, management, capital, methods of production, technology, etc. to even the standards and forms of consumption. This way is inadmissible to him. He exhorts, this is not the road to progress and development. We shall forget our individuality and become virtual slaves once again. He observes, India can develop only if we discard the aids from foreign countries. Gandhi also believes that "The real reform that India needs is Swadeshi.

However, in this era of interdependence, mutual help and cooperation become necessary for economic development. Deendayal understands it and is not averse to availing of foreign aid for this purpose. Thus he says, We should use foreign aid when it is most essential and that too in minimum quantity. Such aid should be free from any condition. If this is done, the aid would be useful for new industries needed for economic development.

Apart from Swadeshi, his emphasis is on decentralized economy. He is dissatisfied with the centralized pattern of development and rues the fact that centralization and monopolisation have been the order of the day for all these years, knowingly or unknowingly. He comments, The planners have become prisoners of a belief that only large scale centralized industry is economic and hence without worrying about its ill-effects, or knowingly but helplessly they have continued in that direction. In a centralized system man, according to him, is just a cog and an inconspicuous entity who is coerced by the mechanized central command. Deendayal is of the view that man - the highest creation of God can be established in his rightful position only through a decentralized economy.

In the scheme of decentralized economy, Deendayal recognises the individual along with his family as the basic unit of production activities' and finds it essential to accept individual with his family as the unit of enterprise and as the cornerstone of the economy to realise the paradigm of decentralisation. Family is made a unit of economic development to ensure maximum participation of people in developmental activities. Maximum participation of people in the developmental process is also ensured by the Marxists through social ownership of means of production. Gandhians also uphold this view by making village as a unit of development. Participation of people to a large extent is needed to make and execute plans in consonance with the problems and interests of the people. It is ensured by decentralized planning and not through centralized one because the latter creates a wide gap between the plans formed and the intimate problems confronting man.

In agricultural sector, Deendayal prefers family farms as compared to cooperative holdings. The land is owned by the family as unit and not by the cooperatives. He is opposed to the cooperative farms and apprehends that In a cooperative we are faced with the crucial problem of how to distribute the produce. When people with all sorts of lands and with no lands and those with varying rights in land are joined together, it is practically impossible to divide the produce equitably. For equitable distribution family farms are preferred because family represents an ideal - for every man according to his capacity and for every man according to his needs.

Deendayal emphasizes the development of agriculture. The physiocrats - a group of French political economists in the second half of the eighteenth century also lay emphasis on the development of agriculture. They pictured a predominantly agricultural society and asserted that wealth consisted solely of the products of the soil. Deendayal is aware of the fact that India is primarily an agricultural country. According to him, writes Sharad Anant Kulkarni, the national income issue cannot be rationally solved without all-round growth of agriculture in India. Deendayal affirms this view and says that the best way of generating marketable surplus is to increase agricultural produce. He concentrates on achieving self-sufficiency in agricultural produce to avoid dependence on other countries. He unveils the truth that While imports may help us tide over our present difficulties, the real solution to the problem lies in maximising agricultural production in the country. Dependence on foreign sources will impoverish and entangle us.

The development of agriculture is not only for generating the marketable surplus but also a requisite for the growth and development of the industry. Deendayal says, Without increasing agricultural income, one cannot stabilize industries. He argues that when the farmer produces more than his needs and is able to raise his level, standard of livelihood, and when as a result he needs industrial option, then agriculture and industry will work in tandem. So if one thinks from the national angle, it is extremely or absolutely imperative to increase agricultural production. This argument holds that the widest possible industrialization of the country will be sustained by a fully developed and strong agricultural base. The two are complementary. Industrial development depends upon the effective demand of commodities, capital and raw material supply. Industry demands raw material from the farmers. It encourages farmers to raise production and helps to elevate the standard of living by increasing the purchasing power of the farmers. Therefore, Deendayal knits agriculture and industry in a symbiotic relationship.

The development of industry was also of much concern to Deendayal Upadhyaya. He asserts that Industrialization of India is necessary from all angles. It is necessary because without this one cannot reduce the number of dependent people on agriculture. Not merely because of over dependence on agriculture, but also with a view to develop the country properly and providing full employment to all people, engaging them into industries is essential. So far India has been producing raw material yet is depending upon foreign countries for finished products. Consequently, India has not been self-reliant.

On the basis of criteria and parameters such as crafts, efficiency, capital involved and resource availability, he roughly classifies industry into two heads; small-scale and large-scale industries as given below:

1. Small-scale with less training: cloths, shoes, rubber, glass, etc. industries.
2. Small-scale with more training: engineering goods, etc., industries.
3. Large-scale with less training: cement and fertilizer, etc., industries.
4. Large-scale with more training: mineral oil, iron, etc., industries .

In the field of industry he asserts, We ought to protect Indian industry from foreign enterprises and also protect small industries from large scale industries in India. For the industrial development of India he exhorts that as far as small industries and ancillary units are concerned, the foundation of our industrial policy and activities in this respect must remain in the hands of the individual entrepreneurs. According to him, the question of their being under the control of the state does not arise.

Deendayal restricts the industries of the third and fourth categories to a limited sphere and asserts that these industries would remain confined in the industrial map of the country. He gives adequate importance to small industries" instead of capital industrial projects. Deendayal emphasizes, Instead of giving priority to large scale industries, we must give priority to small size enterprises. He is also against urbanisation and insists that the need of the times is not new cities but industrialisation of villages. Regarding the ownership of industries, he is neither for state nor private ownership of all the industries. Instead, he is of the view that it must be decided on a pragmatic and practical basis. While recognising two types of industries, namely small scale and large scale, he is also much concerned with their area of operation and their relation with each other. He suggests that there can be two kinds of relationship between large and small industries. The large industries should produce production goods while small industries should produce consumer goods. For example, that things like plastic powder, polymer, tin sheets, iron wires, etc. should be made in large scale and through their use thousands of consumer goods should be made through small scale industries. The parts and components should be made in small scale ancillary industries, and integrated into finished products by large industries.

Expounding such a relationship by putting industries on their respective sphere of activity, he says with relief that if the industries are established properly, the negative competitive industries will be considerably curtailed.

For the establishment and proper development of the industry, Deendayal emphasizes the consideration of seven 'M'. According to him, These are man, material, money, management, motive power, market and machine. The skill, ability, and capacity of workers to whom work is allotted must be taken into consideration. Work may need trained and professional workers in large numbers. Material availability is also important. What type of material is needed? Its availability on the place, amount of material, its properties and qualities are of utmost importance. Estimate of money or capital involved in establishing an industry draws considerable attention. Also how much capital is to be used and how can it be utilized for achieving the goal of production are the crucial questions which draw attention. There is also a need to concentrate attention on various kinds of power available in the country. It may be in the form of human and animal labour, wind, water, stream, oil, gas, electricity, and atomic power. What type of motive power is to be used and beneficial? According to Deendayal all these factors must be taken into consideration to run the industry and opt the method of production, finding modalities to raise production, etc. Likewise, managerial skills must be considered with adequate attention to coordinate the efforts to develop the industry. Due attention should be given to the problems of workers. Besides this, it is also necessary to think of quality and quantity of the goods produced, their utility and usefulness to the society as a whole, its marketing, area of market it commands, etc. Lastly machinery, which according to Deendayal, was developed to increase man's productivity and decrease his labour. He asserts, today we consider the machine the focal point and think of changing everything else according to it. The entire system of production is centred round the machine. However, he points out that to import the machinery from Western countries, where shortage of manpower was the guiding factor in the design of machines, would be a serious mistake. Therefore, he cautions, If we blindly follow the Western machine age neither sarvodaya nor socialism will be able to protect our culture, nor will we be able to solve the problems before us. He like Gandhi pledges to fight the excessive and blind craze for Western machines, which is clear from his following quote: We will have to fight this machinism on all fronts - political, economic, social and ideological. Our ideals will have to be Dharamrajya (Moral Rule) , democracy, social equality and economic decentralization. A synthesis of all these could alone give us a philosophy of life as would preserve us in the midst of all storms of today. You may call it Hinduism, Humanism or any other ism; this is the only way that accords with the soul of Bharat and can instill a new vitality in the people of his country.

Deendayal is of the opinion that Science and the machine should both be used in accordance with our social and cultural life. He adds, Our machines must not only be tailored for our specific economic needs but also must at least, avoid conflict with our socio-political and cultural objective, if not support them. It is pertinent to note that man is the primary concern for Deendayal. According to him, The machine is an aid of man, not a competitor, He adds, If machine replaces man and man dies of starvation, the purpose for which the machine was developed would be defeated.

Therefore, Deendayal emphasizes the adoption of machine with great care. He writes, We shall have to take into account the limitation or usefulness of machine and decide on its field of application its application has to take into account the particular condition of each country and its requirements. In India, he asserts, No doubt Charkha has to be replaced by machines but not necessarily automatic machines everywhere. Full employment must be the primary consideration. Gandhi also holds, Machinery has its place but it must not be allowed to displace the necessary human labour. He adds, It is criminal to displace hand labour by the introduction of power-driven spindles, unless one is ready at the same time to give millions of farmers some other occupation in their homes. According to him, The machine should not be allowed to cripple the limbs of man.

Taking into account the available resources, Deendayal favours labour intensive technology for India. He says, When we think of the means of production in India we arrive at the firm conclusion that our production process must be labour intensive. According to him, if the machine is such that requires only a few men to run it, then the rest of the people will be thrown out of employment. If the 1 & C machine has to be imported from other countries at such a heavy cost that the additional production it causes will be insufficient to make it economic, then such a machine is not suitable to our requirements. Just as to let a part of the installed capacity of a factory remain unutilised is a losing proposition, so also to let the people of this country remain unemployed is a losing proposition. Therefore, Deendayal asserts, Taking into consideration all these factors we should design suitable machines. We shall have to develop a Bharatiya technology. Dr. Amit K. Mitra also observes, Expounding the objectives of Indian economic system he (Deendayal) emphasized the idea of Bharatiya Technology which was referred to by Mahatma Gandhi as Swadeshi Technology. Thus, it is important to note that Deendayal's preference is for indigenous technology, developed according to the available resources and conditions of India.

Machines help to raise production. It is pertinent to know the objective set forth by Deendayal in raising production. As discussed earlier, he is against production based on the calculations of profit and loss. It

may be referred here that Harold J. Laski also wants to reorganize the instruments of production to satisfy the human demands in respect of the right to an adequate standard of living and not for profit. Gandhi asserts that factories should be nationalized or state-controlled. They ought only to be working under the most attractive and ideal conditions, not for profit, but for the benefit of humanity, love taking the place of greed as the motive...mad rush for wealth must cease.

Deendayal is averse to greed based production. Production with such an aim is not guided by the needs, necessities and desires of consumers but by the profit seeking aim where the needs of wealthy and the well-fed will be attended to rather than the needs of the poor and hungry. It causes alienation of the weaker sections of society. Depression mounts among the alienated poor whereas affluent class flourishes, which is socially and morally unsound. Affluent ones establish their hegemony in the economic field, infiltrate indirectly into administration and political machinery and become the controller of all activities of the state. According to Deendayal, production should be need-based. Asserting for need based production, he says that before producing we must think of our needs. The needs are, however, not always static, they change from time to time. Deendayal therefore, asserts that with the change in our needs we must change the objectives of our production. He further states, production should be increased, but which commodity should be produced needs to be studied in detail.

It may be pointed out that production and consumption are inter-related. The quantum of production depends on consumption. Deendayal has insisted upon restraints on consumption. He writes, If we fail to promote the concept of restraints on consumption, the people would not be happy despite increasing supplies of commodities. Pleasure lies in restraints in consumption... We must learn to live within limits. In order to achieve this, he suggested man to limit his ever-increasing desires, which is clear from his following words: We are on the one hand exploring new means to satisfy ever-increasing desires, on the other hand we are facing ever-increasing problems. This race is likely to destroy the human society in its humanness. It is therefore imperative to define the goal of economic system from the 187 standpoint of consumption. This could be cognised at restraint in consumption.

It may be argued that man can not produce things for the satisfaction of his needs without the help of nature. Nature supplies him material resources. Deendayal opposed excessive and blatant exploitation of natural resources and advised to consume these with restraint so as to maintain the equilibrium of nature. He instructs cautiously that the natural resources are limited, and cannot be used irrationally. Further he asserts that Nature renews its depreciation and losses by its own processes. However, he deplores that man is destroying nature as if the whole of its resource is meant for his own existence. The speed of destruction by man is not compensated by the speed of renewing resources in nature. The equilibrium cannot be sustained this way.

Deendayal's humble call is for love for nature instead of its exploitation. He permits, to use up that portion of the available natural resources which the nature will be able to recoup easily. So, he does not favour, extravagant use of available resources, but a well regulated use, and sternly asserts that milking rather than exploitation should be our aim.- Any economic system, according to him should not thrive on the exploitation of nature but on its resilience and maintenance.' It may be observed that Deendayal does not consider man apart from the nature. He, like Advaitic Vedantists visualizes the entire cosmos as a unified system of which man is an integral part. Such a vision inculcates a sense of harmony, fellowship and love with all forms of nature.

Thus, it can be stated that Deendayal believes not in unlimited production by introducing most modern technology without considering its ill effects but aims at need based production with a restraint on consumption and providing equitable distribution in society. For this he believes to find an optimum where we produce what we need.

On the whole, the economic system given by Deendayal Upadhyaya has following objectives:

1. An assurance of minimum standard of living to every individual and preparedness for defence of the nation.
2. Further increase above this minimum standard of living whereby the individual and the nation acquire the means to contribute to the world progress on the basis of its own 'Chiti'.
3. To provide meaningful employment to every able bodied citizen, by which the above two objectives can be realised and to avoid waste and extravagance in utilising natural resources.
4. To develop suitable machines for Bharatiya conditions (Bharatiya Technology) taking note of the availability and nature of the various factors of production (Seven 'M').
5. This system must help and not disregard the human being, the individual. It must protect the cultural and other values of life. This is a requirement, which cannot be violated except at a great risk.
6. The ownership, state, private or any other form, of various industries must be decided on a pragmatic and practical basis.

It is obvious from the foregoing presentation of the basics of Deendayal's economic ideas that he is against the capitalistic system as it is based on the profit motive with scant regard for the welfare of the people as a whole. The capitalistic system creates by and large plenty for a few and subsistence and penury for the vast

majority. He is also against the capitalistic system not merely because of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few but also because it creates artificial demand for goods, which are not necessary for use or for the quality of living. These demands are created through manipulative marketing techniques and advertisement propaganda. Deendayal is not per se against such demands and proliferation of goods and services but his criticism stems from the fact that such a capitalist orientation is at the expense of basic goods and essential services, which are needed by the common people at large.

However, it is true that in the economic system obtaining in the West Europe, America and Canada, the classical capitalistic system is not operative today because in the countries cited above the system has incorporated a host of welfare features. In these countries various concessions and benefits to the poor, unemployed, senior citizens, etc. are there. These countries provide unemployment allowance on the expense of the state. The state also maintains up-to-date rosters of employment for job interviews. In other words the state takes care of lean periods in the life of their citizens. Unfortunately, this is not so in the developing countries. In any case it is not so in India. Of course in India because of strong family system together with its strong obligation and commitments the aged and the unemployed have the family to fall back upon and it has to be understood that most of the family members depend upon the elder of family. The economic system prevailing does not help to meet the required needs of the family.

However, it is pertinent to note that Deendayal does not denounce the private initiative. In his economic system, he creates a large place for the private initiative, which he favours especially in the area of small-scale industries, Deendayal is also in favour of private initiative in the area of agriculture in particular as he neither believes in collectivization of agriculture as it happened in U.S.S.R., nor favours cooperative farming. He leaves it, very much in the domain of the family as a unit. Collectivization in Russia failed to produce enough food to sustain its population. So Deendayal is found to be prophetic in his vision of agricultural economics.

Communist economy is opposed by Deendayal for three possible reasons. Firstly, because it does not deliver the desired results; secondly, its totalitarianism kills all initiative; thirdly, it leads to rampant corruption, the controllers of the communes and collectives fatten and the workers are reduced to serfdom. However, Deendayal does not outrightly reject the state control. He is for control and regulation and insists on the active role of the state in the development.

Deendayal's main concern was independence of the nation. For him political independence has no meaning without economic independence. He talks about self-sufficiency and self-reliance. To achieve self-reliance, Deendayal accords primacy to the development of agriculture. He is aware of the ill effects of dependence for agricultural produce. Adequate food is necessarily needed for any nation to provide sustenance to its people. And if a nation fails to produce sufficient food, it falls prey to other nations to meet its demand. Other nations provide food tied to certain conditions thereby threatening the independence of the acceptor country. In India, the First Five Years plan has accorded priority to the agricultural sector but it is unfortunate that in a country where the economy is predominantly agrarian, due attention has not been paid for the development of agriculture in the succeeding Five Years Plans.

Deendayal is not opposed to mechanization, he believes that the Charkha will have to be replaced by the new requirements. However, like Gandhi, he is of the opinion that machine should not be allowed to become a competitor of man. Therefore, he insists upon such a mechanization, which suits to Indian conditions and is compatible with the interests of man in India. He favours labour intensive technology more than the automation in India.

Machines play an important role in nation's life because these are considered as the bedrock of industrial development. Deendayal's main concern is small-scale industries and production of consumer goods through them. It is pertinent to note that heavy industries and producer goods are essentially needed. These become necessary for defence preparedness also where highly mechanised equipment develops defense technology for the country to protect itself from the foreign invasions and aggressions. Not merely in the field of defence but also in the area of civil activities the heavy industries are needed. Deendayal is not opposed to heavy industries, but he talks about the selective development of heavy industries only in the areas where these are necessarily needed but not in the areas where these restrict the growth of small-scale industries. In this context Deendayal is different from both the views of Gandhi and Nehru. The former insists heavily on the relevance of Charkha and the latter considers heavy and large-scale industries as the way for the development and progress of India. Deendayal instead, believes in the development of both the small and large-scale industries. He knits both the industries in harmony and conceives an integrated and complementary model of industrialization.

However, it is worth while to note that heavy industries need developed technology and latest equipment. For its development one needs to take foreign aid and help. A nation cannot develop such industry without the help of foreign nations. Here self-reliance and self-sufficiency come in contradiction with modern way of development. Today we are witnessing an era of interdependence in the world scene, where nations develop themselves through their collective efforts. The world has become one in many areas such as

communication, technology, dissemination of common ideas. In fact, today the world has become a global village. Mutual aid for the development of nations is adopted. EEC and SAARC associations are the steps to achieve this end of mutual development. It seems that in the world of today self-reliance in isolation ceases to reflect any positive meaning. It is worth mentioning that Deendayal emphasizes mutual cooperation at philosophical level, however, on the national and political level he advises to take the foreign help and cooperation in respect of grant-in-aids cautiously only in exigencies.

It is observed that the economic ideas of Deendayal revolves around man and thus may be labeled as humanistic. Humanistic economy is reflected in his commitment to provide the basic necessities for all, creating work conditions in which the worker has both a sense of self- esteem and deep sense of belonging. For Deendayal man and his interests are at priority. He is opposed to mechanization at the altar of man's interest, rejects mad hankering after profit and seek to attain around development of man and society in an indigenous manner. Further, keeping the problems of India in his mind, he is of the view that the economic policy should be designed according to the Indian conditions and requirements. Deendayal does not want the nation to fall under the trap of other nations through over-reliance on them.

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES:

- [1]. Lord Robbins, Political Economy past and Present: A Review of Leading Theories of Economic Policy (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1976), p. 1.
- [2]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Ideology, Technology and Decentralisation, Manthan, 3, No.2 (Special 1980), 75-76. Also see, Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 73.
- [3]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 73. Ibid., p. 70. Ibid., p. 63. Ibid., p. 65. "ibid., p. 70. Ibid., pp. 73-74.
- [4]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Letter to Maternal Uncle, organiser, op. cit.
- [5]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 74.
- [6]. S.Radhakrishnan, Recovery of Faith (New Delhi: Orient Paperbacks, 1987), p. 28. Ibid., pp. 28-29.
- [7]. Sri Aurobindo, The Human Cycle, The Ideal of Human Unity, War and Self-Determination, op. cit., p. 73
- [8]. Swami Sivanada, The Principal Upanishads, op. cit., p. 5.
- [9]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, pp. 74-75.
- [10]. D.B.Thengadi, Marx and Deendayal-The Two Approaches, Manthan, 12, Nos.7-9 (July-Sept. 1991),133-140.
- [11]. S .Radhakrishnan, Recovery of Faith, op. cit., p. 67. 195 K.G.Mashruwala, Gandhi and Marx (Ahmedabad: Navjeevan Publishing House, 1956), p. 19.
- [12]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Ideology, Technology and Decentralization, Manthan op. cit.
- [13]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 70. Ibid., p. 66. Ibid., p. 75. Ibid., p. 76. Ibid., p. 11.
- [14]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Economics of Synthesis, Manthan, 3, No.4 (March 1981), 3. 'Ibid. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, pp. 7 6-77.
- [15]. D.B.Thengadi, His Legacy: Our Mission, op. cit. , p. 18.
- [16]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 63. Ibid., p. 67. Ibid. 'ibid. 196 Ibid., p. 69. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., pp. 188-89.
- [17]. H. J.Laski, A Grammar of Politics, p. 107. "Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p. 187.
- [18]. Ibid. E.Roer, The Twelve Principal Upanishads, Vol.1, op.cit., p. 2 07.
- [19]. Deendayal Upadhyaya quoted in Ashok Modak Two exponents of Humanism: M.N.Roy and Deendayal, Manthan 12. No.7-9 (July-Sept., 1991), 140-152.
- [20]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, ed., Sudhakar Raje, op.cit., pp. 187-88.
- [21]. B.N.Ganguli, Gandhi's Social Philosophy: Perspective and Relevance (Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, Pvt. Ltd., 1973), pp.270-79.
- [22]. M.K.Gandhi, Sarvodaya (Ahmedabad: Navjeevan Publishing House, 1958), pp. 92-93.
- [23]. Vinoba, Bhoodan Yajna (Ahmedabad: Navjeevan Publishing House,1957), p. 64. 197 •
- [24]. Deendayal Upadhyaya in Pt.Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, ed. Sudhakar Raje, op.cit., p. 189.
- [25]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p. 185. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 78. "Ibid. 'ibid. Ibid.
- [26]. Deendayal Upadhyaya quoted in Sharad, Anant Kulkarni, Integral Economic Policy (New Delhi: Suruchi Prakashan, 1989), p. 110.
- [27]. B.N.Ganguli, Gandhi's Social Philosophy: Perspective and Relevance, op. cit., p. 2 87. Deendayal quoted in Sharad Anant Kulkarni, Integral Economic Policy, op.cit., p. 110.
- [28]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 78. Ibid. ei Ibid., pp. 7 6-77
- [29]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p. 192. 70 Ibid.
- [30]. Sharad Anant Kulkarni, Integral Economic Policy op.cit., p. 64 .

- [31]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p.188.
- [32]. Deendayal Upadhyaya quoted in Sharad Anant Kulkarni, Integral Economic Policy, op.cit., p.105.
- [33]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p. 190
- [34]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p.78. "ibid., pp.119-120. Ibid. Ibid., p.120. °Ibid., p.71.
- [35]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p.193. Ibid., p. 194.
- [36]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, pp. 70-71.
- [37]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p. 193. Gandhi says that what I object to is the craze for machinery.
- [38]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op. cit.,p.193 . Ibid., p.195.
- [39]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p.71.
- [40]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p.193. °Ibid., p. 194.
- [41]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, pp. 70-71. °Ibid., p. 73.
- [42]. B.N.Ganguli, Gandhi's Social Philosophy: Perspective and Relevance, op. cit., p.314.
- [43]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op.cit., p.191.
- [44]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 72.
- [45]. Harold J. Laski, Crammer of Politics, op.cit., p. 107.
- [46]. B.N.Ganguli, Gandhi's Social Philosophy: Perspective and Relevance, op. cit., p.315.
- [47]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, p. 65. "°Ibid. "Ibid
- [48]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, pp.77-78