

Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism: The Political Dimension

Dr. Sanjeet Singh

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

This paper seeks to examine the political dimension of Deendayal's philosophy of Integral Humanism. In this context, it is essential to know his formulations on nation, state and government. It is required for a proper and comprehensive understanding of the contours and lineaments of the subject of the present study. According to Deendayal Upadhyaya, a nation needs four things. Firstly, land and people, which we call country; secondly, collective will, comprising the desire of all; thirdly, a system, which can be called as a set of principles or constitution for which the concept of Dharma is invoked in our culture; fourthly, ideals of life. All these four elements comprise a nation. He draws an analogy between individual and nation as he writes that just as man needs body, mind, intellect and soul, likewise the above four, make a nation. Deendayal emphasizes that only a group of people and a piece of land, neither separately nor together, constitute a nation. There are many landmasses, which cannot be called nations. He asserts that we cannot call the North and the South Pole areas as nations. Likewise there are many territories in South Africa, which cannot be termed as nations. There are many islands and land segments where people live even though there developed no nationhood. Deendayal draws a distinction between a country and nation. He is of the view that land and people constitute only a country (Desh). He stresses that though country or Desh and nation appear synonymous because the former is the basis of the nation manifestly," yet the two differ as the country is the visible entity while the nation is a subtle and unseen reality.

Deendayal opines that one cannot think of a nation without a piece of land and its inhabitants, the people. Though both are closely related, but nation for him is much more comprehensive and at the same time is an imperishable entity. A nation according to him is formed, "when a group of persons lives with a goal, an ideal, a mission, and looks upon a particular piece of land as motherland, the group constitutes a nation. If either of the two - an ideal and a motherland - is not there, then there is no nation." The people to whom Deendayal refers are not, however, mere inhabitants of a particular piece of land as he talks about the mutual relation of people and land as that of son and mother. The relation is fundamental because there can be other relationships between the land and its inhabitants. The colonizers and exploiters have a relationship of exploitation with no attachment to the colonized land. Instead they desire to plunder it for wealth and to seek their selfish ends. They may own land, houses, real estates and property but Deendayal regards them as outsiders and intruders, and not inhabitants in the strict sense. Deendayal further states that mere invocation of Bharat would not exhibit and express the meaning of nation. The name, Bharat makes one think of only a territory, but the appellation, "Bharat Mata' evokes a special, unified consciousness that establishes a relationship between the land and the residents.

It is pertinent to point out here that the idea of the motherland or Janma-bhumi is cultural specific in India. The country is conceived as mother, which is regarded "not amere mass of territory but a living entity working through her sons and fulfilling her mission through them." This notion represents the highest ideal of love and devotion to the land as mother by the inhabitants. Many Indian thinkers such as Sri Aurobindo, Swami Vivekananda, Bankim Chander Chaterji, etc. regard their country as motherland. The concept of motherland also conceives the Hindu ideal of patriotism. Bankim Chandera's vision of the mother in the song - Bande Mataram, which means hail to the mother, first published in his Ananda Hatha or Abode of Bliss in 1882 shows that nationalism is the very spirit of the concept of motherland. A. Appadorai is of the opinion that the concept of motherland as the key idea of nationalism is brought out by M.S. Golwalkar in his work - Not Socialism But Hindu Rashtra (1964)

According to Deendayal solidarity of the people with the land in which they reside, lays in the concept of Ekjan, one people and one nation. It cannot be manufactured artificially. He states that it is not that fifty, hundred, five hundred millions of people gather and decide to join to make a nation. According to Deendayal, Ekjan is a living organism. Just as a human is born, not made, likewise Ekjan is a self-begotten reality. Deendayal believes that Ekjan, which is the basis of nation, evolves over a passage of time, which is rooted in a long and unbroken tradition spanning generations. Deendayal is of the view that nation appears and unfolds through a long process involving years, centuries, milleniums and epochs, when people living in a particular territory begin to identify with it and acquire a specific disposition. The people are connected to similar

traditions, and share memories of both joy and sorrow, of friendship and enmity. It also comprises mutually beneficial activities, and is bent upon realizing fundamental principles in unison with one another. A cavalcade of great men who are committed to austerity, sacrifice, heroic effort dedicates itself to consolidate, advance and enrich the above tradition. According to Deendayal emergence of Jan, people with specific disposition and cultural tradition evolves a nation. Snyder affirms this view and says, nation as a sentiment, "is re-created in each generation by acculturation and is transmitted from mind to mind by education." Further, he adds that it is historical phenomenon, which emerges as a response to special sociopolitical and economic conditions.

Deendayal emphasizes that Ekjan, which shapes the disposition of the people, establishes a specific nature and identity of the nation. He is of the view that just as a person has a distinct nature, likewise the nation too has a distinct nature. Nature of man varies from individual to individual. A successful litterateur or poet cannot be an engineer or scientist. As such, Bharat has a distinct identity or nature of her own. Deendayal emphasizes that the fundamental character of our country has been predominantly spiritual. Qualifying, he asserts that it does not mean that we ignore materialism. He observes that lured by our richness and abundance foreign invaders came to India. Therefore, according to Deendayal we did not devalue materialism; however, our minds with all its intensities and priorities dwelled on spiritual concerns.

Ekjan according to Deendayal is the life-breath of the people. It shapes the consciousness of the people residing in a specific territory. The unified consciousness exhibited by the psycho-spiritual nature of people in unison is termed as Chiti by him. To Deendayal, the fundamental tenets and principles evolved on the basis of the Chiti (unified consciousness) determine and maintain the nature and identity of the nation. If archetypal tenets are destroyed then nations wither away. Deendayal says that in the world so many nations survive as only past memories. The ancient Egypt, Persia and Greece are no more now. The landmasses and people still exist there, but their cultural reality and basic self-nature stand destroyed. Therefore, he exhorts that the identity of nation resides in its archetypal matrix. This viewpoint is also upheld by Swami Vivekananda who proclaims that India will survive, so long as she is faithful to spirituality.

Deendayal believes that the flow of our national life has continued for centuries. Diverse and many kinds of tendencies have streamed into our national life. Just as rivers and rivulets become a part of unbroken and mighty flow of the Ganges on mingling with it, likewise, Sakas, Huns, and many more tribes and clans mingled into our national life and have now become an integral part of it. Deendayal is of the opinion that with the passage of time new factors have mixed up in our national life, however, these could not change the original character of the principles on which the nation has evolved. He avers that if the principles, which constitute the Chiti (unified consciousness of nation) are followed and upheld, then the nation becomes strong and stable, acquires vitality, and glows energetically. As long as such consciousness exists a nation remains living and resilient. With its weakening, the nation weakens and ultimately gets destroyed.

According to Deendayal, Chiti provides power and energy called Virat. It protects the nation from distortions and malformations, and leads to national awakening. He is of the view that if Chiti and Virat are actuated then only can the nation and its people progress, draw all kinds of worldly and spiritual pleasures, emerge triumphant in the world and attain glory. In this context, D.B.Thengadi while writing on Deendayal Upadhyaya opines, "Every nation has its soul its 'Chiti'. The strength and energy activating the nation is its 'Virat'. It is channelised by 'Chiti'. The place of 'Virat' in the life of a-nation is similar to that of 'Prana' in the body. Just as 'Prana' infuses strength in various organs of the body, refreshes the intellect, and keeps body and soul together, so also in a nation, with a strong 'Virat', alone can democracy succeed and the government be effective.

Deendayal deplors that unfortunately today our national life is straying away from our fundamental principles. We are obsessively involved in a material rat race. Many problems such as regionalism, casteism, linguism, etc., have been vitiating the life of our nation. Further, he believes that myriad diversities also characterise our nation. He emphasizes the need of undertaking the task of awakening the Virat of the nation by acting in accordance with the Chiti or the ethos of nation. Thengadi writes that according to Deendayal, "When the 'Virat' is awake, diversity does not lead to conflict, and people cooperate with each other like the various limbs of the human body, or like the members of a family. Deendayal asserts that unity and harmony can be established in the midst of diversities. But he qualifies that harmony can be established only among people with certain similarities. Harmony cannot be achieved with perversion. One can make rice curry by mixing many kinds of grains, but one cannot put a piece of gravel in it. This very principle, according to Deendayal is also applicable to national life. Our languages, modes of worship, life styles and food habits may be -different. However, harmony can be established among these diversities if our Antakarna (innermost subliminal) is full of respect and fosters unshakable faith in the motherland, and our heart complex is imbued with similar ideals and life values." According to him, the way to harmony is the spiritual outlook of life. This outlook inculcates a sense of tolerance, which is essential and helpful to establish and augment harmony among the varied diversities. He believes that tolerance is a special hallmark of Indian culture, which according to him has led to the development of various sects in India. A person may worship Shiva, Vishnu, Shakti, and Ganapati

without any conflict with another. He asserts that all the people while following their ways of worship, can attain realization according to their religion.

Deendayal emphasizes the importance of specific life ideals and culture for the evolution of a strong and a virile nation. He says, It is essential that we think about our national identity. Without this identity there is no meaning of independence, nor can independence become the instrument of progress and happiness. As long as we are unaware of our national identity, we cannot recognize or develop all our potentialities. Under alien rule this identity is suppressed. The basic cause of the problems facing Bharat is the neglect of its national identity. His concept of nation emphasizes on cultural self-determination. According to the International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, In nationalities that are striving for the creation of a nation-state, the quest for cultural self-determination precedes the quest for political self-determination and prepares the ground for the latter.

According to Deendayal, identity of India resides in her past heritage and culture. Therefore, he seeks to strengthen them. It embodies an attitude of rejection of the craze for alien culture. The aim is the revival of ancient culture with a firm belief in the golden age of previous glory. Historically, this idea was epitomized by the Arya Samaj (1875) and the Ramakrishna Mission (1880) in the social and religious spheres and by men like Balgangadhar Tilak (1856-1920), Lala Laj Pat Rai (1865-1928), Bipin chander Pal (1858-1932), and Sri Aurobindo Ghosh (1872-1950) in politics. Deendayal Upadhyaya wanted to rejuvenate and vitalize the age-old Indian traditions through B.J.S. To him B.J.S. is not only a party but also "a vital philosophy and virile movement" to establish "Bharatiya Samskriti and Maryada."⁹ He adds, "It is not a new movement. During the last century, Mahrshi Dayanand, Swami Vivekananda, Lokmanya Tilak, Dr. Hedgewar, Mahamana Madan Mohan Malaviya and Mahatma Gandhi have all been pioneers in the field. It is their tradition that we have to carry further. That will lend some meaning to our independence, and that alone will decide what to accept, what to reject, and what to project.

Being the exponent of Indian tradition Deendayal says, Bharatiya Sanskriti is not static but dynamic. In fact, living is dynamism. When you cease to grow, you stagnate. And stagnation leads to disintegration and death. Because of our glorious past and miserable present we find two tendencies working in society. One accepts the old, which in effect means the existing, as something sacramental, not to be questioned and never to be changed. The other denounces 130 everything old and yearns for a change unmindful of the direction and shape it takes. The Jan Sangh disapproves of both these tendencies. Let the past inspire us. But we must be forward - looking. To preserve what has been bequeathed to us is no service to our forebears. Slavery too was bequeathed to us. Man has striven hard to get rid of that legacy. There might be hundred other legacies of the kind. Riddance of them is the only way. Deendayal is also not opposed to the modern developments. He says, "We did not remain always mere passive witness to whatever new challenging situations arose; nor did we merely react to every alien action. We too, have attempted to reshape our life as required to face the new situations. He adds, "While we do draw inspiration from the past, we do not regard the past as the highest pinnacle of our achievement: while we have a realistic approach to the present, we do not feel tied down even to the present. Therefore, he states, "both from national as well as human standpoint it has become essential that we think of the principles of the Bharatiya culture. If with its help we can reconcile the various ideals of the western political thought then it will be an added advantages for us. D.B. Thengadi writes, "Panditji was vitally concerned with the problems of national reconstruction. He studied all the various thought systems of the west as well as those of ancient India. His mind was rooted in the past, living in the present, and moving dynamically towards the future. Unlike some of our radicals, he did not accept everything western as progressive. Unlike the conservatives, he would not cling to everything traditional simply because it was traditional. He sought to reconcile Bharatiya values of life with the modern scientific and technological advance.

Deendayal advocates not to neglect and disown the past, however, emphasizes rejection of that which is redundant and obsolete. Further, he also desires the windows to be opened to allow fresh air to come in. In other words, he is not against the cross-cultural contacts and cohabitation. However, he says, "In this age of adulteration and manufacture of spurious goods, let us judge things not from their label but from their contents. Let us be free from phobias as well as manias." He stresses to accept only those things, which suit the Indian ethos, or conscience. To him, "Chiti is fundamental and is central to the nation from its very beginning. Chiti determines the direction in which the nation is to advance culturally. Whatever is in accordance with Chiti, is included in culture ... Whatever is against Chiti', is discarded as perversion, undesirable, is to be avoided. '*Chiti' is the touchstone, on which each action, each attitude is tested, and determined to be acceptable or otherwise. Chiti' is the soul of the nation. On the strength of this Chiti', a nation arises, strong and virile. "

From the above, it may be observed that Deendayal stresses that the Indian nation has a unique character because of its peculiar culture, which has its origin in antiquity with particular kinship streamed through generations and blood rooted in the ancestral soil. The emphasis is on the purity of national character, which is guarded and protected from alien influence. However, it would be amiss to interpret his nationalism as a closed nationalism. He says, "It is true that a narrow sense of nationalism should not be allowed to obstruct the

progress of the nation. Deendayal is not averse to cross-cultural contacts and does not confine a society chauvinistically or narrowly at its own but opens it to be in contact with the outside world for the proper development of man and society.

Though Deendayal is not against the acceptance of the Western ideas but he does not consider them as the highest pinnacle of wisdom. He is a protagonist of Indian culture who believes that because of her peculiarity, India has to play a vital role in the world. He stresses, nation has also a life mission."^o In this context he says, "Bharatiya Samskriti connotes not simply elements that go to make a culture characteristic of a particular people, but also a world philosophy. It is this philosophy that can unite the divided world, and give it peace. The ideals of co-existence and world unity would remain merely tactical slogans unless imbued with this vital philosophy. It is our mission." Vivekananda proclaims, "Once more the world must be conquered by India. This is the great ideal before us. Let them come and flood the land with their armies, never mind. Up India, and conquer the world with your spirituality! Spirituality must conquer the world. Likewise, Schleiermacher in Germany, Michelet in France, Mickiewicz in Poland, Mazzini in Italy and Dostoevsky in Russia also attribute a mission of liberation of mankind to their respective nations.

This idea of one nation liberating another, through the excellence of its culture is widely shared. In India the Vedantists consider the Indian culture as the highest pinnacle of wisdom and subscribe to it the task of illuminating other societies. Swami Vivekananda began the work of dissemination of Indian ideals in the last decade of the nineteenth century. The exchange of ideals is imminent and good. Among the nations of the world, there must be back and forth flow of cultures and philosophies, and there must be cohabitation of attitudes and ideas. Dissemination of ideas is right, but if it is done with an intention of expansionism and imperialism aimed at parochial and narrow selfish interests then it becomes a dangerous hegemonic tendency. It goes on to derecognize the rights of others races, treats them as inferior, and claims self-superiority. History has witnessed the European nationalism, which had a tacit motive of expansionism and imperialism through armies. The conquest of Asia and Africa under the slogan of the Whiteman's Burden, claiming racial superiority over the rest of humanity was full of exploitive trappings. In this context, C.R. Das has written that nationalism in Europe was "an aggressive nationalism, a selfish nationalism, a commercial nationalism, of gain and loss. Such nationalism, which pretends to be the savior of humanity proves detrimental and alarming because of its nefarious designs underneath i.e. to attain self aggrandizement and exploit others. It becomes more alarming in the present age of science and technology, when the powerful nation extends its exploitive tentacles in terms of economic imperialism. As a result of which there is the enrichment of the rich countries, and deterioration of the socio-economic conditions of the poor countries. The latter fall prey to various problems such as poverty, unemployment, underdevelopment, illiteracy, disease, etc. The people living under such conditions are forced to die of starvation. Therefore, exploitive and imperialist nationalism is dangerous for man and humanity at large, and is thus antithetical to the spirit of humanism.

Deendayal Upadhyaya wanted India to be strong and prosperous. He emphasizes, "We shall make Mother India *sujala, suphala* (laden with fruits and overflowing with water) in the real sense of these words. As *Dashaprahana Dharani Durga* (Goddess Durga with her ten weapons) she would be able to vanquish evil: as *Lakshmi*, she would be able to disburse prosperity all over and as *Saraswati* she would dispel the gloom of ignorance and spread the radiance of knowledge all around her. With faith in ultimate victory, let us dedicate ourselves to this task." He also believes that India must work actively to impart her wisdom to the entire humanity. Deendayal says, "This responsibility and urge for duty need not be confused with the attitude of the European colonial powers who sought to justify their rule on the plea of discharging the white man's burden.' There is no Brown Man's Burden. We have no such illusions, no such designs ... Our role is not that of the preceptor but that of the exemplar. That has been our way all along ... An ounce of practice is better than a pound of precept is the old saying. It has a moral for us."^o Deendayal does not inhibit the exploitive intention when he talks about the dissemination of Indian culture across the world. Further Deendayal's conscious Vedantic ideal of human unity does not consider patriotism in a competitive and antagonistic way. The family, community, nation and humanity according to him are the successive stages in the evolutionary push to universality.

It is evident here that Deendayal is not only a nationalist but also an internationalist. D.B. Thengadi writes, "As we all know. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya was a nationalist to the core. He loved not only the abstract concept of nation' but also the nation in flesh and blood. His patriotism did not prevent him from being an internationalist. Rather internationalism was only the natural evolution of his enlightened nationalism. He has realised that affinity of an individual with different organisms, ranging from family to the Universe, Was only an outward manifestation of the evolution of his consciousness.

Mutual cooperation is the fundamental tenet of Deendayal's philosophy. According to him, cooperation sustains life on earth. He says that we get oxygen supply with the help of vegetation whereas we provide carbon dioxide so essential for the growth of vegetation. He asserts,"The recognition of this element of mutual sustenance among different forms of life and taking that as the basis of an effort to make human life mutually

sustaining is the prime characteristic of civilisation." ® On the contrary, "If conflict and enmity is made the basis of human relationships and if on this basis history is analysed, then it would be futile to dream of world peace to result out of such a course of action. " Thus Deendayal Upadhyaya highlights the importance of mutual cooperation and harmonious relations in life. Such a perception does not conceive national solidarity in contradiction to internationalism, instead, brings harmony between the two. Thus, his nationalism is neither exploitive nor antagonistic to the service of humanity. T.H. Green is of the opinion, "The love of mankind, no doubt, needs to be particularized in order to have any power over life and action. The man whose desire to serve his kind is not centred primarily in some home, radiating from it, to a commune, a municipality and a nation, presumably has no effectual desire to serve his kind at all. But there is no reason why this localized or nationalized philanthropy should take the form of a jealousy of other nations or a desire to fight them, personally or by proxy. Similarly according to Bosanquet, national solidarity is not antagonistic to the service of mankind. To quote him, "The patriot must be loyal to his nation not simply because it is his nation but because it stands for human values, values which are open to all mankind to cherish and pursue even though in fact only a minority at a given time recognize them. Such patriotism is, at the same time, cosmopolitanism in the true sense. Thus, it may be argued that national solidarity, which stands for a national cause, is, at the same time not antagonistic to the interests of the entire humanity.

It may be argued that Deendayal's concept of nation is geo-cultural. He believes that the geographical territory in which people reside is not merely a piece of land but also their motherland. He calls upon the people to serve and foster their motherland with earnest dedication and loyalty. He wants to evolve the feeling of nationalism on the basis of an emotional and a sentimental relationship of mother and son between the land and her inhabitants. However, his emphasis on territory as a basis of nation does not convince because history is replete with transfer of territory from one country to the other. He has also emphasized the importance of culture for nation. According to him, India as a nation has its basis in the ancient Indian traditions and culture. He is of the opinion that the culture of India is represented by Hindu traditions. Although, he acknowledges that many races have come to India with the passage of time and their culture got mingled with ancient Indian traditions yet the original character of the Indian culture remained unchanged. Therefore, he propounds a theory of one culture and one nation. This theory is ardently criticised by those who believe that India is a country of multiple nationalities where the people of diverse cultures, faiths, beliefs and ideals reside. In their opinion, Deendayal's notion of one culture and one nation forces other communities to adapt themselves according to the Hindu mainstream. Now the question arises, is Deendayal against the people other than Hindus? It is evident from his presidential speech that Deendayal shows his earnest concern for the entire populace of India. Thus he states, "We are pledged to the service not of any particular community or section but of the entire nation. Every countryman is blood of our blood and flesh of our flesh. We shall not rest till we are able to give to every one of them a sense of pride that they are children of Bharatmata." However, a contradiction appears when Deendayal stresses that the people living in India must necessarily adapt themselves to one culture, i.e., ancient Indian mainstream. How will he provide a sense of pride for the communities who are asked to relinquish their cultural self-identity?

Deendayal resolved to build a strong and virile India. It is pertinent to note that Indian people have struggled very hard to attain independence of their country from the Britishers. Self-rule was the prime motive of the freedom fighters. However, most of the Indian leaders were not merely satisfied with self-rule but also wanted good governance for the proper development of an independent India. To achieve this end, many leaders and thinkers suggested various ideas and institutions according to their experience and mental make up for the development of India. Deendayal Upadhyaya was of the opinion that the political and economic development of India should be ensured according to its socio-cultural conditions. Therefore, he stressed to evolve the political and economic institutions in accordance with the societal values of India. In light of this, it is expedient to know and analyse his views on state and government in respect of India.

Deendayal views the nation and the state as two different entities. "Differentiating between the two, he says that nation is natural and self-begotten, but the state is artificially created, which comes into existence to fulfill the needs of the nation. Further, he states that state is temporary and nation is permanent. He is of the view that a nation establishes various institutions in order to fulfill its economic, social and cultural needs.° Therefore, according to him, "state is one of the several institutions, an important one, but is not above all others."The pluralists also regard state as one of the institutions of society. He, however, does not devalue the state and believes that its importance is indisputable. The state and its mechanism protect the nation and make it resilient and puissant. State comes forward to rectify the distortions, which appear in the people of nation. When some complexity appears in society, state solves it, and it protects the weak and the poor from the powerful clutches of the prosperous people in the society. Further, state establishes relations with other states and also provides security by protecting society from external aggression. Deendayal is of the view that state changes if it is incapable of fulfilling the necessities and functions entrusted upon it by the nation. He says that if a distortion creeps into the state, and if it proves unsuccessful in discharging its responsibilities, the nation

changes such a state. The nation changes its representative." According to him, state is an attorney of the nation. Its power of attorney is given by the nation. If an attorney does not work well, the power of attorney can be changed. Anderson writes, "The State, in Upadhyaya's view comes into existence by a type of social contract which the nation uses to protect itself and to satisfy basic human needs. If a particular form of government fails to adequately fulfill these goals, the nation then has the right, if not the obligation, to adopt a new form of government."

Deendayal emphasizes that the state is for nation and not the other way around." The state is a means and the nation an end. Nation is a priority, as its interests are primary. The *raison d'être* of state lies in the service of nation. If the state does not discharge its responsibilities, its forms and arrangements will be changed. The rule is owned and disowned on the above parameter. It is acceptable only if it works for the efflorescence of the nation. He is of the view that the politics, which weakens the nation is undesirable because it does not serve and foster the necessities of a nation." Deendayal emphasizes to make the nation strong. He says that if the nation is not self-reliant, strong and awakened, it goes astray and becomes decadent. When the nation becomes dormant, all kinds of defects and malformations lodge themselves in the body politic, and all the institutions such as state, panchayats, family, etc. representing it lose control and become capricious. If the nation does not stay awake, then the state can abuse the rights given to it by the former. If the state becomes unbridled and steals all the powers and verities of the nation then dictatorship begins and the nation gets crippled. And if the nation is awake and dexterous, the state remains under control. According to him, this is possible only when the people of a country pay homage to their nation, worship and love it. Nation is a sole truth and to espouse this truth is a cultural imperative. Politics can succeed only when such a cultural force, resurgent and imbued with national emotions, feelings and thought becomes its guiding inspiration.

Deendayal was against foreign domination and alien rule. A nation ruled by the alien ruler would not be able to progress and achieve glory. He rejects foreign rule outrightly even if it is a benevolent rule. He says that even suffering and deprivation is welcome in self-rule than comfort and happiness in good foreign governance." He is of the opinion that every country must ensure its development according to its own conditions. He emphasizes, "Every country has its own peculiar historical, social and economic situations and its leaders decide the remedies to the ills that beset the country from time to time taking into consideration its background. It is illogical to believe that remedies which the leaders of one country decided to try for their problems are likely to be applicable as such to all other peoples ... Therefore, it is neither possible nor wise to adopt foreign Isms in our country in the original form in toto."

Therefore, Deendayal emphatically pleads for self-rule. Espousing self-rule (Swarajya) as a categorical imperative, he asserts that three attributes come to the forefront in grasping self-rule. Firstly, rule by the people, who belong to the nation; Secondly, such rule should work in the interest of the nation; and, thirdly, the ability and capacity to bring about the good of the nation should inhere in oneself, i.e., it is futile to think of self-rule without self-dependence. He is of the view that if a state, though in one's own hands, becomes a camp follower or falls under foreign sway or dominance then self-rule becomes worthless, sans meaning, and such a dependent self-deficient state becomes the cause for destruction.

To Deendayal, self-rule is not just independence of the country but it has wider and comprehensive connotation. According to him, the independence of the country from foreign yoke does not make a country really free because self-rule is intimately related to one's own culture and is meaningful only if it becomes an instrument for the expression of one's culture. Only such a rule can contribute to our progress and happiness. He says that Swarajya is meaningful as long as it fulfills the inexorable demands of the nation. He asserts, "From the national stand point, we shall have to consider our culture because that is our very nature. Independence is intimately related to one's own culture. If culture does not form the basis of independence then the political movement for independence would reduce simply to a scramble by selfish and power seeking persons. Independence can be meaningful only if it becomes an instrument for the expression of our culture. Such expression will not only contribute to our progress but the effort required will also give us the experience of joy.

According to Deendayal Upadhyaya, self-rule of post independent India has failed to provide freedom in the true sense. He observes, "During the half century gone by, the country's mind has been dominated completely by the Congress and its ideology. Its leaders have been not only the framers of national policy but the arbiters of contemporary lifevalues as well. After independence, the reins of government also came in their hands. It cannot be gain-said that awakening of political consciousness in the common man has been the most significant contribution of this era. If this political consciousness, unpolluted by the exigencies of day-to-day politics, had been made an instrument for the country's resurgence on a positive national basis, we would have made considerable progress by now and the country might have been spared the problems which beset it today. He deplors that independent India is victim of mental slavery and is devoid of a feeling of self-reliance as it clings blindly to foreign ideas and concepts. He says, "to-day even after independence, we cannot say that a definite direction has been decided upon. He adds, "We had taken pride in resisting things British while they ruled us, but strangely enough, now that the Britishers have left, westernisation has become synonymous with

progress ... In fact thoughtless imitation of the West must be scrupulously discarded."® Upholding a similar view, Gandhi says, "We in India are much given nowadays to imitation of the West. We do grant that it is necessary to imitate the West in certain respects. At the same time there is no doubt that many western ideas are wrong. It will be admitted on all hands that what is bad must be eschewed. Therefore, independence for Deendayal does not mean just the ouster of Britishers but also freedom from slavery of foreign ideas and culture as these consume self-reliance and endanger the development of society. To him, "It is essential that we think about our national identity, without the identity there is no meaning of independence, nor can independence become the instrument of progress and happiness. Deendayal specifically asserts that the original culture must remain knitted and protected as the core reality. However, he is of the view that depending upon the situation. Western ideals can be reconciled with it to achieve an added advantage, but it should not lead to the neglect of self. He exhorts, "the new era at whose threshold the country stands today, should be a positive manifestation of ... political awakening. There are people in the country who are still chained to the age gone by. Then there are others who are ignorant of national values, or have scant regard for them, and so are readily influenced by foreign concepts. The country's transition into the new era, therefore, is not being smooth. It is accompanied by severe strains and struggles. It is against this background that we must analyse present problems and draw up our policy.

Deendayal is influenced by the concept of democracy. He says, "The people of this country have an abiding faith in nationalism and democracy and they will not tolerate elements who seek to subvert these values. He states, "Democracy has been defined as government by debate... Bharatiya culture goes beyond this and looks at debate as a means for the realization of truth. We believe that truth is not one-sided, and that its various facets can be seen, examined and experienced from various angles." He believes that the effectiveness and vibrancy of democracy depend upon consciousness of responsibility, discipline and the feeling for the nation in the life of the people. If these sanskaras (spiritual values) are absent in the citizen, democracy degenerates into an instrument of individual, class and party interest. He wanted an Indian style of democracy. According to him, "Instead of trying merely to imitate the one or the other, let us try to evolve democratic practices suited to our own genius. He was not contented with majority rule or rule of people and therefore, advocated Dharma-Rajya, having its basis in Dharma. He says, "Of the 45 million people of India, even if 449,999,999 opt for something which is against Dharma, even then this does not become truth. On the other hand, even if a person stands for something which is according to Dharma, that constitutes truth because truth resides with Dharma." It is pertinent to point out here that according to J.S.Mill, the Will, which is the basis of all institutions including the state is not dependent on numbers, as for him it has qualitative foundation that takes the form of a belief almost, of a religion. To Mill, one person with a belief is a social power equal to ninety-nine who have only interests. Rousseau also emphasizes that General Will is embodied not necessarily in majority but even in one man - a legislature who will show people what is good for them.

D.B. Thengadi writes, "Pandit ji was the first political leader in post-independence era to declare unequivocally that what mankind needed most was a DharmaRajya, not merely a rule by majority. Deendayal says, "Dharma is not necessarily with the majority or with the people. Dharma is eternal. He is of the opinion that rule of majority becomes detrimental when it goes against Dharma. He calls such a rule or government, a rule of thieves. If an elected government allows people to go against Dharma and does not punish, then that government is in reality a government of thieves. To Deendayal, Dharma is a sole sovereign truth as the sovereignty resides only in Dharma and not in other institutions of the body politic. He asserts, "In a Dharma Rajya, the state is not absolutely powerful. It is subject to Dharma. We have always vested sovereignty in Dharma. Neither the Legislature is higher nor Judiciary. Dharma is higher than both. The Legislature will have to act according to Dharma and Judiciary too will have to act according to Dharma. Dharma will specify limits of both. The Legislature, the Judiciary or the people, none of them is supreme ... even the people are not sovereign 145 because people too have no right to act against Dharma ... Even the general will cannot go against Dharma. "° Not only this, he goes to the extent that even God cannot act contrary to Dharma."God who is omnipotent is also selfregulated and consequently fully in tune with Dharma. God descends in human body to destroy adharmas and re-establish Dharma, not to act on passing whims and fancies. Hence even God can do every thing but cannot act contrary to Dharma. He equates Dharma with truth and says, "Elections and majority can decide as to who will form the government. The truth cannot be decided by majority. What the government will do will be decided by Dharma. According to him a democratic government must be rooted in Dharma, He exhorts, "Therefore, in the definition of democracy, to say that it is a government of the people, it is not enough; it has to be for the good of the people. What constitutes the good of the people, Dharma alone can decide. Therefore, a democratic Government Vana Rajya' must also be rooted in Dharma i.e. a Dharam Rajya'. In the definition of Democracy' viz. government of the people, by the people and for the people', of stands for independence, by' stands for democracy, and for' indicates Dharma. Therefore, true democracy is only where there is freedom as well as Dharma. Dharma-Rajya encompasses all these concepts.

It is, however, important to note that Dharam Rajya, according to Deendayal, is not a theocratic state. He says, "Dharam Rajya does not mean a theocratic state. Let us be very clear on this point. Where a particular sect and its prophet or Guru, rule supreme, that is a theocratic state. All the rights are enjoyed by the followers of this particular sect. Others either cannot live in that country or at best enjoy a slave-like, secondary citizen's status. He emphasizes, in Dharam Rajya "there is freedom to worship according to one's religion. Dharam Rajya accepts the importance of religion in the peace, happiness and progress of an individual. Therefore the state has the responsibility to maintain an atmosphere in which every individual can follow the religion of his choice and live in peace. He adds, "The freedom to follow one's own religion, necessarily requires tolerance for other religions", however, he does not warrant unlimited religious freedom as "every religion has freedom to exist. But this freedom extends only as far as it does not encroach upon the religion of others.

The preceding discussion reveals that Deendayal does not believe in ancient Indian conception of the origin of the state, which holds that in the past there prevailed a golden age of harmony and happiness in which people lived a peaceful life on account of their virtuous disposition. However, with time moral degeneration came and people fell prey to cupidity and selfishness. The law of the jungle came into operation where the strong devoured the weak. The people requested the Creator of this world {Brahman} to rescue them from such veritable hell and protect them, by appointing Manu as the King. According to Altekar, "The accounts in the Mahahharata show that the state was regarded as a divine institution; king's right to govern was partly due to his divine creation and partly due to the agreement of the subjects to be governed by him in order to terminate the anarchy. The ancient thinker Kautilya also holds that in order to get out of the insecurity, the people in desperation opted for a state to rule them. They selected Manu as their king to provide them protection, establish law and order. In lieu of this the people agreed to pay taxes for the king. To Deendayal, state is created neither by the divine nor by the people for the termination of anarchy. He believes that the state is a creation of the nation to meet its inexorable demands. It is an outcome of a contract at the will of the nation to fulfill its interests. The nation alone is the sole proprietor of deciding the terms and conditions of the contract. The contract is one sided and it is up to the nation to extend or terminate it. The state is seen only as the facilitator of the national interests. If state fails to protect and propagate national interests then nation changes such a state and it ceases to be the representative of the nation. It may be noted that Deendayal's conception of state does not conceive and embrace the modern concept of state, which considers state consisting of four essential elements viz. population, territory, government and sovereignty. He equates the state only with government.

Further, to Deendayal, the state is one of the several institutions created by the nation. According to the pluralist theory of sovereignty, the state is one of the institutions of the society. The pluralists like Maitland, Sidney Webb, Cole, Barker, Laski (English thinkers), and William James, Miss M.P. Follet, Maclver (American), etc. advocate that the sovereignty is divisible and resides not only in state but also in other institutions of society. There are Western thinkers such as Bodin, Hobbes, Hegel, Austin, etc. who advocate the Monist theory of sovereignty of state. To them, a comprehensive and unlimited authority resides in the state. For Hegel, State is an end in itself and is the final embodiment of spirit on earth. Deendayal differs from both of the above. According to him, sovereignty resides neither in state nor is divisible among the various institutions of the society. Instead, it resides in Dharma. He says, "We have always given primary" importance to Dharma, which is considered sovereign. All other entities, institutions or authorities derive their power from Dharma and are subordinate to it. He considers Dharma as sole sovereign truth and the basis of good for the nation. To Rousseau, General Will is sovereign and has its basis in welfare of all.

In his scheme of Dharam Rajya, Deendayal Upadhyaya is against the notion of the federal state. He says, "The federal constitution considers the individual states as fundamental powers, and the centre as merely a federation of states. This is contrary to the truth. It runs counter to the unity and indivisibility of Bharat. He observes, "India that is Bharat will be a federation of States. This is ridiculous. He feels that a blow has been struck at the basis of her unity by considering the country as a federation of different states. To Deendayal, federalism viewed as such would prove detrimental and disastrous for India's unity because it encourages anti-national sentiment, which might lead to a demand of autonomy and complete secession from the nation. He views nation as an integral and organic entity, which according to him forms a unified state structure. Therefore, in his view the body-politic, must be both unitary and unified. He asserts, "We have thought of the provinces as limbs of Bharat Mata and not as individual mothers. Therefore our constitution should be unitary instead of federal.

The unitary state is one where the powers are concentrated and originally located at a single sovereign centre. The powers of the units are only delegated ones to carry out administrative and developmental functions. Their powers depend on the will and wish of the centre. But Deendayal's conception of unitary state is different. He states, "Unitary State does not mean concentration of all powers in the Centre; just as the head of the family does not have all the powers with him even though all the transactions are carried out in his name. ... Thus a unitary State does not mean highly autocratic centre nor does it entail the elimination of provinces. He opines, "Centre States tensions should not imperil the country's unity, it is necessary that while on the one hand the

structure of our constitution is made unitary, on the other, financial and other powers presently concentrated in the Centre should be decentralised in favour of the States to enable them to discharge their functions responsibly. He favours suitable power to provinces and various entities below its level as well. He holds, "The provinces will have various executive powers. Even the various entities below the provincial level, such as the Jana Padas, will also have suitable powers. The Panchayats too should have powers. It is necessary that their powers be considered fundamental. In this way, the decentralization of powers will be accomplished. The authority will be distributed to the lowest level, and will be fully decentralized. At the same time, all these entities of power will be centred around the unitary State. This arrangement will embody Dharma.

The unitary form of government adopted in countries like England, France, Japan, etc. undoubtedly has some merits. The powers are concentrated under the central government, which facilitates it to take prompt and quick decisions on important matters of the society. A unified policy for the progress of nation, uniformity of laws and administration, exist in the entire country. On the otherside, such a governiaent tends to repress local initiative, discourages rather than stimulates interest of local entities, thereby impairing the vitality of the local government. The central government has unlimited and unchecked powers and local units have only delegated powers devoid of constitutional support. It can lead ultimately to a highly autocratic system of central dictatorship, denying democratic norms. In a federal government, units have original powers, which restrain the centre from becoming an autocrat. Further, it can be said that unitary form of government may suit small countries with a homogenous society but may not be able to function well in a country with a vast geographical area and heterogeneous society having multifarious pluralities: ethnic, religious and racial.

The central authority cannot redress the different problems satisfactorily of such a society. The people at the periphery remain ignored, unattended and isolated. Various socio-economic problems arise and aggravate, seriously threatening the very fabric of nation's unity. The secessionist demands for separate homelands may lead to disintegration of nation. Thus, a unitary state may lead to divisiveness. Therefore, devolution of power is desirable and essential in a diverse and multifarious society. One cannot realize the full benefit of democratic government unless one admits that all problems are not central problems, and the solutions to these lay not at central level but require decision and redressal at the place where problems arise, i.e., at local level by the persons to whom the problems are related. Thus, devolution of power is desirable and essential. It ensures peoples participation in the developmental process and allows them to seek the solution of problems in their way. People feel attached to the national mainstream, which brings unity and strengthens the nation. Harold J. Laski says, "since society is essentially federal in nature, the body which seeks to impose the necessary unities must be so built that the diversities have a place their in. He adds, "Once, in fact, a federal State comes into being there grows up a sense of nationalism.

It is important to note that the unitary state of Deendayal Upadhyaya favours the devolution of powers to the lowest level, however, he proposes the devolution of suitable power. But he did not define the suitable power, and also failed to suggest clearly and categorically the way to grant the suitable authority to the lower units. Further, though he favours devolution of power yet he believes that the unitary state is the centre of power. He wants to establish harmony while seeking devolution. He draws an analogy between the functioning of a family and the state. The distribution of power between centre and different units of the body politic on the analogy of head of family and its members is, however, erroneous. In a family there is intensive cohesiveness and understanding among the members of family. They have almost similar interests and ideas. It is very difficult to seek the above family characteristics in a diverse and heterogeneous society, which is full of vertical and horizontal divisions. Further, even in families the problems are usual on various issues then what to talk of a diverse society. Hence, allocation of powers on the analogy of family seems much impractical, vague, shadowy and too idealistic.

Besides, it may be pointed out that Deendayal Upadhyaya has not taken the cognizance of the functioning of different political parties. In a democracy, there are different political parties with specific principles and programmes. These differ mostly on various issues and are unanimous on only rare issues. These parties form the governments at the centre and in the provinces. It is very difficult to evolve a family like cohesiveness of thought and action between the governments at centre and states belonging to different parties. These parties can go to the extent of subverting the government of other parties in the Provinces. The invocation of Art. 356 to throw governments out of power in states, is a controversial issue in India. Deendayal himself, as an activist of a political party, has reacted against the irresponsible behaviour of the central government. He says, "Our Constitution is federal in form but most of its provisions reveal a unitary bias. The political situation prevailing during the last 20 years and the existing planning and financial arrangements have made the .Centre all the more powerful. In the past, as the Congress held sway at all levels, no one ever challenged the Centre's dominance or alleged misuse of authority by the Centre. The situation has now changed, however. Several States are now in the hands of non-Congress Governments. They wish to serve the people according to their own ideas. They should be given full opportunities to do so, and provided with resources to meet their obligations. The sovereign authority of the nation vests in the Central Government. In its dealings with the State

Governments, let the Central Government show an awareness of this responsibility, and act in a liberal and impartial manner. If, instead, they keep looking at things from the narrow party standpoint and try to explain away pettiness of approach by citing powers conferred on them by the Constitution, they would only be harming the country's interests. The point, which the researcher would like to highlight is that Deendayal as an activist of a political party has himself agreed that an overwhelming centre can misuse power for vested interests. Therefore, it is erroneous to talk about a unitary state on the analogy of the family. It is worth while to mention that Deendayal advocates a strong unitary state for the unity of the nation on one hand and on the other as an activist of a political party criticizes such a state for the misuse of power. This develops contradiction in his ideas.

Deendayal's notion of Dharam Rajya is different from Ram Rajya of Gandhi and Organised Democracy of M.N.Roy. Gandhi aims at an enlightened anarchy whereas Deendayal Upadhyaya believes in a strong state. Both Deendayal and M.N.Roy advocate devolution of power, however, Roy's concept of devolution is comprehensive and wide than that of Upadhyaya. Deendayal propounds democracy on the basis of Dharma but M.N.Roy emphasizes Radical or Organized Democracy with widest diffusion of power on the basis of People's Committees. Further, the latter advocates partyless democracy whereas the former is not against the role of political parties in the democracy.

Before concluding this paper it is pertinent to highlight that a nation for Deendayal is a self-begotten and abstract reality. The state is an arrangement together with the government to realize the necessities of the nation. It serves as an agent of the nation and justifies itself in realizing the demands of the nation. It is important to notice that Deendayal emphatically upholds the primacy of Dharma not just for the individual and society but also for the nation, the state and the government. For Deendayal, Dharma is not just a sovereign value and a balancing wheel between Artha and Kama to attain Moksha but also the anchor sheet of nation, state and government. To him it is a keel of society and the cosmos or the Universe, and is the hub from which radiates the axial lines of truth, solidarity, fraternity, selfhood, right governance and true democracy. It sustains life on the earth.

NOTES AND REFERENCES:

- [1]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 36.
- [2]. Prof. Haridas Mukherjee and Prof. Uma Mukherjee, *Bande Mataram and Indian Nationalism* (Calcutta: K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1957), p.1.
- [3]. A. Appadorai, *Indian Political Thinking in the Twentieth Century From Naoroji to Nehru: An Introductory Survey* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 67.
- [4]. Louis L. Snyder, *The Meaning of Nationalism* (New Jersey : Rutgers University Press, 1954), p . 90. n Ibid., p . 74.
- [5]. D.B. Thengadi, "Deendayal-India's Gift to the Bewildered," *Manthan*, 2, No. 2 (Sept. 1979), 5-7.
- [6]. D.B. Thengadi, "Deendayal - India's Gift to the Bewildered," *Manthan*,. op. cit.
- [7]. Hans Kohn, "Nationalism," in *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York: The Macmillan Company & The Press, 1968).
- [8]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Bharatiya Jan Sangh," *Organiser*, Special Diwali issue (1964), p. 11.
- [9]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 14.
- [10]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Presidential Address," in *Fourteenth Annual Session of B.J.S. at Calicut* (Dec. 23- 30,1967).
- [11]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 18.
- [12]. D. B. Thengadi, *His Legacy: Our Mission* (Calicut: Jayabharath Publications, 1973), p. 13.
- [13]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Bharatiya Jan Sangh," *Organiser*, Special Diwali issue (1954), p.11.
- [14]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, pp. 38-39. Ibid, pp.7-8.
- [15]. J.L. Talition, *Political Messianism* (London: Secke ' S. Warburg, 1960), p. 253. Ibid., p. 268.
- [16]. Gaetano Salvemini, *Mazzini* trans. Rawson (Californ: Standard University, 1957), p. 37.
- [17]. Hans Kohn, *Prophets and Peoples* (New York: Crowell Collier Publishing Co., 1961), p. 138.
- [18]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Full Text of BJS Presidential Address," *Organiser*, op.cit. °Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Bharatiya Jan Sangh," *Organiser*, op.cit.
- [19]. D.B. Thengadi, *His Legacy: Our Mission*, op. cit., p. 11.
- [20]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 20. 63 Ibid., p. 21
- [21]. T.H. Green, *Principles of Political Obligation* (London: Longman's Green & Co., 1921). p. 175.
- [22]. A. J. Milne, *The Social Philosophy of English Idealism* (London: George Allen & Unwm Ltd., 1962), p. 264.
- [23]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Full Text of BJS Presidential Address," *Organiser*, op.cit.
- [24]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 44.
- [25]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Rashtra Jeevan Ki Disha*, p. 47. 'Ibid., p. 46. "Ibid., p. 47 75 Ibid. 159

- [26]. Walter K. Anderson, "The Political Philosophy of Deendayal Upadhyaya: The Concept of Integral Humanism," in *Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism: The Concept and Applications*, ed. Mahesh J, Mehta, op. cit., p. 97.
- [27]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, pp. 15-16. "For details see, Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Rashtra Jeevan Ki Disha*, p. 49.
- [28]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p.18.
- [29]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Full Text of BJS Presidential Address," *Organiser*, op.cit. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 2.
- [30]. Gandhi, quoted in Appadorai, *Documents on Political Thought in Modern India*, Vol. II (Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 136.
- [31]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 5.
- [32]. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, op. cit., pp. 196-97.
- [33]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, "Full Text of BJS Presidential Address," *Organiser*, op. cit. 97
- [34]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, pp. 58-59.
- [35]. D.B. Thengadi, "Deendayal - India's Gift to the Bewildered," *Manthan*, op. cit. 101 Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 59.
- [36]. Deendayal Upadhyaya, *Integral Humanism*, p. 50
- [37]. Harold J. Laski, *A Grammar of Politics* (New Delhi: S. Chand & Company Ltd., 1979), p. 270.