

Examining First lecture on Integral Humanism by Pandit Deendyal Upadhyaya Ji

**Dr.Gurpreet Singh Uppal, Assistant Professor of Political Science, P.G. Department of Political
Science ,Khalsa College ,Ghardiwal,Hoshiarpur ,Punjab ,India**

**Dr.Gopal Krishan, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Gobindgarh Public College, Khanna,
Punjab ,India**

Abstract

Pandit Deendyal Upadhyaya has delivered four lectures on Integral Humanism in Bombay on April 22-25, 1965. In this article an attempt has been made to examine his first lecture on 'Integral Humanism'. Upadhyaya explained the problems being faced by our country due to selfishness of our politicians. He was of the opinion that people should be aware of the motives of the politicians. He put stressed upon national identity as an instrument of progress and happiness. There exist a common desire of the people in every country and if that common desire is made the basis of our development, than the common man would feel that his nation is moving in a right direction. The nation could only develop when its people became aware of our national identity. It is the soul of the nation. Every country wanted independence so that it could make progress as per their natural bent. Our Civilisation and tradition can contribute to world peace

Keywords: Socialism, Democracy, Capitalism, Nationalism, Dialectic Materialism

Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhyaya presented his thoughts on 'Integral Humanism'. At the beginning, he made a reference to the meeting of Bharatiya Jana Sangh at Vijayavada where the statement of 'Principles and Policies' was adopted which contains 'Integrated Humanism'. Upadhyaya contended that during the time of freedom struggle, the main objective was to free India from the yokes of British rule and to get independence. He raised the question of what would be the face of New Bharat after independence. In which direction we were to move? To him, answers to these questions were equally important. Though, as he said, it is not true to say that no attention was paid to these aspects during national movement for freedom. Even that time some thought were devoted on this issue. He made a reference to Mahatma Gandhi, by saying that he discussed the idea of Independent Bharat in his book 'Hind Swaraj'. Even before him, Lokmanya Tilak explained the philosophical basis of the rejuvenation of Bharat in his

book 'Gita Rahasya'. The book contained the comparative analysis of different school of thought prevailed at that time.

Upadhyaya said that even though the Congress party and other political parties also adopted resolutions from time to time which contains reference to Integrated Humanism, still this subject did not get the required attention at that time. He then mentioned the reason for this. At that time all believed that to get freedom from Britishers was more important than anything else. Discussions regarding the post-independence were not the priority.

Upadhyaya contended that the Independent movement had kept aside the internal differences among the people of different views and united them for a common objective of freedom of Bharat. As a result, even those who were the advocator of Socialism and wanted it to be the basis of future Bharat, worked within the Congress as a socialist group. They did not make an attempt to form a separate party and worked with other nationalist in pursuit of independence of Bharat. He further said that the revolutionaries, who worked with different means, also agreed that to gain independence is more important than internal differences. The revolutionaries too, were working independence in their own way. All were agreed, however, that the foremost task was to gain independence.

Upadhyaya then spoke on the post independent challenges and said "Now that we are independent, what shall be the direction of our progress" This issue has not been discussed adequately even after seventeen years of independence and the direction of our progress has not been decided upon, he remarked.

Upadhyaya spoke on the ideological basis of that Congress party. He said that the Congress party has supported the concept of welfare state, ideology of Socialism and Liberalism for the economic progress of Bharat. However these are mere slogans and only used for political gains. He said this on the basis of his personal discussions with a gentleman. That gentleman suggested him to form a joint front against Congress. That Upadhyaya naturally asked the gentleman, "What programme shall we adopt? Some programme is essential for forming such a joint front, he said. That he asked again "What would be our economic policy?", "What would be our foreign policy?" These policies should be chalked out before making such attempt.

The Gentleman replied to Upadhyaya that "Do not worry about it. Whatever you like you can adopt. We are ready to support, anything from extreme Marxist to downright capitalist program." There seemed to be no problem for that person to adopt any

programme that could defeat Congress, Upadhyaya said, the only purpose was to eliminate Congress from the power. To Upadhyaya, these means are still adopted by the political parties to defeat the opponent party. Even now the Communist and other parties came together to fight against the Congress party.

Upadhyaya had made a reference to the elections that were held in Kerala at that time. In those elections various small political parties entered into various alliances to give fight to Congress. These parties included, Communists, Muslim League, Swatantra Party, S.S.P. Rebel Congress known as Kerala Congress, Revolutionary Socialist Party etc. in such a scenario, it was clear how the political parties compromised with their principles and ideologies in order to get political benefit.

Upadhyaya stated that the role of Congress party is also not different as regard to its ideology. This party has made democratic socialism as its goal, however the behaviour and working of Congress leaders showed that there were no definite principles and no single direction in Congress. Persons of different ideologies could be found in Congress. Those who support Communism and those who support capitalism lived in the same party. Upadhyaya compared the Congress party with magic box which contains a cobra and a mongoose living together.

Upadhyaya asked that whether we can make progress in such conditions. There was a need to analyse this political conditions of our country otherwise we would lost our goal and confusion would prevailed in the country over the direction for economic progress. He seemed realistic in his lecture when he said that it was not possible for 450 million people of Bharat to agree on all or even on a single question. To arrive on such consensus is not possible in any country. However according to him, there exists a common desire of the people of every country and if that common desire is made the basis of our development, than the common man would feel that his nation is moving in a right direction. This thing would create unity in the country. Upadhyaya illustrated the example of Chinese invasion on India in October/November 1962 to make his point. During that time people stood united and made sacrifices for the country. The gap between the people and the government was disappeared and even the political parties were united. He asked "How did this happen? The external threat made us recognise ourselves, he remarked. The government adopted those policies that were based on the common

desire of the people and which enhanced their sense of self-respect following a call for sacrifice. As a result we remained united at that time, he said.

Our problems emerged because we neglected our self

Upadhyaya put stressed upon national identity as an instrument of progress and happiness. The nation could only develop when its people became aware of our national identity. It is the soul of the nation. He stated that the potential of our country could only be achieved when there was consciousness among people for national unity. Every country wanted independence so that it could make progress as per their natural bent. Happiness would prevail thereafter. He was of the view that going against nature would result into troubles. The natural instincts should not be ignored rather they should be elevated to the level of culture. Psychology proved that suppression of natural instincts might lead to different mental disorder. That person remained restless and dejected. His confidence would be lost and could not realise his potential. This state of affairs was very harmful for a person. Upadhyaya later said that same thing would happen to nation if it undermines the natural instincts. Infact the root cause of the problems of Bharat is disregard of national identity.

Upadhyaya opined that the leaders who run the government today and the people who took keen interests in political affairs did not know this root cause. As a result the opportunist leaders, who did not follow any principles, rule the country. He lamented that it was unfortunate that politicians lacked principles, aims or standard code of conduct. They did not hesitate in leaving their political party and joining other party of opposite ideology. He said that the alliances between political parties are not governed by principles rather governed by electoral gains. The lust for power reigned supreme among politicians. The politicians wanted to remain in power by any means. Upadhyaya abruptly gave an example of Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim who elected on the ticket of Muslim League in 1939. Later when he joined Congress, he resigned from the membership of the house and sought re-election by following healthy principles of public conduct. Another similar example of principle based politics was in 1948 when socialist left the Congress party and founded Socialist Party, all those who were members of the legislature resigned from the house and sought re-election on the ticket of Socialist Party. Upadhyaya underlines the importance of principles among the politicians by presenting such examples.

However, according to him, now this healthy tradition had disappeared. The politicians now lacked integrity. The values had been degenerated. The people had lost faith in them. An atmosphere of distrust had prevailed. He warned by saying this system should be changed otherwise the unity and integrity of the country would be jeopardised.

What should be our direction to move on

Upadhyaya stated that our nation is standing at crossroads where it had to decide which direction it wanted to move. Some people suggested that we should start from the point where we left one thousand years ago when foreign invaders disrupted our life. However Upadhyaya did not agree with this suggestion. He said nation is not like a cloth whose weaving can be resumed after a gap of long time. It is also not correct to say that foreign rule over our country has disrupted the current of our national life so profoundly that from that life it remained stationary and static. We had fought against foreign forces and continued to struggle for independence from the aliens. During that period, the current of our national life had not stopped but slowed down. He made a reference to the river Ganga to present his point. To turn the water of Ganga to some previous point was futile. The water of Ganga might be crystal clear at Haridwar but not Banaras, still it was a same holy Ganga. It did not become a separate river. He contended that during the last one thousand years some other nations made remarkable progress while we were reeling under foreign rule. We could not contribute to world progress. Since now our country gained independence, so we could make our contribution to world progress. We should share the responsibilities of the world with other advanced countries.

Upadhyaya asserted that upto this point there was no space for different opinions. He said we must discuss the reasons for the tremendous progress attained by the western countries. In fact the difficulty arises when we did not discuss such reasons. The Britishers who represent West had ruled the country for one hundred years and during that period had slowly and gradually fostered respect for Western. Not only the scientific advancement but their way of life, food habits etc. also entered into this country. Their material science along with their social, economic and political characteristics became our standard. Today the Western influence could be clearly visible in an educated person in our country. Upadhyaya said that it is on our part to decide whether increasing

Westernisation is good or bad for us. He contended that during the British rule, we opposed western things but now we embraced the western culture and values. The term westernisation has become synonymous with progress. He also made it clear that narrow nationalism should not affect progress of the country. Western science and western way of living are two different things. It is necessary to adopt Western science to make progress and advancement but it did not require adoption of their way of living. People should not blindly follow their culture and values. This subject is very important. When we have to decide for which direction our country should move, we have to take into account this issue.

The Emergence of European Nations

Upadhyaya also spoke on the issue of nationalism. He said that Nationalism along with Democracy and Socialism has affected the west. Those who talked of world peace and world unity has also made an attempt in that direction. Among all these, Nationalism is the oldest and strongest term. Upadhyaya opined that after the fall of Roman empire and declined the influence of Catholic Church led to the emergence of many nations in Europe. Infact the history of Europe is the history of conflicts among the European countries. These countries extended their empire to beyond European continent and established their colonies after defeating other weak countries. Nationalism brought nation and state together resulting in the formation of nation states. At the same time decline in the influence of Roman Catholic Church had removed the influence of religion on politics in Europe. In this way the concept of secular state emerged.

Emergence of democracy in Europe

The concept of Democracy has put a deep impact in the political life of Europe. Before the advent of Democracy, there was a king as a head in every nation. Gradually minds of people awaked against the autocracy of the royalty. The Industrial revolution and the increased trade helped in the emergence of business community in all nations. The conflict between these new centres of power and the kingdom and feudal lords started. In this scenario, Democracy emerged as a philosophical basis. Initially the democracy was sought in Greek city republics. The ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity attracted the people. In France, there was a bloody revolution took place for securing the ideals of democracy.

England too witnessed periodic movements. The idea of democracy spread throughout Europe. The nations who had monarchy turned to democracy. The kingdoms were either replaced or became powerless. The real powers were entrusted with the Constitutional head. He asserted in his lecture that democracy was widely accepted in the Europe. Even those who had suppressed democracy did not denounce it. The verbal support to democracy by dictators like Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin has confirmed this fact.

Exploitation of Workers

Upadhyaya also emphasised upon the pathetic conditions of workers who were working in the factories. Industrial revolution had changed the economic basis of the country. The production has increased manifold and so as the trade. This has resulted in the emergence of labour class. They have to be shifted from their homes to the factory cities. The conditions of working migrates has deteriorated and the industry owners started their exploitation. Their working conditions were pitiable. No rules were framed for safeguarding working class. He was economically weak and unorganised. He became a victim of exploitation, injustice and harassment. Those to whom political powers were given belonged to the same group who exploited the workers. Therefore to Upadhyaya, there seemed no hope of solution of problems by the state.

Many movements were started against the injustice to the working class with a hope to improve their conditions and life. They were known as socialists. Karl Marx was one of them. With a aim of removing injustice to workers, he studied the entire history of mankind and the economic and political structure. He than presented his analysis of the situation. It was claimed by Marx that he has given a scientific theory i.e. socialism. All the subsequent socialists might not fully agree with the views of Marx but they were greatly influenced by his views.

Dictatorship of Proletarian

Upadhyaya stated that Marx in his theory of Dialectic Materialism explained the root cause of the exploitation of workers. According to Marx, the private ownership of the means of the production is responsible for the exploitation. However Marx suggested a way to stop this exploitation and that is state's control of means of production. For that state has to be redeemed from the hands of the exploiters and it should be ensured in future that their influence did not increase. Ultimately dictatorship of the proletariat class must be established. To ensure that the people accept the dictatorship, the exploiter class

needs to be liquidated. At the final stage the state would be replaced by a classless and stateless society.

He mentioned in his lecture that the social revolutions took place in Europe. In some countries, it was successful and in other countries it was failed. However in those countries where Socialism was not accepted, the governments had to provide rights to the workers. The concept of “Welfare State” was accepted by the European states. The concepts of Nationalism, Democracy, Socialism or equality dominated the socio-political thinking in Europe. Besides these concepts, the issues of world peace and world unity were also became a subject of thinking. These concepts are good ideas. These promote development of humankind. However, according to Upadhyaya, each of these ideals is incomplete. Infact in practice, these are opposite to each other. Nationalism is against world peace. When democracy and capitalism resulted in exploitation of workers in some countries than socialism replaced capitalism. Therefore, the West was facing an uphill task of reconciling these ideals. But they were not successful in doing so. They had tried different combination and permutations. England based their social and political system on the basis of nationalism and democracy while France could not follow the same. There democracy led to political instability. In England the labour party wanted to reconcile the ideology of socialism with democracy but people opposed it as they doubt that whether democracy would survive if socialism consolidates. So the labour party has stopped supporting socialism vehemently. On the other hand, Hitler and Mussolini adopted nationalism cum socialism and denounced democracy. Upadhyaya asserted that socialism later on became a instrument for their nationalism that posed a great threat to world peace and unity.

He exclaimed that we might get guidance from the western world but they had no concrete suggestion to offer. They were also at crossroads and unable to decide what was good for them and what was not. Under such condition we cannot get any guidance from the West. Infact we had to think that how can we contribute in solving this dilemma being faced by the European countries.

Upadhyaya raised the question that after witnessing the progress of the world, could we contribute to the common store of knowledge? We are the members of world community so we must fulfil our responsibilities. If we having something at our possession which can be helpful to others than we must share that thing with them. In this era of adulteration, instead of adulterating ideas we must on the contrary scrutinize and improve upon them wherever possible before accepting them. Rather than being a

burden on the world, we must attempt to resolve if possible the problems facing the world. He said that we must consider what contribution our culture and traditions could make to the world culture.

References

- 1. Upadhyay Deendayal, “Integral Humanism: An Analysis of Some Basic Elements” Prabhat Prakashan, New Delhi**

Web Links

- <https://deendayalupadhyay.org>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rWtGi6AZvSk>
- <https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/22447359-integral-humanism>