Chapter VI

An Evaluation of Deendayal Upadhyaya’s Integral Humanism

Humanists, both Western as well as Indian aim at the development and welfare of man. Deendayal Upadhyaya has propounded a philosophy of Integral Humanism. It needs to be analyzed and evaluated in the framework of humanistic thought both Western as well as Indian.

Deendayal Upadhyaya’s philosophy of Integral Humanism has various dimensions such as social, political and economic. Deendayal’s conception of man seems to be influenced by the Vedanta, which considers man both as a physical entity and a mighty spiritual being. In this context, he also resembles modern Indian thinkers such as Radhakrishnan, Sri Aurobindo, etc. The Western thinker St. Thomas also postulates that man possesses not only a bodily nature but also a rational and spiritual soul.

Deendayal Upadhyaya talks about both bad as well as good tendencies in man. He calls them as the Asuri Bhauv (demoniac disposition) and the Devi Bhauv (dynamic disposition of the Goddess) and is of the view that the former is based upon self-interest and the latter on selfless service. It is observed that St. Augustine also gives a bipartite division of human nature.

Deendayal believes in the inward divinity of man, and evolution of human nature, which leads to the realization of the conscious power of divine. In this respect he resembles modern Indian thinkers such as Aurobindo, Radhakrishnan, Gandhi, etc. According to Deendayal mutual cooperation is a
sign of progress whereas conflict of degradation. He wants to build up the edifice of civilization on the basis of love, sacrifice, harmony and mutual cooperation. It clearly shows that he gives primacy to the brighter side of the human nature. However, it is pertinent to draw attention towards the harsh reality that transformation of nature is not simple and quick. Most of the people in society, in fact, remain entangled to their lower tendencies such as self-interest, greed rather than social interest and selfless service. Further, Deendayal emphasizes on developing harmony and cooperation among the people of society, however, it is not very simple and easy. The truth is that the people are far less adjusted and conflict and chaos are more marked in society. This is because the most of the people fail to develop the qualities and virtues, which are considered as pre-requisites by Deendayal for a civilized society.

It may be mentioned that Charvaka also seeks to attain pleasure in life. The Epicureans of the Hellenistic period, Aristippus of Cyrene, Omar Khayyam also talk about the pleasure in life. The basis of their conception of pleasure is materialism, which may be termed as crudely hedonistic. The utilitarian thinkers of nineteenth century such as Bentham and J.S. Mill also talk about the happiness of man. Bentham’s notion of happiness is quantitative, which too reflects hedonism. It may be argued that Deendayal conception of happiness is different from the above mentioned thinkers and even to that of J.S. Mill. Deendayal emphasizes on the integrated fulfillment of all the aspirations leading to the material as well as the spiritual happiness. Further, Deendayal rejects the empirical notion of Benthamite happiness, which believes in the happiness of
the greatest number. He, instead, aims at the happiness of all. This stance of Deendayal resembles the Sarvabhutahita (the good of all) of the Bhagawad Geeta. The modern Indian thinkers such as Vivekananda, Tilak, Sri Aurobindo, Gandhi etc. also hold similar viewpoint.

Deendayal's formulation of Purushartha is integrated, holistic and hierarchical. He advocates the establishment of a balance among the claims of Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha. Deendayal emphasizes the relevance of all the values of life. He is of the view that higher ones cannot be attained in the absence of the lower ones. In this configuration Dharma is viewed as the stabilizing pivot or anchor sheet. Deendayal's exposition of Purushartha is undoubtedly traditional. It is woven on the ancient paradigm of classical Indian thought. It may be noted that though Deendayal emphatically holds the importance of spiritual values, but he does not show any bias against materialism. It is evident by the stress he has given on the fulfillment of Artha, however, on the basis of Dharma. In fact, he favours to achieve a balance between materialism and spiritualism.

It may be noted that the concept of four-fold values (Purusharthas) is a traditional formulation. All the values of life are considered essential. However, there are some thinkers who do not give importance to some of them. Charvaka does not accept Dharma and Moksha, the non-Vedic schools - Jainism and Buddhism consider that the lower values cease to be considered as necessary for higher ones. Sankara believes that the three debts are automatically paid up when one renounces the world.

Deendayal is of the view that an individual is inseparably attached to society. Society, according to him
is an enlarged man. He believes in organic conception of society. It may be stated that notion of society as the cosmic man is enunciated in the Vedic hymn Purusaskta. The conception of society as an organism has appealed to several Indian thinkers such as Sri Aurobindo, R.N.Tagore, S.RadhaKrishnan, B.C.Pal, etc. The well-known Western thinker Herbert Spencer also considers society as an organism.

It is however, difficult to accept the organic notion of society and is wrong to draw anatomical corollaries between individual and society. The inter-dependence of individuals in society cannot be denied, however, it is wrong to assert that individual belong to society like that of parts of an organism. Each individual has its own centre of consciousness and it is not merely the expression of social consciousness. The organic notion of society displaces man from the centre of his consciousness to the consciousness of collectivity. As a result individual ceases to maintain his identity and is coerced by the collectivity. It leads to the denial of individual freedom. The moment we regard the society as an organism, the interests of society become primary than that of the interests of individual. Thus, it leads to the subordination of individual to society, which is disastrous for human development. Deendayal, however, concedes that society cannot lay an unlimited claim on the individual. He seeks to attain harmony between individual and society, and emphasizes to achieve prominence in individual life along with social development. These two stances taken by Deendayal do not appear to be consistent with each other.

Further, it may be pointed out that Chatur-varna system forms an integral part of Deendayal's organic notion of
society. He appears to have given legitimacy to this division for the orderly functioning of the society. But, while doing so, he has obviously ignored and overlooked the negative consequences of the four-fold division of the society, which could lead to the development of rigid and intolerant caste system. The history reveals that the problem of casteism has vitiated the social fabric of India. It encouraged divisive tendencies and sectional approaches and led to horizontal division of society. Thus, instead of promoting harmony in society, which Deendayal wanted, the conception of Chaturvarna, which is endorsed by Deendayal is most likely to promote inter caste conflict and disharmony in the society.

Deendayal does not limit his discourse to the question of the relation between man and society. He also deals with the relation of man with entire humanity and universe. Deendayal is of the view that all the diverse things of nature are the flowering of the single mystically perceived entity. The entire universe is pivoted in Godhead. According to him the apparent diversity of the nature is mere an expression and transformation of the underlying unity. He appears to be influenced by the Prinama-Vada theory of the Sankhya school of Indian philosophy, which holds that the things of the world are not be looked upon as new creation but only the transformation within the primordial substance. Deendayal’s philosophical postulation of ‘unity in diversity’ reflects monism, which is influenced by the Advaita Vedanta. It may be noted that waves of monism can be traced in the Western thought. Miliesion School of Pre-Socratic period holds that single substance is the cause of the world formulation. Further, Deendayal’s notion of ‘yat pinde tad brahmade’ (what is in microcosm is also in
macrocosm) resembles the Milesian cosmology, which holds the same relation to the life of the world as to that of man. It is an early instance of the argument from the microcosm to the macrocosm. Plato, Plotinus, Spinoza, Bradley and Bergson also reflect the conception of monism in their own way.

It is however, pertinent to refer that though Deendayal believes in Advaita Vedanta but he rejects Sankara's notion of Mayavada and Karam-sanyasa. To Deendayal both the spirit and the world are real, and are like the two sides of the same coin. He does not believe in world negating attitude. He believes in Karam-marga and expounds the path of Niskama-karma and Karam-yoga as envisaged in the Bhagawad Geeta. In this context, he resembles modern Indian thinkers such as Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Tagore, Tilak, etc.

The notion of nation occupies an important position in Deendayal's philosophy of Integral Humanism. Deendayal Upadhyaya considers nation as the motherland. It is pertinent to point out here that the idea of motherland or Janma-bhumi is cultural specific in India. The country is conceived as the mother. This notion represents a 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 and reflects the Hindu ideal of patriotism. Bankim Chandera's vision of the mother in a song - Bande Mataram, which means hail to the mother, first published in his Ananda Matha or Abode of Bliss in 1882 shows that nationalism is the very spirit of the concept of motherland.

Deendayal is of the view that nation becomes strong, stable, acquires vitality and grows energetically only if the principles which constitute Chiti (unified
consciousness) of nation are followed and upheld. He believes that Chiti is the soul of the nation, which provides power and energy called Virat to the nation.

Deendayal deplores that unfortunately today national life is straying away from our fundamental principles. People are obsessively involved in material rat race. Many problems such as regionalism, casteism, linguism, etc. have been vitiating the society. Further, he believes that myriad diversities also characterize the life of our nation. He emphasizes the need of awakening Virat of the nation by acting in accordance with the Chiti or ethos of the nation. He wants to establish harmony among the myriad diversities, however, qualifies that harmony could be established only among the people with certain similarities. He asserts that languages, modes of worship, life styles and food habits of the people may be different but harmony can be established among these diversities if the people foster full faith in the motherland and their heart complex is imbued with similar ideals and life values. Further, he also emphasizes the importance of spiritual outlook to establish harmony among the diversities.

According to Deendayal, identity of India resides in her past heritage and culture. He seeks to strengthen them. It embodies an attitude of rejection of blind craze for the 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 and the Ramakrishna mission in the social and religious spheres and men like Balgangadhar Tilak, Lalalaj Pat Rai, Bipin Chander Pal and Sri Aurobindo in Politics. Deendayal Upadhyaya wanted to rejuvenate and vitalize the age-old Indian culture through B.J.S.
Deendayal Upadhyaya is known as an exponent of Indian culture (Bharatiya Sanskriti). This notion according to him is not static but dynamic. He asserts not to neglect and disown the past heritage. However, emphasizes on rejection of that which is redundant and obsolete. He insists to become forward looking and stresses the windows to be opened to allow the fresh air to come in. Deendayal is not against the adoption of new ideas, however, advises to accept only those things, which suit Indian ethos or conscience and conditions. In this context the ideas of Deendayal Upadhyaya may be considered quite relevant.

Though Deendayal is not against the acceptance of Western ideas, however, he does not consider them the highest pinnacle of wisdom. He is a protagonist of Indian culture and believes that because of its peculiarity of wisdom India has to play a vital role in the world for illuminating other societies. Vivekananda also proclaims that India has a great ideal of liberating the world with her spirituality. Likewise, Schlerenmacher in Germany, Michelity in France, Mickiewicz in Poland, Mazzini in Italy and Dostoevsky in Russia also attribute a mission of liberation of mankind to their respective nations.

The idea of one nation liberating another through the excellence of its culture is widely shared. In India, Swami Vivekananda began the work of dissemination of Indian ideals in the end 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 an exchange 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. History has witnessed the European nationalism, which had a tacit motive of expansionism and imperialism through armies under the slogan of 'Whiteman's Burden'. Modern Indian thinkers and freedom fighters opposed this nationalism. C.R.Das termed the European nationalism as the aggressive, selfish and commercial. Deendayal Upadhyaya was also opposed to European nationalism. He emphasized on imparting the knowledge of Indian wisdom to the entire humanity. However, according to him this responsibility need not to be confused with the attitude of the European colonial powers.

Deendayal is not only a nationalist but also an internationalist. Mutual cooperation is the fundamental tenet of his philosophy. He wants to attain world peace on the basis of mutual cooperation and harmonious relations of life. His perception does not conceive national solidarity in contradiction to internationalism, instead, brings harmony between the two. Deendayal's nationalism is neither exploitative nor antagonistic to the service of humanity. T.H.Green and Bosanquet also hold that national solidarity, which stands for national cause, is not antagonistic to the service of 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 is 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 emotional and sentimental relation 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, which is represented by Hinduism. Although, he acknowledges that many races have come to India with the passage of time, however he maintains that their culture got mingled with ancient Indian traditions and thus the original character of Indian culture remained unchanged. Deendayal propounds a theory of one culture and one nation. This theory is not widely accepted in India. It is criticised by those who believe that India is a country of multiple nationalities where people of diverse cultures, faiths, beliefs and ideals reside. In their opinion, Deendayal's notion of one culture and one nation is sectarian, which forces other communities to adapt themselves according to the Hindu mainstream and principles. Now the question arises, whether Deendayal is against the people other than Hindus? Deendayal advocated his earnest concern for the entire populace of India. He pledged to work for all the communities of India. Like Gandhi, he also considers every countryman as his blood and flesh. He believes that all are the proud sons of Bharatmata. However, 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 is of the opinion that nation establishes various institutions to fulfil its economic, social and cultural needs. State according to him is one of the institutions, an important one, but not above all others. In this context, he resembles pluralists, who hold that state
is one of the institutions of society. Deendayal regards the state as a temporary institution, however, believes that its importance is indisputable. 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. Thus, the raison d’être of state according to Upadhyaya lies in the service of nation. If the state does not discharge its responsibilities, its forms and arrangements will be changed.

Deendayal was against the foreign domination and alien rule. He rejects foreign rule ipso facto even if it is a benevolent one. He emphatically pleads for self-rule, which according to him is not just independence of the country but it has wider and comprehensive meaning. He believes that Swarajya is meaningful only if it becomes an instrument for the expression of one’s culture. Thus, he emphasizes more on cultural freedom of the nation.

Deendayal deplores that the self-rule of post-independence India has failed to provide freedom in the true sense of terms. Because the independent India has become a victim of mental slavery and is devoid of a feeling of self-reliance as it clings blindly to foreign ideas and concepts. He like Gandhi is against the thoughtless imitation of Western ideas. Deendayal wants freedom from the slavery of foreign ideas. He asserts that the original culture of the country 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 the added advantage.

Deendayal is influenced by the concept of democracy. He, however, wants an Indian style of democracy. He prefers Dharam-rajya instead of Jana-rajya because truth according to him resides
only in *Dharma*. He asserts that if majority opts for something, which is against *Dharma* and one man ‘stands for something, which is according to *Dharma*, then truth is embodied only in one man. It is pertinent to note here that J.S. Mill believes that one person with a belief is a social power equal to ninety-nine who have only interest. Roussean also emphasizes that ‘General Will’ is embodied not necessarily in majority but even in one man – a legislator who will show people what is good for them.

Upadhyaya asserts that sovereignty resides only in *Dharma*. In this context, he differs both from pluralists and monists. The former maintains that sovereignty resides in all the institutions of society whereas the latter asserts that sovereignty resides with state only. Deendayal is of the opinion that the executive, the legislature and judiciary cannot act against *Dharma*. He goes on to say that even God cannot act contrary to it. It is, however, important to note that Deendayal’s notion of *Dharma-rajya* is not theocratic because such a state allows all to follow and propagate their religious faiths without any discrimination.

In his scheme of *Dharam-rajya*, Deendayal Upadhayaya is against the federal state. He feels that a blow has been struck at the basis of India’s unity by considering the country as a federation of different states. He asserts that the constitution should be unitary instead of federal. However, he opines that unitary state means neither highly autocratic centre nor it entails the elimination of the provinces. He is for the devolution of suitable powers below down to the level of panchayats.

It is important to note that the unitary state of Deendayal Upadhayaya favours the devolution of powers to the lowest level, however, he proposes devolution of suitable
power. But, what is this suitable power and how to grant this suitable authority to the lower units are not clearly and categorically expressed by Deendayal. 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 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 the family there is intensive cohesiveness and understanding among the members. It is very difficult to seek 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, 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 democracy, there are different political parties having specific principles and programmes. These differ mostly on various issues and are unanimous only on 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 the centre and state 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 out power the government of the 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. It is important to highlight that being an activist of a political party he himself agrees that an overwhelming centre can misuse power for vested interests. It is worthwhile to mention that he advocates a unitary state for the unity of the nation one hand and on the other criticizes such a state for the misuse of power. This develops contradiction in his ideas.

Deendayal’s notion of ‘Dharm-rajya’ differs from both Ram-rajya of Mahatma Gandhi and Organised Democracy of M.N.Roy. Gandhi aims at an enlightened anarchy whereas Deendayal believes in a strong state. Both, Deendayal and M.N.Roy advocate devolution of power. However Roy’s concept of devolution is comprehensive and wider than that of Upadhyaya. Deendayal propounds democracy on the basis of Dharma whereas M.N.Roy emphasizes on Radical or Organised Democracy based on widest diffusion of power to the People’s Committees. Further Deendayal is not against the role of political parties in democracy but Roy was skeptic and harshly opposed to the political parties. Therefore, he advocates party-less democracy.

While enunciating economic dimensions of his philosophy of Integral Humanism, Deendayal 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 opposes both the capitalist and communist systems and states that both these systems have failed to take account of the integral man, his true and complete personality and aspirations. The centralization of power, economic and political, is implied in both resulting in dehumanization of man. Some modern Indian thinkers such as Radhakrishnan, Aurobindo, Tagore, Gandhi, etc. also talk
about the weaknesses of both the capitalist and communist systems.

Man is the central concern in Deendayal’s economic thinking. He considers man as the highest creation of God, and aims at the progress and happiness of Integral man. At the very outset he reminds us of India’s age-old heritage of man’s conception, which holds that man is not merely a repository of material desires and deeds but also a spiritual entity. Thus, he wants to evolve a coordinated system, which ensures materialistic as well as non-materialistic values of life for the proper development of man. He stresses the need of integrated and harmonious fulfillment of Artha, Kama, Dharma and Moksha.

The economic system he asserts must provide the minimum basic necessities of human life. If a government provides the minimum requirements, then only it is a rule of Dharma. Otherwise, it is a rule of Adharma. Deendayal does not believe only in political democracy but also wants to establish economic democracy. He talks about work for everyone. The work according to him should not only give a means of livelihood to a person but it should be of the choice of that person. He favours minimum wages and just system of distribution with some sort of social security. It is pertinent to refer here that Harold J.Laski also believes that man has not only right to work but also the right to be paid an adequate wage, which implies that there must be a sufficiency for all before there is a superfluity for some.

It may be noted that Deendayal gives importance both to rights as well as duties. In this context, he resembles the modern Indian thinkers like Vivekananda, Gandhi, Radhakrishnan, etc. The Tattiriya Upanishad also teaches one to perform one’s duties towards the society. Deendayal is of
the view that he who earns will feed and every person will have enough to eat as it is a categorical imperative duty to take care of all including children, the old, the diseased and invalids. Deendayal emphasizes on equitable distribution according to the ideal—'from everyman according to his capacity and to everyman according to his needs.' He believes in the Principle of Trusteeship, which has its basis in the functioning of family, where all have the right to earn but wealth belongs to family only. The head of the family indistinctively knows the needs of every member and distributes the things accordingly. It may, however, be pointed out that the application of this principle of Trusteeship seems to be more idealistic and less pragmatic in the society because the functioning of family and society are altogether different. It is difficult to conceive harmony and cohesiveness among the member of society like that of members of family. M.K.Gandhi has developed the idea of Trusteeship, which exalts the virtue of self-abnegation and motivates the rich to voluntarily give up their claims to the surplus wealth for the benefit and upliftment of the poor. Vinoba’s notions of Bhoodan (land-gift) or Sampattidan (gift of wealth) is also based on such ideas.

For the economic development of the nation, Deendayal is against the foreign aid. He is of the opinion that economically dependent country loses its self-pride and identity. In this respect his ideas are quite relevant. He, however, is not against the acceptance of foreign aid in minimum quantity in dire necessity.

Deendayal emphasizes on Swadeshi and decentralization for the development of India. According to him, man can be established at the rightful position only through a decentralized economy. In his scheme of decentralized
Deendayal makes individual along with his family as the basic unit of production activities. He is different from Gandhians and Marxists, who give importance to panchayat and cooperatives respectively.

Deendayal emphasizes the development of both agriculture and industry. The Physiocrats — a group of French political economists in the second half of the eighteenth century also lay emphasis on the development of agriculture. Deendayal believes that primarily India is an agricultural society. He asserts in achieving self-sufficiency in agricultural produce. According to him, agricultural development also helps to achieve the industrial development. He knits the development of agriculture and industry in a symbiotic relationship. Such a perception is important and relevant in a country like India.

Deendayal broadly classifies industries in two heads: small scale and large scale. He gives an adequate importance to the small-scale industries instead of large scale. He is for the industrialization of villages and opposes urbanization. Regarding ownership of industries, Deendayal is neither for all nationalization nor for no nationalization. He is of the view that ownership of industries be decided on the practical and pragmatic basis. Deendayal builds a relationship of complementarity between small-scale and large-scale industries. He tries to do away the negative competition and conflict among industries, and establishes harmony among these, which is necessary for the overall and proper industrialization of India.

For the establishment and proper development of the industry, Deendayal emphasizes the consideration of seven 'M's, which are man, material, money, management, motive
power, market and machine. He is very particular about the mechanization. Like Gandhi, he rejects blind craze for the imitation of Western technology. However, he is in favour of replacing Charkha by machines. In respect of mechanization he insists to take into account the particular conditions and requirements of the country. Deendayal is neither for blind mechanization nor far no mechanization. He opposes the installation of automatic machine everywhere. He asserts that full employment must be a necessary condition while going for mechanization. He favours labour intensive industries in India. Deendayal emphasizes to develop a Bharatiya or indigenous technology according to the available resources and conditions of India. He develops an integrated indigenous model of development, which is very important for the development of Indian society because of its peculiar conditions.

Machines help to raise production. Deendayal is against the production, which is based on the calculations of profit and loss. Harold Laski and Gandhi are also opposed to such a production process. Deendayal like Gandhi favours need based instead of greed based production. Deendayal insists on restraints in consumption. He opposes excessive, blatant and ruthless exploitation of natural resources, and advises to consume these with restraints so as to maintain the equilibrium of the nature. He sternly asserts to milk rather to exploit the nature. Deendayal does not consider man apart from the nature. He, like the Advaitic Vedantists visualizes the entire cosmos as a unified system of which man is an integral part.

On the whole, it is observed that Deendayal’s ideas revolve around man and aim at his development. As discussed, Deendayal seeks to achieve not only the material development
of man but also craves for his spiritual advancement. Further, his humanism has cosmopolitan ramification because it seeks to attain the welfare and happiness of all humanity. In the above context Deendayal resembles the spiritual humanists of India such as Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Tagore, Gandhi, Radhakrishnan, etc. He differs from J.L.Nehru and M.N.Roy. Though Nehru also admits the influence of spiritual values in life but his scientific humanism is not based upon the age-old Indian traditions like that of Deendayal. M.N.Roy’s humanism is also termed as Integral Humanism, however it completely rejects spiritualism. His integralism is different from that of Deendayal Upadhyaya. The cause of this apparent world is the spirit to latter where as for the former it is the biological process. Both believe that the various creations of the nature are integrally attached to an underlying unity, however, the basis of this ontology is spiritual for Deendayal whereas for M.N.Roy it lies in physical evolution.

The ideas of Deendayal Upadhyaya are largely rooted in Indian culture. One may point out some shortcomings and inconsistencies in his views but he deserves the credit of enriching Indian thought through his philosophy of Integral Humanism, which aims at an overall development - social, political, economic and spiritual of man. Moreover, his philosophy of Integral Humanism is also important as it seeks to harmonise the interests of an individual, the society and the entire universe. Therefore, his ideas are of great significance for man and the mankind as a whole.

Indian spiritual humanism including that of Deendayal Upadhyaya aims at the establishment of a well-knit harmonious order of development for man and mankind. However, such an order could not be achieved. Indian society
witnesses more conflicts than harmony. Conflicts on the basis of caste, religion, language, region, etc. have been tearing apart the social fabric of India. Therefore, there is a need to become a true humanist and follow humanism in letter and spirit. Otherwise, humanism will remain merely an academic exercise without any practical utility.
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