Chapter II

Genesis and Development of Humanism

Deendayal was not only a political activist but also a thinker who pondered over various issues and aspects of social, political and economical importance. He formulated the philosophy of “Integral Humanism”. This work seeks to examine its various dimensions. However, before analyzing Deendayal’s ideas on humanism, it would be imperative to have an insight into the concept of humanism in its various manifestations as expressed in the Western and the Indian thought.

Humanism is a subject to varied definitions and interpretations. Broadly speaking, humanism is a man-centred philosophy.\(^1\) According to H.J. Blackham, “Humanism proceeds from an assumption that man is on his own and this life is all, and an assumption of responsibility for one’s own life and for the life of mankind - an appraisal and an undertaking, two personal decisions. Less than this is never humanism.”\(^2\) For N.K. Devaraja, “Humanism is an attitude towards and an approach to man’s life and values regarded as phenomena confined to the earth. As such it is characterized by interest in man, concern for man, and faith in man’s reason and conscience for discriminating perception of truth and goodness.”\(^3\)

Man is distinguished from other beings because of his rational capacity. Highlighting it, Pradhan writes, “that human beings are radically different from the non-human Nature, that human beings are self-conscious and self-governed beings making a community of human individuals according to the rational principles.”\(^4\) Thus, humanists have
ultimate faith in man. He is considered as the master of his own destiny and believed to possess the capacity to solve his problems at his own. Therefore, according to the humanists the centre of belief, thought and system is man, any deviation from this standpoint is not acceptable to them.

Philosophically, humanism is opposed both to supernaturalism and naturalism. While affirming this, Edward P. Cheyney writes, "That which is characteristically human, not supernatural, that which belongs to man and not to external nature, that which raises man to his greatest height or gives him, as man, his greatest satisfaction, is apt to be called humanism." Aditya Kumar Mohanty observes, "Humanism as an articulated system of thought is of contemporary interest and is motivated by the revolt against the supposed religious authoritarianism on the one hand and Scientism on the other. It is nothing but a conscious self-assertion of man against the onslaughts of Materialism and religious autocracy."

From the above, it is clear that on the one hand, humanism is strongly abhorrent to the religious authoritarianism and rule of supernatural, which is usually thought of in the form of heavenly Gods and immortal entities. On the other, humanism is ardently opposed to naturalism. This notion took a distinctive if not a dominant position in the seventeenth century as a result of the suggestions of Bacon and the discoveries of Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo. Precisely, naturalism is an outcome of the scientific spirit and enthusiasm of science. According to Cheyney, "naturalism has grown up as an intellectual conception ... asserting the desirability of making science the predominant element in education, urging the continuous
study of nature." Interestingly, spiritual speculation and transcendence have no place in naturalism. It delves keenly and deeply only in the external material world of nature. Emphasizing this point, W.D. Niven writes that naturalism "includes all types of theory which rule or try to rule out of consideration whatever is called 'supernatural' or 'spiritual' or transcendent of experience. It attempts to transcend materialism." 

Supernaturalism and naturalism oscillate from one extreme to the another. The former delves keenly in transcendental and metaphysical speculations and the latter is deeply engaged in scientific calculations based upon self-explanatory laws and phenomena of nature. Both supernaturalism and naturalism are incompatible to humanism because in both the cases man is not considered as 'the measure of things', which leads to displacement of man as the centre of all things. Man's importance, dignity and individuality thus get undermined and eroded. David Ehrenfeld observes, "Humanism asserts human dignity and the freedom of the human spirit." J.W. Gebhard also states that "in its most general application humanism may mean any philosophical or ethical system centered on the concepts of the dignity and freedom of man." Therefore, "Against the backdrop of scientific determinism and divine-ordination the humanists' claim of autonomy or freedom becomes more significant." According to Schiller, "on its critical side humanism was essentially a protest against the dehumanizing and depersonalizing procedure which seemed to characterize both the natural sciences and absolutist metaphysics." Hence, Garhringer is of the opinion that a man becomes a humanist when he comes to see that bases of all moral
thought is neither nature nor supernature, but the specifically human.\textsuperscript{14}

Historically, the glimpses of this man-centered philosophy are visible in the Greek period. Protagoras (500-430BC), a pre-Socrate philosopher and an earliest Sophist, enunciated the famous doctrine, 'man is the measure of all things.' It represents the quintessence of humanism in an apothegm.

However, it can be argued that humanism could not become a focus of academic interest during the Medieval period. It got subordinated in the Middle-Ages to the doctrine, the discipline, the philosophy of the church, and to the scholasticism\textsuperscript{15}, which dominated the academia in universities. During this period, knowledge came under the influence of superstitions and theological dogmas. Theology was the main principle and approach to life. During those days, the holy church had a divinely ordained unquestioned authority. It claimed a divine right to enforce the holy laws on all men without any regard to the secular power. According to H.M. Gwatkin, "The jurisdiction of the Church covered not only ordinary spiritual matters but the special cases of heresy and witchcraft, and things of a more secular nature like usury and marriage, and some purely secular things like wills ... The Church also constantly interfered in the matters of high policy, forbidding wars, reconciling wars, and not uncommonly stirring them up. If a king was disobedient, he must be rebuked, or in graver cases interdicted or excommunicated, and even deposed and his kingdom given to another."\textsuperscript{16} It is pertinent to point out here that the period of Middle-Ages marked a complete deterioration, degradation and degeneration in the values of life. Injustice, wickedness, hardship, sufferings and moral
depravity were widely prevalent in the society during those
days. It is substantiated by Louis Gettschalk, who has
remarked, "The hardships of medieval life ... made life seem
much less valuable to people than it does now. It was a
rather course and brutal age ... Punishment were severe with
maiming, breaking on the reel and hanging relatively common
for offences that today would be punished only with
imprisonment, if at all ... Drunkenness and gluttony were open
to those who could afford them and a much sought for escape
among those who could not. Thievery ranged ... and
embezzlement and corruption at all levels of government."17

Though humanism had got eclipsed during the Middle-
Ages, it had a rebirth in the Renaissance period.18 The
edifice built on superstitious and dogmatic beliefs of
Christian thought could not sustain itself for long. In the
meanwhile, tremors appeared in Scholasticism spontaneously,
which not only reduced its influence considerably but also
paved the way for the development of humanism. It may be
noted in this context that the Greek classics formed the
springboard of inspiration with guiding spirits for the
emergence of modern humanism. F.C.S. Schiller has aptly
observed, "modern humanism is so largely and avowedly a
conscious revival of the critical relativism of Protagoras
and appeals so explicitly to his maxim that 'man is the
measure of all things' that it may without injustice be
described as Neo-Protagoreanism."19

It also needs to be kept in view that Renaissance
humanism developed in Italy during the fourteenth century
and persisted through Reformation well into the age of the
Enlightenment. It is traceable to the fourteenth century
Italian poet Francesco Petrarch (1304-1374)— the "father of
humanism"20 asserted that "man and his problems should be the
main object and concern of thought and philosophy.\textsuperscript{21} Petrarch’s scholarship and enthusiasm for classical Latin writings, “the humanities” gave great impetus to a movement that eventually spread from Italy to all of western Europe.\textsuperscript{22}

It is essential to point out that education was the core element of humanism. Its academic vision was uninterested in theology, unregardful of the authoritarian church and strongly critical of scholasticism. Humanism, in fact, “furnished two of the principal roots of the Reformation- criticism of the mediaeval church and the free study of the Scriptures. But in the main it has been antagonistic to positive and authoritative religious belief.”\textsuperscript{23} As a result of the reformation a “new and more energetic way of life was introduced, which even when not explicitly antipathetic to the church was on the whole indifferent to ecclesiastical problems. Flourishing schools grew up in the towns and in the higher spheres of thought and creative art the humanist scholars and the painters of the Renaissance were evolving a culture which by recapturing the spirit of pagan antiquity sought to restore man to a more central place in the universe.”\textsuperscript{24}

The consistent and continued development of Renaissance humanism led to Enlightenment\textsuperscript{25} and ultimately attained climax in the form of a movement. According to Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, “A movement which represented an extensive change – almost in the nature of a mutation – in art, literature and thought took place in western Europe at the close of Middle Ages and in early modern times ... It embodied the transition from mediaeval to modern times. On its literary and intellectual side this movement has been called humanism.”\textsuperscript{26}
It can be argued that modern humanism is an outcome of a long battle against religious authoritarianism and autocracy. While conforming this, A.S.Rama Raju writes, "The subject matter of Humanism is a long story of rebellian with man as the hero. The rebellion, against scholasticism, religious fanaticism, narrow nationalism and alienation speaks of the essence and scope of Humanism."^27

Though, this humanism developed during the renaissance period (i.e. from 14th to 16th century) and its scope widened in the eighteenth century, however, the word humanism came into general use only in the nineteenth century.^28

As discussed earlier, central to humanism is the faith that man is absolute, capable of thinking for himself and is the better judge of his interests than anyone else, and pursues what he wants with more energy and vigour than anyone else will pursue for him. Man is considered not only the measure of all things but also the creator of values, ideas, systems and institutions. Dakin observes, "Man is not only the measure, but to an indefinable extent the master and the creator of reality."^29 Because of this creative ability, man erects and evolves the necessary systems and ideas for his convenience and benefit, and for humanity as well.

Since humanists emphasize on the autonomy of man, therefore, man according to them must create and evolve a system, which ensures his independence. This viewpoint led to the emergence of individualism and classical liberalism. It allowed man to work freely with minimum restraints because state was considered as a necessary evil and the authority of state got restricted mainly to maintain law and order in the society. Laissez - faire^30 became the fundamental principle of society. The "main spokesmen of
classical economics assumed, or at least hoped, that human happiness would best be attained by the application of the principle of laissez-faire."^{31}

This principle of laissez-faire paved the way for free competition, unbridled individualism and rise of capitalism. It steered a blatant and unfettered competition with a tendency of unconscious profit making urges in the society. As a result, such a system facilitated the progress and development of only a few people. The conditions for the majority of people became unjust and pathetic. It led to human conflicts, selfishness, utter negligence of unpreviledged, reign of the fittest, and development of a few at the altar of the interests of dejected and suppressed majority. Human values got eroded and society became decadent. Such a system could not ensure the welfare and happiness of all the people of society, and thus, turned antagonistic to the spirit of humanism. It is worth mentioning that humanism strives for equalization of opportunities and aims at the welfare and happiness of all. Corliss Lamont aptly observes, "Humanism ... is a philosophy of joyous service for the greater good of all humanity in this natural world and ... is a way of thinking and doing for average men and women seeking to lead happy and useful lives."^{32} He further states, "Humanism believes in an ethics or morality that grounds all human values in this-earthly experiences and relationships; and that holds as its highest goal the this-worldly happiness, freedom and progress-economic, cultural and ethical - of all mankind, irrespective of nation, race or religion."^{33}

The classical liberal thought and individualism failed to attain the desired objective of over all human happiness and welfare of all. Therefore, there emerged an urgent need
to modify, amend, and rectify the classical liberalism in order to make the notion concordant with and suitable for the aspirations of average men and women. The modified notion of liberalism, which came to be known as modern liberalism, marked its advent in the nineteenth century. It negated and rejected the principle of lessaiz-faire, advocated active involvement of state and favoured reasonable restrictions on man to attain the objective of welfare and happiness of all. A new idea of Welfare state was propagated. Such a state works with humanitarian approach and aims at providing minimum standard of living and full employment as the top priorities. Further, in the field of social security, it aims at providing protection against sickness and old age. It is observed that Welfare state has helped in coping up with the needs and requirements of man and society to some extent. But the problems such as poverty, unemployment, social security, economic inequalities, etc. still persist and continue to haunt all societies. Such problems are antithetical to the essence of humanism. Marxists criticize Western liberal philosophy and argue that human happiness and humanism cannot be possible in the Western liberal societies. Karl Marx is regarded as the pioneer of such ideas. A.S. Rama Raju observes that Karl Marx – the pioneer of socialist humanism emphasizes that man is the root of all mankind. According to this view of Marx, man is the creator of things. He has created, destroyed, and is creating the systems. However, the systems developed by man, according to the Marxists depend upon the social existence of man and mankind. Karl Marx states, "It is not consciousness that determines life, but life that determines consciousness ... Consciousness is therefore from the start a product of society, and it remains such as long as men exist at all."
In other words social existence in the form of economic forces and factors, modes of production and tools of production determine the type of society and its structure in various ramifications such as social, political, economic and cultural.

According to Marx, the existing history has witnessed two hostile classes: haves and have-nots in every social set up. He says, “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.” The struggle is between oppressors and oppressed, exploiters and exploited. The exploitation of the oppressed becomes more and more deterrent and unfettered with the changing modes of production, and reaches its climax in the capitalist society. Karl Marx and other Marxists are opposed to the exploitation of the have-nots and talk about the liberation of the oppressed from the clutches of the exploiters. This reveals the essence of humanism in their ideas. Gaustav A. Wetter, while writing on Marxian ideas observes that “the true humanism of Marxist-Leninism finds its expression in love for oppressed humanity.”

Marx suggests violent overthrow of the capitalist system. He calls upon the workers of the world to get united as they have nothing to lose except their chains. It shows his firm concern to demolish the capitalist order. His aim is the establishment of a communist society. However, there will be a transitional state of dictatorship of proletariat which will wipe out the vestiges of the bourgeoisie order and pave the way for the communist society - a classless and stateless society based on the principle of egalitarianism. Welter observes, “the relentless prosecution of the class-struggle for the classless society is the indispensable
condition for the victory of proletarian humanism throughout the entire world." 38

Though the Marxian ideas advocate the interests of the poor, dejected and exploited ones, but it has also inherent shortcomings. Firstly, Marxists erect and build the edifice of their ideas on the basis of economic forces and factors. Marxism considers only the economic aspect of man's life and ignores other aspects such as social, political, cultural, etc. Secondly, the dictatorship of proletariat establishes complete state control and denies autonomy and freedom to the man. The means and tools of production lay in the hands of state. Every thing belongs to state. Such an environment inhibits personal initiative of man, which leads to disrespect and indignity to the human beings. Therefore, in view of the above two reasons man is not able to develop his personality and achieve his maximum fulfillment in communist system. Thirdly, communist ideology got overwhelming response during twentieth century. The communist revolution of 1917 established the proletarian dictatorship in Russia. Its influence was also visible in other parts of the world. Ironically, the influence descended and got eroded in the same century. U.S.S.R. collapsed and got disintegrated. M.N. Roy argued, "Is it an irony of history or an irony of fate? Whatever it may be, it is due to the fact that the era of proletarian revolution, heralded a century ago with so much fanfare and prophetic confidence, never came. Nearly three quarters of a century lapsed before the confidently expected revolution took place in one country, more or less on the prescribed pattern. But it did not spread, to become the world revolution; and the post-revolutionary developments in Russia were not reassuring; they did not move towards the utopia depicted in the Communist
Manifesto. Ascertaining the reason of downfall one may argue that the system could not work well to fulfill the aspirations of man and mankind.

Today's world is a world of information and technology. It is the creation of man and is the result of his scientific temper. The world is reduced to a global village. In the present world scenario the concept of globalization is gaining attention and is becoming the area of interest. It seems appropriate to discuss and analyze globalization in the context of humanism.

Information and technology has made the interaction and access easier and swifter among the people belonging to different societies and cultures. Such a development has helped human beings in various ways and fields such as education, science, commerce, business, industry, etc. Further, it provided opportunities to the people of all countries to invest in any part of the globe and forge alliances with appropriate companies. But the underdeveloped and developing societies are capital or fund-starved and are therefore, unable to go forward. The developed or affluent societies are getting best opportunities to expand their business, markets and industries throughout the world.

It may be noted that the developed societies constitute a small chunk of the world population but are using the maximum resources of the world. Economic disparities between developed and other nations are very high. "Global inequalities in income increased in the 20th century by orders of magnitude out of proportion to anything experienced before. The distance between the incomes of the richest and poorest country was about 3 to 1 in 1820, 35 to 1 in 1950, 44 to 1 in 1973 and 72 to 1 in 1992."
Globalization again increases the chances of exploitation of unprivileged nation by the affluent ones. Further, the economic inequalities between these countries may increase to an alarming extent and the problems such as poverty, unemployment, social insecurity may become inexorable in the poor countries. M.V Naidu writes, "Globalization of trade, investments and banking can only mean further dictation and domination of the developed countries and further indebtedness and impoverishment of the underdeveloped or developing countries." Therefore, it is useless to talk about humanism in a condition where a large part of humanity is forced to live under innumerable hardships and sufferings.

It can be argued that man's welfare, development and fulfillment remained central to the Western humanists. However, the modes, means and ways to achieve human fulfillment kept on changing with new developments and circumstances. Initially humanists emphatically propagated for the complete autonomy and freedom to man but this way man could not obtain the desired results. Thereafter, a modified version and way to arrive at humanism was advocated. The idea of welfare state and reasonable restrictions on man became the concern of humanists. The Marxists adopted quite different way to achieve the objective of humanism. The ways may be different but the objective of the humanists throughout was the welfare of man and mankind. There remains much to be done in this direction for the overall development of man and humanity. No doubt the development of the humanism in the West has gone a long way in liberating man from the clutches of religious orthodoxy and autocratic state. But the fact remains that the Western civilization has often put humanity under
distress. The world has witnessed two world wars. The affluent Western countries initiated the armament race and today also, these countries are preserving deterrent weapons. Humanity is under constant threat and pressure. Not only this but these countries have also initiated an international economic order, which caters only to their interests. The interests of developing and the underdeveloped countries are crucified and being exploited badly by the developed ones. This is contrary to the humanistic spirit.

The Western humanists believed in man’s rationality, ability, and his capacity to solve problems and create things. Man was considered as the master of his destiny. This motivated man to create and discover various things for pleasure and satisfaction. With the advent of science, various discoveries and inventions brought pleasure to the man. In this connection man’s urge and desire to enjoy more and more kept on increasing and multiplied limitlessly. Science, scientific discoveries and inventions are welcome developments but it has negative effect also.

Today, we can experience many horrendous problems because of excessive consumerism and man’s mad hankering after wants. The problems such as pollution, ecological imbalances, depletion of ozone layer, increasing temperature of the earth, deforestation, decreasing flora and fauna, etc. are of main concern today, not only for scientists but for humanists as well. Humanists concern is vital and imminent because Homo-sapiens or human beings are themselves in grave danger because of the above problems. In such a situation the question of human survival becomes primary than the human welfare and dignity. Therefore, Western humanism faces a grave challenge even today.
There is a need to examine the Western humanistic thinking to do away with its lopsidedness and shortcomings. The Western humanists have seen man’s development in a segregated and isolated way, and lacked the vision of integral and interconnected concept of development. Man belongs to nature and nature belongs to man, therefore, both should be viewed in tandem with each other. Man carries within himself not only his individuality but also all the humanity with all its potentialities. Western conception on the contrary puts man and nature at the opposite sides. Therefore, man sets himself for the inadvertent and blatant exploitation of nature for his enrichment only. Such a viewpoint needs to be corrected. Radha Kamal Mukherjee argues, “The enrichment, deepening and renovation of Western civilization depend upon a new valid metaphysics as the basis of a new integral, transcendent or cosmic humanism... Western ethics and philosophy of activism urgently need to be corrected today by cosmic humanism grounded in ontological and ethical mysticism.”

Mukerjee’s argument is that Western humanistic thinking requires a spiritual cosmic vision. Such a vision discovers an intrinsic unity among all beings and brings man, society, humanity and nature nearer and together in all its potentialities. Aditya Kumar Mohanty writes, “Metaphysically, humanism is grounded on the vision of underlying unity and sociologically, it encourages the ethics of holistic living or world fraternity.” The cosmic concern for humanity is grounded in mystic vision of things. Such a vision inculcates virtues such as universal love, compassion and sacrifice in the individual. It widens the mental horizon of man. Such an individual works for the welfare of all but not only for self-aggrandizement. It
inculcates a sense of belongingness for all. At practical level with the breaking of narrow domestic walls, the activities and experiences of individual become concordant and compatible with society and humanity. The man works not only for his self-interests but also for the welfare of his fellow brethren with a conscious holistic approach of development.

In the foregoing pages there is a discussion on Western humanism. Now, the researcher settles to study the humanistic utterances of Indian thought. At the very outset it may be pointed out that the history of Indian philosophy dates back to the Vedic times. The early Vedic texts mainly imagined pantheons of Gods and Goddesses endowed with different capacities that rule over the physical nature and lives of man on earth. N.K. Devaraja writes, "the centre of the world-stage as conceived by the Vedic Aryans is occupied by over a score of gods and goddesses who rule over the course of physical nature on one side and that of men’s lives on earth on the other side." According to him, Varuna was looked upon as the guardian of moral law. The Hindus Encyclopaedia of Hinduism mentions the bonds and nooses in many places with which Varuna seizes and punishes the transgressors of his laws.

It is pertinent to note that the transcendent Gods were not antithetical to man, instead were beneficent. A.S.Geden writes, "noticeable feature of the Vedic gods is their predominantly beneficient character ... The great gods themselves are either neutral and indifferent, or interfere actively for the suppression of wrong and the punishment of the sinner. Ethically regarded, their power was conceived as making for righteousness; and, though subject to gusts of passion, and open to external inducement and cajolery like
men, the god stood on the whole for justice and right as against deceit, fraud, and wrong."\(^{47}\) It may be referred here that while writing on the notion of God, Radhakrishnan observes, "There is cordial harmony between God and man in Indian thought, while the opposition between the two is more marked in the West...Western culture is an opposition between man and God, where man resists the might of God."\(^{48}\)

In India, the philosophical base is predominantly Upanishadic-Vedantic. Indian thought and scholarship manifested in its new form with the emergence of the Upanishadic philosophy. The Upanishads attach much importance to the eternal entities, Brahman and Atman. P. Deussen writes, "There are two words, brahman and atman, which are oftenly used in the Upanisads to signify the inner essence of the individual as well as of the whole world."\(^{49}\) He adds, "Brahman means the eternal principle as realized in the whole world, and atman the same principle as realized in ourselves."\(^{50}\) According to him, Brahman and atman are identical and is expressed in the following words: tat tvam asi (that art thou), (Chhand. Up. VI, 8.7.), and aham brahman asmi (I am Brahman), (Brih. Up. i.4.10.).\(^{51}\) Radhakrishnan writes, "In the Satapatha Brahmana and the Chandogya Upanisad it is said: 'Verily this whole world is Brahman', and also 'This soul of mine within the heart, this is Brahman'. 'That person who is seen in the eye, He is atman, that is Brahman. God is both the wholly other, transcendent and utterly beyond the world and man, and yet he enters into man and lives in him and becomes the inmost content of his very existence.'\(^{52}\)

It is pertinent to note that God is not seen away and apart from man but is seen in man. Radhakrishnan writes, "Narayana is the God in man who lives in constant
association with nara, the human being. He is the immortal dwelling in the mortals." This concept of nara-narayana not only humanises the God but also exalts the position of man. C.P.M. Namboodiry writes, "the exalted status given to man in Indian philosophy and culture - at times even putting him at par with God, as in the conception of the Divine as a 'man-God' unity (nara-narayana) - provides us with a clue to understanding how the continuity of Indian culture is constituted. It could not have been entirely fortuitous that, despite its very pronounced religious leanings, the Indian mind felt constrained to put man, if not on an equal pedestal with God, at least in a position of similar independence. On the contrary, it is a manifestation of a profound commitment to the human situation, and it is of a kind seldom met with elsewhere." Man is one of innumerable species in the cosmic horizon. Upanishadic thought considers Brahman as the cause of the apparent world. The Upanishadic metaphysics conceives intrinsic unity and integral congruence of the nature or the cosmos. The apparent world, which constitutes diversity is therefore, superficial because all the creations of nature are integrally intertwined and interconnected with one underlying unity - the Brahman. C.P.M. Namboodiry observes, "It is often said that Indian culture presents a picture of 'unity in diversity'. And it is also true that even a casual observer would not fail to notice an underlying integrity behind the apparent multiplicity of the Indian cultural spectrum." It emphasises not only internal integralism but also harmony among the diverse things of nature. Man, who is one of the creations does not consider him apart from other creations and lives in a harmonious manner. Radhakrishnan observes, "The human individual ... lives independently in his
own inexpressible infinity as well as in the cosmic harmonies." It is pertinent to mention here that "Humanism may be defined as an integrated system of human meanings, goals and values and harmonious programme of human fulfilment, individual and collective. It seeks to clarify and enrich man’s goals, values and ideals and achieve his full humanness through bringing him in ever deeper and more intimate kinship and harmony with the surrounding life, society and cosmos."

According to the Upanishadic metaphysics man is inextricably connected with the transcendent. However, it does not amount to cessation of his autonomy because atman or self is considered as eternal, immortal, imperishable and indestructible. Devaraja writes that according to Upanishads, "the souls owe neither their being nor their continued existence to God." It follows that the individual self has independent identity and existence. In this context it is observed, "Humanism, as understood in the West, suggests a philosophical outlook which guarantees full autonomy to man; but in most of its European versions it goes hand in hand with some form of atheism...The general tendency in Indian thought, however, is to preserve both human autonomy and the existence of God."

The law of Karma and the theory of transmigration put man in the centre-stage. It emphasizes that future of man depends on the Karma or actions performed by a particular man in his life. Poussin writes, "The Indian solution of the great riddle of the origin of suffering and the diversity of human conditions is to be found in the word Karma... Hindus believe the souls have been transmigrating from the beginning; they practically hold that the well being or the suffering of everybody is only the result of former acts
Padhi writes, "Karma doctrine returns reward and punishment to human action only... human suffering is not due to any extrasensory element. This is purely a human affair within the human situation." Man himself is the only architect of his future and destiny and none other even the God. N.K.Devaraja observes, "God cannot punish or penalise the soul without reference to its moral past. God, in fact acts more or less as a catalytic agent, that brings about the fruition of the good and evil doings of the soul itself." The law of Karma clearly establishes that man's fate depends on his own deeds and misdeeds. He himself is the master of his destiny. Thus, law of Karma reflects the humanistic outlook. D. D. Bandiste writes, "Humanists believe in enjoying life and making it better through our creative efforts. The attempt is to make life ever richer, better and happier. The insistence is that everyone, whether as an individual or as a member of a group, should try in a concrete way, to make this earth a better place to live. For them, liberation means liberation from the worldly evils to be obtained through human efforts."

The four-fold purusharthas or aspirations are the basic goals of an individual life in Indian thought. C.P.M. Namboodiry writes, "we remember that moksha (liberation) is only the last of the four cardinal values (purushartha) which Hinduism enjoins, the other three being dharma (social and moral devoir), artha (material desires) and kama (physical desires). A person is taken to be ready and qualified to strive after the final liberation not until he has satisfied to a large extent his human desires, and even then, only after he has fulfilled his obligations towards his fellow-beings." All the aspirations are considered basic and essential for the all round development of man.
The emphasis is on the integrated development of all the aspects of human personality. Namboodiry observes, "It is largely because of (the) integral outlook that every aspect of human life received attention and found expression in Indian culture." In other words the stress is on the simultaneous and integrated fulfillment of both the material or earthly desires, and spiritual or eternal quest for final release or deliverance from the woes of earthly life.

It may be pointed out that the prayers in the early Vedic hymns and aspirations of worshippers of Gods were concerned with the obtaining of earthly goods. The eternal quest for release from the woes of earthly life developed and gained importance in the Upanishadic philosophy. Raju observes, "the early Rigvedic Aryans did not bother much about life after death or about salvation (moksha) conceived as a state of existence beyond the reach of birth and death." A.S. Geden also writes, "It is in the Upanisads and the philosophical systems based upon them that the Hindu conception of Mukti is most fully worked out and expounded."

The earliest known celebrated commentator on Upanishads, Sankara (C700-C750), who advocated the philosophy of Advaita Vedanta has attached greatest importance to the conception of Mukti. According to Sankara, knowledge is the only path or means to attain liberation. He is of the view that knowledge firstly destroys ignorance or Avidya and then leads to salvation. He maintains that knowledge can destroy what is presented by ignorance and it can also eradicate bondage if it is unreal or illusory. For example, the realization and knowledge that something is a rope destroys the snake for which the rope is understood. V. S. Ghate argues that according to Sankara, "knowledge and
knowledge alone can lead to moksha. It is only a realization of our real nature of which we can never be really deprived, but of which we have been only forgetful.\(^\text{73}\) He further observes that “the reality is to be attained not by reasoning (tarka), but by introspective realization (anubhava).”\(^\text{74}\) Therefore, Sankara advocated the path of contemplation\(^\text{75}\) and attached greater importance to the direct experience. (Sakshatkara)\(^\text{76}\) for self-realization. He also prescribed the role of scriptures to remove the veil of ignorance or Avidya, however, a limited and secondary one.\(^\text{77}\)

According to Subhas E. Bhelkey, “as far as the Advaitic mode of spiritual humanism is concerned Sankaracarya has described the ideal form of spiritual humanism.”\(^\text{78}\) He adds, “According to spiritual humanism the entire world is one community. It goes beyond all geographical and political boundaries in which the entire human race is divided. There are different races, different histories to each of them, different societies with different legacies. Nevertheless, all these races and societies have the same aspirations. This is realized when the essential unity of atman is understood. This brings all men together and builds one homogenous family of them under one roof.”\(^\text{79}\) Sankara’s humanism is grounded in his Advaitic Vedantic vision. It envisions unity among all the creations of the world and considers them the manifestations of only one spiritual power. Man which is one of the creations is conceived as an integral part of the cosmos, realises oneness with nature and does not come to a state of being foreign to the existing things of the nature. The mystic vision of Sankara infuses a sense of belongingness among the human beings that tie them in a relation of complementarity and harmony. Man does not inhibit and exhibit ill will against any, and does
not cause any damage to the other creations. Man lives with
compassion, cooperation and harmony.

It is worth mentioning that Sankara’s humanism is
reflected only in mysticism. It lacks the practical and
pragmatic aspect. Sankara exalts the spiritual aspect of
human life and ignores the material one. He insists upon
moksha only and ignores the other three values of life. The
extravagant neglect of the apparent world as illusion or
maya by Sankara makes man indifferent and inactive towards
society. N.K. Devaraja observes, “Sankara seems to exalt the
life of contemplation over that of action.” Sankara
believes in karam-sanyasa, however, man cannot afford to be
inactive in a society, because the latter not only fulfils
the basic needs and desires of man but also provides
education and security to him. The society and man are
intimately related to each other. The status of man depends
upon the type of society in which he resides. Therefore, man
must work to build his society strong, prosperous and
virile.

Sankara preached the way of knowledge (jnana-marga) and
gave a low place to the way of action (karma-marga). Radhakrishnan is of the opinion that “For some reason or
other, most of the religious leaders (acaryas), including
Samkara and Ramanuja, underestimated the value of karma-
marga”. R.L. Turner writes, “of the three ways of salvation
as commonly conceived in orthodox Hinduism, karma-marga,
 Khan -marga, and bhakti-marga, the first, though least
considered by the philosophers has probably been most
followed by the vast bulk of people.”

It may be pointed out that the way of karma can be
traced back to the Vedic time, however, it was known in the
form of sacrifice only. Turner observes, “The great bulk of
the *karma* prescribed by the Veda consists of sacrifice." In the *Rigveda* the Gods (anthropomorphic beings) were propitiated and appeased by concrete actions. Sacrifice, though not as yet grown to unwieldy proportions, was a necessary means to obtain the favour of the Gods. In *Brahmanas* writes Turner, "The Sacrifice, now called *karma*, or work *par excellence*, is all-important. It overshadows the whole of life; every action must be regulated with regard to it; and without it nothing can be obtained or hoped for. By its means alone can a man expect to attain salvation, still for the most part looked upon as a material heaven. Not only men but the gods also are subject to its influence and by it have obtained their present position." The *Mimamsa* also maintained that salvation was possible only through action. According to it salvation is indeed above the world of action; still it could be reached only through action. The *Dharmasastras-books* also consider the *karma-marga* as an essential part of the *grhaستha аsrama*, where a householder performs duties towards his family as well as engage himself in a definite series of sacrifices addressed to gods and the spirits of his ancestors.

It may be observed that *karma-marga* as conceived in the previous discussion was mainly concerned with sacrifices and general religious duties on the part of the performer. This notion witnesses a complete change in the *Bhagwad Geeta*. Henrich Zimmer observes, “In the *Bhagavad Gita* the old Brahmanical way of the Vedic ‘path of sacrifice’ (*karma-marga*) is left far behind.” He adds, “The ancient days of the Vedic, sacrificial, external routines had long passed at the time of the proclamation of the *Bhagavad Gita*. The ceremonious priestly style of worshipping divine beings was no longer dominant.” The *Bhagavad Geeta* advocates the idea
of karma-yoga. "Yoga means the peaceful union of the mind with any particular object. When the mind is firmly fixed on the performance of the deed, it is called karma-yoga."\(^96\) N.A. Nikam writes, "Karma-yoga is both action and renunciation; it is a renunciation of the 'fruits' of action; karma-yoga is the way of renouncing the world by being constantly engaged in activity for the good of the world."\(^97\) "Karma-yoga" according to Zimmer, "requires that the individual should continue carrying on his usual duties and activities of life, but with a new attitude of detachment from their fruits, i.e., from the possible gains or losses that they will entail. The world and its way of actualization is not to be abandoned, but the will of the individual is to be united in action with the universal ground, not with the vicissitudes of the suffering body and nervous system."\(^98\) The Bhagavad Gētā preaches self-less action or more literally desireless action (niskama-karma)\(^99\) and commends the performance of duty in a totally disinterested way, with no desire for its worldly fruit but with a view to perfecting character.\(^100\) Thus karma-yoga of the Gētā, which is also known as 'Yoga of Selfless Action' is the way of salvation in the world.\(^101\)

Unfortunately, the ancient learning and scholarship declined with the passage of time. Dogmatic beliefs and superstitions started creeping into the society. A plethora of evil practices and malformations blemished and spoiled human values. The intolerant casteism\(^102\) and Sati\(^103\) vitiated the social set up and dejected humanity. Superstitions and dogmatism kept on growing with the passage of time through the centuries and aeons. Various other evil practices and distortions such as female infanticide, child marriage, bali (human sacrifice), forced labour, begar, etc. crept into the
Hindu society. N.K. Devaraja writes, “On the eve of Muslim conquest, according to the eminent historian K.M. Panikkar, manifold deterioration had set in the Indian Hindu society.” The society was in a mess. Indian people ceased to grow. Humanism was subdued, eroded and smashed by the bigoted beliefs and social evils. Civilization became static and decadent. K.M. Panikkar observes, “Completely insular in ideas, without any knowledge of what was happening in the rest of the world, the Indian people ceased to grow. Civilization became decadent and inbred for lack of fertilizing contacts with dissimilar cultures. Society became static and the systematizations of previous ages which were more academic than real at the time of their conception like chaturvarna - the four castes - and food and drink taboos came to be accepted as divine regulations and conformed to with a rigidity which could have surprised Manu and Yajnavalkya.”

Indian learning, scholarship, culture and way of life were overshadowed both by dogmatism, superstitions and social evils as well as by the long foreign rule and domination over India. Norman D. Palmer observes, “Hindu political thought never again approached the mountain peaks of the classical period. It was largely submerged during the long centuries of foreign invasions and rule.” Ancient Indian thought remained subdued in the Middle Ages during the Islamic rule. India also remained under the subjugation of British rule for a long time. Indian people suffered a lot under the yoke of British imperialism, however, during this period, Western education and ideas put an indelible impact on the minds of Indians. Palmer writes, “Most of the leaders of Indian thought and politics in the past century or more, including those who have been most anti-British and
those who have preached the necessity of going back to the Vedas and of following Vedanta, have been under strong Western influence. The Western influence helped to usher in an era of enlightenment and Hindu renaissance. The nineteenth century, particularly its later half, is generally believed to be the period of the renaissance of Hinduism.

Raja Ram Mohan Roy (1772-1833) - the pioneer of Hindu renaissance considered the European ideas as the beacon of light and drew inspiration from them. Percival spear writes that Mohan Roy, the “father of Hindu Reformation”, did not hesitate to “borrow from the West with a boldness and an assurance which went far beyond his own puzzled generation.” Mohan Roy wanted to spread the Western knowledge throughout India. Therefore, he emphasized the importance of modern educational institutions. He, according to Devaraja, “fought for the establishment of educational institutions of the modern type, which might enable the Indian people to acquire knowledge of modern science and technology.”

Though Roy was greatly influenced by the Western currents of ideas but he did not reject the Hindu thought outrightly. Thus, he wanted a synthesis of Western and Indian Ideas. According to K. M. Pannikar, the Brahmo Samaj founded by Mohan Roy in 1828 for the reinterpretation of Hinduism, was “a synthesis of the doctrines of the European Enlightenment, with the philosophical views of the Upanishads. As a religion Brahmo Samaj was based firmly on the Vedanta, but its outlook on life was European, and derived its inspiration from the intellectual movements of the eighteenth century.”
Raja Ram Mohan Roy emphasized, “the restoration of Hinduism to its primitive purity” on the basis of reason. According to Donald H. Bishop one of the tenets of Brahmo Samaj was: “The Vedas, the Upanishads and other ancient writings were not to be accepted as infallible guides, that reason and conscience were to be the supreme authority, and the teachings of the scriptures were to be accepted only in so far as they harmonized with the light within us.”

Percival Spear also states that Mohan Roy, “considered that reason as expressed in the Upanishads was the basis of Hindu religion and that all social institutions or customs should be judged from that standpoint. From this premise he drew two conclusions, that Hindu society needed radical reform and that Hinduism could welcome external influences which were not contrary to the spirit of reason.”

Roy was very keen to reform the Hindu society. He strived to cleanse the society from the welter of dogmatic beliefs and social evils, and emphasized to reconstruct Hinduism on the basis of reason. This standpoint served as a corner stone and cardinal principle for the subsequent reformers and thinkers for the reconstruction of Hindu thought. Donald H. Bishop observes, “Theism in India in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries ... was linked to contemporary liberal religious thought ... Its goal was the purifying of religion ... from dogma, pruning it of bigotry and narrowness, subjecting it to the light of reason and freeing it from superstition.”

The reform movement initiated by Roy continued through individuals such as Devendra Nath Tagore (1817-1905), Keshab Chander Sen (1838-1884), Dayananda Saraswati (1824-1883), Rama Krishna Paramahansa (1834-86), Vivekananda (1862-1902), Annie Besant (1847-1933), etc. through organisations such as
Brahmo Samaj, Arya Samaj, Ramakrishna Mission and Theosophical Society. The efforts of reformers bore fruit with the enactment of legislation against some of the practices, which were repugnant to the human values. Sati (immolation of widows) was outlawed in 1829. The Civil Marriage Act of 1872, allowed the remarriage of widows, abolished child betrothals and marriages and guaranteed property right to the women.\textsuperscript{117}

The period of Hindu renaissance laid the foundation for the emergence of the Modern Indian thought. Various thinkers have contributed to its development by incorporating new ideas and advocating changes. It is essential to lay bare and draw out briefly the humanistic inferences enshrined in the ideas of some of the modern Indian thinkers.

According to Vivekananda, "We are but little beings, sparks of that mass of fire, and the whole universe is a manifestation of God Himself."\textsuperscript{118} He believes in Advaita Vedanta in asserting that "one Brahman appears in many."\textsuperscript{119} Man according to him is one of the creations of Godhead. He is of the view that God is inherent in everything and asserts to "Look upon every man, woman, and everyone as God."\textsuperscript{120} Thus, Vivekananda humanises the God and emphasises his worship only in the form of human beings. He says, "The only God to worship is the human soul in the human body. Of course all animals are temples too, but man is the highest, the Taj Mahal of temples. If I cannot worship in that, no other temple will be of any advantage."\textsuperscript{121}

Vivekananda exalts the position of man and considers him as the "greatest being."\textsuperscript{122} According to him, "Man is higher than all animals, than all angels; none is greater than man. Even the Devas (gods) will have to come down again and attain to salvation through a human body. Man alone
attains to perfection, not even the Devas."\textsuperscript{123} By considering man as the highest being and greater even to God, he enthuses faith and confidence in him. Swami writes, "we must have faith in ourselves first and then in God. He who has no faith in himself can never have faith in God."\textsuperscript{124} Praharaj observes, that "one of the important reasons to consider Swamiji as a humanist is his strong optimism that admits the human potency to be self-sufficient. And the manifestation of human potency is not conditional to the grace of God or any Supernatural power."\textsuperscript{125}

According to Mohit Chakrabarti, "The quest for dynamic humanism as Swami Vivekananda always inspires and suggests, is a quest for service to man and society which is never different from the quest for the All Serene-Naranarayana."\textsuperscript{126} Devaraja writes, "Swami preached the gospel of service to the weak and the needy."\textsuperscript{127} Vivekananda exhorts, "I say 'daridranarayana bhava, murkhodeva bhava' (The poor, the illiterate, the ignorant, the afflicted - let these be your God). Know that service to these alone is the highest religion."\textsuperscript{128} According to Mohit Chakrabarti, Vivekananda’s humanism is comprehensive and dynamic active force, which encompasses entire humanity, protects and promotes the interest of all-mankind. Thus he introspected on humanism in the light of global peace and alround wellbeing of mankind - 'Sarve sukhī noh bhavantu sarve santu niramaya.'\textsuperscript{129}

Rabindra Nath Tagore is also a profound humanist. The centre of his philosophy is man. According to him, man "is a sovereign who builds his world and rules it."\textsuperscript{130} He emphasizes that of all creatures, man has reached multicellular character in perfect manner, not only in his body but in his personality.\textsuperscript{131} Tagore is of the view that individual selves are the replicas of the creative super -
spirit. He writes, “Man, as a creation, represents the creator, and this is why of all creatures it has been possible for him to comprehend this world in his knowledge and in his feeling and in his imagination, to realize in his individual spirit a union with a Spirit that is everywhere.”

Tagore has pronounced his belief in the infinite but it is not apart from man. He asserts, “you do not realize the infinite in the stars or rocks, but the infinite revealed in man.” While writing on Tagore, B.Kar observes, “The sense of God is introduced in man just to arouse in him the moral or ethical sense. That is why God is not conceived in a transcendental level to whom man is to surrender or seek for his grace.”

It may be noted that Tagore humanises the God, which according to him can be realized only through the service and love towards man. Tagore writes, “thy God is ... there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and the pathmaker is breaking stones ... Meet him and stand by him in toil and in the sweat of thy brow.” He suggests to become visvakarma “the world worker” and advises that “we must work for all.” The chief aim of Tagore is the attainment of Universality through love, sympathy and adjustment. His humanism is not confined to the ‘narrow domestic walls’ but encompasses entire world and humanity with ever-widening thought and action. Jatawa observes that it stands firm for the spiritual fellowship of all men and conceives the coming era of "the great federation and fellowship of men."

Besides, Vivekananda and Tagore, Gandhi was also a humanist. According to him, all persons are the children of the same God who are tarred with same brush and “the divine
powers within us are infinite."\textsuperscript{140} He gives greatest importance to man because "the individual is one supreme consideration"\textsuperscript{141} for him. He argues, "if the individual ceases to count what is left of society?"\textsuperscript{142}

Gandhi believes that "Man's ultimate aim is the realization of God."\textsuperscript{143} In this context V.P.Varma writes, "Gandhi was a great devotee of God but he had also immense faith in man. There was no antithesis between his humanism and his belief in divine providence. He said: 'My faith is in God and therefore in the people.' God is organically bound up with mankind and all living beings. Hence love for man leads to the realization of God."\textsuperscript{144} Gandhi seeks the realization of God in the service of humanity. He says, "The immediate service of all human beings becomes necessary part of the endeavour simply because the only way to find God is to see Him in His creation and be one with it. This can only be done by the service of all."\textsuperscript{145} Gandhi was much concerned with the poor and believed in the notion of Dridranarayana.\textsuperscript{146} The overflowing love for the poorest of the poor in particular and humanity in general reveals Gandhi's intense humanism. Varma observes that "His humanism inspired his sufferings in serving the sick and the leper. He derived satisfaction from affectionate service and ministrations to the victims of the disease. There were others in the Ashrama who would have been glad to take care of the sick, but Gandhi's humanity was so deep that he would personally take care of the sick."\textsuperscript{147}

According to Gandhi, "The end to be achieved is human happiness combined with full mental and moral growth."\textsuperscript{148} Praharaj writes that Gandhi's "concept of Sarvodaya which aims at the upliftment of everyone puts maximum emphasis on 'man' as a whole."\textsuperscript{149} Encapsulating Gandhi's humanism, Abdul
Sattar states, “Gandhi Kept the spiritual well-being of man ... All thinking, all morality and religious teachings, political ideas and economic ideals were geared to welfare of all, i.e., Sarvodaya. It seems to be the meaning of Gandhi's humanism.” Sattar is of the view that “Gandhian humanism embraces the whole mankind as it reaffirms the spirit of cosmopolitanism and brotherhood of man.”

Another humanist thinker in modern India was M. N. Roy. According to him, “Man did not appear on the earth out of nowhere. He rose out of the background of the physical Universe, through the long process of biological evolution.” He is of the view that the entire physical universe is an outcome of this process. It reflects his monist world view, which has its basis on physical realism. He views man as an integral part of this universe: “The umbilical cord was never broken: man, with his mind, intelligence, will, remains an integral part of the physical Universe. The latter is a cosmos - a law - governed system.” Since man to Roy, is an integral part of the cosmos therefore, his Radical Humanism is also called as Integral humanism.

Roy considers man as a rational being. He is much concerned with the development of man and believes that man has inherent capacity of infinite enrichment and enjoyment. Roy suggests that “the Radical scientific approach to the problems of man’s life and inter-relations is bound to be more successful.” To him, freedom is “the basic urge for all social advancement.” He emphasizes, “Guided by the dictum of ancient vision that man is the measure of everything, the philosophy of the future should proclaim that the merit of any pattern of social
organisation or political institution is to be judged by the actual measure of freedom it gives to the individual."

Roy deplores that the existing ideologies and institutions have denied freedom to man, and led to his degradation. He emphasizes, "To overcome this crisis, the fighters for a new world order must turn to the traditions of Humanism and moral Radicalism." According to Roy, "Radicalism starts from the dictum that 'man is the measure of everything,' (Protagoras) or 'man is the root of mankind' (Marx)." Roy's humanism is ardently opposed to parliamentary democracy as well as communism. It enunciates a concept of Organized Democracy "composed of a countrywide network of Peoples Committees." It aims at "the widest diffusion of power" so as to restore individual in his position of primacy and dignity.

Roy's humanism is comprehensive because it advocates the "reconstruction of the world as a commonwealth and fraternity of free men." He asserts, "A cosmopolitan commonwealth of free men and women is a possibility. It will be a spiritual community, not limited by the boundaries of Nation-states-capitalist, fascists, communist or of any other kind-which will gradually disappear under the impact of cosmopolitan Humanism."

Similarly, Nehru was a celebrated humanist. Narsingh Narain observes, "In the humanism of Nehru there was no room for dogmatism... for Humanism claims to be opposed to all dogmas." According to Nehru, "Too much dependence on supernatural factors may lead, and has often led to a loss of self-reliance in man and to a blunting of his capacity and creative ability." Emphasizing the importance of man, he says, "One may not lose faith in man. God we may deny but
what hope is there for us if we deny man and thus reduce everything to futility."168

Nehru advises, "India must ... lessen her religiosity and turn to science."169 His humanism is grounded in science and scientific approach to life. He emphasises, "There is growing synthesis between humanism and the scientific spirit, resulting in a kind of scientific humanism."170 Tandra Patnaik writes, "a model was offered to us by Nehru in his book, The Discover of India. He prefers to call it Scientific Humanism."171 Dr. Jatava regards Nehru as a Democratic humanist: "Jawahar Lal Nehru was one of those humanists, who have been responsible to link the destiny of man with democracy, secularism and socialism in India."172 Nehru views democracy and equality together and enunciates the notion of Democratic Socialism for the development of people.173 Nehru's principles of Non-alignment and Peaceful Co-existence give cosmopolitan ramification to his humanism. He unequivocally emphasized his concern for international peace for the welfare and happiness of entire world. Dr. Jatava writes, "the most valuable contribution of his (Nehru) humanism to the world is the idea of peace. He endeavoured to enlarge the area of peace in the face of rapidly expanding spheres of physical and ideological hostilities."174

While summing up, it may be observed that Western humanism sought to establish dignity, autonomy and individuality of man against the religious orthodoxy and authoritarianism. V. P. Varma observes, "In the West, humanism is regarded as a philosophy which champions the cause of man, his freedom and individuality against a theological world view."175 He adds, "In the West, humanism
is oriented to raising man as if, against the imperialism of God.\textsuperscript{176}

On the contrary, "in India man is a product of God."\textsuperscript{177} The philosophy in India is essentially spiritual.\textsuperscript{178} Indian humanism is thus largely rooted in the spiritual philosophy of ancient India. It may be pointed out that unlike Western Renaissance humanism, Hindu renaissance was not a reaction against religion itself. In India, religion and humanism are not conflicting. Radhakrishnan observes, "There is no conflict between religion and a reasonable humanism."\textsuperscript{179}

It is worth mentioning that barring a few exceptions, Indian humanism is predominantly spiritual. Varma observes, "In Indian thought ... the status of man is sought to be exalted by stressing his spiritual potentialities."\textsuperscript{180} The concern is not only to seek empirical development of man but also his spiritual fulfilment. While commenting on the philosophy of Sri Aurobindo, one of the profound humanists, V. P. Varma observes, "Aurobindo is not satisfied with the glorification of the empirical man, be it even at the highest level of his scientific and political development. Instead, he wants the supermental transmutation of the human being and his nature."\textsuperscript{181}

The modern Indian thinkers such as Vivekananda, Aurobindo, Tagore, Gandhi, etc. are known to propound spiritual humanism. They, however, reject Sankaracharya’s notion of mayavada and karam-sanyasa. They assert that both the spirit and this world are real. Further, they believe in karam-yoga instead of karam-sanyasa and thus activate man to work for the welfare of society. This reflects the pragmatic approach of their spiritual humanism.

Pandit J.L. Nehru, one of the celebrated contemporary Indian humanist also admits that "some faith is necessary in
the things of spirit which are beyond the scope of our physical world, some reliance on moral, spiritual and idealistic conceptions. Or else we have no anchorage, no objectives and purposes of life."^182 It may be noted that Nehru’s approach to humanism is though scientific but even then he does not reject outrightly the importance of spiritual quest in man’s life. However, M.N.Roy, the Radical Humanist differs from all of the above humanists including J.L.Nehru for he completely rejects the spiritualism in its all forms. In this context, D.M.Praharaj observes, “The general feature of Roy’s humanism is that there is strong denial of spiritualistic background ... He considers that beyond the consideration of biology man cannot be analysed further. Biology does not sanction the presence of soul, which is spiritual in human body."^183

In the preceding pages the philosophy of humanism in the West and India is analysed. In the light of this framework, the Integral Humanism of Deendayal Upadhaya will be examined in the following pages.
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