Chapter III
Deendayal Upadhyaya’s Integral Humanism: The Social Dimension

This chapter seeks to deal with the social dimension of Deendayal’s philosophy of Integral Humanism. An attempt has been made in it to describe and analyse the various aspects of the theme. As already observed, humanism is a man centred philosophy therefore, in order to have an insight into Deendayal’s humanist thought, it is pertinent to examine his views first on man and then to deal his relation with society and universe, which is being done in the present chapter.

I

Deendayal is of the view that man is a complex of (tattvas) elements. He says, “Body, mind, intelligence and the soul, - these four make up an individual.” Highlighting the importance of all the constituent elements, he asserts, “We do think of the soul, but it is not true that we do not consider body, mind and intellect of much importance.” According to him these four elements cannot be viewed separately because “these are integrated”, and intertwined with each other. If any element is missing or underdeveloped vis-a-vis the other, then something vital remains amiss in the personality of man. Further, an excessive satisfaction of any of these as a substitute for the other cannot solve the problem. It always leaves the man dissatisfied at some level. Thus, Deendayal emphasizes, “We have ... considered the life of an individual in a thorough and integrated manner. We have set the aim of developing body, mind, intellect as well as soul in a balanced way ... This concept of a complete
human being, an integrated individual, is both our goal as well as our path." Nargolkar also observes that Deendayal’s notion of man conceives a balanced development of the constituent elements of human personality. He writes that to Deendayal, “Man’s progress means the balanced development of (the) entities residing in the body.” For the development of man, Deendayal emphasizes the importance of body and stresses that the satisfaction of bodily needs is necessary for the realization of self. In this context he admits the Upanishadic influence on him. He says, “Upanishads declare in unambiguous words nyam atma balheenan labhya i.e. a weakling cannot realize the self. Again, shreer madhyam khalu dharam sadhnam, or the body is truly the primary instrument to discharge the responsibilities that Dharma enjoins.”

It may be noted that Deendayal’s conception of man considers him as a conglomeration of material as well as non-material elements. Thus, he does not share the Charvaka viewpoint, which maintains that man is a product of four material elements: earth, water, fire and air. To Deendayal, man is not only a physical entity but also a mighty spiritual being. It can be evidently argued that his conception of man is inspired and influenced by the Vedanta, which considers man as a complex being consisting of varied elements. While writing on Vedanta, Rajmani Tigunait observes, “The human being can be studied in four major parts: body, prana, mind and self.” The Taittiriya Upanishad gives an account of the structure of man. In this Upanishad, soul is envisioned as being in the centre of a series of sheaths, five in number. These sheaths are physical (annamaya kosha), vital (pranamaya kosha), mental (manomaya kosha), intellectual (jnanamaya kosha), and that
of bliss \((anandamaya~kosha)\). These are in an ascending order of subtlety.\(^{11}\)

Deendayal Upadhyaya also resembles modern Indian thinkers such as Radhakrishnan, Sri Aurobindo, etc. in asserting that man is more than a physical entity. For Radhakrishnan, man is more than matter, life or mind or all these put together.\(^{12}\) According to Sri Aurobindo, man is a "complex being."\(^{13}\) He asserts, "man is a developing spirit trying here to find and fulfil itself in the forms of mind, life and body; and we shall perceive luminously growing before us the greater ideal of a deeply conscious, self-illumined, self-possessing, self-mastering soul in a pure and perfect mind and body."\(^{14}\) The Western thinker, St. Thomas also postulates, "man possesses not only a bodily nature but also a rational and spiritual soul."\(^{15}\)

After having discussed Deendayal’s concept of man, it is appropriate to discuss his views on human nature. Deendayal observes that "Human nature has both tendencies, anger, and greed on the one hand and love, sacrifice on the other. All these are present in our nature."\(^{16}\) He divides human nature into two types, viz: the \(Asuri-bhauv\) (demonic disposition) and the \(Devi-bhauv\) (dynamic disposition of Goddess). According to him, the former is based on self interest and the latter on selfless service.\(^{17}\) He is of the view that lower demonic tendencies degrade man and obstruct his path of self perfection. Instead, \(Devi-bhauv\) is a divine imagination, which leads man towards divinity. Therefore, he accords primacy to \(Devi-Bhauv\).\(^{18}\)

Deendayal conceives a bipartite division of human nature. It is interested to note that St. Augustine also visualised bipartite notion of human nature on the basis of two cities: one based on the appetitive and possessive love
and the other on common love for all and God. He says, "We see ... that two cities spring from two different kinds of love ... The one glorifies in itself, the other in the Lord. The one seeks glory from men, to the other the greatest glory is the witness of God in the conscience ... The one is dominated by passion for dominance either in the person or its leaders or in respect of those nations which it subdues. In other each citizen serves his neighbour in love, the rulers in giving counsel and the subjects in humble duty."^19

Upadhyaya believes in transformation of feelings and attitude of man from the limited to the highest consciousness through a process of evolution. Therefore, he visualises an evolutionary nature of man. He observes that our nature is established in Godhead, which cannot be seen by us in a gross way. According to him, we draw close to it when we move towards the centre, which is all pervading God or Brahman.^20

Deendayal seems to be influenced by the Upanishadic doctrine, which holds that man's nature is essentially divine.^21 In this context, he resembles Radhakrishnan and Aurobindo. Radhakrishnan holds that those who exalt and encourage the spirit of hatred overlook the fact that there is something of the divine in every man.^22 Aurobindo observes, "man is inwardly a soul and a conscious power of the Divine."^23

Deendayal appears to believe that man is an evolutionary being. Chandra P. Aggarwal states that it is perhaps the most significant tenet of Deendayal's philosophy. It holds that though man is imperfect at the present stage, but he is capable of attaining perfection by discovering and following his true nature. At the level of higher consciousness, man seeks to discover a luminous
reality beyond the phenomenal world. Even at the level of everyday experience man seeks to improve his surroundings to create fulfilling relationships with his environment.\textsuperscript{24} In this context, V.V. Nene observes that Deendayal believes in "an extension of a man’s ‘Mine’ and ‘I’ consciousness successively through all humanity, all animate world, inanimate world, and all nature till it reaches and merges with God."\textsuperscript{25}

Deendayal suggests selfless service to achieve self-perfection. He illustrates this by giving an example of a peasant who produces because he feels duty bound to produce the food to satisfy the hunger of other beings around him. Here the self-interest is actuated by social interest. Deendayal argues that man is dutiful not only to society but also to all the creatures of universe. Hence our farmers consider it as their duty to feed insects, birds, cows, dogs and men in yajna.\textsuperscript{26} It may be noted that Deendayal seeks to realise self-perfection through the service of humanity. Here, he resembles the modern Indian thinkers like Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Gandhi, etc. and also Western thinker T.H. Green, who holds that man cannot attain perfection without taking others in consideration.\textsuperscript{27}

Upadhyaya wants to evolve a feeling of oneness and myness with the entire creations of the world. He encourages man to adopt the way of cooperation. He regards mutual cooperation the sign of progress while conflict a sign of degradation.\textsuperscript{28} Deendayal emphasizes, "mutual co-operation sustains life on this earth. The recognition of this element of mutual sustenance among different forms of life and taking that as the basis of an effort to make human life mutually sustaining is the prime characteristic of civilisation."\textsuperscript{29} He wants to build up a well-knit harmonious
edifice or order of civilization on the principle of complementarity and mutual relationship based on fellowship, cooperation, sympathy and good will in man’s life.

II

Deendayal is of the view that corresponding to the four-fold elements of human personality there are four-fold aspirations of man, viz: bodily, mental, intellectual and that of soul. He asserts, “We have tried to satisfy the manifold aspirations of man taking care that efforts to satisfy two different aspirations are not mutually conflicting. This is the integrated picture of all the fourfold aspirations of an individual.” The pursuit of these gives happiness to man. Therefore, according to Deendayal, man directs his actions to achieve such a happiness. He writes that the goal of all human activities is one: to achieve bliss and felicity. Though Deendayal believes that the activities of all creatures in the universe are guided by the desire for happiness but according to him the experience of happiness is varied in character and nature. He writes that happiness is of many kinds. Human beings enjoy taking food, drinking water, protecting his body from rain, heat and cold. There are many kinds of experiences such as the fragrance of flower, watching colourful sceneries from which man derives pleasure. However, Deendayal feels that the pleasure which pertains to the sense organs is short lived. He regards this pleasure as Rajasukh. According to him, sensuous happiness is enjoyed both by animals and men. He differentiates between animal and man because man has a certain aim in life. He holds that man devoid of an objective is an animal devoid of mission. Man’s speciality or uniqueness lies precisely in having goal consciousness.
Man tries to attain other happinesses for his all round progress. Therefore, happiness according to Deendayal is not confined to physical pleasures only but it has a relationship with other things too.\(^{37}\)

Emphasizing the happiness of mind, Deendayal says that mind's happiness is too an imperative.\(^{38}\) He observes, "Normally an individual is thought of in the physical bodily forms. Physical comfort and luxury is considered happiness. But we know that mental worry destroys bodily happiness. Everyone desires physical comfort. But if a person is imprisoned and there he is given the finest of food etc., will he be happy? A person does not experience joy on getting nice food if it is also accompanied by a few abuses."\(^{39}\) In this context, while narrating a story from Mahabharata he says that Lord Krishna did not accept nice food and hospitality offered by Duruyodhna but accepted simple food offered by Vidura's wife because the latter was offered from the fullness of heart. Thus, ahara is not only eating merely food, but also involves and partakes the emotions accompanying it. So, according to him many a time, physical pleasure seems flat or stale.\(^{40}\) Deendayal emphasizes, "Even a modest meal served with dignity and affection tastes better than the finest delicacies served with disrespect. It is necessary therefore, to take note of the mental happiness."\(^{41}\)

It is pertinent to point out here that Deendayal accords a higher place to the mental than the bodily pleasure. It is true that both provide happiness but differ qualitatively. He is not opposed to the bodily pleasure but in the case of conflict between the two, mental pleasure becomes primary.
Highlighting the intellectual pleasure, Deendayal emphasizes that man has wisdom too; he thinks, which has its own joy. He states that intellect possesses capacity to know about good and bad, flimsy and intense, ephermal and everlasting, and sets forth man’s aim in life. He elaborates that life mission, which man has accepted through wisdom becomes the parameter of his feelings of happiness and sorrow. While emphasizing the importance of intellectual pleasure he writes, “Even after a person gets comforts for the body, and importance, and affection, etc. which please the mind, if he is involved in some intellectual confusion he is reduced to a state almost similar to madness ... A lunatic may have all physical comforts, he may be perfectly healthy and properly cared for by his relatives; but he does not possess intellectual happiness. Intellectual peace is also essential and important.” It may be inferred that according to Deendayal the satisfaction of intellectual aspiration gives intellectual pleasure to man. Man has intellectual hunger, which craves for answers to the riddles of various questions, and when he finds answers, he experiences a pleasure before which the physical and mental pleasures are pale shadows.

Deendayal does not restrict himself upto intellectual happiness but goes forward and talks about the happiness of soul, which according to him is the highest and eternal happiness. He illustrates it by giving the following example: A mother with her child in her lap enjoys the eternal happiness i.e. the happiness of soul. While holding the happiness of soul as eternal, he tries to explain the meaning of soul. To him, it is something apart from body, mind and intellect. The soul is the phenomenon of ‘I’
P.T. Raju also subscribes the same viewpoint in this context. He states, “The problem of the Upanisads is to find out what the ‘I’ ultimately is. Ultimately, it is the atman, not the physical body.” Deendayal says that myness is felt with which a relation of atman is established. To illustrate the above, he gives an example of a man and woman staying in the same inn. The child of the woman starts weeping and does not stop. The man time and again tells the owner of the inn about the disturbances and finally asks him to throw the woman out with her child, but when he comes to know that the woman is his wife and child is his own, he starts loving him. It is obvious that the attitude of man changes because of the feeling of myness stemming from the psychic relationship. Deendayal, however, cautions that this myness must be seen in a comprehensive way because the happiness resulting therefrom is not terrestrial. It is not a state of personal belongingness but a state of a pervading sense of belongingness. According to Upadhyaya, once a man realizes the happiness of soul, he becomes more and more large hearted.

Deendayal is of the view that as the consciousness of man expands, the distinction between the personal and public thins out so much so that at its culminating point duality of ‘I’ and ‘thou’ vanishes and selfishness perishes. Man aims at the welfare of all and identifies himself with the humanity as a whole. He comes to realize and experience that it is the soul, which pervades all over. This experience according to Deendayal is Brahmanubhav (experience of the eternal) that provides eternal and boundless joy to man. There exists no other real happiness than this. Other types of happiness are lower than that of soul.
Thus to Deendayal Upadhyaya, the mental pleasure is finer and more invigorating than physical pleasure, the intellectual subtler than the mental, and the pleasure of soul is eternal and highest. It is important to note that pleasure of soul is related with spiritual realization.

Charvaka, who belongs to the heterodox school of Indian philosophy, seeks "salvation in pleasure" but his notion of pleasure is "crudely hedonistic." In the Western political thought, the Epicureans of Hellenistic period also enunciate the notion of happiness. According to Epicurus, "pleasure is the beginning and end of the blessed life." The philosophical basis of this happiness is materialism. Thus, Epicureans conceptualize the happiness of man in a hedonistic manner like Charvaka. Aristippus of Cyrene also believes in enjoyment of pleasure in life. He holds that we should drink and be merry, for tomorrow we may die. Omar Khayyam too subscribes to the same view, which is evident from his following remark: 'while you live drink! For once dead you never shall return.'

The utilitarian thinkers of nineteenth century such as Bentham and J.S. Mill also talk about the happiness of man. According to Bentham, "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure." To him the action, which brings pleasure is good. He applies the principle of utility both to approve and disapprove of every action, which augments or diminishes happiness. According to Bentham, "By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness, (all this in the present case comes to the same thing) or (what comes again to the same thing) to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness to the party whose interest is considered: if
that party be the community in general, then the happiness of the community: if a particular individual, then the happiness of that individual. He approves only that action, which brings maximum happiness to the maximum number, or which caters to the interests of the sum of the several members who compose it. It may be pointed out that Bentham’s notion of happiness too reflects hedonism. Further, Benthamite principle of utility is a conception of quantitatively conceived happiness, which does not make a qualitative differentiation among pleasures. J.S.Mill differs from Bentham he exhorts, “It would be absurd that while, in estimating all other things, quality is considered as well as quantity, the estimation of pleasures should be supposed to depend on quantity alone.” Diverging from Bentham, he prefers qualitative happiness and emphasizes, “It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And if the fool or the pig, are of a different opinion, it is because they only know their own side of the question. The other party to the comparison knows both sides.”

A conscientious examination of these views about the happiness of man, leads us to the conclusion that Deendayal’s conception of happiness is different from Epicureans, Bentham and even to that of J.S.Mill. Beyond the limited hedonistic sensuous pleasure, Deendayal craves to attain the highest happiness pertaining to the soul. The fulfilment of fourfold aspirations related to body, mind, intellect and soul is predicated on sensuous pleasure, mental satisfaction, peace and knowledge, and realization of self. The pleasures as pointed out by Deendayal vary qualitatively and man continues to pursue these till he
experiences the highest. He expounds an integrated notion of happiness as the happiness accruing from the four fold aspirations are intertwined and are complementary to one another. Further, Deendayal’s conception of happiness is holistic but hierarchical. It is holistic because he stresses the fulfilment of all the aspirations arising out of the body, mind, intellect and soul. It is hierarchical because happinesses, which accrue from body, mind, intellect and soul respectively are in an ascending order. These differ in kind and quality. Such a conception may be termed as qualitative conception of happiness. No doubt J.S.Mill also makes a qualitative distinction between the types of happiness but Deendayal differs even from him because like other classical Indian thinkers he gives great importance to the happiness of soul – which is something missing in the case of J.S.Mill. The classical Indian thought remained engrossed in dealing with the question of spiritual realization. S.Radhakrishnan writes, “In India the interest of philosophy is in the self of man. All the orthodox schools remained engrossed with Atmanam Viddhi, know the self ... within man, is the spirit that is centre of philosophy.”

Further, Deendayal rejects the empirical mathematics of Bentham based on the criterion of the happiness of the greatest number. Upadhyaya dismisses it as artificial and hollow because it leads to the neglect of the interests of minority. He, instead, aims at the principle of the good of all – the Sarvabhutahita as emphasized in the Bhagwad Geeta. To quote him, “We do feel, though indistinctly to begin with ... that all men should be happy.” The modern Indian thinkers such as Vivekananda, Tilak, Sri Aurobindo, Gandhi also hold a similar viewpoint.
In dealing with the issue of the achievement of the fourfold happinesses, Deendayal lays stress on four types of Purushartha: “Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha.” According to him, “Purushartha means efforts which benefit a man.” In this context, he holds, “The longings for Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha, are inborn in man, and satisfaction of these give him joy.”

It is pertinent to mention here that the concept of Purushartha is a traditional formulation of the ancient Indian thought. As P.V.Kane writes, “It should not be forgotten that, according to our Sastras the goals of human life are four, Dharma (an ethical life or doing what is right), Artha (a life of acquisition of wealth i.e. economic life based on justice), Kama (a life of the enjoyment of innocent pleasures and right desires) and Moksha (liberation), the last being the highest goal to be attained only by a few people (it is called Paramapurushartha).”

Deendayal Upadhyaya makes a clear distinction between the concepts of Dharma and religion. According to him, “Religion means a creed, or a sect; it does not mean Dharma.” Further, he says, “Dharma is not confined to temples or mosques. Worship of God is only a part of Dharma. Dharma is much wider ... To attend temple or mosque constitutes a part of religion, sect, creed, but not necessarily ‘Dharma’.” He holds, “Many misconceptions that originated from faulty English translations, include this most harmful confusion of Dharma with religion.” Upadhyaya emphasizes, “‘Dharma’ defines a set of rules to regulate the social activity.” He also adds, “Dharma is very wide concept. It is concerned with all aspects of life. It sustains the society. Even further, it sustains the whole
world. That which sustains is ‘Dharma’.” It may be pointed out that Deendayal’s concept of Dharma is idealistic. He considers it as a value of life, which sustains the entire cosmos but the bitter truth is that hardly any one follows it.

In the above context, it is worth-mentioning that Dharma is a fundamental concept in ancient Indian tradition. According to P.V.Kane, “The concept of Dharma began to occupy the highest position in the times of the upanisads. The Br. Up. 1.4.14 states ‘there is nothing higher than Dharma’ The Tai. Aranyaka avers ‘Dharma is the support (or prop) of the whole world’. Mahabharata and Manu repeatedly refer to the high value of Dharma. The Mahabharata claims that everything concerning the four purusartha is contained in it and that what is not contained in it about them would be found in no other work. In Udyogaparva it is stated, ‘Dharma is so called because of its character as the sustainer of all beings’.”

Deendayal’s notion of Dharma has its roots in the ancient Indian philosophy. According to Norman D. Palmer, “Dharma - a word for which there is no exact English counter part - is probably the central concept of Hindu political thought, but it clearly has a significance far beyond the realm of polity.” He is of the view that “Locke’s ‘dictates of right reason’ have been described as ‘practically the same as the Dharma of the Indian theory’.” He also compares Dharma with the “external law of Thomas Aquinas.” Deendayal’s concept of Dharma has negative as well as positive connotations. It is negative because its rules and regulations put reasonable, ethical restrictions on man to regulate his activities in the society. It has positive connotation because of its wider and comprehensive effect as
the sustainer of life. On its basis, Deendayal motivates the man to obey the ethical code of rules and regulations set forth by Dharma.

Artha according to Deendayal includes needs of body in terms of livelihood and material progress. He also includes "political and economic policies" in Artha, however, he does not explain the meaning of Artha in this context except to refer that justice and punishment was included in Artha during ancient times. Thus, Artha according to Deendayal constitutes material progress and wealth. It seeks to secure pleasures in terms of food, clothing, luxury, etc. V.V.Nene observes that Deendayal is of the view that Artha, "is the means like money, etc. For securing the pleasures and needs of body like food, clothing, etc... procurement of food, clothing, shelter are connected with the production of wealth and so with body, land and people. The desire for happiness is the force that prompts the acquisition of wealth ... Wealth, honourably and dutifully earned is Artha - Purushartha."

Deendayal has also dealt with the concepts of Kama and Moksha in his conceptual framework of Purushartha. According to him, "Kama relates to the satisfaction of various natural desires." It seems that Deendayal Upadhyaya includes the enjoyment of pleasures like food, sleep, sex, etc. among the natural desires. It goes without saying that there is hardly a man who has no desires and who does not work for their fulfilment. According to Atharvaveda, Kama is said to have appeared in the very beginning and was in fact the very first flow of the mind.

The etymological roots of the word Moksha can be traced from the Sanskrit word 'Muc', which means deliverance or release from pains and penalties of every kind. Deendayal
deems it (Moksha) necessary for the soul.\textsuperscript{89} According to him Moksha "has been considered the highest of these purusarthas, efforts for moksha alone are not considered to give benefit to the soul. On the other hand, a person who engages in action, while remaining unattached to its fruits, is said to achieve moksha inevitably and earlier."\textsuperscript{90} He has expressed the view that man cannot attain Moksha in isolation by practising Yoga in the Himalayan cave but can achieve it only by dedicating himself to the society through an active service.\textsuperscript{91}

Upadhyaya appears to have been influenced by the philosophy of Karma-yoga. He rejects Karma-sanyasa envisaged by Sankara. Diverging from the latter, Deendayal firmly believes in the Vedantic notion of karma-mukti, or the path of gradual release, which can be attained here in this life.\textsuperscript{92} According to Radhakrishnan, "In later Vedanta, this view of moksa came to be known as sadyo-mukti, instantaneous release, and jivan-mukti, release while yet living. So far as the content of release is concerned there is no difference between the two views."\textsuperscript{93} The Mimamsa also maintains that salvation is possible only through action.\textsuperscript{94} Deendayal commends performance of duties in a disinterested way without bothering about the consequences. In this context, he is influenced by the nishkama-karma of the Bhagavad Geeta.\textsuperscript{95} Further, Deendayal believes that moksha is not possible in isolation as it requires one to dedicate earnestly for society. He believes in the concept of collective liberation, sarvamukti (liberation of all).\textsuperscript{96} This stance of Deendayal resembles Mahayanistic idea of universal liberation.\textsuperscript{97}

Deendayal regards all the Purusarthas equally important. Artha is necessary for material prosperity,
Dharma is essential for society, Kama is required for the satisfaction of bodily desire, Moksha is needed for the soul. He is of the view that these Purusharthas are complementary to one another. Therefore, all of them are collectively needed for the proper fulfilment and advancement of man.\textsuperscript{98} Hence, these four Purusharthas should be considered together and not separately.\textsuperscript{99} According to Upadhyaya, the importance of Purushathas keeps on changing with time and circumstances.\textsuperscript{100} He illustrates this by comparing the priorities of a hungry and a thirsty man. A thirsty person has greater need of water than food. But a hungry person prefers food than water. Likewise sometime Artha is important, sometime Kama, sometime Dharma and sometime Moksha.\textsuperscript{101}

However, he is of the view that Dharma is the basis of the other Purusharthas. He emphasizes that we must get Artha and Kama only through Dharma. If we discard Dharma then Artha will be converted into Anartha and if we combine Dharma with these, only then we will be able to achieve our objective of proper development and fulfilment.\textsuperscript{102} It may be mentioned here that the Mahabharata also recognizes Dharma as the higher value than Artha and Kama. According this epic, writes P.V.Kane, “the three (Dharma, Artha, Kama) are meant for all men that Dharma is the best of the three, that Artha is middling and Kama is the lowest and that if there be conflict then Dharma must be followed and other two abandoned. This shows Artha and Kama were made subservient to Dharma (the ethical code) and all three were subservient to the spiritual goal.”\textsuperscript{103}

However, it does not mean that the subservient purusharthas lose their importance and relevance. Deendayal asserts that Artha and Dharma are complementary and thus
form the basis of each other.\textsuperscript{104} To make this complementarity clear, Upadhyaya gives the following example: we take food to protect prana and it helps us in digesting food. This proves that on the one hand prana is there due to food and on the other hand the food is digested due to the prana.\textsuperscript{105} This shows their symboiotic relationship. Likewise, Dharma and Artha are related to each other. If anyone of them is missing, it leads to perversion. Deendayal asserts that lack of Artha results in destruction of Dharma.\textsuperscript{106} The latter survives on Artha. If there is enough Artha, Dharma is obeyed properly. Otherwise, the people will quarrel with each other there by leading to Adharma.\textsuperscript{107}

According to Deendayal Upadhyaya, a man will not be able even to maintain his body, mind, etc. in a healthy and efficient state in the abhav (absence or inadequacy) of Artha. He says, "Dharma is of primary importance, but we should not forget that it is not possible to practice Dharma in the absence of Artha. There is a saying 'What sin will not be committed by one who is starving? Those who have lost everything become ruthless’. Even a Rishi like Vishwamitra driven by hunger broke into the home of a hunter and ate the flesh of a dog. Therefore, we are enjoined to see that there is enough wealth created continuously, since wealth also strengthens Dharma.”\textsuperscript{108} It may be remembered that starvation may lead even a good man to theft, corruption, dacoity, gambling and other crimes. Deendayal is of the opinion that not only the abhav of Artha but also the excess of it causes problems. Abundance of wealth may lead one to desire for limitless luxuries. It fuels the lust for sensual pleasures. As a result man may become a moral wreck. Deendayal says, "In a state of affluence if there arises an excessive attachment to carnal pleasures, man becomes merely a mammon-
worshipper and loses all sense of his duty to his society, country and Dharma. He misses all Purusharthas (objectives) in life and ruins himself and others. In the first Prabhav of Artha (excessive influence of wealth) wealth no more remains a means but becomes an end in itself. In the second Prabhav it does not remain for the practice of Dharma but becomes merely a means of getting carnal pleasures. This attachment to physical pleasures knows no end and the man never feels that he has enough, however, much he may have. Sky is the limit.\(^{109}\)

From the above discussion it is evident that according to Deendayal both the conditions of Abhav and Prabhav of Artha lead to problems in society. Therefore, he favours an optimum and adequate Artha to meet out the needs of man in society. He advocates ‘guarantee of work for everyone’\(^{110}\) for the fulfilment of basic needs of man. He also stood for alleviation of poverty as he is of the view that enough wealth be provided for man to meet out the requirements of his livelihood.

Deendayal advocates that Kama should be attained through Dharma. He says, “Kama too can be attained only through Dharma. Having produced the material things, such as nice food, when, where, how and in what measure it will be used can be determined only by Dharma. If a sick person eats food meant for healthy one and vice-versa, both of them will be at a disadvantage.”\(^{111}\) According to him an attitude of doing and eating everything as one desires is not desirable. Only doing and desiring what is worth doing and desiring is a conscious attitude. He says, “Dharma helps in restraining the natural tendencies of man, whereby he is able to determine what is beneficial to him apart from what is pleasurable.”\(^{112}\) Deendayal visualizes Kama in two types of
desires - beneficial and pleasurable. This is an Upanishadic idea. Kathopanishad conceptualizes Kama under two broad heads: the Preya, which aim at pleasure and Shreya, which aims at the good of soul. But Deendayal is fully aware of the role of kama for achieving Dharma. That is why he recognises the necessity for the fulfilment of physical needs. In this context he makes the following observation: "If the physical needs are neglected, and desires entirely suppressed, Dharma does not grow. Dharma cannot be observed if one has no food to eat. If the fine arts which satisfy the mind, are altogether stopped, then the civilizing influence on people will not be present. Mind will become perverse and Dharma neglected." Thus, Deendayal builds a complimentary relation between Dharma and Kama.

It may be reiterated that Deendayal Upadhyaya considers Moksha as the highest among the Purusharthas. It is realized only if Artha and Kama are secured in accordance with Dharma. According to Deendayal only such an integrated and harmonious progress ultimately leads to Moksha. In geometric terms it implies that the three values of Dharma, Artha and Kama form the three sides of equilateral triangle and Moksha at its top represents the highest value of life. In this context, it may be noted that Charvaka does not accept the higher values (Dharma and Moksha) of life and the non-Vedic schools-Jainism and Buddhism believe that the lower values cease to be considered necessary for higher ones. Sankara who belongs to the orthodox school of Indian thought also expresses similar viewpoint. According to him, "one could take to (sannyasa) whenever one felt disinterested in the world ... whether one realized the first three values of life or not. The three debts are automatically paid up when one renounces the world."
Unlike them, Deendayal’s formulation of Purushartha is integrated, holistic and hierarchical. He emphasizes the relevance of all the values and does not ignore the lower ones. He is of the view that higher ones cannot be attained in the absence of lower ones. Deendayal advocates the establishment of a balance among the claims of Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha. Dharma in this configuration is viewed by Deendayal as the stabilizing pivot or anchor sheet. His exposition of Purusharthas is undoubtedly traditional. It is woven in ancient paradigm of classical Indian thought. It may be noted that he emphatically holds the importance of spiritual values of life. However, he does not show a bias against materialism. It is evident by the stress he has given on the fulfilment of Artha, no doubt, on the basis of Dharma. In fact, he favours to achieve a balance between materialism and spiritualism. He does not reject materialism on the name of spiritualism, which clearly shows his earnest concern for the material development and progress of man.

IV

In this chapter, we have so far discussed Deendayal’s conception of man, his happiness and values of life. Here onwards, we shall be dealing with his concept of society. It is essential because a man does not live in isolation. He has to co-exist with other men. As a result, man comes into contact with successively larger groups. Therefore, man is inseparably attached to the collectivity. Deendayal says, "The individual ... is not limited to singular 'I' but is also inseparably related to the plural 'We'. Therefore, we must also think of the group or the society."118

According to him society is enlarged man. He considers it a cosmic man having thousand heads, thousand legs and thousand feet. The intellectuals are his heads, the heroes
his arms, the farmers and traders his stomachs and legs, and artisans or craftsmen his feet. The intellectuals, the heroes, farmers and the artisans altogether constitute his body. According to him, "Society is self-born. Like an individual, society comes into existence in an organic way ... it is an organic entity." He asserts, "society too has its body, mind, intellect and soul." He adds, "In reality, society is an entity with its own 'SELF', its own life; it is a sovereign being like an individual." He is of the view that society has its own feelings and thinking. While illustrating this, he says, "Group has its feelings too. These are not exactly similar to the individual’s feelings ... The intellect, emotions and energies, strength of a group, are fundamentally different from those of an individual. Therefore, at times, it is experienced that even a weakling, despite his individual weak physique, turns out to be a heroic member of the society. Sometimes an individual may be ready to put up with an affront to his person, but is unwilling to tolerate an insult to his society. A person may be ready to forgive and forget a personal abuse to him, but the same man loses his temper if you abuse his society." Deendayal asserts, "Group feelings cannot be considered a mere arithmetic addition of individual feelings." This postulation can be supported through primary algebra. It can be deduced that when A and B squared individually, they become A^2 and B^2 but if they are organized i.e. bracketed and squared, (A+B)^2 then the result would be A^2+B^2+2AB. It is the organization, which brought 2AB in addition to A^2+B^2. Therefore, it can be proved mathematically that society or group has its own entity, which is different from that of individuals.
Deendayal regarded individual and society as the two sides of the same coin. To illustrate his argument, he gives an example of a square box having two layers at the top and in the bottom, which cannot be separated by taking out any one of them. Even if the size of the box is reduced, the layers will remain. He is of the view that as the two sides of coin head and tail are inseparable, likewise individual and society are inseparable and are indifferent. "Deendayal rejects the mechanistic notion of society. He asserts, "People do not produce society. It is not a sort of club, or some joint stock company, or a registered co-operative society ... We have not accepted the view that society is some arbitrary association."

Deendayal rejects the views of both the individualists and collectivists in respect of relation of man and society. According to him their views are one sided and hence are not complete truth. The individualists ignore the society in the name of individual development while the collectivists ignore individual and believe only in making society all-powerful. They completely ignore man's multiple qualities and needs for preserving individual identity. He argues that if a man becomes more prosperous and powerful, he will exploit society and if society gets all the levers of power then it will take away the liberty of individual.

According to him the views of individualists and collectivists lead to conflict between individual and society. He warns that conflict and confrontation are conducive neither to the welfare of individual nor that of society. Deendayal holds that the debate regarding the primacy of individual or society is phoney. He asserts that the individual is as big as society and the society is as big as individual. Hence, he pleads that while caring for
ourselves, we should simultaneously care for society. Deendayal has in fact stressed for the need of adoption of a middle path for the advancement of both man and society. Only this, he believes can lead to all round dynamic development. Deendayal emphasizes, "WE are individualists and also stand for the societies. In accordance with Indian philosophy we look to the interest of society even while not ignoring the individual. Because we care for society we are 'socialist' in that sense, and because we do not ignore the individual we are also individualists. Because we do not consider the individual to be supreme it is said that we are not individualists. On the other hand we also do not think that society should rob the individual of all his freedoms and peculiarities. We are against the individual being used as a part of a machine and in that sense we are not socialists. It is our conviction that society cannot be thought of without the individual, nor can an individual have any value without society. Hence we want a synthesis of the two."

Deendayal arrives at a conclusion that individual and society are not contradictory but complementary to each other. He wants to build a harmonious relation between the two. According to him, individual and society are knitted to each other through the bonds of education, work, enjoyment and sacrifice. An individual receives education from his parents and teachers. Society makes arrangements for his livelihood and enjoyment. Individual reciprocates it by offering his services and sacrifices to the society. Deendayal emphasizes that it is the society, which educates and enculturates man, gives opportunities to develop his latent qualities, makes him prosperous, wise, brave and powerful. After getting everything from society man becomes
endowed and starts working for the society. He does not think of himself only. But like a tree, which does not eat its fruits, man too dedicates himself to the service of society. He thinks of all.\(^{135}\) In fine, Deendayal believes that society takes care of man and in lieu of this he dedicates himself for the service of society. In this way, individual and society are knitted in harmony.\(^{136}\) According to him the basis of harmonious relation between individual and society is Atmeeyata (self-hood) which evolves a sense of myness with all. It is not based merely on equality because quest of man is most likely to lead to rivalry and envy. It can lead to dissatisfaction and conflict, and can impede the all round development of man and society. Hence, he asserts that our thinking should not be equality oriented but selfhood oriented. Only this can help in fulfilling the necessities according to the needs of all.\(^{137}\)

It may be stated that Deendayal’s conception of society has its roots in the Hindu philosophy. The conception of society as cosmic man is explicitly enunciated in the Vedic hymn Purusasukta. According to it, “when they divided the primeval being, the Brahman was his mouth, the Rajanya became his arms, Vaisya was his thighs and from his feet sprang the Sudras.”\(^{138}\) A conception of society as an organism has appealed to several Indian thinkers. For Sri Aurobindo, “Society is only an enlargement of the individual.”\(^{139}\) To him it is, “a larger, a composite individual the collective Man”\(^{140}\) He believes that like the individual, it “has a body, an organic life, a moral and aesthetic temperament, a developing mind and a soul.”\(^{141}\) Likewise, R.N. Tagore,\(^{142}\) S. Radhakrishnan,\(^{143}\) and B.C. Pal,\(^{144}\) etc. also hold that society is neither an artificial agglomeration of separate individuals nor a contrivance set up for limited ends but an
organism and living being. The well known Western thinker Herbert Spencer too holds, "that society is", not "a manufacture; whereas it is a growth. Neither the culture of past times nor the culture of the present time, has given to any considerable number of people a scientific conception of society - a conception of it having a natural structure in which as its institutions, governmental, religious, industrial, commercial, &c., &c., are inter - dependently bound - a structure which is in a sense organic."145

It is, however, difficult to accept the organic notion of society and it is wrong to draw anatomical corollaries between individual and society. S.L.Malhotra writes, "No doubt there is some resemblance between the functioning of a social system and that of an organism. It cannot be denied that there is an inter-dependence of individuals in society like that of the parts of an organism. But it is wrong to say that individuals belong to an organism. Each individual has its own centre of consciousness and it is not merely the expression of social consciousness."146 The organic notion of society displaces man from the centre of his consciousness to that of collectivity consciousness. As a result individual loses his identity and is coerced and subjected to by the collectivity. It leads to denial of individual freedom. The moment we regard the society as 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 because the objective of human life is not submergence in collectivity but it seeks to attain harmony between individual and society, and 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 is important to point out, that Chatur-varna system forms an integral part of Deendayal's organic conception 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 fourfold division of society. This conception can lead to the development of rigid and intolerant caste system. It could be misused to give legitimacy to the caste system. The history reveals that the problem of casteism has vitiated the social fabric of India. It encouraged divisive urges and sectional approaches and led to the horizontal division of society. Thus, instead of promoting harmony in society, which Deendayal wanted, his conception of Virat Purusha with Chatur-varna is most likely to promote inter caste conflict and disharmony.

V

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 humanity and universe.

He believes in the principle of "Yat pinde tad brahmande" (what is in microcosm is also in macrocosm). In other words the entire cosmos is a manifestation of one principle. He asserts that the entire universe is pivoted in Godhead. Deendayal is of the view that all the diverse things of nature are the flowering of the single mystically perceived entity. This idea is elaborated by him through the following illustration: "The unit of seed finds expression in various forms - the roots, the trunk, the branches, the leaves, the flowers and the fruits of the tree. All these
have different forms and colours and even to some extent different properties. Still we recognise their relation of unity with each other through the seed."\textsuperscript{150} Deendayal considers that various parts of the tree are mere manifestation of one seed. The outward or apparent-forms are internally attached to one seed and thus represents unity. To him, seed and tree are correlates.

Thus, he envisions intrinsic unity among the manifold things of the universe. Deendayal says, "We do not admit that there is diversity and plurality in life but we have always attempted to discover the unity behind them ... The diversity in life is merely an expression of the internal unity."\textsuperscript{151} He further holds, "Unity in diversity and the expression of unity in various forms has remained the central thought of Bharatiya culture."\textsuperscript{152} While writing on Deendayal's philosophy, V.V.Nene observes, "Bharatiya culture has also considered the unity of men - nay it has considered the unity of humans, the animal, and plant world and even the inanimate world. But the basis of this consideration is not the superficial diversity but the underlying unity. Since there is a single principle - Atma - common to all."\textsuperscript{153}

It may be observed that Deendayal envisions that entire cosmos is a single unified system. All the diverse forms of universe are integrally attached to one-another. "The individual occupies a pivotal position"\textsuperscript{154} in this system. Man is attached intrinsically with all the creations of the universe. Therefore, his vision is termed as Integral Humanism.

It may be observed that Deendayal's vision, which visualizes one entity as the cause of the apparent diversities of the universe resembles very closely to the
Upanishadic idea of 'one and many' viz. "He who makes manyfold the one seed." Deendayal is of the view that the underlying cause and the effect (the manifested apparent world) are correlates only. There is mere transformation of one entity into the other forms. He seems to have been influenced by Parinama-vada theory of the Sankhya school of Indian philosophy, which holds that no one can convert non-existence into existence. According to this theory of evolution (Parinama-vada "the things of the world are looked upon as the result, not of new creation, but of transformation within the primal substance." Vedanta also influenced Deendayal's philosophical postulation of unity. According to Isa Upanishad, "The unity and manifoldness are both aspects of the life divine. Unity is the truth and multiplicity is its manifestation ... Unity constitutes the base of multiplicity and upholds it but multiplicity does not constitute and uphold the unity." Deendayal considers this cosmos as a single unified system because as discussed he believes that entire universe is pivoted in Godhead. He appears to have been influenced by the non-dual philosophy of Indian Vedantic tradition. It closely resembles the conception of 'That One', Tat Ekam (R.V., 129), which traces the growth of monism in Veda and upholds that a single primordial cause unfolds itself as the universe in all its diversities. Further, Advaita Vedanta expounds, that which exists is one; sages call it by various names (Ekam Swadipra Bahudha Vadanti); what ever exists is his manifestation, 'That Thou Art' (Tat Tuam Asi). The Chandogya and Munduka Upanishads have expressed similar view: "It is Brahman that is below and is above, that is to the west and to the east, that is to the south and to the north. Brahman indeed, is this whole universe." It may be
noted that waves of monism can also be traced in the Western
tought. Milesian School of Pre-Socratic period holds that
single substance is the cause of the world formulation. It
may be pointed out that the Milesian cosmology resembles
Deendayal's cosmic vision for its idea: "that primary
substance bears 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 too holds that
the things are many in name, but in nature are one. There is
only one world, not many and there cannot be more than one
because it is a created copy in accord with the eternal,
original apprehended by God. Plotinus also considers world
soul as the creator of cosmos. Spinoza, Bradley and
Bergson also hold an analogous conception in this context.

It is pertinent to note that despite being a monist,
Deendayal does not accept the mayavada of Sankara, who holds
that only Brahman, is real and the world is an illusion.
Unlike him, Deendayal considers both the Brahman and world
as real. For him, both are like the two sides of the same
coin. He does not conceive a world negating attitude, which
is evident from his notion of karam-mukti as discussed
earlier. He motivates man to work for the upliftment of the
people in society. In this context, he resembles modern
Indian thinkers such as Swami Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo,
Radhakrishnan, Tagore, etc.
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