

Integrated Human Philosophy : A Brief Study

Dr. Preeti Gupta

Assistant Professor, Dept. of B.Ed. Dr. Virendra Swarup Institute of Professional Studies, Kanpur

Panditji's (Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya) most valuable contribution to mankind was his enunciation of the concept of **Integral Humanism**. Those deeply involved in the make-and-break politics may mistake Panditji's Integral Humanism as a new '*ism*' or doctrine or dogma propounded by him in order to counter all other prevailing '*isms*' or to add a new one. It is all too well-known that prophets of an '*ism*' or a new political thought claim originality. It is more so in the West. A slight deviation or difference with the current thought entitles one to proclaim himself the founder of a new doctrine. But no such thought ever crossed Panditji's mind. As a true votary of culture, he was not given to this narrowness. He believed in what *Bhagwan Sri Krishna* said in the *Gita* that true knowledge is timeless. One may observe some variation in its expressed form owing to varied situations and conditions but that does not mean the creation of new knowledge. Panditji, through his creative ability and positive outlook put a new gloss on the true and eternal thought current and reinterpreted it to suit the changed and contemporary world. It would be clear, therefore, that integral humanism was conceived only to perfect '*isms*' so that they could meet the challenges posed to them. It was farthest from his thought to add to the ideological bitterness prevailing in the society by outright rejection or repudiation of any of the contemporary ideas, *ism* or viewpoints while expressing his own.(1-4)

Why this '*ism*' or that Panditji was opposed to all '*isms*'. He only believed that which was truthful and timeless, could face the challenges of change and, therefore, could hardly fit into the steel-frame of any '*ism*'. In other words, no '*ism*' can ever suit all countries and conditions and for all times. He precisely thought so. But in the modern age, people cannot think without an '*ism*', and he too adopted the usage only as a device for the convenience of his audience.(5)

But to dispel any doubts in his behalf, he used to explain that as one cannot easily concentrate his mind in *Brahma*, he needs in the beginning, to fix his mind on *Brahma*. Once one gets accustomed to this form of concentration it becomes easier for him later to do so in respect of the "Nirguna" or "Nirakar" *Brahma* also. So to grasp easily the real and eternal truth which is above all '*isms*', first one has to comprehend fully the reality that exists in this world through the medium of integral humanism.

To engage oneself in constant debate, discourse or a controversy is the function of a philosopher. Panditji was not a philosopher in that sense of the term. To call him so is to belittle him. In the tradition of *Bharatiya* sages of yore, he was in fact a *seer*. Therefore, whatever he has seen and perceived, may be called Darshan. The word philosophy hardly conveys what we *Bharatiyas* mean by the term. This kind of “*Darshan*” is neither new nor unfamiliar to us. It has flourished in our soil. It will be worthwhile to understand this basic point before we proceed further so that there is no confusion because of the use of this suffix.(6)

Why at all we needed the term and the concept of Integral Humanism at this juncture, specially when many many ‘isms’ and thoughts were born, spread and are regarded as *progressive* in the west. Many of our people wonder whether it is worth its while to strain our brains unnecessarily when our problems could be solved by borrowing the wholesale ‘isms’ or theories of the west. Similarly, it is also unreasonable to reject everything of western origin. It would therefore be useful to briefly review the currents and cross-currents of western thought in the last three or four centuries.(7)

Western Thought

Let us, first of all, deal with ‘sect’, or religion. It can be stated briefly that when this drama of religion was being enacted on the European stage, the entire system or order was centrifugal. The Pope was the central point and the entire Christian world revolved around him. Later on, **two revolts** challenged the centralized authority of the **Pope**.

In the second phase of religion, the idea that there was no need of an intermediary like the Pope between the seeker and the sought became very powerful. This gave rise to sects like the Protestants. The people thought that interference by an external authority which may be confined to religious matters, should not be permitted in the affairs of the state. Thus was born the concept of **Nationalism**.

In the third phase, we find that the existence of religion was attacked and it was decried as meaningless as an ‘opiate’. To think of a supernatural power beyond perceptible human power came to be regarded as devoid of truth and mere flight of imagination. The origin, middle and the end of the universe was nothing but godless physical matter. Religion was nothing but an illusion. As physical elements and matter were believed to be origin of nature, mind too was considered a superstructure on matter. In other words, religion, culture, ethics, etc., has no independent existence and were mere

reflections of social and economic conditions. Thus in the third phase, matter became fundamental and **religion was totally rejected**.(8)

Reaction against Atheism

The next phase of development in Europe witnessed a *reaction* against materialistic atheism. Scholars and thinkers began to realize that whatever views **Marx** might have formed on degeneration of religion and the **Church** and howsoever relevant they might have been to the situation then prevailing there, it would be wrong to regard them universal or global. Instead, emphasis shifted to re-evaluation of the place of religion in the different countries in different periods. Thinkers began saying that even if religion was not to be regarded as fundamental to human life, they would have to concede, it had a distinct place and it would be wrong to think that religion was an opiate or its form was determined by social and economic condition.(4)

Change in Marxists' Thinking

Such ideas started gathering momentum. Further, even the staunchest of Marxists who, very loudly denounced God in favour of materialism and who condemned religion as **opiate**, started doubting **Marx as crude materialist**. His thesis in **1842**, on the freedom of the individual and the freedom of the press, and his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts published in **1844**, prompted his followers to declare that he was not a mere materialistic thinker. They thought that just as inanimate and material things influenced abstract thought, abstract thinking too influenced insentient material objects. Similarly, if, on the one hand, social and economic situation played an important role in shaping religion, culture and ethics, on the other, socio-economic conditions were also influenced by religion, culture and ethics. In other words, they act and interact on each other.

Four Centuries of European Thought

Let us discuss what does *European history of four centuries* reveal? We find that in the early period **individual** is the primary unit. But when the curtain is raised, we do not find the free individual anywhere on the scene. He is merely a puppet in the hands of the Pope or of the Monarch with no free will of his own.(3)

In the next stage, we see that the individuality of man asserts itself through defiance of the oppressors. This led to open revolt against the **Pope** and the **Monarch**, which liquidated the authority of the Papal state and

monarchy. Later, the thought that individual freedom should remain unrestrained gained ground. Institutions like the Parliament, or other democratic systems which ensured individual freedom came into existence and people were happy that those agencies could protect individual liberty.

With the passage of time, individual liberty led to freedom for exploitation; the democratic institutions turned into means of exploitation of the weak by the strong, of the poor by the rich and of the less intelligent by the more intelligent. We thus witness in Europe emergence of two classes – *the exploiting minority* and *the exploited majority*. Those oppressed to any kind of exploitation were up against freedom of exploitation while those opposed to it wanted to do away with individual freedom. In other words, extinction of individuality of the individual was demanded. The situation, then, warranted a **totalitarian** apparatus. And what could it be?(5)

All intents to establish a totalitarian state in the name of individual freedom and all institutions wanting freedom of exploitation met with strong opposition. **Thus arose the need of a revolution, a bloody revolution**, since democratic institutions were found to be incapable of ending exploitation. It is how the idea of a **bloody revolution** aimed at establishing a dictatorship of the **proletariat** gained popular support. Incidentally, a bloody revolution did take place in Russia. But experience proved that it was not the dictatorship of the entire exploited masses but of a coterie, a ruling *coterie*. People tolerated the order in the hope that, that was a transitory phase and that as soon as the dictatorship of the have-nots was established, the situation would change. But their hopes were belied and they began to realize that the dictatorship of an individual or a small clique has come to stay. That, perhaps, is the reason why we witness signs of revolt against this order, the one under which they are groaning.(6)

Thus we see that this churning of various ‘ism’ could not find a ‘panacea’ for the ailing society because all their endeavor were like watering the branches and leaves and neglecting the parched roots-the soul- the invisible underlying universal consciousness realization of which can enable human being to realize the ‘oneness’-the universal harmony-the unity the absence of The Unity the expense of which had been the cause of many misconceptions and misbehaves which had been leading to strife- struggle- was ended bloodshed.

Pandit Deendayal hall that Humanism- the realisation of Universal Oneness- not humanitarism can pave the way to peace progress and prosperity of all the soul breathing on this planet- Earth.(7,8)

References:

1. Bandiste, D.D. Humanist Thought in Contemporary India. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation, 1999.
2. Bandyopadhyaya, Jayantanuja. Social and Political Thought of Gandhi. Bombay: Allied Publishers, 1969.
3. Bandyopadhyaya, Narayan Chandra. Development of Hindu Polity and Political Theories Part I. Calcutta:, R. Combay & Co. 1927
4. Barthwal, Harishchander. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: Vyaktitva Evam Jeevan Darshan. New Delhi: Deendayal Research Institute, n.d.
5. Bentham, Jermy. An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1823.
6. Bhishikar, C.P. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Ideology and Perception: Concept of Rashtra. New Delhi: Suruchi prakashan, 1988.
7. Blackham, H.J. Humanism. Middlesex: Penguin Books Inc.,1968.
8. Objections to Humanism. London: Constable & Co. Ltd., 1966.