

Life Philosophy of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay

*Dr. Shishir Kant Tripathi

Assistant Professor

Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology

Govt Lahiri P.G. College Chirimiri, C.G.

**Dr. Shrutika Shukla

Department of History

Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur, C.G.

Abstract: Deendayal Upadhyay was a great politician, social thinker and philosopher, who provided a new model to Indian politics for the development and good governance of India. He is one of those politicians of his time who needs to be acknowledged more. He was a scholar who tried to provide a practical alternative in politics and prepared the ground for what the new generation was craving. Traces of the cultural ethos of this country which is thousands of years old can be found in his philosophy. He not only created a cadre for the ideology of cultural nationalism but also provided a strong foundation to realize his ideals for the organisation. Pandit Upadhyay made it clear through his writings that indiscriminate use of the Western system is neither appropriate nor practical, because there are differences in the civilization, culture and administrative structure of each country. It becomes more imperative to study the thoughts of Deendayal Upadhyaya to empower the deprived sections of the society and ensure social justice for all. It is important to observe the thoughts of Upadhyay in the present political context not only because he was a great Indian philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist and political scientist but also because he was one of the most important leaders of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, who gave a new perspective to Indian politics. There is no doubt that it was due to the propagation and practice of his ideals and values that the Bharatiya Jana Sangh developed and later the BJP was born. He was completely in tune with the Sangh's method. And through the Sangh, he dedicated his life to the service of the nation. He was one of the primary leaders who not only instilled a sense of nationalism among the people of the country but also established himself as a person who condemned and became vocal about exploitation by the state. Deendayal Upadhyay is better known for his ideas of Integral Humanism. This is a concept that is deeply embedded in the Indian public psyche. The philosophy of Integral Humanism advocates the simultaneous and integrated functioning of every human being's body, mind, intellect, and spirit. Upadhyay had set this task for himself in his Poona lecture on Integral Humanism, which later became exemplary for all human beings. While determining the role of man in the society, he had said – Contemporary politics in India was based on the understanding of man and his role in the society. The political leadership of post-independence India attempted to apply Western notions of a good society to Indian conditions, but the results were unsatisfactory. Economic growth was slow, unemployment and exploitation increased, national unification was weakened, and cultural progress was slow. Through this, Upadhyay ji has given a new direction to Indian political thinking and philosophy. Therefore, it is the need of the hour to analyse the contribution of Upadhyay ji in public life by throwing light on his political and social life. The presented research paper delves into the relevance of Deendayal Upadhyay's thoughts and values in the present time. Is his philosophy still relevant in the present changing environment due to information, communication and technology? One of the major objectives of this study is to shed light on Upadhyay's social, economic, nationalist, democratic and socialist thinking in the current political paradigm. These are such burning questions which have been raised in this research paper.

Key words: United India, Nationalism, Political and Economic, Integral Humanism, Democratic, Antyodaya, Socialism, Jan Sangh.

Introduction: Since the establishment of human society, discussion started on how to live and let others live. In this regard, many philosophers, intellectuals, leaders and religious gurus have expressed their views from time to time and

added values to their concepts. Deen Dayal Upadhyay, who was a prominent Indian philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist and political scientist, developed the theory of Integral Humanism as a new concept. According to him humans had four hierarchical qualities of body, mind, intellect and soul, which corresponded to four universal purposes, kama (desire), artha (wealth), dharma (moral duty) and moksha (total liberation). Dharma is the 'fundamental', and salvation is the 'supreme' aim of mankind and society. Dharma is the thread that follows 'Kaamash' and 'Artha' towards the supreme goal of human life, 'Mokshaash'. This four-pronged effort inherent in ancient Indian culture is not unified and disjointed and contradictory like the Western ideology of capitalism and communism. Thus, Deendayal's idea of 'Integral Humanism' can alone ensure holistic and sustainable development of the society leading to happiness and peace at individual, social, national and global levels. The main ideas of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay can be seen in his concepts of Indianness, Dharma, Dharmarajya and Antyodaya. Antyodaya, though a term belonging to the Gandhian lexicon, is rooted in the thoughts of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya. His vision of 'education for all', work for every hand, and water for the city and farm, was seen to translate into his idea of economic democracy. Explaining his idea of economic democracy, he says, 'If one vote for all is the touchstone of political democracy, then work for all is a touchstone of economic democracy. He advocated swadeshi and decentralization, opposing the ideas of large-scale industry-based development, centralization and monopoly. He further said that any system which reduces employment opportunities is undemocratic. He advocated a system free from social inequality where capital and power were decentralised.

Thus, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay is widely known for his philosophy of Integral Humanism which is also the official philosophy of the Bharatiya Janata Party. According to Upadhyay ji, the primary concern in India should be to develop an indigenous economic model that puts man at the centre. Integral humanism is based on politics and ethics in indigenous and small-scale industrialization in economies. These concepts revolve around the core themes of harmony, primacy of cultural national values and discipline. Thus, Upadhyay proposed that Indian thought provides insight into the solution. He argued that every nation, including India, had a unique national ideal, shaped by its physical environment and its collective experience, which informed the ideal of its political and social life. Therefore, the task of the philosopher is to propound this national ideal and the duty of the politician, it is rightly believed, to discover ways of applying the ideal to his time. Thus, a good society is one in which every individual or group works to maintain the well-being of the nation. In justice, every person does socially useful work according to his ability. Every nation creates its own institutions to meet human needs. Property, unions, religious sects, means of production, even the state are merely instruments of the nation. The natural desire of people within the geographical area historically associated with the nation is to be politically united. In Upadhyay's view, the state comes into existence by a type of social contract that the nation uses to protect itself and meet basic human needs. If a particular form of government fails to adequately accomplish those goals, the nation has the right to adopt a new form of government. He believed that communism and capitalism were illegitimate for the basic instincts, because both encourage social conflict by appealing to the basic instincts of man. Similarly, the present caste system is a flawed institution because it promotes social tension, even though it may have been valid in an earlier era, when conditions were different. He argues that the current economic system, which allows wide inequality in income and control over the means of production, is unnatural, because it results in exploitation, physical suffering that weakens the nation's bond of brotherhood. For social harmony, Jan Sangh proposed that the maximum income should not be ten times more than the minimum.

Upadhyayji was in favour of decentralization of political power and economic system. This motive inspired him to support workers' control over the means of production. He favoured individual ownership of small-scale enterprises and co-operative ownership of large complex industries. Some kind of Populist motives can be identified in his call for education in the mother tongue. In his view, English education tended to create class distinctions, which weakened the sense of community. Deendayal Upadhyay was a successful organizer, skilled politician, and a wealthy personality dedicated to the service of the nation. While still studying in his youth, he joined the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and later worked as a full-time worker. To create a tradition and harmony between the two organizations, Upadhyaya was given the responsibility of Bharatiya Jana Sangh (BJS). When Dr. Syama Prasad Mukherjee founded the party after consultation with the RSS leadership, he was made the General Secretary of the party. Pandit Upadhyay groomed Atal Bihari Vajpayee, LK Advani, Nanaji Deshmukh and many other leaders who took the BJS and later the Bharatiya Janata Party to new heights. The ideology of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh took off when Upadhyay's close associate and confidant Atal Bihari Vajpayee became the Prime Minister of the country in 1996 and was the first non-Congress leader of India to hold this post. Pandit Upadhyaya was an astute political

strategist who realized the importance of coalition politics, which was to play an important role in the coming decades. Along with Ram Manohar Lohia, Charan Singh, he formed an alliance against the Congress, first in 1963 and later in 1967, resulting in the fall of Congress governments from nine states. It was a milestone in Indian political history as it created space for pluralism in political practice and shattered the belief that the Congress was invincible. In 1977, his dream of a non-Congress alternative took shape when the Janata Party, led by Morarji Desai, formed the government at the Centre. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay was one of those extraordinary personalities who inspired modern Indian politics to stand on the organic foundation of humanity. But the irony is that Deendayal Upadhyaya has not yet got his due place in the intellectual and political history of India, which he really deserved.

1. Ideas of integral humanism

Pandit Upadhyaya propounded a set of ideas known as Integral Humanism. He defined it systematically in four lectures he delivered in Pune in April 1965. Elements of his thinking on this matter had already been presented for discussion in the Jana Sangh and adopted as the fundamental ideological statement of the party in Vijayawada in January 1965. Upadhyay began systematically to implement Integral Humanism in practical politics in his presidential address at the 14th annual session of the Jana Sangh in Calicut in December 1967. For Upadhyay, any system in which man does not achieve primacy is bound to eventually collapse. His intellectual discourse in the form of Integral Humanism re-establishes the place of man in the right perspective and attempts to develop him as a complete personality. Upadhyay's theory of Integral Humanism draws its core support from the age-old wisdom of Indian sages who revealed this wisdom to mankind several thousand years ago. He writes that 'Man, God's supreme creation, is losing his identity. We must restore him to his rightful position, make him realize his greatness, reawaken his abilities and encourage him to strive to attain the divine. This is only possible through a decentralized economy. 'Swadeshi' and 'decentralisation' are two words that can summarize the economic policy suitable for the present circumstances. Pandit Upadhyaya rejects both capitalism and communism as both are related to centralization of economic power. In capitalism, wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few and in the case of communism, in the hands of the state. Interestingly, he cited the 'New Class' to prove that 'a new class of bureaucratic exploiters has come into existence' in communist countries.

When social thinkers talk about different types of people based on behaviour and intelligence economic man, technical man, contemplative man and so forth integral humanism envisions a single individual. Each side is different from the other, each behaves in its own way without the other shining through. It attributes to man the four centres of energy, body, mind, intellect and soul, from which all his diverse thoughts and actions originate. All four centres are integral parts of a human being, yet they vary in their operational intensity according to society's norms and expectations from the human being. Integral Humanism makes the first attempt to use a new and revolutionary concept of man. Moving from the idea, this is a first step towards producing some details of a humane, interactive, cooperative socio-economic system. In Upadhyay's view, the core of the socio-economic system is the right action of the individual which is action according to religion. He defines Dharma as the innate laws that maintain and further the existence and progress of the entity they serve. Eminent politician and lawyer Subramaniam Swamy expressed the philosophy of Integral Humanism in an essay and wrote, 'The objective of Integral Humanism is national development, the priorities are primacy of man through balanced development of human beings, development strategy is conflict resolution and harmony, resources Together is through trusteeship and asceticism and the institutional framework is decentralization and self-reliance Pandit Upadhyay not only rejected Western ideas, but argued that every nation had a unique national ideal, shaped by its physical environment and collective experience, which should inform its political and social life. By presenting the concept of Integral Humanism, Deendayal Upadhyay has presented a new fundamental alternative ideological framework to the world. Among the various forms of government, he considered democracy the most natural because it gives the nation a direct voice in shaping its destiny. The 1965 Statement of Principles of the Jan Sangh, based on his concept of Integral Humanism, cautioned that political democracy was a sham unless it was accompanied by social and economic democracy.

2. Thoughts related to Antyodaya

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay propounded the idea of Antyodaya which means welfare of the last person standing in the queue. Deendayal Upadhyay spoke and wrote a lot for the upliftment of the common man. He believed that the whole purpose of politics was to work for the poor and marginalized people. Deen Dayal's source of inspiration was the poor, helpless, tradition-bound common man who endured centuries of foreign invasion and misrule and kept the soul of the nation alive. In most of his political statements he seemed convinced that the future of the country was in the hands of the common man, and he felt it was important to introduce them to modern realities. He himself had

written that I will not judge the progress of my country in terms of what the government has done or what the scientists have achieved, but I will judge the progress of my country in terms of the progress of the man in the village, in terms of his potential. I will do that to provide a better life to my children How capable they are seeking to achieve these goals he declared himself a Karma Yogi and he asked everyone to act in the same manner. In his presidential address in 1967, he concluded with a strong expression of support for the poor and the powerless, saying, "Our countrymen are the blood of our blood and the flesh of our flesh." We will not rest until we are able to give everyone a sense of pride that they too are children of Mother India. We will make Bharat Mata Sujala, Suphal (laden with fruits and drenched with water) in the real sense of these words.

3. Ideas related to socialism

In the eyes of Deendayal Upadhyay, the solution to the world's problems lies not in socialism but in Hinduism. This is the only philosophy of life which considers life as a whole and not in pieces. Also, it would be a big mistake to believe that Hinduism is against modern scientific progress. Socialism accepts that all things can be achieved only through struggle, which is not right. Both science and machines should be used according to our social and cultural life. Today socialism is being discussed everywhere and it is being considered as the most beneficial system for the people. Socialism means state control over all means of production and distribution. In such a situation, people are reduced to the status of labourers. There is no independent ownership. To establish such socialism, class struggle and bloody revolution are called for. Efforts are also made to bring this socialism in a peaceful manner. But since this system accepts conflict between the individual and society and limits the freedom of the individual, under it man becomes merely a part of a machine. The relationship between individual and society under such socialism is not in accordance with Indian culture and tradition. We are not socialists of this kind, nor are we individualists in the Western sense. Our Upanishads say that one who concentrates on the individual attains darkness, and one who worships only collectively goes the same way. The Indian system demands a mixture of both. Our effort is to integrate the individual into the whole, because an individual can die but society can never die. We want synthesis, we are individualists and stand for society. According to Indian philosophy, we do not ignore the individual but look towards the welfare of the society. Because we care about society, we are socialists in the sense that we do not ignore individual individualists. Along with this, we do not consider the individual as supreme all the time, hence it is said that we are not individualists. On the other hand, we also do not think that society should deprive a person of all his freedoms and specialties. We are against the individual being used as a part of the machine and in that sense, we are not socialists. We believe that society cannot be imagined without the individual, nor can the individual have any value without the society. So, we want a synthesis of both. Indivisible India has concluded that it is wrong to consider individual and society as mutually contradictory. Of course, if there is any distortion or lack of system then it is necessary to take steps to remove it. But the basic truth is that individual and society are one and inseparable. In a cultured situation, a person will think about the society even while thinking about himself. If someone thinks of doing good to himself by causing harm to the society, then he would be thinking in the wrong direction. This is a state of perversion and will not benefit the individual because the individual will have to suffer the situation in which the society finds itself.

4. Political philosophical Ideas

Pandit Upadhyay was a great thinker and politician of the twentieth century who tried to bring revolutionary changes in Indian politics. Like a great hero, he made an incredible effort to assimilate India's civilization, culture and tradition. He wanted to develop a political philosophy in accordance with the nature and tradition of India, which could ensure the all-round progress of India. He propounded the political philosophy of Integral Humanism which became the cornerstone for every worker of the Bharatiya Jan Sangh and later the BJP. He believed that Indian politics cannot be seen in isolation from India's culture and philosophy of life. Both socialism and democracy are the results of class struggle. Although the objective of both is to end this conflict and establish unity, the method they have adopted for this purpose has only changed the form of these classes, not eliminated them and hence this conflict has become even more intense. . Democracy recognized that the conflict between the king and the subjects was eternal and hence it abolished the king. But conflict between different sections of people has been permanently accepted by democracy. Socialism took as its basis the struggle between the rich and the poor. The classes changed but the conflict did not end, because all systems of thought in the West stem from Darwin's theory of survival of the fittest. The world does not run because of conflict but through coordination and cooperation. If you are a democrat, then be guided not by anyone but your conscience. Political parties that stand for the people also stand on the strength of the people. If people want that no one should bow down to them then people should give them their power. It is the people who are the creators of political parties, and through them build their political fortunes. What's a good party? Clearly one that

is not merely a collection of individuals, but a body with a distinct purposeful existence distinct from its own desire to seize power. Political power should not be a means for the members of such a party. There must be dedication to a cause in the rank and file of the party. Bhakti leads to dedication and discipline. Discipline is to a party what religion is to a society. Different political parties should try to develop a philosophy for themselves. Don't let them become just a group of individuals banded together for some selfish purpose. It is also necessary that the philosophy of the party should not be limited to the pages of the party's manifesto. Members must understand this and dedicate themselves to putting it into practice.

The question of discipline is important not only for keeping the party in perfect health but also because of its effect on the conduct of the people in general. A government is primarily an instrument of protection and security and not of destruction or change. It seeks to inculcate respect for the law among the people and that the parties who wish to be guardians of the law themselves set an example in this direction. The essence of democracy is the spirit and capacity for self-governance. If the parties cannot govern themselves, how can they hope to generate a desire for self-governance in the community? While on the one hand it is necessary for the community to guarantee and protect individual liberty, on the other hand it is desirable for the individual to voluntarily submit to the general will. Therefore, it is necessary for parties to set a code of conduct for their members and strictly follow it. The duty of the elector is to oppose a bad candidate because he cannot claim that the party to which he belongs is good. Vote is a mandate. People should also realize that vote is not a means of expressing gratitude to any candidate but a mandate to fulfil their wishes.

5. Ideas related to united India and nationalism

The Jana Sangh has acknowledged Akhand Bharat (undivided India), which encompasses all of the fundamental principles of nationalism and an integral culture. The sense that this whole region, from Atak to Cuttack, from Kutch to Kamrup, and from Kashmir to Kanyakumari, is not only sacred to us but also a part of us is encapsulated in these words. Every devotee of undivided India exhibits the fundamental unity of their entire lives, despite the fact that there may be numerous outward distinctions based on time and location among those who have lived there since the beginning of time. India's partition is unnatural, but what is the unnatural history of India's division? History is an inventive attempt to eliminate the barriers that stand in the way of realizing life's essential unity. The largest barrier to achieving this oneness was slavery. We thus battled against it. This insight should have been aided by independence. However, we are disappointed that it did not occur. Conflicting emotions are clashing in our lives nowadays. "Our country is unified India." India is not naturally divided. We attempt to fool ourselves today into thinking that we are happy in this strange circumstance, but we are not. We will be released from this internal struggle and our efforts will become more cohesive and powerful if we embrace this reality. The largest barrier to a unified India is the separatist and anti-national mindset of the Muslim community. The triumph of this mindset is the establishment of Pakistan. People who are skeptical about unified India believe that Muslims won't alter their stance. If this is the case, India's interests would be severely harmed by the continued presence of six crore Muslims in the country. Will any Congressman advocate for the expulsion of Muslims from India? If not, they will need to integrate into this nation's national life. Only the spirit of unity will be able to unite our nation if its lack of unity causes it to become split. We ought to work toward this. It would be incorrect to regard Pakistan as a distinct independent state because its existence has fragmented this nation's political independence. It stands for the strategy and custom that aims to eradicate India's national identity in favor of foreign rule and ideals. Pakistan is thus a holdover from India's enslavement. Our political emancipation won't be complete till we liberate our brethren from this servitude.

6. Ideas related to democratic system

Democracy requires debate, but it can only be productive if both sides pay close attention to what the other has to say and are prepared to acknowledge the truth. If we insist on our own viewpoint rather than attempting to comprehend the viewpoint of the other person, such discussions must remain pointless. Truth can be attained via meaningful discourse. We think that reality is multifaceted and may be viewed, analyzed, and experienced from a variety of perspectives. Therefore, a seer is someone who possesses the ability to see the unity that underlies all of this multiplicity. Conflict between the individual and society does not exist in a democracy devoid of values; if it does, it is an exception. For the sake of society, individual freedom must be restricted. Unrestrained freedom leads to a person's demise rather than their growth. For an individual to really develop, they must fully identify with society. The person serves as both a media and a gauge for society's level of perfection. There is no conflict between societal goals and individual freedom. Democracy is a tool for the people to fulfill their obligations. The nation's spirit, people's

awareness of their responsibilities, and their discipline all affect the instrument's efficacy. Democracy devolves into a tool of party, class, and individual interest if citizens lack these values. Democracy is hampered by the concentration of social, political, and economic power in the hands of one individual or organization. When power in one area becomes concentrated in the hands of one individual, that individual typically attempts, either directly or indirectly, to concentrate power in other areas as well. In general, one should avoid entering the realm of economics and be kept apart from various administrative entities. In contrast to socialism, which concentrates power over all means of production in the hands of the state, a capitalist economy first acquires power in the economic domain before moving into the political one. The democratic rights of the individual and their appropriate development are opposed by both of these regimes. Therefore, we need to consider the division of authorities in addition to centralization. It would be inappropriate to dedicate our entire existence to Western-developed democratic institutions and customs, or to the prefabricated models of socialism that Lenin, Stalin, and Marx advocated. The nation's way of life transcends both of these concepts. Rather than forcing Western politics on India, we must create our own political ideology. By doing this, we can get insight from Western thought. However, we shouldn't let this overwhelm us or take it for granted.

Political Parties and Democracy Three key components make to the definition of Swaraj. First and foremost, the people who live in the nation should run the government. Second, in order to ensure that its policies are focused on the national interest, the government should operate in that capacity. Third, for the benefit of the country, such a government needs to have its own authority. To put it another way, it is incorrect to think of Swaraj as being independent. Even in cases when the government is run by citizens, Swaraj may lose its significance if it adopts the policies of another country. The state may be forced to act against the interests of the country if it is not autonomous in terms of its policies, self-reliant in terms of economic planning, and self-reliant in terms of defense.

7. Ideas related to economic system

Two terms that might sum up the economic strategy appropriate for the current situation are "decentralization" and "swadeshi." The idea that only large-scale, centralized industry is economically successful has imprisoned planners, and as a result, they have persisted in that direction without considering the negative consequences, or deliberately but helplessly. "Swadeshi" has also experienced the same situation. As a result, the idea of Swadeshi is mocked as archaic. We are pleased to use foreign help in every aspect of our lives, including management, money, production techniques, technology, standards, and consumption patterns. This is not the way of development and advancement. The beneficial aspects of "Swadeshi" ought to serve as the cornerstone for reconstructing our economy. We must fundamentally distance ourselves from the West since reliance on the Western economy impedes our economic growth due to disparities in time and geography as well as differing standards of living. We might quickly become overwhelmed by the amount of critical literature published by Western economics. There might be some principles in the study of economics that are universal and independent of time, location, or system, but very few individuals would be able to recognize this. Despite being experts in Western economics, our economists have not been able to contribute significantly to the field since the Indian economy is unable to supply them with the essential concepts or places for experimentation. No right is everlasting, whether it has to do with property or something else entirely. All of them rely on societal interests. In actuality, the individual is granted these rights in order to fulfill his societal obligations. A soldier is equipped with weapons because it is his responsibility to defend society. He forfeits his right to bear arms if he fails to fulfill his obligation. In a same vein, a person is granted the right to property in order to fulfill the obligations set forth by society. It becomes vital to periodically define and amend these rights for this reason. Property rights are not a society's absolute rights. The right to use a specific item for a certain purpose and within a specific limit is known as the right of ownership. Over time, these rights continue to evolve. As a result, we cannot, in theory, become entangled in the struggle between individual and societal rights. For us, there are other types of society besides the state. We think that society expresses and fulfills itself in a variety of ways, including the person, the family, the community, and the state. In this country, the joint family is the practical unit in which we wish to maintain the individual's social spirit, where each person has the right to earn money but the family retains ownership rights. The family uses the funds for their own needs. Gandhiji and other intellectuals advocated this Indian concept of trusteeship. Right to Food: These days, the phrase "one must earn one's bread" is frequently heard. Even capitalists do not fundamentally disagree with this slogan, which is typically used by communists. If they differ at all, it's only in terms of who makes money and how much. Capitalists view capital and business as crucial components of production, and if they take a substantial portion of the profits, it is because they believe it is their right. Communists, on the other hand, view labor as the primary factor of production. As a result, they assign laborers a significant portion of the production. None of these theories are true. In a strict sense, our motto

ought to be he who earns will feed, and everyone will have enough to eat. Food is a fundamental human right. Education and training lead to the ability to earn. Even the wealthiest members of society are required to eat. Children, the elderly, the ill, and those with disabilities should all be cared for by society. However, as time has gone on, our reliance on outside resources has increased. We worry that because there is already enough food available, the government may get complacent in its attempts to boost local production. Only if we bring back our old motto of "freedom from foreign food" will this be feasible. We will get entangled and impoverished if we rely on outside sources. Political democracy is unquestionably measured by one vote for all, and economic democracy is measured by working for all. According to this perspective, minimum wages, a fair distribution system, and all forms of social protection are essential. In order for a person to feel autonomous, work should not just be a source of income but also a choice.

Conclusion: Deendayal Upadhyay undoubtedly had a significant impact on Indian political philosophy by giving the Jan Sangh concept the structure of an organization. This is not an exaggeration. Since he was the party secretary for roughly fifteen years and used his organizational abilities to turn the Jana Sangh into a powerful political force, Upadhyay's contribution to Indian politics is mostly seen in the area of party formation. He undoubtedly had a deep interest in Indian politics and political philosophy. Integral humanism is connected to the fundamental ideas of Deendayal Upadhyay's political and social philosophy. In his presidential speech at the Jana Sangh's fourteenth annual session in Calicut in December 1967, Upadhyay highlighted the practical application of Integral Humanism in politics. However, his sudden passing prevented more in-depth discussions of these fundamental ideas. However, the party members who acquired his philosophy carried on his work in this area, and as a result, this philosophy turned out to be a helpful tool for political criticism. The political philosopher's job is to define what human nature ought to be. This allows for the definition of what constitutes a good political system. The prevailing schools of Western social and political thinking, in his opinion, had failed to significantly better the human condition in the West. Because of this, he thought that many Indians accepted nationalism, democracy, and socialism without question. These have only partially addressed the human search for a fulfilling existence, and nationalism itself is a danger to international harmony. Democracy and capitalism were associated with exploitation and governance. As a response against the idea of capitalism, socialism and democracy have deprived people of their freedom and dignity. He emphasized each of these political ideas and claimed that they led to an increase in material acquisition. Greed, class conflict, exploitation, and societal chaos resulted from this. As a result, he not only produced a cadre for the cultural nationalist ideology but also offered a solid foundation of organization to carry out his ideas. Unquestionably, the party that Upadhyay ji attempted to form is currently in control of more than half of the states in addition to having a full majority at the federal level. The fundamental tenet of Prime Minister Narendra Modi's work is "Sabka Saath, Sabka Vikas, Sabka Vishwas," which is nothing more than the Antyodaya concept of the twenty-first century. Upadhyaya first proposed this concept fifty years ago. The goals of Deendayal Upadhyay, which the Prime Minister Modi-led government is currently attempting to realize, are reflected in the programs and policies of the current BJP government. Studying Deendayal Upadhyay's ideas becomes even more crucial in light of the current government's attempts to empower the underprivileged segments of society and guarantee social justice for all. Because Upadhyay's philosophy is firmly ingrained in this country and can be found in its thousands-year-old cultural ethos, his ideas have become even more significant in the current political climate.

References:-

1. Upadhyay, Deendayal, Integral Humanism, Jagriti Prakashan, Noida, 1986.
2. Upadhyay, Deendayal, Deendayal Upadhyay: Sampurna Vangmaya, Prabhat Prakashan, New Delhi, 2016.
3. Upadhyay, Deendayal, Political Diary, Suruchi Prakashan, Jhandewala, New Delhi, 1986.
4. Upadhyay, Deendayal, Direction of National Life, Rashtra Dharma Pustak Prakashan, Lucknow, 2004.
5. Kulkarni, Sharad Anant, Pt. Deendayal Upadhyay Vichar Darshan, Volume-4, Integral Economics, Suruchi Prakashan, Jhandewala, New Delhi, 1986.
6. Kesari, Arjun Das, strong advocate of Indian culture: Deendayal Upadhyay, Uttar Pradesh Message, Information and Public Relations Department, Uttar Pradesh, September 1991.
7. Goenka, Kamal Kishore (ed.), Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Profile, Deendayal Research Institute, New Delhi, 1972.
8. Goenka, Kamal Kishore (ed.), Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay: Individual Philosophy, Deendayal Research Institute, New Delhi, 1972.
9. Thengadi, Dattopant, Pt. Deendayal Upadhyay Vichar Darshan, Volume-1, Tatva Jigyasa, Suruchi Prakashan, Jhandewala, New Delhi, 2014.
10. Dubey, C.M., Deendayal Upadhyaya: The Pride of Nation, Manuscript Prakashan, New Delhi, 2020. Deodhar, Vishwanath Narayan, Pt. Deendayal Upadhyaya Vichar Darshan, Volume-7, Individual Darshan, Suruchi Prakashan, Jhandewala, New Delhi, 1986.
11. Pathak, Vinod Chand, Political Thought of Pt. Deendayal Upadhyay, Satyam Publishing House, New Delhi, 2009.
12. Bakshi, Shiv Shakti Nath, Deendayal Upadhyay: Life of an Ideological Politician, Rupa Publications, New Delhi, 2018.
13. Bhardwaj, Rajkumar, Deendayal Upadhyay: Rachana Sanchaan, Medha Publishing House, New Delhi, 2019.
14. Singh, Amarjeet, Pioneer of Integral Humanism: Deendayal Upadhyay, Prabhat Prakashan, New Delhi, 2018.
15. Singh, Manoj K., Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay, Koshik Publishing House, New Delhi, 2020.
16. Sharma, Maheshchandra, Deendayal Upadhyaya: Maker of Modern India, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, Patiala House, New Delhi, 2002.
17. Sharma, Maheshchandra, Deendayal Upadhyaya: Duties and Thoughts, Vasudha Publication, New Delhi, 1994. Sharma, Maheshchandra, Deendayal Upadhyaya: Works and Personality, New Delhi, 1991.
18. Sharma, Maheshchandra (ed.), Deendayal Upadhyaya: Sampurna Vangmaya, Prabhat Prakashan, New Delhi, 2016.
19. Sharma, Vijay Dutt (ed.), Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: A Unique Personality, Haryana Granth Academy, Panchkula, 2017.