

**PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA**  
**IDEOLOGY AND PERCEPTION**

**PART - I**

**AN INQUEST**  
**(A PREFACE)**

**D.B. Thengadi**

**Suruchi Prakashan**  
Keshav Kunj, Jhandewala  
New Delhi - 110 055

**CONTENTS**

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
1. A Philosophical Inquest	01
2. An Introse	04
3. Impassive	56
4. "Pt. Deendayal Updhyay Vichar Darshan"	74
5. Unportrait	76
6. Frank Philosophy	81
7. <i>Eternal Dharma</i>	88
8. Renaissance Law	91
9. Vision of Life	96
10. Integral Humanism	103
11. Eternal Concepts	118
12. Earthly Devices	120
13. Faith of Life	129
14. Humanity	138

15. The Nationality	145
16. Scientific <i>Hindutva</i>	165
17. Disciplined Liberty	183
18. A Vital Force	187
Appendix	191
About the Author	234
Glossary	236

---

## A Philosophical Inquest

Feb. 11, 1968.

**T**his day a thunderbolt struck the country.

The sudden news of Pandit Deendayalji's murder filled the whole country with sorrow. Lamentation was everywhere.

"I was deeply shocked by the news of Shri Deendayal Upadhyaya's death", wailed the President Dr. Zakir Hussain.

All party leaders and other leaders paid their homage to him and among these were Vice-President V. V. Giri, Shri Neelam Sanjeeva Reddy, Shri Morarji Desai, Shri Yashwantrao Chavan, Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan, Shri Hiren Mookherji, Smt. Violet Alva. Acharya and Mrs. Kripalani, Shri Nanasaheb Gore, Shri Nath Pai, Shri S.M. Joshi, Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri Prem Bhasin, Shri Rajabhau Khobragade, Sant Fateh Singh, Shri Jagjivan Ram, Shri S.K. Patil, Shri Chakravarti Rajgopalacharya, Barrister N.C. Chatterji, Shri Charan Singh, Shri K. M.

Munshi, Seth Govindadas, Bakshi Gulam Mohammed, Shri Gulam Mohammed Sadik, Sardar Swarn Singh, Shri Laxman Singh Gill, Shri Humayun Kabir, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, Shri Om Prakash Tyagi, Shri Ramgopal Shalwale, Smt. Sindhutai Phatak, Shri Raghuvir Singh Shastri, Shri Ram Chandra Vikal.

RSS *Sarkaryavaha Maanneeya* Balasaheb Deoras, *Mananeeya* Lala Hansraj Gupta, *Maan*. Madhavarao Mule, *Maan*. Prakashdattaji Bhargava, *Maan*. Babasaheb Ghatate, *Maan*. Vasantao Oak, *Maan*. Brahmadevji, *Maan*. Sohan Singhji and others close to him, as also *Maan*. Bhaurao Deoras, Barrister Narendrajit Singhji and Mrs. Buwaji paid him sorrowful homage.

In its homage the working committee of *Jana Sangh* said, "In just a few years *Jana Sangh* has attained a prominent position. If credit for this can be assigned to any single individual, that individual is Shri Upadhyaya."

Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee, who had now to shoulder his responsibility, said, "The one lamp there was, has gone out and it is dark all around. Shri Upadhyaya was a man of great foresight and he always thought of the entire country. He was a fundamental thinker and a skilful organiser. He could lead and move with the workers. The credit of building up *Jana Sangh* is his."

Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi said, "Shri

Upadhyaya was playing a very prominent role in the political life of the country. Whatever the differences between *Jana Sangh* and Congress, Shri Upadhyaya was the most respectable leader and he had dedicated his life to culture and country's unity."

*Param Poojya Sarsanghchalak* Shri Guruji just said, "Oh God !"

Though he was not a member of Parliament, the *Bharatiya* Parliament paid him homage.

All the people in the country shared the grief of Panditji's maternal cousin brother Shri Prabhudayalji Shukla.

It was as if the whole *Bharat* Nation was sobbing :  
WE WERE VERY FONDLY LISTENING  
AND YOU WERE NARRATING.  
BUT FATE INTERVENED,  
AND NOW YOU ARE SLEEPING.<sup>1</sup>

**"BADE SHOUK SE SUN RAHA THA JAMANA,  
TUMHI SO GAYE DASTAAN KAHE-KAHE"**



1. (This is from an Urdu couplet)

## An Introse

**V**ery little is known about Panditji's life prior to his entering RSS. He shunned publicity. He spoke little about himself.

Panditji was born on 25th Sept. 1916 [*Vikram Samvat* 1973; *Shalivahan Shak Sam.* 1838, Bhadrapad-Ashwin Krishna 13, Monday] at Dhankia on the Jayapur-Ajmer Railway line in the house of his maternal grandfather Shri Chunnilal Shukla (Station-master of Dhankia). Panditji's father Shri Bhagavati Prasadji hailed from Nagala Chandrabhan in Mathura district and he worked as a station master at Jalesar Road near Mathura. Panditji's mother was Smt. Rampyari. Panditji's (paternal) grandfather Pandit Hariramji was a famous astrologer; when he died, Agra and Mathura observed a day's mourning.

Two years after Panditji's birth, a brother was born to him. He was named Shivdayal. Just six months after this, Pandit Bhagavati Prasadji died. So, with his mother,

Panditji went to stay with his maternal grandfather Shri Chunnilal Shukla. When Panditji was six and a half years of age, his mother also died. Thereafter Panditji was cared for by his maternal uncle Shri Radharaman Shukla, who was Frontier Mail Guard at Gangapur (Rajasthan). On Kartik Krishna 11th Tithi [A.D. 1934], Panditji's younger brother Shivdayal died, leaving Panditji alone. Of course all the persons in his maternal uncle's family loved him. Shri Prabhudayal Shukla, Swaminath, Brahmanand, Vinod Kumar, Vijay Kumar, Arun Kumar-all these retained close relationship with Panditji up to the end.

Panditji matriculated from Kalyan High School of Sikar and stood in first class first in Ajmer Board. For this both the High School and the Board honoured him with gold-medals. After another two years, he passed intermediate examination from Birla college of Pilani, with first class in first position and was honoured by the college and the Board with gold medals. From S.D. College, Kanpur he passed his B.A. examination (Mathematics) in first class. From Allahabad he passed his L.T. In between, for his education, he had to stay for some time at Gangapur, Kota, Agra and Ramgadh. At Ramgadh his uncle (mother's side) Shri Narayan Shukla was station-master. While yet a student, he had befriended Shri Sundar Singhji Bhandari. During his entire college career he was a scholarship holder.

In 1937 he came into contact with RSS. That year at the time of Makar-Sankranti festival Bhagwa Dhwaj (flag) was given to Kanpur Shakha (branch) at the hands of Pandit Satavalekar. On this auspicious occasion Panditji took the RSS oath. The credit of his entry into RSS goes mainly to *Mananeeya* Bhaurao Deoras. At that time *Maan*. Bapurao Moghe, Bhaiyaji Sahasrabuddhe, Nanaji Deshmukh, Babu Joshi were staying in UP for RSS work. In 1942, Panditji started his *Pracharak*-life by taking up the responsibility of district-*pracharak* for Lakhimpur district [*pracharak*=propagator]. He used to stay mostly at the place of *Maan*. Pandit Shyam Narayan Mishra. At that time the principalship of a Higher Secondary School at that place was offered to him. But he declined the offer as it did not fit into his status as a *Sangh-pracharak*. In 1947 he was appointed *Sah-Prant-pracharak* of UP. During his tenure, all the UP workers of RSS came into close contact with him.

Sarvashri Ramnath Bhalla, Satyavrata Sinha, *Maan*. Prof. Rajendra Singh, *Maan*. Veeren Bhai, Dr. Krishna Vihari, Jugade brothers, Karanjkar brothers, Krishnadatt Sharma, Gopal Krishna Kalantri, Kunjbiharilal Rathi, Rajanikant Lahiri, Radheshyam Kapur, Dr. P.K. Banerji, *Maan*. Devalejee, Gopalrao Kaliya, Jayagopalji, Anantrao Gokhale, Pandit Shyovarana Singh, Sateesh Saxena, Madhusudan Bapat, Vijay Munje, Manohar

Athavale, Rajabhau Savargaonkar and Dr. Gune of Gwalior, etc. were fortunate to be his co-workers.

In 1947 was started *Rashtra-Dharma Prakashan*. Under its auspices were published the magazine '*Rashtra Dharma*', the weekly '*Panchajanya*' and the daily '*Swadesh*'. Of these the last two were edited by Panditji. Nanaji Deshmukh was the managing director of publication. On editorial side were Sarvashri Mahavirprasad Tripathi, Rajivlochan Agnihotri, Atal Behari Vajpayee, Mahendra Kulashreshtha, Girish Chandra Mishra, Tilak Singh Parmar, Yadavarao Deshmukh and Vachanesh Tripathi. The *Rashtra Dharma* family members also included Sarvashri Manmohan Gupta, Jwalaprasad Chaturvedi (manager), Radheshyam Kapur (publisher), *Pawagi*, Bajrang Sharan Tiwari (Press manager). The loving family-head was Pandit Deendayalji.

*Jana Sangh* in UP began under the presidentship of advocate Raj Kumar (Lucknow); and *Pradesh Jana Sangh* work was entrusted to Panditji. Earlier on 5th May 1951 People's Party was formed at Calcutta under the leadership of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji. On 27th May 1951 *Bharatiya Jana Sangh* was formed at Jalandhar on the provincial level. On 8 Sept. 1951 a preliminary meeting of prominent workers from different provinces was held in Delhi; the meeting discussed the formation of an *Akhil-Bharatiya* party. From 20th to 22nd of October an *Akhil-*

*Bharatiya* party gathering was held at Delhi. The inauguration took place on the grounds of Raghomal Arya Higher Secondary School. On 21st October formal announcement of the formation of *Bharatiya Jana Sangh* was made. The first *Akhil-Bharatiya* session of *Jana Sangh* took place at Kanpur in December 1952. That time Pandit Deendayalji was made the the General Secretary.

It is necessary to understand Panditji's attitude vis-a-vis political questions before he entered the political arena. The RSS view of politics and political parties is clear from Shri Guruji's speeches during that period. These lectures have been later published in the form of a booklet 'Dhyeya-Darshan'. That gives a general idea of RSS thinking. It will be interesting to know what Panditji personally thought about politics. It is enough for the present to point out that for this purpose, it is worthwhile to go through his original articles listed below.

### **PANDIT DEENDAYALJI'S ARTICLES**

Vik. Sam. - 2004-2006 [1947 to 1949 A.D.]

#### ***Rashtradharma Patrika***

**HISTORY (1)** *Bharatiya Rashtradhara ka Punya Pravaha* [Buddha to Shankaracharya]; Year 1-Issue 1, Shravani Purnima, Vikram Samvat 2004,

**(2)** *Bhagavan Krishna*; Year 1-Issue 2, Bhadrapada Purnima, 2004.

**SANSKRITI (3)** *Chiti*; Year 1-Issue. 3-4, Kartik Purnima 20004.

**POLITICS (4)** *Rashtra Jeevan ki Samasyayen* : Issue 9, Sharad Purnima 2006,

**(5)** *Bharatiya Rajneeti ki Maulik Bhoolen*; Issue 11, Margasheersha Purnima 2006.

#### **Panchajanya Saptahik**

**HISTORICAL HINDSIGHT (1)** *Lokmanya Tilak ki Rajneeti*

[On the occasion of first death anniversary of Lokmanya Tilak]; Shravan Krishna 8, 2005 Vikrami.

**SATIRICAL ESSAY (2)** I PC- *Dhara 144 ke Itihas evm Upayoga par Vyang Ashadha*, Shukla 7, 2005.

**(3)** *Rajneetik Aaya-Vyaya* (July 1949 to June 1950); Bhadrapada Shukla 10, 2005.

**SANSKRITIK (4)** *Jeevan ka Dhyeya-Rashtriya Atmanubhooti*; Bhadrapada Krishna 9, 2006,

**(5)** *Sahishnuta ke Saman hi Jayishnuta ki Avashyakata* (Will to be Victorious is equally necessary as forbearance); Vijaya Dashami special 2006.

**POLITICS (6)** *Bharatiya Samvidhan par Ek Drishti (Kathor Evam Brihad Samvidhan ke Nirman ke Bajay Samvidhanik Vikas Prakriya Prarambh Karne ka Aagrah)*; Margasheersha Shukla 4, 2006.

During this period his two literary books also were published: (1) *Jagat-guru* Shankaracharya (2) *Samraat* Chandra-gupta. These will give a substantial idea of Panditji's thoughts, before he entered politics. [See appendix 1]

Really speaking his mental make up was that of a RSS-*pracharak*. Now a days it is difficult to imagine the hardships and difficulties that a *pracharak* had to face while starting RSS work at any place. The people of Gola Gokarnanath have seen Deendayalji staying for so many days by eating roasted grams only as food. In Muhammadi, local residents have seen him sleeping at night on the shop foot-boards. Once a horse- cart driver asked for two paise more than usual fare from Railway Station to town area; to save this money, he has walked all the way in rain: Hardoi people are a witness to his this routine.

Of course circumstances were unfavourable. But it is also true that his mind was unattached to any thing but a *Karmayogi*. Even later on when facilities were available, he did not use them. He washed his clothes himself and mended them. He never discarded any clothing or foot-wear until it had become totally unserviceable. He used *swadeshi* things and insisted on it. By his dealings he had set an example of how public money must be very frugally spent in one's capacity as a trustee. He never looked down doing even small things.

He was careful to observe his principles even in small matters-it became his natural way of life. Because even while engrossed in worldly work, his real description would be that of a '*Jnyani*' [one who has known God] who does any work as 'worship' prompted by love of God. But his day-to-day behaviour was like common men and even persons close to him could not appreciate his real greatness.

While working in '*Rashtradharma*' he has many times composed, bound and even dispatched the issues [see appendix 2]. Unattached dutifulness was his natural inclination.

**Undeterred by pain, unattached to pleasure,  
Not dreaming of success nor fearing failure,  
Do your duty, that is *dharma*-assigned.**

[*Bhagavad Geeta*]

This was his nature. His idealist mind was untouched by pride and personal ambition. In compliance to orders, he entered politics. But his mind was detached as the couplet below depicts the attitude of one who -

**"Goes thru the market but wishes to buy nothing.**

**And goes thru the world but desires nothing."**

Though in the midst of active politics, Panditji was unattached as a leaf of 'Lotus' plant is not wetted even by

the water around it [Unattached 'अनासक्त' means having no personal longing for sense-pleasures and no abhorrence to bodily discomforts]. In his speech at Jaunpur Shri Guruji says:

"Deendayaji had not the slightest inclination towards politics. In past years he asked me several times : "This is a nasty affair into which you have placed me. Permit me again to do work of a *pracharak*." I said, "Whom else can I put into this nasty affair ? Only a man, with such deep and unfaltering faith in organisation work, can remain in this nasty affair and still be unaffected by it; he only can clean it up. None else can do it". "(This is why *Param Poojaneeya* Balasaheb had said, "Whenever I saw Shri Deendayaji, I was reminded of RSS founder Dr. Hedgewar only, none else.")

In spite of intense dislike for politics, once the responsibility was entrusted to him, Panditji did that work so systematically, so scientifically, with all his heart and ability that for all people it has become a practical demonstration of *Bhagavad Geeta* aphorism 'Yoga is skill in doing work'. In his essay '*Jana Sangh*' Greig Baxter says:

"It (*Jana Sangh*) is the only party that has increased its percentage of the popular vote as well as its share of Parliamentary and Assembly seats in each successive election from 1952 through 1967."

'The *Jana Sangh*: Ideology and Organisation in Party Behaviour' is a long essay by Walter K. Anderson. In it he says, "Upadhyaya's assumption of the Presidency in 1967 signified that the basic organising phase of the party was completed and it now intended to become a serious competitor for power on the national level."

This is what he built up starting from a scratch.

When he was charged with responsibility at the national level, the field of his practical experience and of close personal contacts went on ever widening. In the early stages of *Jana Sangh* he had the opportunity to work with Sarvashri Dr. Mookherji, Dr. Bhai Mahavir, Balraj Madhok, Mahashaya Krishna, Bhalla brothers, Vaidya Gurudatt, Maulichandra Sharma, Uma Shankar Trivedi, Vasantrya Oak and others. During the presidencies of Sarvashri Bapusaheb Sohoni, Premnathji Dogra, Dr. Raghuvir, Devprasad Ghosh, Pitambardas, A. Ramarao, Bachchharaj Vyas, the prime-mover was only Panditji. The *Jana Sangh* Office-in-charge Shri Jagadish Mathur followed him like a shadow. All office bearers and workers of *Jana Sangh* and especially all organising secretaries, were benefitted by contact with him.

Workers in different fields, who had taken their *Sanskars* [*Sanskara*-purposely imbued good qualities] and inspiration from RSS, always looked to him for guidance.



And Panditji attended to their queries as from the members of his vast RSS family. *Akhil-Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad* had as its first president and general secretary respectively Shri Om Prakash Bahal and Shri Ved Prakash Nanda. Both of them had a long contact with Panditji. Panditji's main office was at Delhi. At that time persons in close contact with him were Shri Jagadish Abrol, Chamanlalji (not in politics) and others. Whenever he was staying at the office, he would make it a point to visit '**Organiser**' office and exchange notes with Sarvashri K.R. Malkani, L.K. Advani and Sudhakar Raje. He would hold such discussions with similar-minded pressmen throughout the country who worked for different *Bharatiya* languages papers. Main among such persons were Shri Dadasaheb Apte, the founder of *Hindusthan Samachar*, Shri Bapurao Lele and Shri Baleshwar Agrawal.

In the RSS field, he used to meet workers on all levels. In Sangh meetings his contribution was always worthy of mention. When the Sangh-Constitution was being drafted under the guidance of *Maan*. Eknathji Ranade, his participation was substantial, while *Maan*. Dadasaheb Apte and *Maan*. Rajpal Puri were also specially helpful. The discussions between Panditji and *Maan*. Babasaheb Apte were an example of what happens when two like minded and gifted men meet for a common cause. He had very intimate relations with *Sarkaryavah*

(General Secretary of RSS) and *Sah-Sarkaryavaha*. To this class belong *Maan*. Malharrao Kale, *Maan*. Appaji Joshi, *Maan*. Bhaiyaji Dani, *Maan*. Eknathji Ranade and *Maan*. Madhavrao Mule. The same is true of *Maan*. Yadavrao Joshi and other RSS office bearers Dr. Abaji Thatte who was P.A. to *Sar-Sanghchalak* and Shri Pandurangpant Kshirsagar who was in-charge of the central office of RSS.

In the important period following the lifting of the first ban on RSS, workers in other fields used to especially contact *Param Poojneeya* Balasaheb Deoras. It is true that the various institutions run by *Swayamsevaks* (volunteers) are autonomous. RSS does not look upon any such institution as its front organisation (front in any particular field) or transmission belt. Still a worker feels that both in private life and in public life he should have the benefit of guidance from elders; it is thus, that workers looked up to *Param Poojya* Balasaheb Deoras for practical guidance. Panditji also used to discuss with him various things in connection with the organisation in his field of action.

Panditji's most important, vital and extra-ordinary relationship was with *Param Poojaneeya* Shri Guruji. It is difficult to describe the relationship between P.P. Shri Guruji and Shri Deendayalji.

All the concerned people knew that Shri Guruji had

very high expectations from Deendayalji both as a *pracharak* and a worker. Both of them had a common wavelength, Deendayalji could correctly guess the likely reaction of Shri Guruji on any event. RSS ideas of exercising control on institutions run by *Swayamsevaks* are unlike those of communists. As stated earlier, no such institution is a front organisation or transmission belt of RSS. Sangh *Swayamsevaks* are its wings. Sangh is connected with *Swayamsevaks*. It is expected that the *Swayamsevaks* should organise their work and develop thoughts in their field of work in the light of the examples or models set forth by Sangh. But unlike communists Sangh has no intention of controlling the deliberations and actions of its workers in various fields. Of course, Sangh is confident that its *Swayamsevaks* will always act properly in all matters. As Shri Guruji and Panditji held similar views, this expectation was always fulfilled in the case of *Jana Sangh*.

### **After Independence And Division**

After independence, came the period of new creations. All patriots were worried about problems arising from the division of the country, resettlement of refugees, Pakistani aggression in Jammu-Kashmir, Pandit Nehru's love for Sheikh Abdulla, Abdulla's ambition and the article 370 which fuelled it, Pandit Nehru's rush to UNO and the rot of 'Azad Kashmir', the anti-*Hindu* policy of East

Pakistan, Nehru government's pliant attitude towards Pakistan and the consequent various pacts with it, the policy towards parts of the country ruled by Portugal and France and etc. It was clear that the struggle for *Swadharma* (our own *dharma*), our country and independence was not over. It was also clear that the Congress government was not ready to give top priority to defence of the country and to educate the public for it, to make military training compulsory, to permit all citizens to bear arms and of taking special care of the welfare of soldiers on rolls and retired soldiers. Even after the creation of Pakistan, Congress continued appeasement of Muslims falling in a prey for the temptation of their votes. For securing votes efforts continued to (of which divide Sikhs, Buddhas, Jains and Lingayats all are part and parcel of *Hindu* society) from *Hindus*. The government was wilfully conniving at the machinations of foreign missionaries. It was on account of this that the recommendations of the Niyogi Commission and the Rege Commission were not heeded. For the same reason *Hindus'* demand for stopping the slaughter of cows and their progeny was not heeded by government. A change of religion is not a change of nationality. Without giving up one's method of worship, one can join the national mainstream just as in Indonesia the Muslims continue to live in *Bharatiya* culture. This, the Congress was not prepared to point out to the

Muslims.

The government was disinterested in the future of *Bharatiyas* abroad. Consequently *Bharat* government avoided the responsibility to secure citizenship rights to *Bharatiya* people who had settled in South Africa, Sri Lanka, Burma, Malaya, Mauritius and Fiji. It also failed in its duty to establish special contacts with the aforesaid countries as also with Surinam, Guiana and Trinidad etc. In his desire to project his image as a liberal and thereby to secure World leadership, Pandit Nehru was developing a foreign policy contrary to the *Bharatiya* interests. Neglect of Nepal; disinterestedness in maintaining good relations with neighbouring countries; the connivance at China's occupation of Tibet in spite of warnings given by Dr. Mookherji, Dr. Ambedkar and Shri Guruji; the welcoming of Colombo Resolution; the handing over of the Berubari; Kachha; Goa; and other parts of *Bharat* forcibly occupied by China; liberal attitude towards the Muslim emigrants in Assam and Naga insurgents [later this liberalism led to Tashkand pact]; irresponsible inaction about the future of Mohan Ranade and Dr. Maskarhinus; the slogan of '*Bharatiyas* and Chinese are brothers' with total neglect of China's war-preparations on the *Bharatiya* border; the decision regarding British Common Wealth devoid of national honour; the dreaminess of not seeing the futility of the declaration of the non-alignment of weak nations;

all these are the consequences of Pandit Nehru's baseless dreams of World leadership. The government adopted a pliable policy towards foreign investors. Mahavir Tyagi has described Pt. Nehru, in his presence, in the following words:

**Made enemies of his own people,  
And friends with his enemies;  
Cut the heads of his own men  
And tried to become a Sardar.**

On all these national matters, the reactions of Shri Guruji and Deendayalji were the same. But even more important are the goal of 'making our nation very prosperous'; a resolve to secure undivided *Bharat*; the motto 'Lead us from darkness to Light'; the suggestive colour of the party flag<sup>1</sup>; the nature of *Bharatiya* nationalism (one country, one people, one culture, one nation); self-sufficiency; the naturalness in *Bharat* of equal respect for all religions; the nature of *Bharatiya* Constitution; the desirability of '*dharmarajya*' (The rule of Law) [See appendix 3]; and *Bharatiyakaran* (Indianization) of all things. Of these all, both Shri Guruji and Panditji were strong protagonists.

They held the same views about the goal of politics.

---

1. Panditji used to say about saffron flag, "This is the flag that can give us realistic knowledge of history, the best inspiration for future and the initiative for activity in the present."

They did not, like Bentham, consider the goal of politics to be 'the greatest good of the greatest number'. Their tradition was: "Work for the good of all".

According to Brihaspati's treatise on politics, the aim of politics is to help men secure *dharma* (morality), money and happiness. But at the same time according to Brihaspati, money and happiness must be secured in consonance with *dharma*. Manu, Kautilya and Kamadandi say the same thing. While summing up his discussion of the science of *dharma*, Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Pandurang Vaman Kane says, "The goal of the State was deemed to be to enable men to attain the four *purusharthas* particularly the first three (as the last moksha depends only upon individual philosophical insight and mystical experience and was attainable by a microscopic no. of human beings). Even the *Brahaspatya Sutra* (II 43) says that the fruit of polity was the attainment of *dharma*, *artha* and *kama*. Somadeva begins his *Nitivakya Sutra* in a characteristic way when he performs obeisance to *Rajya* (the State) which yields the three fruits of *dharma*, *artha* and *Kama*.

"The *Dharmashastra* authors held that *dharma* was supreme power in the State and was above the king, who was only the instrument to realise the goal of *dharma*."

Both Shri Guruji and Panditji longed for the

achievement of this goal by methods suited to modern times.

Because of their agreement on the fundamentals, their views on various questions were also the same. Similar were thoughts about policies in different fields of national activity. The basic principles of foreign policy; the plan for the cultural national union of south-east Asia; plan for Nuclear Deterrent; the protection of civil liberties and human rights; the guiding principles for reconstruction of provinces; the nature of the State; ways of bringing about social equality and unity; the need for independent and united national church; policies based on foresight in the matters of language, education and internal administration; these are such subjects. Both insisted that in economic planning the evil effects of both excess and paucity of *artha* and *Kama* [money and enjoyment] must be carefully avoided.

The place in and limitations of planning in national reconstruction; priorities in plans; top priority for elimination of unemployment and price control; the insistence on the continuous and cheap supply of consumable needs; remedy for the problem of food; propagation of the insistence on use of *swadeshi* [indigenous] goods; decentralisation of economic power; analysis of Charu Majumdar's newly created Naxalism; criteria for ownership of land and industries; planning for maximum production,

equitable distribution and restrained consumption; guarantee of the right to work and of minimum maintenance; necessity for fixing the permissible ratio between maximum and minimum wages; the propriety of 'work for every hand and water for every field'; modernisation of the tax structure; the question of technology useful in the *Bharatiya* context; on all these subjects the thoughts of Shri Guruji and Panditji were the same. Later in the *Jana Sangh* session held at Vijayawada from 23rd January to 26th January 1965, the document 'Principles and policies' which was adopted there, was the result of such thinking. Similarly it will be educative to compare Shri Guruji's lecture series and Panditji's exposition of Integral Humanism in the Sindi camp.

Not only was there unanimity of thought but the policy in expression too was the same. Both insisted that technical terms should be *Bharatiya* and not foreign. The wording should not be loose or hazy. Both believed in the dictum 'A single word properly understood and used produces the desired effect whether in this world or in heaven.' [See appendix 4]

Luckily Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji had the same 'wavelength'. So one can get an idea of the atmosphere during the early days of *Jana Sangh*. [See appendix 5]

It is true that RSS is not interested in power-

politics. But the fields of thought and action of RSS and *Bharatiya* nation have the same boundaries and they cover the same country and people. Therefore RSS can not divorce itself from politics. RSS expects that politics should be there only for the furtherance of the cause of *Bharat* nation. The circles of politics and nationalism are not identical but still they do largely overlap. *Brihaspati* has stated that politics is for the people. We have, on several occasions, experienced the confusion arising from a lack of understanding the difference between a Nation and a State [See appendix 6]. The *Bharatiya* tradition is: politics for the national good and national work in the light of *Dharma*.

Will it ever be possible to put this tradition into practice for a power-hungry leader? In Feb. 1963, while speaking before the representatives in the *Akhil-Bharatiya* session of *Jana Sangh* at Bhopal, Panditji said, "There are differences among *Jana Sangh*, *Praja Samajwadi Party*, *Socialist Party* and *Congress*. Today it is necessary not to broaden the gulfs separating them but to narrow down the differences or even to forget them. It is necessary to isolate treacherous Communists in the national interest. But if a party or an individual does not completely cooperate with us in this, it will be unwise to constantly dub him as a communist-supporter and thus push him into the communist fold."

"We must be the first to go to towns and villages and inspire hope and confidence in the people. The treacherous people are plotting to make a Chang Kai Shek of Pandit Nehru. This must be explained to the people and it is necessary to resolve and publicise that we shall not allow any repetition in *Bharat* of the unfortunate history of China. The model before us is that of Panna Dai who most painfully sacrificed her son to save the prince. We are ever prepared for any sacrifice in the protection of the national pride, integrity and culture (the highest in the world) which is our proud inheritance."

During Panditji's American tour, the Friends of India Society had arranged a reception in his honour. Dr. Norman D. Pamer said after Panditji's death, "Panditji was not the type of man of whom Alexander Pope has said:

Born for the universe, narrowed his mind

And to his Party gave up what was meant for mankind."

With this background, the unique reply given by Panditji to Shri Shyam Bahadur Verma throws a lot of light on Panditji's thoughts. Shri Verma asked, "Deendayalji, Congress became corrupt after coming to power; don't you think that *Jana Sangh* will also become corrupt if it comes to power?" Panditji replied, "**It is true that power corrupts. But if, after taking all precautions, *Jana***

***Sangh* does become corrupt, we will disband it and organise a new *Jana Sangh*. If that is not enough, we shall create a third. So will it go on.** Bhagwan Parashuram killed tyrant kings 21 times. Ultimately Ramachandra came forward as an ideal king and then Parashuram retired to the forest. Why should we have a mad love for an institution because it is built up by us? A child plays with a carrot like a toy, but when the play is over, the child eats it up. When even an organisation built up by us acts contrary to national interests, it is *dharma* to destroy it. Nation is the highest thing, not an institution." Can a power-hungry politician ever talk like this?

In any nation which has newly acquired its independence, public leaders may be classified into four classes. One class is that of pure power-mongers. They have the concentration of **Arjuna in archery**; no other good thought or act can disturb their concentration. The other class is that of those who think of nothing but **national reconstruction**. Their mind is also one-pointed but that point is national reconstruction. Sometimes they feel that it is necessary to enter politics for promoting national cause; but they think over the losses and gains and their own stand in life and definitely avoid politics. Or rather they think that political work can be got done through some other persons but that if they directly participate in politics, they will lose their high moral status and the national loss

will be even greater.

It is possible to definitely identify these two classes, without confusion. But the dividing line between the next two classes is rather thin and it is difficult to demarcate them. One class is of people who are really power-seekers who do work a bit for national reconstruction as otherwise there can be no hope of their power-attainment. This class is formed of people whose primary object is power and national reconstruction is incidental to it. The other class is of people who have no liking for politics and whose first love is national reconstruction; these people take to politics only because the way to their goal lies through politics. This class may be described as of people who are primarily national reconstructors and incidentally politicians. Panditji obviously belonged to this fourth class.

It is difficult for the Western political thinkers and their *Bharatiya* disciples to understand the psychology of *Bharatiya* national great men. In fact, if the *Bharatiya* national thinkers are measured by Western standards, the Western thinkers may well conclude that the *Bharatiya* thought mentioned in history were mostly mad.

The mother of a candidate for an emperor's crown prayed to God, "Let calamities always befall on us so that we shall always remember You." Today no mother of even a *Gram-Panchayat*-candidate will be ready to pray like this.

A dispute arised between Lord Ram and *Bharat* (at Chitrakoot Parvat about the ownership of) the throne of Ayodhya. Both were of the view that "The throne is yours, not mine and you should acquire it." The same will not happen even in case of any municipality ward in our newly educated *BHARAT*.

There was a man. He built an empire with his own extraordinary abilities and intelligence but asked somebody else to be the premier and himself voluntarily took to the Himalayas. Today such a man will be sent to lunatic asylum.

That there should be a kingdom of *Hindus* is the desire of "Shri." Who is this 'Shri'. His name is not to be found in the list of voters prepared by the Election Commission. What is the importance of the wishes of this 'Shri' who can not cast even a vote?

According to Samarth Ramdas: "The main thing is description of what God's incarnations did; the next important thing is politics." While all worldly things are available through power, why this diversion towards spiritual tales instead of directly heading for power?

But again Ramdas says: "Abandon all pleasures but do this Yoga and acquire political power by hard work."

How foolish! most people seek political power so that they may enjoy pleasures? Then is it not foolishness to

call it yoga and advise people to abandon pleasures for it.

'King is the master but he should not use his power to seek personal pleasures.' 'To enjoy kingship is to abjure all sensual pleasures which kingship brings within easy reach.' The inconsistency in such utterances even a matriculate can see today.

To ridicule all such thoughts is natural in the modern times. It is 'foolish people' like these who have a lion's share in establishing the greatness and immortality of *Bharat* and in creating a set of life-values [See appendix 7]. The progressives of today will find it difficult to predict the behaviour of these people. Samartha Ramdas' prayer to God was, "You have given us a king, make him ever-more powerful in our own life-time." And even then as Shivaji was being coronated at Raigadh, Samartha Ramadas chose not to be present there. How is this? Ramdas would have said, "I shall stay at Sajjangadh and admire Shivaji's mounting the throne." In the same spirit Deendayalji remained in his office at Ajmeri-Gate [Delhi] when in 1967 various *Jana Sangh* ministers of different front-governments (of various States) were being sworn in. This aloofness of Panditji, modern people may not be able to understand.

In this connection it is relevant to narrate an incident: After *Jana Sangh* session at Kalikat, along with

some *Jana Sangh* leaders Panditji reached Doda-ballapur (via Bangalore) where an RSS camp was held and Shri Guruji was present. Shri Guruji was to lecture in the evening. Before that at tea-time Shri Guruji announced, "This evening Deendayal will speak." Everybody was surprised. There upon one *Swayamsevak* said, "All have come here to get your guidance." Guruji insisted, "No, brother, Deendayal will speak." But somebody pointed out, "But he is *Jana Sangh* President." Guruji promptly replied, "No, Deendayal is *Sangh Swayamsevak* and he will speak as such and not as *Jana Sangh* president." Panditji delivered '*Bouddhik*' (lecture) in the presence of Guruji. No comments on this incident are necessary.

Deendayalji was the chief architect of *Jana Sangh's* ideology and policies. And so, one does not meet with confusion and inconsistency in the thinking of *Jana Sangh* as is visible in the case of progressive (?) parties. In the ideology and policies of *Jana Sangh* one sees originality, clarity and significance. For example, take the idea of 'secularism'.

### ***Hindu Means Secular***

In no country in the world is it interpreted in the way it is interpreted in *Bharat* [See appendix 8]. No dictionary of English language gives such a meaning. Actually what Pt. Nehru had in his mind could have been most nearly denoted by the word Non-denominational.



There has been much discussion for and against, about the content of the word 'secularism' from the deliberations in the Constituent Assembly to the recent publication of P.C. Chatterji's 'Secular Values for Secular India'. Dr. Ambedkar himself has clarified the idea of secularism in the Constituent Assembly.

Actually the practical meaning of secularism is clear from the following dictum in Bible: "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's." (At the beginning the word 'secular' did not occur in the *Bharatiya* Constitution. The two words 'secular' and 'socialist' were introduced in 1976 according to the 42nd amendment to the Constitution.

Between *Hindu* nationalism and secularism there is neither inconsistency nor contradiction,-Pandit Deendayalji thought. In India, State has always been secular. Ferdinand and Isabella's cruel inquisition is unthinkable in *Bharatiya* atmosphere. It is wrong to equate 'secular' to 'non-religious'. Secularism means equal respect for all religions. While talking in Parliament on *Hindu* Code Bill, Dr. Ambedkar had said:

"It (Secular State) does not mean that we shall not take into consideration the religious sentiments of the people. All that a secular State means is that this Parliament shall not be competent to impose particular

religion upon the rest of the people. That is the only limitation that the Constitution recognises- secularism does not mean abolition of religion." [see appendix 9]

This has always been the stand of the supporters of *Hindu* Nation. Panditji placed this truth before the people, illustrating it with different examples.

Shri Guruji has repeatedly clarified that in *Hindu* history, State has always been secular. *Hindu* State means secular State. *Hindu* is not a religion. The term *Hindu* refers to nation. And further the idea denoted by *Hindu* is multi-faceted and multi-dimensional; this makes it impracticable to contain it by a definition in the Western way. [see appendix 10]

Respectable Mahatma Gandhiji had clearly stated: "There is, in *Hinduism*, room enough for Jesus, as there is for Mohammed, Zoroaster and Moses.<sup>1</sup>

In this connection Arnold Toyanbee says, "*Hinduism* takes it for granted that there are more than one valid approach to truth and to salvation and that these different approaches are not only compatible with each other but are complementary."

The following statement of Justice Gajendragadkar,

---

1. From non-*Hindus* it is just to expect that they should join the national cultural stream here and have the same respect for our great men like Rama and Krishna as Egyptian Muslims have for the builders of pyramids or as Turkish Muslims have for Atilla or Iranian Muslims have for Darius.

the former Chief Justice of Supreme Court is worth considering.

"Unlike other religions in the world, the *Hindu* religion does not claim any one prophet; it does not worship any one god, it does not subscribe to any one philosophic concept; it does not follow any one set of religious rites or performances; in fact it does not seem to satisfy the narrow traditional features of any religion or creed. It may be described as a way of life and nothing more.... The history of Indian thought emphatically brings out the fact that the development of *Hindu* religion has always been inspired by an endless quest of the mind for TRUTH, based on the consciousness that truth has many facets. Truth is one, but wise men describe it differently (एकं सत् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति)."

On this background consider sister Nivedita's thought: "The supreme crime for the follower of any Indian sect shall be the criticism of another as if it were without the bounds of the Eternal Faith (*Sanatana Dharma*). Rightly defined the Vedas are the sanction of Buddhism, Mohammedanism, Christianity and Confucianism."

Consider K. William Kaap quoted by Shri Humayun Kabir:

"In fact, there must be as many truths and as many facets of reality as there are 'inner dispositions' and

frames of reference. The origin of tolerance in the *Hindu* mind can be traced back to this recognition of abundance of inner attitudes, each of which may provide access to a particular facet of reality. Whereas European philosophy has tended to reject contradictory categories and European thought has sought to interpret reality in terms of clear-cut distinctions aiming at absolute truth, *Hindu* epistemology has recognised a multitude of standpoints and degrees of truths without rejecting any of them.....It (European thought) has also tended to interpret reality in terms of absolute truth and absolute error. This has given intensity and rigour to European thought, but it has also tended to make the European attitude to truth dogmatic and narrow. Indian philosophy, has on the other hand, recognised from the earliest times that reality has many facets and can not be expressed in terms of purely contradictory categories. Indian philosophy has recognised degrees of truth on a scale which has perhaps no parallel in European metaphysics."

On the basis of these facts his conclusion is, "It is this capacity of adjusting and combining seemingly disparate creeds and contradictory systems of belief which more than any other factor accounts for the unique vitality and longevity of *Hindu* culture, due to its ability to accommodate dissimilar elements and to give them a complexity and diversity which is probably unequalled in

the history of mankind."

What Param Poojya Guruji intended as the real nature of *Hinduness* was this fact of its being all-inclusive and all-pervasive. He also believed that if Integral Humanism or in the current language Universal Brotherhood<sup>1</sup> was to be spread over the world, the country that can serve as its base of operation is *Hindusthan*. It was on this background that he insisted on the idea of *Hindu Nation*. He used to say that we will lose our identity and all if we give up the word *Hindu Nation* due to any temptation or any compromise.

Vis-a-vis *Hinduness* what was the background of *Jana Sangh*? -this is an independent subject. There has been a great deal of public debate on the similarities and differences in the stands of Sangh and *Jana Sangh*.

The real Generals who led the war of independence in 1857; the followers of Annasaheb Patwardhan School; the revolutionaries who mounted the scaffold with Shrimad-Bhagavad-Geeta in their hands; *Geeta Rahasya* author Tilak's group of Lal, Bal and Pal in the pre-Gandhi Congress; patriots like Lala Hardayal (who started Gadar Party) who dreamed of a glorious future; the Congress-

1. In our country this word is very loosely used. There are three classes of international thought: (1) International commu-nalism (2) International sectarianism (3) International Humanism. The nature of *Hinduness* belongs to this third class and its base of operation is *Bharat*.

men who, in the Gandhi era, participated in the struggle for independence but were displeased with Gandhiji's policy of appeasement<sup>1</sup> of Muslims; those who, while remaining strong protagonists of *Hinduness* were dissatisfied with some of the policies and declarations<sup>2</sup> of *Hindu Mahasabha*; supporters of the Reciprocal Cooperation policy of Malaviya, Kelkar, Moonje and Jayakar; the followers of Ane-Malaviya Congress Nationalist Party; how much of each of these *Jana Sangh* inherited is a subject on which research has not yet been done.

Eventhough one conclusion can, however, be drawn and it is non-exceptional that the articles published, (before the formation of *Jana Sangh*) in *Organiser*, by Sarvashri P. Parameshwaran, Balraj Madliok, Kamal, K.R. Malkani and *Manya Dadarao Paramartha* and the book 'The philosophy and action of RSS for the *Hind Swaraj*' - by a Christian thinker Shri Anthony Elenji-mittam; all these had pointed to the necessity of a *Hinduness* political party and such endeavour for it.

'*Hinduness*', '*Hindu Nation*'-what is the nature of these? Now-a-days there is much debate on which word

1. Such appeasement includes the items: Khilaphat movement; the idea of mixed culture; policy towards Mopala violence mongers; the words uttered about the murderer of Swami Shraddhanand; the spineless reaction on the suggestion that the Amir of Afghanistan should attack India; policy towards communal awards; the willingness to give a blank cheque to Jinnah; the pliable stand taken at the talks preceding transfer of power.  
2. For example, "Congress is a national party. Negotiations with the Muslims should be entrusted to our *Hindu Mahasabha*."

to use, *Hindu* nation or *Bharatiya* nation. [=The present book also supports and describes these things.] The mention of one reference will be enough here for the context that in the first week of Feb. 1956, while speaking before the Punjab *Jana Sangh* Committee, Deendayalji had said, "Ever since our inception, we have been persistently treating *Hindu Rashtra* as synonymous with *Bharatiya Rashtravad*."

In the first annual session of BJS at Kanpur, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji said, "Our party, though ever-prepared to extend its hand of equality to all citizens, does not feel ashamed to urge for the consolidation of *Hindu* society, nor does it suffer from an inferiority complex to acknowledge proudly that the great edifice of Indian culture and civilisation has been built by the labour, sacrifice and wisdom of *Hindu* sages, savants and patriots."

All the articles of faith of BJS were founded in *Hinduness*. Fortunately from the Party President Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji to the smallest party workers in villages-all held *Hinduness* as their life-faith.

Because of this *Hinduness*, '*Akhand Bharat*' was the first article of faith for BJS. For any doubt from the masses asked, 'How will BJS bring it about', Dr. S.P. Mookherji would reply, "*Akhand Bharat* is no election-slogan for us; it is an article of faith. A leading Congressman asked

him how precisely BJS proposed to effect the 're-union'. His answer was a question. Itself, 'When the Congress gave the first call for freedom, did or could anybody foretell the precise course the freedom movement would take?' This is not a communal question. It is based on national political problem. It is a challenge to cure manhood and humanity alike. No artificial borders can keep *Bharat* divided, which is and has always remained one-geographically, culturally and economically. We are determined to undo the wrong that has been done to the Motherland by the Congress-League conspiracy and will restore her to her natural position." [See appendix 11]

The above will clearly show the basic thinking of BJS. [Leaders like Dr. V.K. John of Madras had joined BJS after having understood this ideology.]

Such fundamental thinking and originality can be seen in the various deliberations of BJS.

### ***Karyakarta Nirman***

Panditji knew that a party does not become strong only by its thought, development, expression and propaganda. He intended that each worker must be properly moulded, that there must be a team of such workers on every level and that through efforts by such teams must be done for contacting, awakening, educating the masses to strengthen their organisation and movement. Through

all these he hoped on the one hand to spread the party roots deep and wide and on the other hand to develop the party branches to spread and also to reach higher towards the higher goal. Propaganda is important; but more important is education and what is still more important for the the workers is to give them good *Sanskars* (*Sanskar* is inculcating good qualities and principles). [Shri Aurobindo says, "Inspiration is real work. Let a truly inspiring word be uttered and it will breathe life into dry bones. Let the inspiring life be lived and it will produce workers by thousands.]

In order to impart proper *Sanskars* to workers the best mean is the purity of life of their leader and his constant, informal and family like relationship with the workers. For this, are necessary, leader's contact with each worker, free discussions in small groups and study camps. And in addition is necessary a large propaganda in news papers, the use of periodicals run by our friends and the party's propaganda literature to educate the workers. The knowledge of each worker's mind, his motivation and mutual personal relationships among the workers; these will uplift the ability to take correct decisions in assigning work to each one of them; [by the knowledge of each worker's circumstances, difficulties and the ability and promptness in guiding and assessing them.]

In case of the workers of inner core the confidence,

arising out of actual behaviour of the leader, that justice will be done to everyone on the basis of assessment of his work, his idealism, his qualities and abilities and not on the basis of leader's personal likes and dislikes; inculcating in the workers' minds life-values conducive to the goal (of which our country today is marked by its conspicuous absence) and the attitude of mind which considers things not from a personal but organisational point of view; elastic discipline which properly balances individual initiative and organisational restrictions; absence of insistence on personal conveniences as also absence of any compromise on principles.

The inculcation of the few factors is necessary; the willingness of the workers to work for a very long time with courage and without hope of any quick success because they have been told that their task is, in a way, lunacy like falling in love with the stars; the credibility about the party, not arising from mere talking but born out of the actual behaviour of the leader as seen through the workers' contact with him; the party-members themselves; the first close circle of party sympathisers; the circle of people formed from among these sympathisers constituting the zone of benevolent neutrality, -these last four forming the infra-structure of the party; all these have to be attended to.

Panditji used to say that without this infra-structure,

any attempt at trying to strengthen a party by mere high propaganda and image-building is just daylight-dreaming. When infra-structure is ready, high propaganda may be necessary depending on circumstances. But such propaganda can not be done without this infra-structure.<sup>1</sup> Even if men and money are available, they can't be properly utilised without this infra-structure. It was in this scientific way that Deendayalji laid the foundation of the party. He was also a skilled organiser; but his eminence as a great thinker paled him as a great organiser. One can say that his capacity to think did injustice to his capacity as an organiser. Once Guruji had uttered, "And here we are the experts in the science of organisation."

In the field of party-organisation Panditji substantiated Shri Guruji's words. An important part in the process of organisation, is the creation of a cooperative team of workers at every level. All the members of this team are co-travellers on the path to the goal; all are fired by the same ideal. They love and confide each other as they tread a common path to a common ideal. Such a cooperative team has been significantly termed as 'Mastermind Group' by Napoleon Hill. The real strength of the organisation lies in the numerical growth of this group as also in each individual's growing faith in the ideal and

1. Confucius says, "There is a way to get the kingdom- get the people and the kingdom is got. There is a way to get the people-get their hearts and the people are got."

qualitative improvement of personal virtues. Panditji was ever desirous that such a group should be formed at each level and that it should ever grow both numerically and qualitatively.<sup>1</sup>

Rather than using the gatherings, sessions or public functions, he used opportunities of informal individual discussions with each worker upto the study seminars for the moulding of workers. Maharashtra-workers remember the 10 day all-India study camp which began on 27th June 1959. Earlier from 8th August to 18th August 1957, an eleven day *Akhil-Bharat* study camp was organised at Vilaspur in Chhattisgadh. In all these camps special stress was laid on the moulding of workers. The various meetings also stressed importance of this aspect. The fruits of all these endeavours had begun to show results in Panditji's life-time. At all levels such teams of workers had started their formation with the numerical strength increasing and the quality improving. [See appendix 12]

Panditji was a strong protagonist of democracy. But his brand of democracy was not of the Western model. He was for democracy consistent with *Bharatiya* traditions.

1. An example of quality and number is illustrated by Napoleon thus : "These same Prussians who are so beautiful today were three to one at Jena and six to one at Montmirail."

Guru Govind Singh had said, "One will fight against 125 thousand."

Though *Bharat* is the largest democracy, he was sorry that it is not the best. For successful democracy people must be educated. The effectiveness of party organisation and people's movement will ultimately depend on the level of people's education. People's education is not mere propaganda; the core of party-propaganda is the praise of the party and the denunciation of other parties. But he did not think that democracy can succeed thereby. Along with the education of the workers, he thought it necessary to educate the masses. He felt anxious about the future of democracy because the number of parties and leaders who think in this constructive way is ever diminishing. It was speciality of Panditji that he could adjust his talk-level to the level of the listeners.

As an example, while talking about 'what is *Sanskriti*?' to an uneducated audience, he said, "It is natural to yawn-which is *Prakriti* (nature). Purposely making queer faced and making large sound while yawning is *Vikriti* (perversion), but yawning without making sound or making faces and holding a handkerchief before the mouth is *Sanskriti* (culture)." He could thus express even a difficult subject in simple words. He was a great mass-educator. But he used to think that a leader running after power can never do real mass-education work. Only one who does not seek power can educate people from his heart.

A political leader can not afford to do real mass-

education. Now-a-days in *Bharat*, as in the West, the insistence on rights based on materialism is dominant. There are only a few exceptions like Kant, Carlyle, Mazini, Renoviar and Bradley who forcefully argued in favour of insistence on duty in the face of the general current to the contrary. So most of the educated *Bharatiyas* are also right-minded. It was therefore not easy to oppose this current and boldly preach the duty-mindedness as per *Bharatiya* culture. But he sacrificed cheap popularity and proclaimed the importance of duty-*Dharma*. In the absence of such mass-education, what happens is [as Durant says] that after the revolutionaries succeed they adopt the policy and ways of those whom these revolutionaries have removed.

### Vigilant Leaders

A leader of people must be vigilant watch-dog of our nation. Only because he is vigilant, others can happily sleep. Soon after independence, Shri Guruji and other patriots became anxious because of the machinations of the foreign secret service agencies and they had given expression to it. To touch this question in the political field will be suicidal, was the thought of both the ruling party and also the opposition parties, as all these parties were solicitous of votes. The reason is, though the machinations of the foreign agencies were treacherous, they had vote-bank lobbies here and the power-seeking parties could

not afford to displease them. In the political field Panditji was the first leader who defied the vote-banks and raised his voice on this question. At that time his talk appeared like a cry in the wilderness. It was of course Government's responsibility to take action. But Government did not heed the warning-neither while Panditji lived, nor thereafter; it was as if Government had resolved not to do anything until it was too late. The question was delicate and it was necessary to be patient. But when Government inaction became unbearable, on 20th Nov. 1972 *Jana Sangh* openly demanded that the Government should appoint a commission to inquire into the activities of the foreign secret agencies in *Bharat*. Though a formal resolution was passed later, it was Panditji who raised this issue for the first time from a political platform. This shows his pure patriotism, foresight and 'eternal vigilance'.

In his letter to King Sambhaji, Samarth Ramdas has advised 'eternal vigilance'. Only he, who is thus vigilant, can be a successful organiser, an effective fighter and a mass-educator. Panditji, right from the beginning, insisted that the financial dealings of public institutions and public activities must be unexceptionable. In 1967, in some provinces front-governments came to power in which *Jana Sangh* was a partner; Panditji's cautiousness in this matter became greater. He deputed Shri Vasant Vinayak Bapat of M/s S.B. Dandekar and Co. (Calcutta) to audit the

accounts and to set financial discipline in Delhi central office, the Maharashtra office at Bombay and UP office at Lucknow. It was intended that Shri Bapat should also Tour other provinces with the same objective.

Only a real mass-educator and an expert organiser can successfully lead a movement. Panditji's term was full of movements. On different questions and on different levels-movements always went on. They need not be listed here. The-first movement in his career was of Kashmir-*Satyagraha*<sup>1</sup>; on 6-3-1953, Kashmir Satyagraha began at Delhi. On 11th May Dr. Mookherji entered Jammu and was arrested and on 23rd June he died a martyr's death in jail itself. Eleven thousand people participated in this *Satyagraha*. [See appendix 13]

The largest movement was against Kachh-pact. The-Kachh-pact was signed on 1-7-1965. Between the 23rd July and 9th August, there were one lakh demonstrations in the country against the Kachh-pact and on 16 August 1965, 5 lakh people protested in front of Parliament House. All such movements were guided and directed by Panditji. Panditji, the controller was the source of inspiration to workers, who did not look up to Panditji merely as a respectable leader. Workers looked upon him as their political idealism personified. This had the effect

1. This movement was started by Jammu Praja *Parishad* for the indivisibility of the country. *Jana Sangh* supported this and gave it a nation-wide form.



of preparing them for taking great risks and forget their great sacrifices.

In the last week of July 1954, under the banner of 'Azad Gomantak Dal' *Maan*. Vinayakrao Apte successfully led a batch-for the freedom of Dadara-Nagar Haveli; the batch contained Sarvashri Tryambak Bhatt, Vishwanath Naravane, Sudhir Phadke, Nana Kajrekar, Rajabhau Wakankar, Raman Gujar, Shivaji Jadhav, Dhanaji Burangule, Vishnu Bhopale, Shantaram Vaidya, Balkrishna Sane, Vasant Badve, Baba Purandare, Shrikrishna Bhide, Vindu Madhav Joshi and his comrades<sup>1</sup>; Hemant Soman who, on 15th August 1954, raised *Bharat's* tricolour flag on the Secretariat at Panji in Goa, braving the rifle-fire of Portugese soldiers; Jagannathrao Joshi who entered the jaws of death by crossing into Goa on 23 June 1955; Rajabhau Mahankal who became a martyr in the Goa-battle; all these persons had before them Panditji as the source of inspiration. Panditji's guidance in any movement was based on the problems involved, the strategy and a careful study of circumstances. The workers were willing to sacrifice everything and Panditji used to ascribe responsibility to each worker with the same love and care as one would bestow on his son.

1. It is painful that the soldiers of the freedom fight for Dadara-Nagar Haveli are not given their proper place in modern *Bharat's* history. In this battle Sarvashri Appa Karmal-kar, Vishwanath Lavande, Shyamrao Lad, Prabhakar Sitari and Mohan Ranade, all from Goa, had participated. Shri Jayantbhai Desai of Dadara-Nagar Haveli and Vishnubhai Pandya of Daman had also rendered significant cooperation.

While Panditji had many qualities that a leader needs,<sup>1</sup> his greatest virtue was that he was never conscious of his greatness. 'A lotus plant is not conscious of the fragrance of its lotus' such was his mental state. From his behaviour and talk nobody imagined his greatness. He hardly ever thought about himself. In no time would he be one with the man opposite him. While describing Calicat (Kalikat) session Shri P. Parameshwaran says, "Deendayalji never went to the venue of the session in a car. Like other representatives he would walk. At the entrance he would halt and show his pass to the *Swayamsevak* there. When washerman would come at the place of his stay, he would say, 'Please sit down, brother'. The washerman would be surprised to be addressed as a brother by so great a man. When in a few days, news came of Panditji's murder, the washerman's eyes were tearful."

Once at Delhi, just before proceeding to a programme, he opened his bag. He had just returned from travel and the clothes were all soiled. The worker there could not bear the idea that the *Akhil-Bharatiya* general secretary should go to the programme in such soiled

1. Hitler has said in his autobiography, "The union of theorist, organiser and leader in one man is the rarest phenomenon on earth."

While considering the various qualities of Panditji, it is natural to recall what sister Nivedita has said about Adi-Shankaracharya. She has said, "Shankara united in one person the devotion of St. Francis, the intellect of Abelard, the force and freedom of Martin Luther and the political efficiency of Ignatius of Loyola."

clothes and said to Panditji, "Please put on this shirt of mine." Panditji replied, "That will make my dhoti look still worse. So it is better to wear my own shirt."

There have been hundreds of occasions like this one. While on tour, he used to stay with one of the ordinary worker and the family used to feel that he was one of them. He would not strain any worker for any of his own convenience and that made it difficult to find out his likes and dislikes. He was soft-spoken, had an amicable disposition and his habits were what would behove of a *pracharak* (propagator). In his recently published article on Panditji, Shri B.K. Kelkar has described his personality by the epithet '*Vedanti*' [*Vedanta* is a philosophy] and it is very appropriate. And so to those who stayed with him, he appeared to be one of them. To all such persons having prolong contact with him, his real greatness came as a sudden revelation after his death and they were all nonplussed as was Arjuna when he had seen the vast, terrible and effulgent form of God. Arjuna then says to Krishna:-

सखेति मत्वा प्रसभं यदुक्तं हे कृष्ण, हे यादव, हे सखेति।

अज्ञानता महिमानं तवेदं मया प्रमादात् प्रणेयन वाऽपि।।

"I never knew your real greatness which you revealed today to me. I considered you as one like me and was taking you as a friend to be addressed in not a very highly praising term. I seek your forgiveness for my failure."

Fortunate indeed were those who had the opportunity to stay and work with him. Several such co-workers of Panditji are there even today in politics and in the limelight of publicity. None of them can forget him. Their leadership is based on their abilities. But some of his organising co-workers are, for various reasons, outside the political field; among such are Yaradraj Shetty of Karnataka, Vasudevan of Tamil Nadu, Subhash Banerji of Mahakaushal, Jal Gimi of Nagpur, Hukum Chand Jain of Vindhya Pradesh, Tarakant Jha of Bihar, Ramesh Mishra of Assam, Shridhar Acharya of Orissa, Madhukarrao Mahajan of Mumbai, Sumant Parikh, Smt. Hirabai Aiyar of Gujarat. Some, though outside politics, are busy in social work. Sarvashri Rambhau Godbole, Dr. Om Prakash Maigi, Prabhakarrao Faizpurkar, P. Parameshwaran, Sau. Sumatibai Sukalika, Lala Bhagwandas, Girirajkishore Acharya are working on different fronts. But unfortunately some of Panditji's coworkers are dead. Ramprasad Das, Satyen Bose, Haripad *Bharati*, Ramdas Kalaskar of Bengal, Gopalrao Thakur of Andhra, Saumitri Sharma, M.A. Vyankatrao, Bhaurao Deshpande of Karnataka, Tekchand Sharma of Delhi, Vasant Gajendragadkar of Gujarat, Rambhau Mhalagi and Premjibhai Assar of Maharashtra, Babanrao Deshpande of Vidarbha, Girirajkishore Kapur of Mahakaushal, V. Rajgopalachari of Madras, Madhavprasad Tripathi of UP are prominent among those

departed. To recall these people is a small attempt at paying back Rishi rin.

It need not be said that most of these have come from RSS and that is natural. Because after 1947 most people in the country have become worldly wise. And foolish people willing to sacrifice their all for the nation are hardly visible outside RSS.

A question is often asked about the relationship between RSS and *Jana Sangh*. What the spokesmen of each of these and also what third parties say has been published many times so far. Like Greig Baxter, the learned Shri Walter K. Anderson has made an indepth study of *Jana Sangh*. What the latter in his essay 'The *Jana Sangh*: Ideology and Organisation in Party Behaviour, says about this subject is worth consideration.

While preparing the background of his views, Shri Anderson gives the general conclusions of other thinkers: In his book 'Ideology as a Cultural System' Clifford Geertz says, "Ideologies function as Road Maps guiding people to desired political end."

Shri Robert Michels says in his 'Political Parties', "Parties which operate in a democratic political system have a tendency to dilute their political goal by maximising support from heterogeneous political elements." A conclusion drawn by Robert Michels in the same book is

similar to what Lenin has drawn in his 'What is to be done'; it is, "Ideological commitment is less likely to be diluted if a separate ideological elite structure socialises and supplies the party with its workers."

On this background Shri Anderson analyses the source of *Jana Sangh* strength and concludes, "The *Jana Sangh* has been able to maintain a high level of ideological commitment among its strategic elites by recruiting workers from the RSS."

Anderson's major conclusion in his own words is : "My major thesis is that the *Jana Sangh's* ability to retain a loyal cadre is a result of its close links with RSS."

Because of this, will not the relationship between RSS on the one hand and the political and other organisations under the influence of *Swayamsevaks* on the other be similar to the relationship between the Communist Party and its front organisations? Anderson observes: "The RSS established a loose symbiotic relationship with each of its affiliates. By assuming the socialisation function for the affiliate workers, the RSS retained its original 'educational' purpose. Golwalkar and the other senior RSS figures recognised that if RSS was to retain its socialisation function, it would have to remain outside the conventional political process and remain aloof from the decision-making process in the affiliates. Had

the RSS leadership been drawn into politics, they would not have much of the aura of detachment which provides them their legitimacy as teachers, 'cultural' commentators and arbitrators. Moreover they genuinely fear that the central values of RSS would be seriously diluted by the bargaining process in the political arena."

What P.P. Guruji had in his mind is a different thing. But this effort at mind-reading by a foreigner like Anderson is certainly commendable.

About the mental condition and the motivation of *Swayamsevaks* working in the political field he says, "The *Swayamsevaks* tend to perceive political participation as an extension of their former RSS activities. For the more committed, participation is gratifying not necessarily for the material rewards or the power that are potentially theirs. The political task, like the cultural task in RSS, is to mobilise people behind the RSS belief system. Indeed, if this was not so, the *Jana Sangh*, which has seldom been in a position to distribute patronage and power, could not have elicited such sustained commitment."

The above example is worthy of consideration as the opinion of a discerning foreigner. The factual position in this subject has been authoritatively classified by Shri Guruji in *Organiser* of 25 June 1956 and it has been referred to in the above book.

[There is, however, one thing which is not mentioned in P.P. Guruji's article; its mention at that time would not have been appropriate. But mention of it today is not only not inappropriate but is necessary to understand properly the then prevailing circumstances. All people know how the views of Sardar Patel and Pandit Nehru about Sangh and *Swayamsevaks* differed. A letter, written after ban on RSS was lifted, reveals Sardar Patel's thought about RSS. This letter was written by Sardar Patel to Shri Venkatram Shastri on 16th July 1949. The relevant portion of it reads as: "I am glad that you expect to see Shri Golwalkar and give him some wholesome advice. I am sure he needs it. You know the condition prevailing in your own province. You have also an idea of the firm conviction that the only alternative to Congress is chaos. At least there is no political body to strengthen that organisation. I have advised the RSS in the past that the only way for them is to reform the Congress from within, if they think the Congress is going on the wrong path. I would suggest, if you agree, that you may take a similar stand."

The above reference is clear by itself and no comments are necessary].

It is doubtful whether a power-seeking leader can understand this as he concentrates his mind entirely on power. He regards power as the most important thing<sup>1</sup> in life.

This outlook is wrong, divorced from the *Hindu* tradition of considering all aspects of everything and unacceptable to any rational mind. A really national thinker, whether of *Hindu*-tradition or otherwise, does consider all aspects of every question. For example, consider a statement of radical humanist thinker Shri V.M. Tarkunde: "Politics being a part of social life, political ideals and political practice must be co-related, not only to each other, but to a total view of existence with a clear conception of the basic instincts of man, the place of individual in society and the general course of history and evolution." In this context it need not be said that the *Hindu* method of thinking is the same.

In short, since the time he took the vow Deendayalji's conduct was that of an ideal *Swayamsevak*. He fulfilled one hundred percent the expectations which *Swayamsevaks*, working in different fields, had from him in his capacity as a Sangh-*Swayamsevak*. In his own field (politics) he did organisational and thought-development in the light of Sangh principles. Common man is tempted, out of a desire for quick success, to accept wrong habits and ways. Panditji did not become a victim to such temptation. He introduced, in the political field, the methods

---

1. There can be a transfer of power without any change in the theoretical approach. There comes about no change of quality. The change in political theory can be of two types. One is the development of an altogether new theory and the other is an altogether new interpretation of the existing theory.

and policies consistent with Sangh *Sanskars*. He knew that this would mean delay in success. But he thought that the delay must be tolerated as the task before him was to clean up the field made dirty by others. [If *Jana Sangh* sticks to its policy of opposition to *Jamindari*, *Jana Sangh* will immediately lose its support and if a compromise is accepted the loss can be averted; such was at one time the condition in Rajasthan. Panditji flatly refused to compromise and accepted the consequences. Many may be remembering this. He had to take many hard decisions like this.]

He combined in him idealism, clear thinking and foresight. So he knew that unscientific haste entails inordinate delay. He had understood the secret in Shri Guruji's guidance: "Hasten slowly." Similarly he had clearly grasped another suggestion of Shri Guruji. The suggestion was that *Swayamsevaks* working in other fields must be especially particular in keeping day-to-day contact with RSS Shakra. He practised all these and thus set a model before *Swayamsevaks*. In this context one finds a definite description of Panditji's qualities in the speech of Shri Bhaurao Deoras given on 25 Sept. 1979 at Deendayal Shodh Sansthan [See appendix 14]. [In terms of the new Western science of leadership, Panditji's leadership was Transforming Leadership and not Transactional Leadership.]



## Impassive

No single rule can be laid down as to the proper time for publicising the personal life and thoughts of the great men who made history. The time for exposition of personal life may or may not be proper for publication of thoughts.

In the case of many great men it appears that their contemporaries are not able to properly assess their work. The contemporaries face a difficulty: the problems of the day, the different attitudes adopted by different people and the consequent prejudices. Even men, with normal eye sight, when caught in a dust storm and with dust in their eyes, can not see clearly even things right before them; in the same way contemporary men, caught in the storm of events, are not able to properly assess the lives and work of great men. Real appreciation becomes possible when the storm is over and vision is clear. This takes time-sometimes decades, sometimes even centuries!

Such is this strange process. After Waterloo was lost. Napoleon's estimate by the entire French nation was very low. But after some decades the entire French nation realised that he was a very great man of theirs. His remains were very respectfully brought from St. Helina and statues were erected to his memory.

The people who crucified Jesus Christ had to change their assessment of Him after 330 years. He was not only admitted to have been a great man but his gospel was accepted by the Roman Rulers.

Perhaps the classical example is that of John of Arc. Due to false propaganda people sullied her name. Even the Vatican denounced her as a base woman and she was burnt alive. 500 years later the same Vatican honoured her as a saint.

Many such examples show that neither contemporary publicity nor popularity is a definite criterion of any body's greatness. His greatness depends on how long a shadow, his work casts on the future.

Therefore the contemporary assessment of any great or stormy personality can not be accepted as standard.<sup>1</sup>

Briefly it can be said of several great men that for

1. The certificate of great patriotism given by the Communist China to Chang Kai Shek after four decades is an example in point.

a proper assessment of them it is necessary and inevitable that in between some time must elapse. But publication of thoughts should be immediate and full; the sooner the better as thinkers can quickly assess his thoughts.

But it appears that in the case of some thinkers, their thoughts-exposition and propaganda are subject to astrological influence. '*Daishik Shastra*' on which Panditji based some of his theses was published in 1920. But it was taken note of by Panditji after four decades. The printed copy of this book came to the hands of Copernicus just a few hours before his death; after 30 years a scientist mentioned it; and after still 50 years it earned a negative recognition, as after 80 years of its publication Pope proscribed it.

The whole of Maharashtra recognises the greatness of 'Jnyaneshwari'. But it was a long time before general recognition came to the book when about 250 years later Eknath reached out its earliest edition, corrected aberrations that had crept into it and put it before the people.

There are many more examples of such delay in thought expression. But such delays have been considered undesirable because it takes more time to assess the thought and humanity is a great loser.

After Panditji's death many had strongly wished that research should be started on the Deendayalji's

thoughts and simultaneously work should be initiated for the preparation of 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: The Man and his Thoughts'. But at the beginning there was delay due to various causes. And later when Emergency was declared, the rapid succession of events made it difficult to start work.

There were weighty reasons for the delay. An important problem was to find a writer who knew this subject. But a still greater difficulty was the paucity of necessary literature.

Considering the great impetus, extensive and dynamic contribution given by Panditji to the thinking process of our country, it must be admitted that the available literature is very scanty.

Before Panditji's entry into politics, *Rashtra Dharma* Prakashan had published two of his books viz. 'Chandragupta Mourya' and 'Jagadguru Shankaracharya'. At that time Panditji was the Editor of weekly 'Panchajanya' and Daily 'Swadesh' (Lucknow). Thereafter some of his books have also been published : 'The two Plans' (1958), 'Devaluation-A Great Fall' (1966), 'Integral Humanism' (1967), '*Jana Sangh* : Siddhanta aur Neeti', 'Akhand Bharat', 'Inko bhi Azadi Chahiye', 'Americi Anaj : PL 480', '*Bharatiya Arthaniti* (Vikas ki Ek Disha)', 'Bekari Samasya aur Usaka Hal', 'Ekatm Manavavad', 'Vishwasghat', 'Tax

ya Loot', 'Rashtra-jeevan ki Samasyaen' etc. All these books he has authored. Some of the books are in the form of collections of his speeches and articles. In 1968 Jaico Publishing House published a collection of his articles in Organiser under the title 'Political Diary'. A critical foreword to this is written by Dr. Sampurnanand, the then Vice-Chancellor of Kashi Vidyapeeth. Shri Bhanu Pratap Shukla and Shri Ram Shankar Agnihotri have edited an important collection under the title 'Rashtrajeevan ki Disha'. 'Ekatm Manavavad', 'Ekatm Manavavad-Samagra Darshan ki Roop Rekha', 'Rashtra Chintan' etc. are other collections.

Deendayal Shodh Sansthan has published the following books.

- (1) Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya-A Profile (Hindi edition edited by Kamal Kishore Goenka and English version edited by Sudhakar Raje), 1972.
- (2) Integral Approach (English & Hindi), 1979.
- (3) Gandhi, Lohia and Deendayal (Foreword by Madhu-Dandavate) (Two separate books in English & Hindi), 1978.
- (4) Destination (Ed. Sudhakar Raje), 1978.
- (5) 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya-Man and Philosophy of Life' (Hindi)-by Dr. Harishchandra Barthwal, 1977.

Besides these we have the books 'Who killed Upadhyaya', 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Murder Case'

(Hindi), 'The Death of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' in Hindi by Tansukhram Gupta, 'Amar Shaheed Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' by Shankar Sultanpuri, 'Ekatm Manavavad' by D.G. Datar, 'Ekatm Manavavad' and 'His Legacy : Our Mission' by D.B. Thengadi, 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' by N. Madhavarao and its Marathi translation by Prakash Deshpande, the poetic essay 'Rashtra Purush Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' by Daaudayal Shastri [with foreword by Dr. Mukundarao Agaskar]. These books throw light on Panditji's life and thoughts. Shri Jagadish Mathur (the office in-charge of BJS), *Rashtradharma* Prakashan Lucknow, Jaico Publishing House, Deendayal Shodh Sansthan Delhi, Rashtrasthan *Parishad* Bangalore and Anil Prakashan of Bombay have rendered valuable efforts.

Panditji's writings are scattered; they are not yet fully collected. Because he shunned publicity, some of his valuable writings have not received broad publicity. And some writings, though published, are such that very few know their author. For example, Dr. Hedgewar's biography written in Marathi by Shri Nana Palkar was translated into Hindi by Panditji. How many know this?<sup>1</sup>

What is true of his writings is true also of his talks and conversations.

---

1. In 1955-56 a critical commentary on current national events used to be published in Panchajanya under the heading Vichar-Veethi and under pen-name Parashar. The author of it was Panditji.



ya Loot', 'Rashtra-jeevan ki Samasyaen' etc. All these books he has authored. Some of the books are in the form of collections of his speeches and articles. In 1968 Jaico Publishing House published a collection of his articles in Organiser under the title 'Political Diary'. A critical foreword to this is written by Dr. Sampurnanand, the then Vice-Chancellor of Kashi Vidyapeeth. Shri Bhanu Pratap Shukla and Shri Ram Shankar Agnihotri have edited an important collection under the title 'Rashtrajeevan ki Disha'. 'Ekatm Manavavad', 'Ekatm Manavavad-Samagra Darshan ki Roop Rekha', 'Rashtra Chintan' etc. are other collections.

Deendayal Shodh Sansthan has published the following books.

- (1) Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya-A Profile (Hindi edition edited by Kamal Kishore Goenka and English version edited by Sudhakar Raje), 1972.
- (2) Integral Approach (English & Hindi), 1979.
- (3) Gandhi, Lohia and Deendayal (Foreword by Madhu-Dandavate) (Two separate books in English & Hindi), 1978.
- (4) Destination (Ed. Sudhakar Raje), 1978.
- (5) 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya-Man and Philosophy of Life' (Hindi)-by Dr. Harishchandra Barthwal, 1977.

Besides these we have the books 'Who killed Upadhyaya', 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Murder Case'

(Hindi), 'The Death of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' in Hindi by Tansukhram Gupta, 'Amar Shaheed Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' by Shankar Sultanpuri, 'Ekatm Manavavad' by D.G. Datar, 'Ekatm Manavavad' and 'His Legacy : Our Mission' by D.B. Thengadi, 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' by N. Madhavarao and its Marathi translation by Prakash Deshpande, the poetic essay 'Rashtra Purush Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya' by Daudayal Shastri [with foreword by Dr. Mukundarao Agaskar]. These books throw light on Panditji's life and thoughts. Shri Jagadish Mathur (the office in-charge of BJS), *Rashtradharma* Prakashan Lucknow, Jaico Publishing House, Deendayal Shodh Sansthan Delhi, Rashtrasthan *Parishad* Bangalore and Anil Prakashan of Bombay have rendered valuable efforts.

Panditji's writings are scattered; they are not yet fully collected. Because he shunned publicity, some of his valuable writings have not received broad publicity. And some writings, though published, are such that very few know their author. For example, Dr. Hedgewar's biography written in Marathi by Shri Nana Palkar was translated into Hindi by Panditji. How many know this?<sup>1</sup>

What is true of his writings is true also of his talks and conversations.

---

1. In 1955-56 a critical commentary on current national events used to be published in Panchajanya under the heading Vichar-Veethi and under pen-name Parashar. The author of it was Panditji.

For three decades he was touring. Most of this time he spent in vehicles-from bullock cart and passenger train to fast aeroplanes.

If he were accompanied by an Image-Builder, the latter would have provided impressive figures in the American style- How many lakhs of miles he travelled, how many crores of people he contacted directly and indirectly, how many days would be necessary to run the 'tapes of all he talked etc. A lot of such data is published in America by companies which take contracts of propaganda at the time of Presidential election. Fortunately Panditji did not have such an Image-Builder. The original Image itself being bright, no such Image-Builder was necessary. 'A naturally beautiful thing does not have to be beautified' or 'Anything beautifies the naturally beautiful'. Also artificial image-building would not suit his temperament.

Of what Panditji may have said during this long continuous touring, is only a hundredth part available to us now? So many *bouddhiks* (lectures) in RSS, so many public lectures, so many meetings, so many personal talks besides personal confidential talks with so many. These do not include discussions within his own mind. If all this were available, it would have been a vast store-house from which to draw something for the new generation and for new workers. Or it may be that, this is the very nature of

our tradition. As far as possible pull on with what is 'heard' and resort to written word from '*Shruti*' to make it possible. Whatever that be, yet there is time. Many, who had been close to him, are still living. Also there may be, in scattered places, notes of his talks and conversations. Out of these the very part collected so far is small, the rest of it is very large. The effort to collect it all, will certainly be beneficial to the nation. Information about his life is also sketchy.

Panditji was self-effacing; he belonged to the tradition of those who would say, 'After my death not even a small monument should be erected to my memory.' There are so many *Rishis* who are the authors of *Vedic Sooktas* and *Upanishads*. We only know their names; but in the cases of how many of them do we know about their lives? It is impossible to expect a man of this tradition that he will write his memoirs like Lloyd George or Churchill or write his partial autobiography like Pandit Nehru or Mussolini or Hitler. Also there were on him the *Sanskars* of RSS. My friend Shri D.V. Gokhale once said, "RSS has raised great men, but made all of them faceless."

Nor did Panditji's life give him any respite. By utilizing the forced leisure in the Landsberg Jail Hitler wrote his 'Mine Cuff'. Lenin found such leisure for writing when he was exiled into Switzerland. Mao Tse Tung was a revolutionary General and an administrator, but he also got such leisure during his stay at Yen-an. But Panditji never

got such leisure because of his extremely busy life.

Panditji's motto was 'Alone, continuously keep moving forward'. It was impossible in his life that he could have a biographer. Firstly, because of the multi-dimensional nature of his work and secondly, because the men around him were disinclined to commute things to writing. In the life of Rama-krishna 'M' had played a vital role. Mahatma Gandhi had Mahadeobhai Desai. Sardar Patel's daughter worked similarly. Madam Samnyatsen reported on her husband. Boswel is famous as Dr. Johnson's biographer. But Panditji's horoscope did not contain such a biographer for him.

Benjamin Franklin wrote his diary everyday. If Panditji had this habit, that would have constituted his honest autobiography. But it was not to be.

Panditji's personality was multi-dimensional. In the history of the world, there have been great men who, by their writings, guided the course of events. Such were Rousau, Waltair, Marx. Some great men were both great mass-leaders and also great writers. To this category belong Julius Caesar, Napoleon, Lenin, Winston Churchill, Charles de Gaulle. Some great men have cast long shadows on history; the characteristics of these people were-they could not produce very valuable writing but had

---

1. Master Mahashaya Mahendranath Gupta.

organising ability; the ability to move forward with people of different mental attitudes; the ability to inspire people to work and to sacrifice, not out of their thoughts or writings but through their personal contacts. Louis the XIV, Marshal Tito, Lyndon Johnson, Ho-Chi-Minh are in this class. Panditji had to play all these roles and many more simultaneously. To assess such a person is like embracing the sky.

The number of Panditji's followers is very large. To love him and to be able to assess his greatness are different things. Neitze has said that as we climb a mountain higher and higher the cold becomes more severe and the air becomes thinner. How many can continue upward march in the face of these facts? And hence it is said, 'It is rarely that a poet is born to adequately appreciate you.'

Because of all these reasons it was natural that taking up this multi-dimensional programme should be delayed. Though events were following in rapid succession, it was impossible that the urge in his followers' minds should be entirely wiped out. The reason is human nature.

### **If Panditji would have been there?**

During my school days I had often occasion to hear or read in newspapers a certain discussion. "What would

he do if Lokmanya Tilak were living today?" Not being conversant with the currents and undercurrents in politics, we school boys wondered why this question was frequently and publicly being discussed. At that time our intellectual development was not such as to enable us to see that this discussion always takes place on the background of the actions and reactions in the wake of new circumstances or problems. But now it is obvious that after the death of every great man, whenever a problem arises before the country, people naturally ask themselves such a question. It is more than 40 years now after Panditji's death. During this period, several important questions arose before the country for being faced. Before the party and patriots, also came up a number of questions. A great unprecedented calamity like Emergency had also been there. On all such occasions it was but natural that his followers should have asked in their minds, 'If Panditji were alive today, then...?'

And in this way the feeling that all about Panditji-the man and his thoughts-must be published began to gather force. It is true that while it is natural to ask this question, it is difficult and perhaps even risky to answer it. Because, however honest the questioner, it is almost impossible to think purely objectively without in any way colouring the thought with one's own mental condition. The questioner, while seeking an answer, is unconsciously

biased by his own tendencies and reactions. This makes such investigation also risky.

But this is not going to stop Panditji's followers from raising this question 'If Panditji were living today...?' in their minds. This question will continue to arise and the effort to answer it will also continue. It must be admitted that the literature etc. available today is inadequate to satisfactorily answer the question of his followers. Of course Panditji has left behind some material to enable tentative guesses. For this, his written and talk-literature, his life and especially his document 'Principles and Policies', can be very useful.

In the light of this document, it is possible to find solutions to many current and future problems. This document touches all fields of national life. Of course its utility has natural and practical limitations. It will not be proper to use it in the faith that everything it says is eternally and everywhere correct or good. It will be better to regard its content as a Point of Reference. It is true that this document throws light on all problems and circumstances. But it does not mean that there is already a complete clarification of every question or principle. In the context of current circumstances, certain questions become serious; thoughts about these will have to be expressed at length and with emphasis through our talks and speeches. In the case of questions which do not become serious or explosive, even though the document may

contain certain relevant basic principles, to go out of the way to enlarge on them (except in study groups) will be looked upon as inappropriate and ridiculous. Because of this general rule, it is possible that what a problem today appears explosive and of highest priority may not have assumed such serious form in Panditji's time and so he may not have discussed that in any great detail of the relevant principles included in the document.

Some of the important problems which faced *Jana Sangh* up to Feb. 1968 have been mentioned earlier in another context. It is clear that some of the problems were related to the fundamental theses, while some were about the determination of the policy and strategy in the light of those principles. From time to time instructions were issued, in the light of the aforesaid policy and strategy, for programmes suited to the occasions. Some problems had arisen suddenly and were of a temporary nature and they had to be resolved rationally. Some problems are chronic or repetitive. To this class belong natural calamities and the consequent rehabilitation; communal and other riots and their evil effects; the victims of police atrocities and firings; the victims of anti-social elements and naxalites; the demand of the people staying in slums; the excesses against *Harijans*; the corruption among ministers; price rise; increase in railway tariff and taxes; the anti-consumer and anti-poor provisions in the annual

budget; the demand by the poor for interest-free Loans- and the movements by the forest dwellers for the enforcement of the land reform acts. The condemnation of South Africa's policy of apartheid; the support to be given to countries, outside *Bharat*, in their struggles for independence against imperialists; the demand for overhauling the constitution of UNO; the reforms necessary in the election system; these subjects also belong to this category.

There is the need of perpetuating the emotion of unity and thus consolidating people's might against foreign aggressions. The guidelines set in these subjects during Panditji's life-time can be useful even in future. Such are also the subjects that follow: reduction in the franchise age; the method for settling the border disputes among the States; the question of the rights of organisations of government servants, teachers and labour; the demand for the complete rehabilitation of the displaced persons from Sindh and giving them the citizen rights; the demand for ceiling on urban and rural wealth and the permissible expenditure; the continued remembrance of the ideals of Undivided *Bharat*. All these can be filled into the predetermined frame. Of course, in view of the changing circumstances suitable changes will have to be made in resolutions, demands, open policies and the movements based on them. But all these subjects are such that the

predetermined direction will be the same.

It is true that repetition of history is never quite the same. Two historical sets of circumstances, though apparently similar, are yet not quite the same. No event repeats itself exactly, but many times the basic questions and the principles remain the same. After Panditji's death, there have been events which have no parallel in his life. Such a thing was the Emergency. And the series of events that followed was quite of a different type. There have been in Panditji's life-time some events which were not exactly same but somewhat similar and the guidelines can be conjectured from them. For example, in the intermediate period, some time was spent in discussing the unification of *Jana Sangh*, *Hindu Mahasabha* and *Rama Rajya Parishad*. The detailed discussion is irrelevant here. From Panditji's thoughts and approach during that, we get, if not guidelines, yet general direction for talks on such occasions: which point to give up, how much to press for particular points, which policy to observe while merging our party with any other party. Similarly at the time of various elections, there were attempts at temporary understandings with other parties. There were even attempts to approach some leftists. It is obvious that these dealings would not be useful in the future in their detail. And yet there is much to learn from the subtleties and limitations in these efforts. After 1967 elections, some

provinces had front-governments in which *Jana Sangh* was also a constituent. Among the other constituents were both rightists and leftists.

It can be definitely said that the guidance given by Panditji then is not outdated even today; what he had directed was based around the minimum common programme as the pivotal point. Of course such events in whose case a statement like this can be made are very few. As said before, two sets of circumstances or two problems arising at different times, though superficially looking similar, are so different in their historical context, psychological subtleties and the complications of events that it will be erroneous to draw straight forward conclusions from the experience of the earlier happenings about the later happenings. Therefore it will be futile to guess what Panditji's reactions would have been about every political situation. But it can be said that in no circumstances Panditji would have compromised on principles. [See appendix 15]

He would not have abandoned the practical ways and policies learnt in Sangh and would never have lost sight of the sciences of organisation based on a deep study of psychology. And that is why in his speech in Deendayal Shodh Sansthan *Maan*. Bhaurao Deoras could positively ask, "If Deendayalji would have been alive today, how would he have reacted to today's circumstances?" Except in

some fundamental things, it is not fruitful to think of what Deendayalji would have thought about every question arising in day-to-day politics.

Though this is generally true, the period of five and a quarter years following Panditji's death will have to be considered an exception to this rule. In this period events rapidly followed one and other. These were : Russian aggression on Czechoslovakia; Non-Proliferation Treaty whose purpose was that the nations, which did not have atomic weapons, should be prevented from having them; the strike of the Central Government servants; the Raveendra Lake incident in Calcutta; the creation in Kerala of Mullapuram as a Muslim majority district; the affront at Rabat; Congress-Communist-Muslim League front; *Bharat-Russia* pact; the foreign stirrings in *Hindu Ocean*; the split in congress; the nationalisation of banks; Telangana movement; Farakka-dispute; Shimla pact; Bangladesh war and the question of recognising independent Bangla Desh. It is possible to say definitely what Panditji's reactions would have been in these matters. This is because we had Shri Guruji with us till 5 June 1973, a criterion for what is good or bad for the country. On the above subjects, one can definitely say that whatever Shri Guruji would say would have been what Panditji would have said.

Except for this brief period, generally it can be said

that until we know fully the life and personality of Panditji, it will be difficult to guess exactly what his reaction would have been about every incident. This means that all his writings must be collected and published. Secondly, just as a number of gifted-writers have (in the present volume) been at great pains to give an exposition of Panditji's thoughts, similarly gifted writers-must undertake to bring out Panditji's 'Multidimensional' personality.

If the project 'Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: an Entire View' (personality and thoughts) is successfully completed, then, it will be useful like a mariner's compass to the national leadership of today and future. Like Raj wade's treatise 'Sources of Maratha History' this present treatise which in itself is a source of guidance, will, let us hope, attract writers who know the subject well.

The present book is a fore-runner of the long expected and all-pervasive literary compilation.



## “Pt. Deendayal Upadhyay Vichar Darshan”

In the book [vichar-darshan] different writers have enlarged on different aspects of Panditji's thoughts. The Institution *Bharatiya Vichar Sadhana*, which works in the field of mass-education, has undertaken the responsibility of publishing the Marathi script while Suruchi Sansthan is going to publish the Hindi and the English versions.

The originator of this praiseworthy project is Shri Vinayak Vasudeo Nene alias Rajabhau Nene who organised a team of learned and thoughtful writers. They are Shri B.K. Kelkar, Shri Sharad A. Kulkarni, Shri C.P. Bhishikar, Shri B.N. Jog and Shri V.N. Deodhar.

All these persons have done this work out of love and mainly for self-satisfaction as was claimed by Tulasidas to be his chief motive in writing Tulasi

Ramayana. Everyone in his heart shared John Banian's emotion, "I did it for my own self to gratify."

Everybody has been humble enough to think with Kalidas that there is no satisfaction till the work is approved by the learned. None repudiates his disapprovers by saying that his work was not meant for them. Today, due to various reasons, there is a thought-vacuum in the country. If this book helps even to partially fill up the vacuum, the authors will feel that their labours have been justified.

All these able writers have done full justice to their assignments. It is not necessary here to dwell upon them. So, avoiding repetitions, I feel that it is enough to lay forth, in some detail, the background of the subjects and the characteristics of Panditji's way of thinking.





## Unportrait

A current joke in America is : a political leader says, "I have already made up my mind; kindly don't disturb it by further facts." The reason is obvious, 'further facts' is an invitation to further thoughts; but where is the time for it? Leader says, "I have no time to think, because I have always to speak."

Apart from the joke, fact remains that leaders, ever in a hurry, have no time to think and so have no leisure to study the various aspects of the subject. Of course, this is the experience in America. But the same state of affairs is likely to be met with in other democratic countries also- the extent may differ.

While this attitude may be convenient, it is not useful in arriving at correct conclusions. Often it happens that thinkers remain always in the same circumstances and same company; the result is that while their thoughts are definite, those thoughts are one-sided. There is absence of thought to be supportive and also opposing elements.

Those whose areas of contact are wide, are less one-sided but less definite also. The attitude 'I feel this way, but it may well be that way too' is apparently a liberal attitude but it contains also a great deal of looseness. It is true that 'बुद्धेः फलं अनाग्रहः' [The intellect does not press for a view]. But not pressing for a view does not mean that there can be the absence of a conclusion or a decision. The mind must be necessarily ready to completely rethink over a question in the light of new facts. But it is no tribute to intelligence, out of fear of new facts, to avoid taking a decision or to helplessly postponing a decision on the basis of facts available.

There should be no hard-headedness but there should be readiness to rethink. At the same time, in the present circumstances there should be no indecision or uncertainty. Thoughts must be definite. If under pretence of liberalism, all opinions and thoughts are loose, nothing important can be achieved.

An idealist thinker never closes the windows of the mind. He takes all aspects into account. Therefore, there is no one-sidedness. But there is also no looseness in thinking. For him not all things are undecided, not everything dependent on fate and not everything is loose. Because he is an idealist, he has a centre and that is his ideal. But he is willing to understand and so there is no one-sidedness. The mind can concentrate but is also capable of taking all aspects into consideration. This was

true of Panditji.

Definiteness was a characteristic of his thoughts.<sup>1</sup>

On the one hand his attitude was 'बालादपि सुभाषितं ग्राह्यम्' [A wise word though coming from a child, should be accepted] but at the same time even words from elders he would sift like the grain from the chaff 'नीरक्षीर विवेक' [the Rajhans bird is supposed to sift milk from a mixture of milk and water]. I don't know what the word pragmatism originally meant. But in our country it has come to mean an easily swayed man : गंगा गये गंगादास, जमना गये जमनादास [He will worship Ganga or Jamuna to whichever river he goes]. Panditji was not a pragmatic of this brand. He was not dazed by the effulgence of any great man. He would refuse to be dazzled and would go to the root of a thing. His area of contact was vast. He had contacts, with different individuals, institutions and parties, to different degrees. His contacts ranged from great saints like Prabhudatta Brahmachari and Muni Susheel Kumar, Bhaijee Hanuman Prasad Poddar and Mahamana Madan Mohan Malaviya, to most crooked politicians.

The National Democratic Party led by Dr. Mookherji included in it, in addition to *Jana Sangh*, the *Ganatantra Parishad* of Shri Prafullachandra Bhanjdev and Shri Rajendra Narayan Singh Dev; *Hindu Mahasabha* of Barrister N.C. Chatterji, Shri V.G. Deshpande, Dr. N.B.

1. "Nothing is so discouraging to subordinates as a chief who hesitates"-Napoleon.

Khare and Sir Gokul Chand Narang; Tamilnadu Toilers Party of V. Munnuswami, A. Jayaraman, V. Noovargasami Padyachi, N.D. Govindswami and others; Common Will Party of A. Krishnaswami Mudaliar, N.R.M. Swami, Doraiswami and Pillai Ramachandra; Dravid Kajahgham of S.K. Kandswami Bebi; Akali Dal (Master Tara Singh) of Sardar Hukum Singh and Sardar Ajit Singh Sarhadi; Loksevak Sangh of Shri Shivamoorti; and some independent members like Annie Marcavek, Edward Paul and Mathuram. Panditji had contacts with all of them. Shri Jamnadas Mehta's Lokashahi Swarajya Paksha; *Praja Parishad* of Jammu; *Swadhin Jana Sangh* of Pandit Neelakanthdas; *Hindu Mahamandal* of R. Shankar; *Ramarajya Parishad* of Swami Karapatriji and Nandlal Shastri; *Swatantra Party* of Chakravarti Rajgopalachari, N.G. Ranga and Minu Masani; Lok Congress of P.Y. Deshpande and Pandit Dwarika Prasad Mishra; Shoshit Dal of Bihar; *Bharatiya Kranti Dal*; *Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti*; *Maha-Gujarat Janata Parishad*; *Goa Mukti Sangram Samiti*; *Janata Party* of Rajasthan; *Janata Party* (Chhota Nagpur); *Jana kranti Dal* of Mahamaya Prasad Sinha-with all these Panditji maintained his contacts. He was also in contact with some followers of Sir Chhoturam's Unionist Party. With some leftists also he had personal contacts; amongst such were Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Shri H.V. Kamath and Shri Ashok Mehta. It was the same bond with Shri Dadasaheb Gayakwad of Republican Party.

From the Congress Dr. Sampooranand, Rajarshi Purushottamdas Tandon, Seth Govinddas, K.M. Munshi, Acharya Kripalani, Lai Bahadur Shastri, Ghanashyamdas, Thakur Raghunath Singh, Rashtrakavi Sohanlal Dwivedi were the personalities with whom he had good contacts. He had also contact with the workers of Rashtra Sevika Samiti, Arya Samaj and Sarvadaleeya Goraksha Abhiyan Samiti. He used to frequently discuss things with Dhananjayrao Gadgil and other economists. 'The Two Plans' book had the solid background of such discussions. While sticking to his convictions based on deep and full thinking, he used to ponder over and sift from the thoughts of high and low and used them for enlarging and strengthening his original ideas. His mind's doors were always open. But he was never carried away by externals into indiscriminate acceptance of anybody's thoughts.



## Frank Philosophy

The main rival of *Jana Sangh* in power-politics was Congress and in the matter of theory were the communists. The communists use to employ cheap tricks to create doubts, confusion and inferiority complex in the minds of supporters of *Hindu* nation. They ask the questions like, "Where is the blue print of your *Hindu* Nation?" with such an air as if they are carrying in their pocket a blue print of social arrangement based on world communism. It is true that the leaders of higher calibre and of more serious temperament do not show such superficiality. But of course the number of higher calibre is on the decrease while the number of over-enthusiasts employing cheap tricks is increasing.

We are opposed to communism as a philosophy; and it is proposed to later on discuss communism and socialism from the philosophical point. But while admitting that the founders and leaders of communism have been

good thinkers, most of their followers are superficial minded; and this is a curse on communism. For example consider this observation by Engels: "The materialist conception of history has a lot of them now-a-days, to whom it serves as an excuse for not studying history. In general the word 'materialistic' serves many of the younger writers in Germany as a mere phrase with which anything and everything is labelled without further study. That is, they stick on this label and then consider the question to be disposed of."

"And as for our own Party a large section of the German communist party is also angry with me for opposing their Utopias and declamations." He utters.

Engels further observes, "You, who have really done something, must have noticed yourself how few of the young literary men who fasten themselves on to the party give themselves the trouble to study economics, the history of economics, the history of trade, of industry, of agriculture, of the formations of society.... It often seems as if these gentlemen think anything is good enough for the workers. If these gentlemen only knew that Marx thought his best things, were still not good enough for the workers, how he regarded it as a crime to offer the workers anything but the very best."

The communists of *Bharat* today even exceed the

European communists of the last century in shallowness. The following comment has been made by Supreme Court judges in their judgment on what a communist leader of all-*Bharat* status had said : "We are doubtful if he has fully appreciated the (Communist) literature, if he has read it either he does not know or has deliberately distorted the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin for his own purpose. We do not know which will be the more charitable view to take..... It is obvious that appellant has misguided himself about the true teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin."

Whatever that be, it is true that communists and some *Swayamsevaks* also who had heard them, had asked Panditji as to what is the 'blue print' of our *Hindu* Nation.

Though we shall discuss a little later about the ways of the leftists, it will be useful to consider the above question at the beginning.

In this context I remember an incident in my boyhood. In his very first tour after restrictions on his movements were lifted, Swatantrya-Veer Savarkar had visited our place Arvi. He was staying with Sanghchalak Dr. Apte. At about 12-30 after midday, about 20-22 students came there with black flags in their hands and started shouting 'Savarkar go back'. Naturally a scuffle was expected. But Tatyarao prevented it. On the other hand he

asked them to be seated in front of him and asked them why they shouted 'go back'. As soon as the question was asked, a student from the 9th standard boldly stood up and asked, in English, "Mr. Savarkar, what is the 'blue print' of your *Hindu Nation*?"

Considering the boy's age it was obvious that the whole thing was the work of some communist teacher in our high school. Tatyrao glanced at the students for a moment and said, "Boys, you have won; I have lost."

Then he turned to the people to start his talk. "There was a period when three well-known revolutionaries from three countries had taken asylum in London: Emon De Valera of Ireland, Savarkar of *Bharat* and Lenin of Russia...."

Lenin was watched by Russian secret agents. When he was underground, for 3 days he was in Savarkar's India House. Only at night-dinner Savarkar and Lenin met.

One night Savarkar said to Lenin, "I am not interested in your 'ism'. But in case you get power, I would like to know what your blue print for Russia would be like." Lenin smiled and asked, "How is it that you are asking me this question now? Blue print can not be developed until you are in a position to put it into practice. Until then only guideline principles are necessary to keep on working. After capturing power, blue print is to be slowly developed taking

all circumstances into account."

Then Savarkar turned again to the boys and said, "Had Lenin asked me the same question today, I would have asked him a counter question, 'Do you remember what you had said when I had asked you about blue print for Russia?' I could have asked thus to Lenin. But, my boys, I can not reply your question."

(It is not surprising that, after coming to power, while replying to a worker, Lenin had said, 'At present my communism consists in Sovietisation of Russia and electrification.')

It appears that the contagious disease of blue print had also spread amongst the socialists of our country. In 1934 at the time of a meeting of the All India Congress Committee, there was also a meeting of Congress Socialist Party which functioned inside the Congress; Jaya Prakashji showed his party's proposed programme to Mahatmaji.

One of the points therein was that as per Marx's proclamation 'From each according to his capacity and to each according to his need' there should be suitable arrangement in the social structure. Gandhiji said, "Jaya Prakash! If you do that, I am with you 100%."

[Though the principle is great, yet it is impracticable in the near future.]-This, Jayaprakash understood what was

meant by Gandhiji. Lenin has written that Karl Marx has not written a single word about Economics. This means that Marx did not set forth: the agencies for production and distribution and their mutual relationships; the system for consumption and utilisation; the machinery that would control the mutual relations among different economic interests. He has given guidelines only and that is a wise concept.

Wolfg and Leon Hard says in his book 'Three faces of Marxism' about what Karl Marx himself thought about a blue print:

"As for the detailed development of these phases and the solutions that will have to be found for individual practical questions, Marx and Engels declined all discussion, since they regarded this as Utopian speculation." The working class (has) .....no readymade Utopias to introduce 'par de'cret peuple', Marx declared, they have "no ideals to realise but to set free the elements of the new society with which the old collapsing bourgeois society already is pregnant." It is not the task of the communists "to create Utopian systems for the organisation of the future society, least of all in questions of details. To speculate on how a future society might organise the distribution of food and dwellings heads directly to Utopia. The people of the communist society of the future will not care a rap about what we today think

they should do."

Boume Tom Watmore and Patrik Good, the editors of the recently published 'Readings in Marxist Sociology, say, "Marxian sociology does not much describe what a socialist society will be like. Marx himself was more interested in analysing the condition of society at present than in predictions about future society."

In a meeting at Thane, Shri Guruji has said while replying to such a question, "*Hindus* have every right to institute any social system after taking into account the circumstances present. The only restriction is that any such system must be in the light of the principles of *Sanatana Dharma*."

At Madras, in a meeting, a student had asked a similar question about blue print. Deendayalji asked a counter question, "Do you want to tie down the hands of future generations?"

Briefly, any question about blue print is childish. Panditji has not given any such blue print and it only shows the depth of his thinking.



## Eternal *Dharma*

We say that thinking about *Dharma* should be in two parts. One is everlasting, unchangeable principles. The second is the social system<sup>1</sup> devised in the light of these principles, but suited to the ever-changing circumstances.

This also is so as per the known thoughts of great thinkers. Eternal principles are independent of circumstances. But their clarification or comments on them are not always independent of circumstances. Though the principle is the same, it has to be interpreted by taking into account the subtleties of the circumstances, the society's level and attitude.

Even if the same 'middle of the road' course is to be explained, the structure and language used while talking to a cruel audience must not be quite the same while talking to fearful people, if it is to be useful. The content may be the same but the emphasis will be different. Because of this

1. Tolstoy has divided *Dharma* into three parts : (1) Essentials of religion, (2) Philosophy of religion, (3) Rituals of religion.

we find that in the open speeches of the spokesmen of the same theory, but made at different times or at different places, apparently there are contradictions. Not only this but the same great man appears to say mutually inconsistent or contradictory things on different occasions. To this class belongs the advice of Vivekanand to leave off Bhagavad Geeta and to play foot ball. If we go merely by the words of a writing or speech without taking into account the context or background, we can be misled. This must be born in mind while understanding any greatman's thoughts.

Another point has already been briefly touched earlier. Panditji's literature contains guidance about all the present and probable future problems. But it is of two types. One is only setting forth of guiding principles. The second is an analytical explanation of these principles. Panditji's literature contains guiding principles for all the aforesaid problems. But there may not be an explanation of each and every principle. Even if a principle is stated but circumstances do not press for its explanation then a practical worker can not afford to waste time in such an explanation. Because the object of what he writes is not a thesis for getting a university doctorate but practical guidance to society. So such a worker will not fail to explain a principle involved in a question which has caused a storm or confusion or explosive circumstance. But if circumstances do not need it, he would not care to give such an explanation.

In the matter of any principles for which explanation

has not been given, it will be wrong to assume either that the thinker's stand was unclear or that he lacked the ability to give detailed guidance. It was because of this that in the cases of some important and vital questions, Panditji stated principles but did not explain them. In order to clarify this subject it will be useful to take as an example a problem of this kind and to discuss it in detail. Such a problem is the social questions before us. To this the above rule applies.



## Renaissance Law

In the document 'सिद्धान्त और नीति' the principles of social questions are given as guidelines and they are complete in themselves. But in Panditji's life-time there was no occasion which demanded enlargement on them. Principles were stated but circumstances had not arisen which made their explanation necessary. It is true that it was in this period that the movement of Dr. Ambedkar, whose attacks were forceful, like John Knox, the demands and religious conversion, all took place. But the strings of control were in the hands of a responsible and educated patriot and so while there was public debate on social questions, it did not cause violence or great worry. [See appendix 16]

On the question of reservations there have been movements, large and occasionally violent, sometimes by one side, sometimes by the other side. On the whole, social condition is taking a very undesirable turn. Delicate



and vital questions are coming, out of debating hall, into the streets. Such was not the condition in Panditji's time; and so, though principles were pondered upon, time had not come for their explanation. [See appendix 17]

In no field was Panditji for status-quo. He believed that old cobwebs in the social structure must be removed and changes be made suitable to the times. In social subjects, he was neither for revolution nor for status-quoism. His way was that of Renaissance; and for it he preached that we must go forward courageously, along the path of mutual understanding.

Going to an extreme on any one side will result in a loss to all. Solving a social problem is like separating the strands in a ball of silk thread when they have got all messed up. The method of cutting the Gordian knot is not the proper way. For centuries some social sections have been exploited and repressed; they must be given the same facilities as the rest of the society and also they must be protected; and if in doing this the advanced sections of the society complain, it only means they are lacking in a feeling of unity. But at the same time if in the backward section a determination does not arise to use the protection and the facilities to quickly stand on their own legs, if they do not imbibe the attitude 'उद्धरे द्वात्मन् आत्मनः' [Lift up yourself by your own efforts] but if, instead they develop vested interest based on caste, then the

crutches of facilities and protection will make them permanently disabled; so thought Dr. Ambedkar. Therefore, he himself set a time-limit for this.

The present unhappy state has arisen due partly to the backward classes not having seriously considered Dr. Ambedkar's warning and partly due to a number of flaws (arising from political causes) in executing Dr. Ambedkar's scheme.

Not only about reservations, but also on other social questions, Panditji's thoughts were in line with those of social reformers from Raja Rammohan Roy to Dr. Ambedkar. Panditji's thoughts are similar to those of Justice Ranade in the latter's quotation:

"The change which we should all seek is thus a change from constraint to freedom, from credulity to faith, from status to contract, from authority to reason, from unorganised to organised life, from bigotry to toleration, from blind fatalism to sense of human dignity. This is what I understand by social revolution both for individuals and societies in this country."

But this can not be achieved by conflict based on hatred nor by merely passing laws. Panditji's thoughts are reflected in what Dr. Ambedkar has said regarding the place of Law in social revolution : "Rights are protected not by law but by the social and moral conscience of the

society. If social conscience is such that it is prepared to recognise the rights which law chooses to enact, rights will be safe and secure. But if the fundamental rights are opposed by the community, no law, no Parliament, no Judiciary can guarantee them in the real sense of the word."

In this way Panditji thought it necessary that all well-wishers of the country should work for awakening the social discerning power (to distinguish good from bad); and he also thought that an effective way of awakening the social and moral conscience of *Hindus* is present in the Sangh method.

It is only as an illustration and also because of its importance today, this question has been here to be dealt with at length. Social bad customs are also included in this. But such questions had not much cropped up in Panditji's time.

Panditji's views about who is qualified to talk about social reform were similar to those of Lokmanya Tilak. The later says, "Any body who wishes to reform *Hindu* customs or *Hindu* religion must at the first place be proud of being *Hindu* and must definitely has a will to stay *Hindu*. Luther and other reformers were like this." It must be remembered that Martin Luther had full faith in Jesus and bible.<sup>1</sup>

Panditji used to say that anybody who had no faith

1. Same can be said about Calvin, Zwingley, Descartes and Bacon.

in his religion and who is not proud of being a *Hindu*, has no moral right to say what reforms are necessary in *Hindu* religion and society.<sup>1</sup>

It is only for clarifying the subject in hand that, as an illustration, a particular problem was discussed here in detail. During the last so many years some other similar problems have come up before the country. In future the number of such problems is going to increase. Panditji's writings contain the principles to be followed in solving them, but there is no detailed discussion of them. The reason was not his intellectual inability but in his time circumstances which would call for their explanation had not arisen. But in future his followers must seek answers to new problems of this type in the light of principles laid down by Panditji.



1. Swatantryavir Savarkar who strongly declaimed restrictions on study of Vedas, professions or trades, touchability, crossing the seas, reacceptance of converted *Hindus*, food participation and inter-caste marriages, was a staunch *Hindu*.

## Vision of Life

Originally this book is named *Vichar Darshana*. We say that Deendayalji was a great thinker. Those who knew Panditji, know well why he was called a thinker. And yet it is necessary to explain the term 'thinker'. During the last two decades, the terms Intellectuals or Academicians have come to be associated, in the country and especially in the metropolis, with intelligent people of a different type. There are several classes of these people who have the ability and the promptness to advise government as also the opposition parties on their policies. But they are all valuable thinkers.

Among such persons are: Sarvashri Rajani Kothari, Romesh Thapar, George Vergese, Bashiruddin Ahmed, Kuldip Nayar and Mrinal Datta Chaudhari; Shri Giri Deshingkar and D.L. Seth who worked with Kothari in 'The Centre for the Study of Developing Societies'; Shri Bhavani

Sengupta and Pran Chopra of 'The Centre for Policy Research'; Shri V.M. Tarkunde, J.D. Sethi and Shri Arun Shouri of PUCL and PUDR. Their ability and their work, all must accept. With due respect for all these gentlemen, it seems necessary to clarify that Deendayalji was a class by himself; he was different in his ideal, in the nature of his life-work and the level and the scope of his thoughts.

Again it is necessary to study the status and the class of Panditji and other *Bharatiya* theorists from another scientific point.

The 'Learned' amongst us are still under the Western influence. Their faith is that all our things and thoughts deserve to be discarded and all that is Western, is the best; and so for them Western philosophy and philosophers are the best and greatest.

By now the history of Western philosophy has been published in most of the important languages. On Greek philosophy is available the literature of Gompers, Burnet, Zeller, Kushman, Windleband, Orlic, Ross, Hicks, Thilly, Stace, Rogers, Taylor, Russel, Copleston and others. Literature is also available which throws light on the entire period from the earliest Western World Thales and Anaximenes to the whole of ancient philosophies. Of this, the period of Greek philosophy is from 625 BC to 322 BC (i.e. upto the death of Aristotle). To this period belong

Socrates, Plato, Aristotle. From the death of Aristotle to the end of Neo Platonism i.e. from 322 BC to 476 AD, the period is included in ancient philosophy; this period is Hellenistic period i.e. period of Roman philosophy. The period from 476 AD to 1453 AD is regarded as the period of Middle Age philosophy. Augustine, Origen, Erigena, Roselin, Anselm, Abelard, Tomas Aquainus, Duns Scotts, Okham, Ekhart, Nicholas, Kuznus were the main philosophers of this period. From 1453 AD to now is the period of modern philosophy. Out of this period from 1453 AD to 1690 AD is known as Renaissance period. The scientists Nicholas of Kusa, Leonardo de Vinci, Copernicus, Brahe, Kepler, Galileo, Huyghens, Newton and the thinkers Francis Bacon, Tomas Hobbs, Des Carte, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Paraselsus, Bruno, Kampanela, Telecio, Machiavelli, Boden, Jacob Bohm, Thomas Moore, Graucius, Althucius, Herbert of Cherbery; all these are considered as leaders of Renaissance.

From 1690 to 1781 AD the period (i.e. from Lock's essay to Kant's philosophy) is called period of Enlightenment. Lock, Burkley, Hume, Piari, Bayle, Waltair, Rousou, were the important philosophers of this period. [Technically the Enlightenment period ends in 1781. Yet it has influenced the writings of Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, Auguste Compte of the 19th century and William James, John Dewi, George Santayana and Burtrand

Russel of 20th century]. The period 1781 to 1831 i.e. from Kant's philosophy to the death of Hegel is known as period of German Idealism. Reinhold, Maiman, Schulze, Beck, Herder, Jacobi, Gate, Schiller, Hardenbergno Wallis, Fichte, Schelling, Schliermacher and Hegel are the philosophers of this period. The period from 1831 is known as developmental or modern period. The Western philosophers and the various lines of thinking are fully known to *Bharatiya* educated people and it is not necessary to mention their names here. As said before, all literature about these is available in all important languages.

The treatises of Copleston, Bernard, Delfgau, Emil Brehier I.M. Bochenski, Vergilius Ferra, are very useful in this. 'The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy' by Paul Edward can be regarded as a standard reference for this subject. 'पाश्चात्य तत्त्वज्ञाना चा इतिहास' in Marathi by Shri Gajanan Narayan Joshi is based on deep study and is exhaustive and standard. It is also up-to-date.

The *Bharatiya* mind can appreciate the above philosophers and their lines of thinking. As West has been, during the past centuries, the centre of important world events, it is natural that every thought in the West has received more importance than it deserved. Our 'learned' people are not even aware of there being any philosophy-cultured philosophy-in existence outside the West. Therefore, it is necessary to have a factual assessment

of this subject. Those who use the term Western Philosophy, have before them only philosophies of Europe, Great Britain and United States. The history of Russian thought has no place in 'History, of Western Philosophy'. Russia, being a great power, has more than compensated for this deficiency. Similarly they do not think about South or Latin America. What does not occur to Western historians can hardly occur to 'educated' *Bharatiyas*. For example, do our educated men know even the names : Luis Pareira Barreto of Brazil, Gabino Barreda of Mexico, Mariano Cornejo of Peru, Lastarria of Chile, Benjamin Fernandes of Bolivia, J. Alfredo Ferreira of Argentina, Enrique Jose Varona of Cuba or the very recent Alejandro Deustua of Peru, Jose Enrique Rodo of Uruguay, Justo Sierra of Mexico? In his 'A History of Philosophy' Fuller has devoted two chapters to Latin America. But it is not enough to remove the one-sidedness of the idea in Western philosophy.

Another point is that this history of Western Philosophy extends over only two and a half thousand years; the ancient period is of one thousand years; that of the middle ages stretches over one thousand years and the recent period over five hundred and fifty years. Philosophy in *Bharat* began in Vedic Period with '*Nasadiya Sooktas*' and has been continuing to flow and get richer. It will be necessary to determine this actual period in terms

of thousands of years.

Most of Western thinking is in the form of reaction to circumstances. *Bharatiya* thinking is mostly independent of ephemeral circumstances and is based on fundamentals; and hence it contains much that is eternal.

In the West philosopher was in a separate class and philosophy was at the most coupled with science. It is necessary to research into the question whether the same thing has happened in *Bharat*. The Western thought has always been based on compartmentalisation, while in our thoughts the approach has always been integral.

It will be adequate to give just one example to clarify this point. The Westerners Des Carte, Spinoza Leibnitz, Lock and Hobbs were roughly contemporaries of Samartha Ramdas. No body has called Ramdas a sociologist. Nor is he described as a philosopher. But a learned admirer and lover of Samartha, Shri Prabhakar Poojari says that Samartha literature contains, on sociology and philosophy, matter which in volume and quality is much greater and higher than what all the five afore-mentioned persons have written. As per *Hindu* method, in place of treating it as a separate domain of thought, the matter has been woven into the fabric of Samartha literature. The question is whether Samartha

can be classed as a philosopher? Should he be bounded by that class? Taking into consideration the *Hindu* custom of taking an integral view of life, it seems improper to put him into any one class.

Though only one great man has been mentioned here as an example, this is true of all other (*Bharatiya*) great men.

The *Hindu* word '*Daarshanik*' is as a matter of fact, deeper, higher and more extensive than the word *Tattwajnya* [philosopher]. Now-a-days it is becoming a custom to treat the two Words as synonyms, but this is unscientific.

*Daarshanik* and philosopher are two different categories. We do not mean to say that men of the first category can not be born outside *Bharat* and especially in the West. But in the West the work of recognising the two classes has not been done. Perhaps they (Westerners) have not yet perceived this difference. Whatever that may be, so long as the two categories are not recognised as separate, it will be unjust to assess the status of Panditji and other *Daarshaniks* like him in the Thought History in terms of the Western technical language. The point here is not of who is the greater. The only suggestion is that there are two separate classes.



## Integral Humanism

This book consists of six parts. In a sense every part is complete and in itself independent. In another sense all the parts together form the whole, just as an orange is made up of the skin and the juicy sectors inside. Every sector is complete in itself and independent, but at the same time it is a part of the whole orange. It is the same here.

As said earlier the writers of all these parts are well-known writers. So they have tried to make each subject as easy as possible. But some subjects are such that it is not possible to make them simpler.

For example the subject '*Sansmaran*' (reminiscences) is educative and also simple. The part '*Politics*' will present no difficulty as now-a-days political consciousness has very much increased. *Rashtra Vichar*

(Nation thought) has been, since several decades, a subject of hot discussion everywhere. The people have before them various aspects of this Subject. The subject '*Rajakiya Sampada*' (Political heritage) is both theoretical and practical and its discussion here is self-explanatory.

It is different with the remaining two parts. '*Ekatm Artha-neeti*' [Policy of Integral Economics] discusses the direction of future economic planning. Political questions have been widely discussed in our country, but this is not true of economic questions. And so the subtleties of the latter have not come before the people. '*Ekatma Manava Darshana*' [Philosophy of Integral Humanism] is after all philosophical. How far philosophy can be simplified has certain inherent limitations. So the common reader is likely to find these two parts rather difficult to apprehend.

This is not the place for either a review or an appreciation of each part. That is for the reader. But it will not be out of place to dilate on some difficult parts with a view to help the-reader to understand them. It may help appreciation.

Like every other subject the canvas for Integral Economics is very large. But apart from some popular slogans, usually in our country there are no attempts to educate the public on economic policies. The manifestos of parties have become only a routine. During propaganda,

there is only nominal explanation of economic programme. There is lot of party praise and very little of education. This makes it difficult for the common man to understand it.

In order to understand the economic subjects in this book it will be useful to see the background and basic principles. In the *Akhil-Bharatiya* camp at Thane in 1972, Shri Guruji had explained the basic principles of economic planning, for modern times, in the light of *Bharatiya Sanskriti*. If these are born in mind, it will be easy to understand the discussion of economic subjects in this book. [See appendix 18]

Integral Humanism Darshan aims at elucidating the basic and all-pervasive principle of total existence. Panditji worked in the political field. In that field the current term was 'ism'. And this thesis was to be explained to the common people. And so, even though he did not like the word ism, as a practical compromise with the common man's level of understanding, he called his thought an ism. But at the same time he took care that by the time the common man is able to understand the subject, he should recognise that this subject, in view of its not being limited and not of temporary importance, cannot be fitted into the frame of an ism. This is a '*Darshan*' which is true at all places and for all time. When talking to children we say that the moon is sitting upon the branch of the tree in front. This is just like that. But this is undoubtedly a *Darshan*

and is above debate. [*Darshan* has no equivalent in Western Languages]

About the 'एकमेव अद्वितीय' [One-without a second] principle ['तत्त्व'] it has been said, 'यतो वाचः निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' [It is such that words cannot describe it nor can the mind grasp it]. The deeper a thing is, the more subtle it is. And the deepest has no limits on its subtlety. The power of words to express is limited. The subtlety of '*Darshan*' is unlimited and any attempt to describe it in words appears unsuccessful and terse.

This does not mean that '*Darshan*' is intrinsically difficult, troublesome or boring. The difficulty lies in its expression and not in experiencing it.

Imagine an attempt to explain in words what is meant by the sweetness of sugar to a man who has not tasted sugar; it is difficult and will bore the speaker and also the listener. But tasting sugar is not only not painful but is a happy experience. To a man who has not seen a lotus, it is not easy to give adequate idea of its beauty and fragrance; any such attempt will be boring to the listener. But the sight and fragrance of a lotus will be a pleasant experience. It is the same with Integral Humanism. This '*Darshan*' is a natural expression of the highest development of the human consciousness. [See appendix 19] This is an experience of greatest happiness. But the

description of this in words will appear incomprehensible. The difficulty is in expression and not inherent in the basic principle. The nature of the basic principle is to give every individual a guarantee of eternal happiness. And this happiness can be experienced even by those who have not even heard of this '*Darshan*' provided their heart [चेतना] has adequately developed.

Gary Zucav says, "It is a common misconception (literally) to mistake the description of a state of being for the state itself. For example, try to describe happiness. It is impossible .....Happiness and the description of happiness are two different things.

"Happiness is a State of being. That means that it exists in the realm of direct experience. It is the intimate perception of emotions and sensations which, indescribable in themselves, constitute the state of happiness. The word 'happiness' is the label or symbol, which we pin on the indescribable state. Happiness belongs to the realm of abstractions or concepts. A state of being is an experience. A description of a state of being is a symbol. Symbols and experience do not follow the same rules."

What is said in the above about happiness is applicable to Integral Humanism '*Darshan*'.

In this case the example given herewith is



enlightening.

This book contains a detailed description of Integral Humanism '*Darshan*'. The basis of this '*Darshan*' is the development of human consciousness from the individual to the Universe. Many questions would arise, like whether this process of development of consciousness is natural and practical. What is the nature of this process? In his speech at the ceremony of laying the foundation stone of Guru Govind Singh Bhavan at Patiala on 27 December 1967, Dr. Zakir Hussain had clarified this process.

He said, "I think, a person only realises the true significance of his link with the motherland when he understands the connotation of the word 'home'. As it is, the concept has multiple and diverse ramifications. Thus, for a child, it signifies the mother's warm and bounteous lap. As he grows up the parents' hut or palace, as the case may be, becomes the symbol of home. Gradually, as his consciousness expands, the entire street or hamlet or town begins to acquire that meaning in his mind. Then things in his neighborhood-trees, plants, schools, sparrows, familiar faces, domestic animals etc. become the presumption and setting of his wonderful home. And thus as he graduates to higher reaches of awareness and knowledge, a man begins to see it as a precinct, that comprehends a variety of walls and thresholds, that embodies diverse ideals and dreams...Religious fables and

parables, art and literature, history and chronicle- all these and a great deal more, then becomes its paraphernalia and its embellishments. In short, very soon, the courtyard of the multi-dimensional edifice begins to grow and envelop the entire country and the natives of the land begin to appear as inmates of one's house. The country's political ideals based on truth and justice, as also its priceless cultural treasures and traditions, its moments of greatness and gladness become an integral part of this superstructure. What started as a mother's lap has finally expanded to include not only the topography around, but also the vast panorama of national life. How wide is the circumference of one's home."

If to the above are added two dimensions viz. internationality or (entire) humanity and cosmicity, it becomes the development of consciousness which Panditji envisages. Look at the thoughts of another great son of *Bharat*. Shri Bipinchandra Pal says: "Nationality is inseparable from Universal humanity."

"The peculiar value and distinction of our concept of *Swadheenata* (self-dependence) and *Swatantrya* (self-subjection) lies in the grandeur of the connotation of the word '*Swa*' or self. The '*Swa*' is both the individual self and the Universal Self and the two are really one.....And man's range of real freedom or self-dependence, as we would call it, expands in proportion as he is able to realise his

unity with the Universal Self."

"The ideal end of civilisation is perfection of man, not only in his physical and material, but equally also in his moral and spiritual aspects. It is more, it is the perfection of a man as a social unit, as a limb and organ of the social whole."

"The great mission of this ancient land and its composite people among the modern nations of Europe, Asia and America, is to replace existing international competitions by international cooperation, to substitute the arbitrament of peaceful consultations and reasonable compromise through an impartial international Supreme Court, for the arbitrament of murderous arms, in the settlement of all international disputes and differences and thus to help forward the realisation of poet's dream of the millennium when the nations of the world shall be as one people living at peace with one another, working together for the furtherance of the common good and the revelation of God in man. The Indian nation's builder must constantly keep this before him."

"Hinduism was not merely a 'federal idea', but it went further, so that India furnishes a model of that Universal Federation, the Federation of the World."

Shri Pal's thoughts are in the same direction. Only Panditji's Integral Humanism '*Darshan*' goes further in the

same direction and tries to give the experience of oneness of the soul of all existence. In his book-'Social and Political Ideals of Bipinchandra Pal' published in October 1974, Amalendu Prasad Mookerji says, "His was indeed, a religion and philosophy of integral human-ism." Shri Mookerji calls him 'spiritual humanist' [It will be useful to give a hint here. Shri Rajabhau Nene has completely laid forth the thought of Integral Humanism. It must be said about the term 'mind' therein that our idea of mind and that of the Westerners are different. Western Psychology has so far researched into only the 'मूढ़' and 'क्षिप्त' states of mind. They have not, so far advanced to the 'विक्षिप्त', 'एकाग्र' and 'निरुद्ध' states. The *Hindu* psychology envisages the investigation of all the 5 states of mind. Similarly our ideas differ much also as regards the nature, working and limitations of intellect. The same is true of '*Atma*' and soul].

It will also be useful to clarify here one more idea dilated upon by Panditji. Really speaking this subject has been ably handled by Shri Balasaheb Jog in this book. It is clear from his exposition that the phrase 'एकात्मक शासन-प्रणाली' should have been translated by the phrase 'Integrated Form of Government'; but upto that time this phrase had not been current. And so, in order that the common man may understand, the familiar phrase 'Unitary Form of Government' was used. Of this there have been also some bad effects. The ideas associated with this

naturally came to be associated with 'एकात्मक शासन-प्रणाली'. This led to certain misunderstandings. But now it is known to all that what Panditji intended was Integrated and not Unitary in the conventional sense. In his presidential speech at the Calicut session Panditji had mentioned (only as a problem pertaining to that particular period) electoral reforms on the lines of West Germany's Mixed System; but this was only as a temporary measure which could be easily fitted into the then present frame. But what he wanted was a complete overhauling of the Constitution.

The *Bharatiya* Constitution is the longest, the biggest and the thickest written constitution in the World. The Constitution of United States of America, alongwith its amendments, consists of just twenty (20) pages. The Constitution of the Fourth French Republic (1946) has only twenty five (25) pages. The Italian Republic Constitution (1947) has thirty five (35) pages. The Federal Republic of Germany's Constitution (1949) is of forty five (45) pages. The original *Bharatiya* Constitution is of more than two hundred and fifty (250) pages.

In spite of this length, various thinkers ranging from Naxalite Nagi Reddy to Constitution expert Koteshwarrao representing various shades of thought have expressed their dissatisfaction about it for various reasons. It is especially noteworthy that among these are included Dr. Sachchidanand Sinha, Dr. Rajendraprasad and Dr.

Ambedkar himself. Chintamani and Masani (Indian Constitution at Work) have gone to the extreme of calling this Constitution "A scheme which is a combination of the draw-backs of different systems."

Pandit Deendayalji's main objection to the Constitution was that its form is not *Bharatiya*. It does not reflect *Bharatiya* culture, traditions, mind and present and future aspirations.

This does not mean that the framers of the Constitution were ignorant of *Bharatiya* traditions and *Hindu* Law. The Constituent Assembly had in it learned men well versed in *Hindu* Law which had developed and evolved continuously from the do's and don'ts contained in *Vedas*, *Vedangs*, *Upanishads*; original literature on do's consisting of *Dharm-Sutras* and *Smritis*; *Meemansa*; customs, moral behaviour; *Ramayan-MahaBharat*; *Nibandha*; *Kautiliya Arthashastra*; *Shukraneeti*; up to *Veermirodaya* of Mitra Mishra. Also at that time were available, Learned men like Dr. P.V. Kane, well versed in this subject. But while preparing the Constitution neither this law and literature nor the knowledge of these learned men was utilised. The Constitution-framers had turned their back on all this traditional literature.

Our Constitution is mainly based on 'The Government of India Act, 1935'. Probably the longest Act

passed by the British Parliament is this one. Though the Constitution has taken, in some matters, a stand different from the Act, still the Act has been the main basis. (See appendix 20). Constitution-expert Basu says, "Three-fourths are based on the Govt. of India Act, 1935."

The framers of the Constitution thought that Parliamentary democracy of British type will be useful to this country. "Many of its ideas like the rule of law, judicial review and responsible government are British." It is obvious that the 1935 Act was convenient for the British empire here.

Though the model chiefly before the framers of Constitution was that of British democracy, there are things taken directly and indirectly from the constitutions of other countries.

Without going into any great detail, broadly one can see the following things. 'Directive Principles of State Policy' in *Bharatiya* Constitution are based on similar provisions in the Constitution of Ireland and the Spanish Constitution earlier to General Franco. The idea of 'Fundamental Rights' is based on similar provisions in the Constitutions of USA and Ireland. There is a similar declaration in the preamble of the Constitution of the Fourth French Republic. Italian Republic Constitution, in its first part, declares the rights and duties of citizens. Constitution of Federal Republic of Germany, 1949 gives a list of

fundamental rights.

In article fifty one (51) of Directive Principles of State Policy, there are directives about international relations and policies of *Bharat*. Very nearly similar directives are present in the preamble of the Constitution of Fourth French Republic, in the article eleven of Italian Republic Constitution and in the Federal Republic of Germany Constitution.

The most important question is about the nature of *Bharatiya* Constitution. At the beginning an idea was mooted that the nature should be federal. The national leaders were constantly afraid that they may be charged with having dictatorial tendency if the nature is made unitary in the conventional sense. Many will remember that Pram Poojya Shri Guruji had warned about the dangers of a federal form. It is obvious that the Constitution makers were in double minds. They were not willing to risk a clear unitary form but were conscious of the risks involved in the federal form. So they did not accept the American federal form but followed the Canadian structure. The Constitution framers purposely used the word 'union'; they did not use the word 'federal'. In this matter our framers were more influenced by Canadian Constitution. Canada was a federation, but it needed a strong centre. Civil war had taught Canada a great lesson; and so they considered it inevitable to have a strong centre in spite of the federal

structure. The conclusion from the history of *Bharat* was of the same form. But because of this being in confused minds our condition was like 'इदं च नास्ति, परं न लभ्यते' [This is not obtained and that is not obtainable, i.e. both are lost]. What we got was the evils of both and we lost the benefits of both.

In this connection Prof. Banerji says, "India's Constitution is federal in form with a pronounced unitary bias."

Prof. K.C. Where says, "It (the Constitution) establishes, indeed, a system of government which is utmost quasi-federal, almost devolutionary in character, a unitary State with subsidiary federal features rather than a federal State with subsidiary unitary features."

The nature of the Constitution, resulting from the confused minds<sup>1</sup> of the framers, has been as they say 'न इधर के रहे न उधर के रहे' [Belongs to neither here nor there]. This has given scope to the ever growing conflict between Centre and States. Had the Constitution been framed on the background of *Bharatiya* traditions, history and cultural unity, then this unnatural quarrel would not have arisen; the divisive forces could not have gained force; there would not have been various kinds of cracks

1. Look at the following confused observation of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: "When the world is in turmoil and we are passing through a swift period of transition, what we may do today, will it be wholly applicable tomorrow? It can not be proclaimed."

in national unity. In case of purely *Bharatiya* form of the Constitution, the *Bharatiya* mind would have experienced just pride of its history and hope for a glorious future; and instead of the people's energy being wasted in mutual conflicts it would have helped national reconstruction. With this ideal before him, Panditji had introduced the idea of *Ekatm Shasan Pranali* (the Integral State Administration) which is congenial with *Bharatiya* nature. Today the Centre-State, quarrel is taking a serious turn. But a patch-work solution, politically expedient, within the framework of Constitution, to temporarily get over problems is not a durable remedy. The everlasting and effective remedy lies in developing an integrated '*Ekatm Shasan Pranali*' and putting it into practice. Shri Balasaheb Jog has laid forth at length the development of this subject so far, in this book.



## Eternal Concepts

In a way Panditji's thoughts can be divided into two groups—those of temporary importance and those of eternal importance. Thoughts of permanent importance are independent of circumstances. But we cannot understand their underlying motive without understanding the circumstances in which the thoughts were put forward. Panditji was not merely a bookish learned man. He was very active in social life. The thoughts put forward by such a man, though they be important at all times, find expression as a reaction to some incident, question or circumstances if the cause for the expression of thoughts is some temporary cause. If the knowledge of the cause, incident, question or circumstances is incomplete then it is difficult to appreciate either of the importance and the depth of the thought. The background of the circumstances of the question is important in itself. The discovery of Copernicus is now accepted by all. But anybody, who does not know the things in which the European and the Christian world strongly believed and that how strong was the Papal power which supported those dogmas at the time of Copernicus,

will not be able to appreciate the depth of Copernicus' thoughts. The thoughts of Terence Mac Swiny of Ireland are very inspiring. But if one looks to the stage in the struggle against imperialism in which his thoughts were spontaneously expressed, then only one can see how fiery the thoughts were. The thoughts of Aristotle about logic, of Lincoln about democracy, of Mazini about nationalism, of Jefferson about fundamental rights of man are of importance for all time but we can appreciate the inner meaning and importance of the thoughts only if we know the particular circumstances under which the thoughts were forcefully expressed. This is true about the thoughts of Pythagoras, Euclid, Des Carte, Pascal, Rousseau, Waltair, Marx and others. The thoughts are important in themselves but their value is heightened by their background. The diamond is valuable but its lustre and beauty are heightened by its setting. The full greatness of either the thinker or the thought do not shine forth without the circumstances as a setting.

All the six parts of this book are brimming with Panditji's thoughts and the circumstances pertaining to different occasions have also been described. But if the reader is not conscious of the background of the circumstances at the beginning of the fifth decade of this century then he can not properly assess either the thinker or his thoughts. For this it is felt necessary to present a picture of the then circumstances before embarking on the subject proper.



## Earthly Devices

After the Second World War, most of the colonies were given freedom under pressure of circumstances. This was not the immediate result of any revolution or conflict. Earlier, there have been movements in different countries; but at the time they became independent; the main reason was the international circumstances. *Bharat* was one of such countries. Here also there have been movements. But as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru admitted later on, by 1947 the Congress leaders were so tired that they were not mentally prepared to give the fight that would have been necessary if the division of the country were not accepted. The actual handing over of power took place according to Indian Independence Act passed by British Parliament. It was the same, very nearly, in the case of other colonial countries who had become free. The result was that even after independence the influence of the Western culture on these countries continued. Their leaders suffered from a kind of inferiority complex. They had begun to think that there is only one

model of development or progress and that Western type of progress is the only type of progress.

Franz Fanon called the third world people as 'the Damned of the earth'. Instead of being angry with this, the third world people developed a feeling of helpless dependence. They forgot the truth that the affluence of the imperialists was based on their exploitation; and began to feel that without the help of their erstwhile white masters, not an iota of progress was possible: they felt helpless. Actually after colonies were given independence, the once imperialist nations were themselves in a pitiable condition. Their affluence so far was not based on their own resources. To use the colonies for securing raw material at cheap rates, to change it into finished products and to use these countries as highly profitable markets; it was this exploitation-circle that supported their affluence. Though they had to set these countries free due to pressure of circumstances, these Northern nations had realised that they will not be able even to maintain their economic structure if they fail to create pockets of their economic empires in the newly independent Southern States; and for this purpose they had started new devices-economic institutions and foreign-aid pacts. If the southern countries had a clear idea of this situation, then the northern countries would have found it difficult to succeed in their plans.

And even in the past colonial countries had thought

it necessary to create a cultural inferiority complex in the colonies to perpetuate their empires; so also now, to build and protect their economic empires, they thought it necessary to continue and create cultural inferiority complex among them. They were also successful in this attempt. This is because, in the first place, the acquisition of independence was not a product of struggle. Secondly, in almost every such country, the persons to whom power was handed over, were already admirers of Western culture and were estranged from indigenous culture. [See appendix 21]. Also not being used to independence, several problems appeared more serious than they really were. Out of fear they had forgotten that development has many aspects, extents and dimensions. Of course there were problems : large unemployment, shortage of consumables, great inflation, poverty, low or average expectation of life, high death rate and a still higher birth rate, illiteracy, ignorance of even elementary rules of health and cleanliness, epidemics, excess or shortage of rains, crops poor in quality and quantity, drought, technology which is either outdated or incongruous with the conditions, divisive forces based on feudal relations, race, sect, language, people's faith in old irrational customs, frequent fightings, military coups, political upheavals, such were the important problems of the colonial countries. The people had never to face these in the pre-independence period

and this caused a fear-psychosis in the new power-wielders.

But even in these circumstances there were leaders like Mahatmaji, Shri Guruji and Shri Deendayalji<sup>1</sup> who were confident that these challenges can be faced and that there was no cause either for loss of hope or for inferiority complex. Problems arise, not only out of poverty, but out of affluence or even a show of affluence. Out of Western type of technology, automatic machines and computers arises much more unemployment. What Keynes, the economist, termed 50 years back as 'Crisis of Saturation' has to be faced. This problem takes different shapes. Economic backwardness, stagnation and consequent price-rise; depression; traffic obstructions and accidents; haste, anxiety, mental tension and consequent upon it neurasthenia, blood pressure, heart disease, schizophrenia; fear and loneliness, fear-psychosis; loss of interest in life, frustration, self-alienation, individual deterioration, mental perversion leading to suicide; crime and violence sex excess and perversion; drug addiction; tendency to be absent from work; ruined family-life and general social tension, all these are the diseases of

1. In order of time, the men who were leaders of renaissance in Asia are Raja Ram Mohan Rai, Meiji Mikado Mutsu-hito, 'Sayyad Jamaluddin (Iran), Dr. Sun-Yet Sen (China) and Mustafa Kamal Pasha (Turkey). In Africa this place was ascribed to Zaglool Pasha of Egypt. While all these great men were influenced by Western material progress, their minds were deeply rooted in indigenous cultures.



Western culture. If technology progresses further the Western way, the West will have to face a serious problem and it has not reached a sufficiently high level of culture with which to face it. This is the problem of leisure. It is difficult that a devil will not arise out of the Western materialistic attitude and great leisure and that devil may ruin humanity.

If the culture is high, leisure is a boon and as Patanjali has said, 'from expert thoughtlessness arises the bliss of the *Atma*.' But if the cultural level is not so, the result is 'Empty mind is Devil's workshop'. In the pursuit of technological progress the Westerners are exploiting nature's resources and upsetting natural balance with consequent pollution of the biosphere; these problems are now shattering, the happy dreams in the West. The leaders of newly independent *Bharat* had not the ability to quietly ponder over all these things. So they were dazzled by the Western material progress. In these circumstances Pandit Deendayalji took into account the things mentioned hereafter and could, without being, confused or misled by circumstances, think of policies good for the country and suited to the times; he was a Seer. After even six decades we can see the dimensions of the effects of Western evils. Increase in crime and violence; the rise of sects like Hippies, Beatniks etc; consumer society; the antisocial violence of university students and labour; the huge piles

of scrap; the ever-increasing suburbs; smoke and smog; the pollution of the biosphere; various industrial ailments; extreme urbanisation and the consequent individual and social problems, all these are symptoms of what Prachaide termed, eight decades back, as 'Malaise in Civilisation'.

The gravity of the question of leisure can be seen from Daniel Bell's book-'Post Industrial Society'. To be able to see through such happenings in the post-independence period, to remain steadfast in the faith in *Bharatiya* culture and to assure the people, *Bharatiya* culture will help ride over the difficulties and lead it to glory points to an extraordinary personality. Firmness of thoughts and fearlessness in their expression were Panditji's characteristics and these were seen even in the field of technology.

In 1954 in my tour of Maharashtra, in a meeting of thinkers, I was asked a question regarding Panditji's views about technology and on hearing my answer the questioner had concluded that Panditji's thoughts are outdated and foggy. Till this time misunderstanding about Gandhiji's views on this subject had not been removed and similarly Dr. Schumacker's thoughts on 'Buddhist Economies', 'Small is Beautiful' and 'Intermediate' or 'Appropriate Technology' had not been published. I do not know my questioner's reaction to these later publications. And now

'Home-faber' of Claude Alvaris has given a shock to such thinkers. The subject of this book is the technology and the culture of *Bharat*, China and the West since 1500 AD. The central part of this is described by Shri Rajani Kothari in his introduction: "This book points to the necessity of rejecting the western pretence of universalism and for non-western cultures to seek answers to their problems within; and in the process not only provide pluralism in techno-cultural system but through such pluralism help westerners themselves in dealing with the new crop of problems they now encounter.... Such a transition from the global spread of one particularistic culture and hence of one technological paradigm to a diversity of cultural and technological systems will not, however, be politically easy to bring about even if it is intellectually and morally appealing. And the author knows this."

Panditji was also well-aware of these difficulties. Even then Panditji did openly put forward his well thought out ideas without caring about what mean epithets may be attached to them.

About six decades back progressive people used to regard the uncontrolled progress of Western technology as the humanity's uncontrolled materialistic progress. At that time consideration of all-round human progress was considered a symptom of outdatedness. Now this attitude is slowly changing. Very suggestive are the words of Shri

V.M. Dandekar in the concluding remarks of a recent speech:

"Human soul cannot develop so long as all labour is used up by mere living; hence a minimum conquest of nature and material progress are necessary. But Marx says, "The more a man conquers nature, greater does become his slavery to his inhuman tendencies. At least so far science and technology had this effect. So human aim, at least hereafter, should not be an unrestricted, unlimited power of production. The challenge now posed before science and technology is the material development, without destruction of human qualities in man and only to the degree necessary for the development of his soul."

In the early period of Deendayalji's national life there was an absence of such balanced minds among the progressives.

[Some leading world intellectuals, scientists, educationists and economists run the 'Club of Rome'. In 1968, the club published a statement which conforms to Panditji's thoughts on technology. This was a coincidence.]

There was an additional reason why our cheap progressives had a scope to condemn Panditji's thoughts. At that time, in our country, discussions on atmospheric pollution had not even started. In 1956 there was an epidemic of jaundice in Delhi. Then it was, that our learned

men and administrators were drawn to the subject of pollution. In the seventh decade of the last century there were epidemics in England due to the pollution of water of river Thames. British government immediately appointed a Royal Commission on Sewage Disposal and then the scientists Windal Taylor, Thresh, Biel and Suckling inaugurated this new branch of science. The Delhi epidemic of 1956 also had its effect and Shri N.V. Modak, city engineer, Bombay Municipal Corporation, gave a first shock to the negligence of government and the people towards this subject. Shri Modak became the Founder-Director of National Environmental Engineering Research Institute of Nagpur. And after that under the direction of Shri R.S. Mehta, Prof. S.J. Arasiwala, Prof. N. Majumdar and Dr. B.B. Sundarshan this science has made commendable progress in *Bharat*. The shallowness of those progressives who ridiculed Panditji has been fully exposed. But all this progress pertains to a later period. When Panditji freely expressed his views about Western technology in defiance of what people thought, circumstances were quiet different from what they are now. [In this science Japan ranks first, USA second and Europe is third. *Bharat* entered environmental science rather late, but it is slowly but steadily progressing and in this science, in Asia, it is at the top.]



## Faith of Life

With a view to create, in the minds of the *Bharatiyas*, cultural inferiority complex, the Westerners introduced here some imaginary thesis and the newly educated amongst us blindly accepted them. The Westerners had nearly succeeded in alienating us from our culture. Even after 1947 this intellectual slavery was not destroyed. 'Whatever the Saheb says is right'-this faith continued. Anything against what 'Saheb' had said was taken as an indication of retrogression. Deendayalji will have to be counted amongst those few who, in the face of being maligned as retrogressive, firmly exposed the falsehood of the Western thesis. The risk in doing this at that time can not be imagined now. But in the greater interest of the nation, Panditji took this risk and exposed the falsehood in the Western thesis. As an illustration we shall consider just one such thesis.

'We English are aggressors but the *Hindus* are

also not the original residents here; the only difference is that our aggression is recent while that of *Hindus* is historically ancient; but in principle we and *Hindus* are equally foreigner to this land; the real original dwellers of this country have been crushed by the various aggressors.' This is a thesis propounded by the British. Out of this was later born the Dravidian thesis. In 1856 Bishop Caldwell argued this, on the basis of language, in his book 'Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages'. Dr. Kittel, Dr. H. Gumdert, Mr. V.A. Smith and others recognised and accepted the imaginary thesis of Caldwell without taking the trouble to scientifically analyse it. On this as foundation Kanakasbhai Pillai built an imaginary superstructure: Dravid as a separate language group, a different people, Lemurian continent as their country, which later submerged in the *Hindu* ocean and so on. Researcher Francis Whyte Ellis and missionaries Beschi, Pope Robert Caldwell and others published an outline of Dravid culture.

Later on, with the suggestion and support of the ICS officers Cardew, Murre Hamick, H.F.W. Gilman and Sir Lionel Davidson, Madras Dravidian Association was formed at Madras in 1912; of course the evil effects of the ugly act of Caldwell did not remain limited to Madras Presidency. It had effects throughout India and *Hindu* society developed horizontal and vertical cracks. It shook

the foundation of *Hindu* unity by attacking their faith 'This country is my mother and I am her son'. Even when all these terrible effects were clearly visible, our learned men did not feel like disproving the thesis of Aryan aggression. Very few tried to checkmate this move of the British; and they did so out of patriotism and love of truth. They were calumnied as retrogressive. Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar, Poojaneeya Shri Guruji and Pandit Deendayalji are among such persons. All that time, making such a statement appeared foolish. After Panditji's death the discussion among the learned people was such that one time detractors of Panditji must be having second thoughts on the subject. But at least in his life-time Panditji's stand was looked upon as foolhardy.

In his essay, 'A Reassessment of the Theories of Racial Origins of the People of the Indus Valley Civilisation from Recent Anthropological Data' Prof. K.A.R. Kennedy, of Cornell University, has established that the view that 'the residents of Indus Valley were not Aryans but Dravidians' is totally wrong. From the racial point of view, there is no difference in the distinctive Morphological characteristics of the north and south *Bharatiyas* so says Shri Kennedy who is a morphologist. Well-known anthropologist Lamberg Karlo-vsky has opined that there is a possibility that the residents of Indus Valley could have been Aryans. In his book 'Dravidian Theories' Shri S. Swaminath Aiyer has

established that Bishop Caldwell's thesis of a separate group of Dravidian Languages is entirely baseless. In his article 'The Aryans-a reappraisal' Shri B.K. Thaper, ex-Director General of the Archaeological Survey of India, has declared, in unmistakable terms, that there is not even an iota of evidence to show that Aryans came to *Bharat* from outside; Aryans are the original residents of *Bharat*.

Another Ex-Director General of the same department Prof. B.B. Lal has proved the same thing, on the basis of the current method of Fire-worship; see his book 'New Perspectives of Indus Civilisation'.

In their book 'The Rise of Civilisation in India and Pakistan', the authors F.R. Allchin and B. Allchin have drawn the same conclusion in the chapter on Aryans.

Shri G.L. Posscehl has edited the book 'Harappan Civilisation'. In the last chapter (of this book) written by Robert Diassen, the same conclusion is drawn. Shri Diassen is the Director of Pennsylvania University. Because of the opinions of all these learned men and especially the Western scholars, those who ridiculed Dr. Ambedkar, Shri Guruji and Pandit Deendayalji have received a severe jolt. Yet ridicule will take its own time to die for there are some of the type who 'even though vanquished, could argue still'. When it is remembered that the above opinions and views have appeared after Panditji's death, this shows his

courage of conviction.

The communists also have tried very hard to destroy our national feeling. The greatest challenge to Panditji's thoughts came from the communists. Before the British handed over power, the communists had suggested that instead of a single Constituent Assembly for the whole of *Bharat*, about 15 to 17 Consemblies must be formed as 'this country is a friendly group of 15 or 17 nations'. Marxian theory says that every national society must have the 'right of self-determination'. The communist suggestion was based on this theory. So the communists were not willing to admit that *Bharat* is one nation. Whether to call *Bharatiya* nationalism as *Hindu* or *Bharatiya*, was a different question. That *Bharat* is basically not one nation and that *Bharatiya* nationalism is an unreal dream-was the communist contention. As in those days the glory of communism was ever mounting higher, the communist view influenced even the hike-worm supporters of *Hindu Rashtra*. How can a great thinker like Marx put forward a wrong thesis? The question of *Bharatiya* or *Hindu* is itself irrelevant. At that time the thought, that *Bharat* is not one-nation at all and that it is a group of nations, was gaining ground and it had become fashionable with the educated persons to say that Panditji's thoughts on nationalism were unscientific and were mere sentimentalism.

But today the scene seems to have changed.

Communists have started saying that they had been wrong in interpreting at that time Marx's thoughts on nationalism. Now both the important communist parties viz CPI and CPM have taken a strong stand in opposition to the demand for Khalistan and the separatist elements in the North-East. Many are surprised; but really there is nothing surprising about it. Rethinking about 'Nation' and 'Nationalism' has started in communist circles since 1962 ; and some glimpses of it can be seen in C. Achyut Menon's article in October 1984 issue of the Malyalam magazine 'Kariyar'. Shri C. Achyut Menon (CPI) was for some years the Chief Minister of Kerala and is amongst the great thinkers of communist party. Dr. M.R. Gopal Krishnan Nayar of Thiruvananthapuram has translated, (and distributed) an English version of this for people outside Kerala.

In this article Shri Achyut Menon has given three Marxian tests of nationalism: geographical unity, similarity of historical-tradition of culture and a single dialect.

He has said that the creation of Pakistan has been against the principle of geographical unity. The undivided *Bharat* had geographical unity; *Bharat* has a different and independent existence from the rest of Asia,

It is true that there are several languages in *Bharat* and that is a difficulty. While language is intimately connected with culture, yet the field of culture is not limited

to language. Shri Menon is saying emphatically that from very ancient times, cultural unity has existed from Himalayas to Rameshwaram.

It is true that before the British rule, until Queen Victoria was declared the empress of India, there was no political and administrative unity. But even then the variety of States here could not destroy the cultural unity here [See appendix 221]. In spite of there being several States here, there has existed, from very ancient times, the feeling that we are the descendents of a single tradition.

"It appears that one factor which helped this cultural unity was the *Hindu* faith. I do not say *Hindu* religion. The reason for it is that *Hindu* religion is not a religion in its ordinary meaning. Another reason is that I include Buddhist and Jain faiths also within the bounds of *Hindu* faith.<sup>1</sup> .....In strengthening unity, Vedic and Upanishadic literature as also the philosophy contained in them and more than these, the mythologies, especially Ramayana and *MahaBharat*, have helped considerably."

"Another factor which helped the cultural unity was pilgrimage which was popular among *Hindus* from ancient times.....There was a feeling among the *Hindus* that from the holy city of Varanasi up to the

1. Shri Aprabuddha, the protagonist of "*Varnashram dharm*" also groups Jain, Bouddha, Lingayat, Mahanubhav, Sikh and *Sanatanis* together in one class.

Amarnath cave of Kashmir in the North West, Hrishikesh and Badrinath in the North and Rameshwaram and Kanya Kumari in the South were all parts of their country. If the establishment of the four main '*Maths*' at the four corner ends of *Bharat* was not one of the major accomplishments of Shri Shankaracharya? Are we not wonder-struck even today at the fact that this man who was to die at the early age of 32, reached the four boundaries of India and hoisted the flag of victory of his ideas, at a time when travel in the country was risky and difficult because of the dense forests and attacks of robbers? Is not the victory-march of Shri Shankara the symbol of India's unity?"

"This unity based on *Hindu* faith had to face obstruction with the Muslim invasion. But it appears that in course of time Islam in India was also Indianised to a certain extent."

Shri Menon's article is like food for thinkers. It is not possible to quote it here in full. But his concluding remarks are: "To speak of Indian nationality is not merely an illusion.....Indian nationalism is a reality."

And now it is necessary to rethink whether the bunch of ideas which we consider as 'nationality' and what the West terms as 'nationalism' are or are not qualitatively different? Again another question is whether 'Nationalism' is of one kind and quality or has it developed into different

types due to differences in historical developments. In this connection it is worthwhile to study the discussion on this subject by Shri L.L. Snyder in his book '*Nationalism: Its Meaning and History, Varieties of Nationalism*'.

While explaining the qualitative difference between our '*Nationality*' and '*European Nationalism*', Shri Bipinchandra Pal says, "This being the true *Hindu* conception, I would, therefore, describe Nationality rather as the Personality of a people, than, following Mazini's lead, define it as their Individuality."

While Panditji lived, there were those who ridiculed Panditji's idea of one nationality present here and declared *Bharat* as a group of nations; the evolution of these people's thoughts, as sketched above, will convince any body of the scientific truth of Panditji's thoughts. We are all sorry that Panditji did not live to see this victory of his thoughts.



## Humanity

Actually Panditji's status was only that of the General Secretary of a political party. But that was just one aspect of his multidimensional personality. Actually he was a seer of principles. From the political view-point alone it is neither possible nor necessary to reach out to all humanity; not necessary because supporting humanism will not fetch more votes; and impossible because it is not a current coin in politics.

Humanism is easy to talk about. Even an extremely selfish man can talk, "The only reality is Brahman and the phenomenal world is an illusion." Tall talk is easy. But in the world today, it is difficult to move in the direction of humanity. The observation of De Maistre is instructive in this connection: "I have seen, in my time, Frenchmen, Italians and Russians; I even know, thanks to Maatesquieu, that one may be a Persian; but as for a Man, I declare that I have not met him in my life; if he exists, it is without my knowledge." "The path of modern culture leads from humanity, through nationality, to bestiality." (Grillparzer, 1848)

In this atmosphere it was foolhardy to talk of humanism and much more so to talk of humanism based on *Dharma*.

In Europe, theoretical and literary humanism movement started in Italy in the latter half of the fourteenth century and it spread to other European countries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Up to the eighteenth century this humanism largely influenced several European societies and it came to be recognised as a prominent feature of European culture. In theory, European humanism differed from naturalism; this is because it considered man as distinctly different from the animal world, while at the same time it regarded the experience of the day-to-day human life as of greater importance than ideas and invisible principles. As a literary movement, European humanism was the emotional world of Italian Renaissance. Ancient Greek and Roman emotions, saturated with intellectual independence, were reflected in European Humanism. This humanism challenged the Christian mind of the middle ages, the theocracy therein, the Papal power and God's power as represented by Vatican city.

The roots of this humanism were in the ancient Greek-thinking. The words of Protagoras which was basic to this is: "Man is the measure of all things-those that are, that they are and those that are not, that they are not."



There are different forms of European humanism and different schools of thought claim relationship with humanism. But they have some common foundation: Man is the shaper of his own destiny; he is free to mould his future; man is the centre of the universe; along with his freedom man must also respect the freedom and the minds of others. Arts, sciences and technology must be developed on materialism which is stressed by Renaissance. In place of following vague spirituality, historical view must be developed in the light of Ancient Greek period. While naked hedonism must be given up, Christian asceticism is equally despicable. We must accept the balanced hedonism of Greek and Roman empires; this is based on the words of Horace: "me quid nimis" (nothing to any excess); enjoyment must be coupled with-moral philosophy; man must be considered fully and in all respects. European humanism thought it necessary that all aspects of life must be considered in a balanced way. Earlier to the rise of European humanism, the whole of Europe was dominated by Christian thought. Now-a-days a new word has become the current: Christian humanism or God-centred humanism. The hollowness of this new term will be obvious if we consider the chain the gospel as preached by Jesus, the churchanity created by St. Paul and the later comradeship of the church with the exploiters in European society.

Humanism was definitely more advanced than the Christianity or God-centered humanism of middle ages. But as it included the reaction to the ideas of middle ages, it went to another extreme. In its revolt against Pope and Church-power, this humanism denied God.

Etienne Borne has said, "Atheism marks itself out as a form of humanism." According to the thinker Feuerbach: ".....In order for man to became all, God must be reduced to nothing."

Because of this extreme stand, this humanism has become anthropocentric or homocentric. This homocentricism finds its best expression in an actor's utterance: "All things are parts of man; all things are for man"; "Man is the only truth." This occurs in Maxim Gorki's drama - 'The lower depths', which Lenin has praised.

Homocentricism and materialism are two characteristics of all types of Western humanism. Classical humanism, Marxist humanism, existensial humanism and the recent ecological humanism, -none of these is an exception to this rule.

Consider the following words of Daumer about the mentality of the workers of leftist revolution: "The frightful tortures that unfortunate beasts suffer at the tyrannous and cruel hand of man are for these barbarians 'rubbish' that no body should bother about."

The materialistic European humanism appears better than any other narrow minded faiths which assign not only no priority but denies even any place for humanism; and yet the anthropocentrism in it can make a man inhuman. Maritain who supports Integral Humanism says in his 'True Humanism': "Any form of anthropocentric humanism is in its final analysis an 'inhuman humanism'."

Panditji's Humanism is, in this respect, different and superior to European humanism.

Even modern 'progressive' European thought-systems which claim to be related to humanism are not able to evolve to real humanism because of their purely materialistic foundation.

Circumstances had set certain limitations on the development of European humanism. The inspiration of Robert Owen, Saint Simon and even Karl Marx was in Ethics. Marx attacked Alienation and Dehumanisation. Veljko Korac, the Yugoslav scholar says: "Marx's aim was true man-living under emancipated conditions of labour and not to be disintegrated by the division of labour."

The inspiration for this thought can not be got from materialism. This is the domain of ethics. As Jaya Prakash Narayan has said; "Materialism as philosophical outlook could not provide any basis for ethical conduct and any incentive for goodness."

But in the last century Europe was obsessed due

to an equation. [Arban says, "Ethics is the science that deals with conduct in so far as it is considered right or wrong, good or bad."] 'Ethics is equal to religion i.e. Church'; and Church was an exploiting force which must be opposed if human mind is to be emancipated from blind faith. This is that equation. [See appendix 23]. This is why Marx shoved aside the moral aspect and gave greatest prominence to economic policy which was used as a means. Pure materialism became the thought-basis. European science which had developed by this time concluded that the basic thing is matter and put forth the possibility of great progress before man. The joint effect of these two resulted in the purely materialistic basis of European humanism. Through this it was impossible, by its very nature, to evolve to real humanism. In the book 'Socialist Humanism' edited by Erich Fromm, the word most repeated is 'alienation'. Marx and other socialist thinkers waged a war against 'alienation' and 'dehumanisation.' But has 'alienation' or 'dehumanisation' ended in any socialist or communist country? The analysis of the failure will establish the superiority of Panditji's basic thinking.

Shri M.N. Roy took into account Western philosophy and cosmology with his *Bharatiya* mind and by *Bharatiya* method tried to structure humanism. He discarded the idea of 'economic man'. He pointed out the shortcomings in capitalism, socialism, welfare State, political party, communism, formal democracy, man's natural

selfishness, idea of class-war and competition; he scrapped all these Western ideas and declared: "Instinct is primitive reason. Man, therefore, is essentially a rational being.....Rationality can subordinate man's selfishness to enlightened self-interest which is a social virtue.....Reason is only sanction for morality.....The crying need of the time is to harmonise ethics with a social philosophy and political practice.....The sovereignty of man.....can be deduced only from the fact that man is a moral entity.....man is moral because he is rational. The universe is a moral order governed by laws inherent in itself. Man grows out of that background. Ethics must be the foundation of the moral philosophy which is the crying need of our time."

The *Bharatiya* thinker, who had studied in depth all Western philosophies, concluded that the entire Western outlook was wrong and insufficient. He added dynamism of ideas to dialecticism of matter and brought his Scientific, New or Integral Humanism away from the West and close to *Bharat*. He was getting more and more disillusioned about Western lines of thought. Still it would have taken some more time to free his mind completely from materialism which had dominated him for decades. Had he had this much time he would surely have arrived at Panditji's humanism; there is ample scope for such a guess [See appendix 24].



## The Nationality

When Panditji entered politics, it had become fashion- to be a supporter or follower of one or another 'ism'; and this had to be one imported from the West. Actually the condition, even at that time, was already such that a thoughtful men could have seen their futility. But due to inferiority complex and the glamour of Western progress, the English educated people had come to believe that progressiveness consists in blindly following the West. This atmosphere was so strong that even leaders who believed in *Hinduism* were tempted to use the phrase *Hindu socialism* and some protagonists of *Vedanta* were wishing to say that their *Vedanta* was *Spiritual Communism*. This shows the slavery of our thinkers in the *Darshanik* field.

Under such circumstances Panditji dared to stay away from Western thinking and declared his resolve to base national reconstruction on *Bharatiya* culture.

In the West after industrial revolution, capitalistic

order started along with Machine Age and people began to look at the progress of capitalism as an index of man's progress. As time passed, the internal conflicts (in the system) became clearer and clearer.

In his book 'Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy', Joseph Schumpeter has said: "(The) Capitalist economy is not and can not be stationary. Nor is it merely expanding in a steady manner. It is incessantly being revolutionised from within by new enterprise, i.e., by the intrusion of new commodities or new commercial opportunities in the industrial structure as it exists at any moment. Any existing structures and all the conditions of doing business are always in the process of change. Every situation is being upset before it has had time to work itself out. Economic progress in capitalist society, means turmoil."

John Maynard Keynes, a saviour of capitalism, out of his own experience has said: "The descendant, international but individualistic capitalism in the hands of which we found ourselves after the first world War, is not a success. It is not intelligent, it is not beautiful, it is not just, it is not virtuous and it does not deliver the goods. In short, we dislike it and we are beginning to despise it."

Shri Dadabhai Naoroji and Justice Ranade have, even at the beginning, given a well-documented discussion of the evil effects of capitalism and the imperialism arising

out of it. Shri G.K. Gokahle and Shri Rameshchandra Dutta have further exposed this exploitation on further facts. Of course, it is in the context of the exploitation of *Bharat*.

This same feeling is everywhere about capitalism. And, under pressure of this, capitalism had to undergo many changes in itself.

In *Bharat* most lines of thinking in Panditji's time were leftist. They varied in hue from light pink to deep red. But leftism<sup>1</sup> characterised them all. Many people have a wrong notion that *Bharat's* contact with fashionable left-thinking is recent. This is not correct. Raja Ram Mohan Roy had gone to England to explain his stand against 'Sati' to Parliament members. There he was introduced to Robert Owen who was a founder socialist leader. The meeting took place at the residence of Dr. Arnot; all that has reached us about the meeting is that as soon as discussion began, Owen lost his temper and started arguing in a loud voice. Sophia Collet, biographer of Shri Roy, has written that Ram Mohan Roy did not lose his temper. It is worth mention that after returning to *Bharat*, Shri Roy did not undertake propaganda for socialism but used his energy in the cause of '*Brahm Samaj*'. Sister

---

1. Trotsky's words given herewith show how, right from the beginning, the egoism of world leftists had become extreme. He says, "Only in a socialist society can the average humanity rise to the level of Plato and Marx."

Nivedita was among the followers of Prince Kropotkin who was the well-known ideologue of Anarchism which was put forward by Proudhon and supported by Bakunin. She brought about a meeting of Kropotkin and Swami Vivekanand. The talks in the meeting were in a cordial atmosphere. This is because the *Hindu* ideal also has been "No kingdom, no king". But it may be noted that Sister Nivedita spent the rest of her life in *Bharat* in propagating and serving *Hindu* ideals.

The West saw many disciplines arising as reaction to capitalism. Except Fabian socialism and Guild socialism, which were mild, all others were violent. Marx made it clear that a bloody revolution was inevitable.

George Sorrel, the originator of Syndicalism and the author of 'Reflections on Violence', as also social scientist Parito have argued about the need of violence. Nietzsche, whose ideals were Will and Superman, Bergson and Fichte have openly supported violence. Bismark's principle of 'Blood and iron' came to be specially respected in Germany after the first Great War. In addition to this, anti-Jew racialism in Germany was made more intense in the light of the writings of Gobineau, Houston Stuart Chamberlain and Rozenberg; and in Hitler's Germany took place an amalgam of anti-Jew racialism, national socialism and violence.

Banito Mussolini, the originator of fascism and the *guru* of Hitler shamelessly declared, "War alone brings to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it." Racialists like Ku Klux Klan or rightists like Italian fascists, German Nazis, Franco's Falangist party of Spain, Unio Nationals party of Salazar of Portugal and Peronist party of Argentina or leftist like Syndicalism-anarchism; no such ism based on naked violence could have found scope in *Bharat*, which is ancient and mature. But after successful Bolshevik revolution in Russia, communism entered *Bharat*. *Bharatiya* branch of communist party was constituted at Tashkand on 17th October 1920 and in December 1925 took place its first all India session at Kanpur. It was not the theory of communism which attracted the *Bharatiya* mind. Many young men who had neither love nor knowledge of its theory were drawn to the party. The reason being the success of the Russian revolution. The hotheaded amongst the young were dissatisfied with Mahatma Gandhi's movement. But there was no alternative leader or movement. They believed that independence can be achieved not by non-violence, but by violence. They were in search of an alternative to Gandhian movement. Because of the success, of Russian revolution they felt that communist party was the alternative

they were looking for and such people raised the communist flag in different provinces. [See appendix 26].

Those who considered communism as extreme and hoped that by developing pressure from below they would be able to change the direction of Congress movement, remained in the Congress but formed, in May 1934, a socialist group. Though Gandhiji's influence was great, the socialist group was not short of well-known men. The group was led by eminent persons like Acharya Narendra Deo, Jaya Prakash Narayan, Usuf Meher Ali, Ashok Mehta, Rammanohar Lohia, Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya, S.M. Joshi, N.G. Gore, Achyutrao Patwardhan, Minu Masani, M.L. Dantwala, Aruna Asaf Ali, Surendranath Dwivedi, Purushottam Trikamdass. Therefore, when after independence socialists started their own separate party, people felt that this new party was the alternative to Congress. In many fields it was felt that Sarvashri Jaya Prakash Narayan, Rammanohar Lohia and Ashok Mehta formed the alternative leadership in the country. Thus when Panditji entered politics. Socialist party was the second important party (the first was of course the Congress) and the well-organised communist party had formed its pockets in some non-Hindi provinces and ranked third party in importance. Socialism and communism were the gossip of the day, so much so that in immediate future the

Congress had to declare that its idea was 'socialist pattern of society'. Such was the popularity of leftism that it was natural for any political leader to wish to declare himself a leftist. But Panditji did not belong to this lot of cheap leaders.

Though in those times, leftism was commended every-where, he (Panditji) was sure that all left-thinking was going to be unsuccessful because of its internal conflicts. And so, without yielding to the influence of the leftist atmosphere and with his vision of a glorious *Bharat* he courageously expounded and propagated the indiginous '*Darshan*'. Though unfortunately he is now not with us to see his predictions coming true, it can be said that the unavoidability of his '*Darshan*' is slowly emerging.

Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan had said, "If European communism has failed, European socialism has been no conspicuous success either." This statement of Shri Jaya Prakash is also true of *Bharatiya* Socialist party. So Jaya Prakashji later unequivocally declared : "However, some years back it became clear to me that socialism, as we understand it today, can not take mankind to the sublime goal of freedom, equality, brotherhood and peace. Socialism, no doubt gives promise to bring mankind closer to these goals than any other competing social philosophy. But I am persuaded that unless socialism is transformed into *Sarvodaya*, these goals would remain beyond its

reach; and just as we had to taste the ashes of independence, so future generation may have to taste the ashes of socialism."

The Socialist party, which after the first general election had emerged as an alternative to the ruling party, has today ceased to exist: this fact is expressive enough.

That thought or ism, which does not have its roots in this soil, can not hold on for long in this country, however great may be its protagonists individually; this is exemplified by the condition of the socialist party today [See appendix 27]. When Panditji began his political career, he avoided the temptation of the easy adoption of socialism even in spite of socialism's effulgent image in the mass-mind; this is an expression of his outstanding personality.

The story of communism in *Bharat* is of a different kind. Unlike socialist party, communist party is not fully routed out. But it has multiple splits. As per government report, Naxalites alone have split into twenty six groups. This is to say that the followers of communism fall into more than thirty groups. The communist party, whose ambition was to bring the whole world under its hegemony, is now in such a battered condition; this appears very surprising on the face of it, but it is natural. *Bharat* has always honoured all philosophies and theories. It would have made no difference if communism had continued

here as a theory. But its very formation began as *Bharatiya* Branch of World Communism (Communist Party of India) and the party had always to adopt policies congenial to Russian foreign policy. Had the communists of *Bharat* been free to frame their goals and policies in the light of the circumstances here, their condition would not have been so bad so soon; because the party had able leaders and dedicated workers. But they could not independently decide their policies as they had to tow the Russian line.

When Deendayalji started his social career, communism was rising on the world level. Russia was among the victors of the second great war; and in the following European reconstruction all the nations of East Europe had come under Russian military domination; in these countries communist governments were established with the help of Russian tanks. Soon afterwards, China, the country with the greatest population, had come under communist rule. In the third world of post-second War period, Russia was supporting the independence movements of the foreign-dominated countries and so the nationalists there were naturally becoming sympathetic to Russia. (Later communists succeeded in forming their government in Cuba which is so close to United States of America). Because of this glaring success of Russia on the world level the

Communist party in *Bharat* also enjoyed some greater glory.

But after Stalin's death, disintegration slowly started in the communist world. The risings of farmers and workers in communist-ruled East European countries were suppressed with Russian tanks; still the anti-Russian feeling in these countries persisted and was brought to surface by the events in Poland. The communist parties in Western Europe began to deviate from the fundamental thesis of Marxism and resolved to cast away Russian domination. The dream of uni-centred world of communism was shattered. Mao of China and Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia openly took a stand against Russia. The largest communist party, outside the communist-ruled world, was the Italian one. Its leaders Gramsci and Togliatti declared the independence of the Italian party and soon this spread to all West European parties. This came to be called Euro-communism. In no communist-ruled country Marxism could be put into practice. This started disillusionment. What Enrice Berlinguer, the chief of the Italian communist party and Carillo, of the Spanish communist party, have said at that time are evidence of this disillusionment.

And after that Chinese communist party has given a great shock to Marxism. The central committee of

Chinese communist party, in the twelfth sitting (during the party's third plenary session), unanimously adopted a document on 20-10-84; its title was 'A decision of the central committee of the Communist Party of China on Reform of the economic structure'. The decision is a open deviation from Marxism. Because of this, suspicion arose everywhere if the Chinese communist leaders were planning to gradually say good-bye to Marxism. And 'People's Daily', the leading communist newspaper, in its issue of 7-12-1984, gave a surprise-shock to the world. Below are given some parts of its editorial as a sample and they are enough to give an idea of the whole editorial: "Marx died 101 years ago and his works were written more than a century ago." "Some of these works were simply conjecture at that time and later underwent tremendous changes. Some of the conjectures were not necessarily alright. There were many things that Marx and Engels, even Lenin, never experienced or had any contact with. We can not expect the works of Marx and Lenin, at that time, to solve our modern-day problems, that is something we have to bear in mind during our study." ..... "Using certain assertions of Marxism to impose restrictions on the reality of modern life will only block the development of history....."

This makes it clear that the Chinese communist



party was preparing to break away from Marxism. But when Panditji started building up his party, the glamour of communism was so great that many were doubtful if Panditji's new party will survive in the theoretical competition. Even in those times Panditji remained steady on his *Bharatiya 'Darshan'*; and time has shown that his prediction about the failure of leftism is coming true.

Shri P.V. Gadgil of Maharashtra was a socialist thinker and a learned critic of Marxism; he had published his book 'Class War or Parliamentary Socialism?' In this book he has called on socialist thinkers to rethink over their traditional or conventional ways in the light of the teachings of Karl Marx and J.M. Keynes, both great thinkers but of radically different views. This was very timely and he deserved to be congratulated on his courage. But it was noteworthy that even such great thinkers were blinded in the beginning by the political success of the leftists.

Panditji has carefully studied even other leftisms (other than socialism, communism, which were popular for some time in *Bharat*) which were not much known in *Bharat*. The essay 'Marx and Deendayal' says, "It must, however, be noted that Deendayalji was well conversant with all the thought-currents of West including the recently evolved New Left of Sartre and Herbert Marcuse.

"Apart from Marxism (and different versions of revisionists, from Edward Berstein to Tito), he was very well acquainted with the direct or indirect social experiments of Robert Owen, Fourier and Cabet; theories of Saint Simon; socialist militancy of Gracchus Babeuf; 'agrarian socialism' of O' conner; proletarian, socialism of O' Brien; 'minority conscience' theory of Blanqui; evolutionary socialism of Louis Blanc; the 'self-help' doctrine of Schulz-Delitzsch; and 'true socialism' of the German trio, Bruno Beuer, Moses Hess and Kail Grun. He had also studied Lassalle, Sismondi, Lamennais and Proudhon. He had critically analysed all the pre and post Marxian European thought-systems ranging from Capitalism to anarchism and including all varieties of socialism."

He also knew full well Dr. Freuds' psycho-analysis, Dr. Watsons behaviourism and the branches these two grew later on.

Prior to Panditji's entry into politics, Mahatma Gandhi had introduced his thought-current, free and different from Western thought-currents and based on *Hindu 'Darshan'*. He said:"Socialism and communism of the West are based on certain conceptions which are fundamentally different from ours. One such conception is their belief in essential selfishness-of human nature. I

do not subscribe to it for I know that the essential difference between man and the brute is that the former can respond to the call of the spirit in him, can rise superior to the passions that he owns in common with the brute and therefore, superior to selfishness and violence, which belong to the brute nature and not to the immortal spirit of man. That is the fundamental conception of *Hinduism*, which has years of penance of austerity at the back of discovery of this truth."

Gandhiji's thought given above is applicable to all Western leftist thought-systems. *Bharatiyas* never attached importance to 'ism'. Every 'ism' is a closed book of thoughts. Acharya Kripalani, of Gandhian tradition, says in his book. 'The Gandhian Way': "...all isms come into existence, not at the initiative of those in whose names they are preached and promulgated, but as the result of the limitations imposed upon the original ideas by the followers. Lacking the creative genius, the followers systemise and organise. In so doing they make the original doctrines rigid, inelastic, one-sided and fanatical, depriving them of their original freshness and flexibility, which are the signs of youth."

But the disciples of Gandhiji made an, 'ism' of his thoughts-[See appendix 28]. Actually Gandhiji used to say that an ism-end in deterioration and so he wished that no

term such as Gandhism should be put into circulation. In his speech at the all-India session of Gandhi Seva Sangh (in Malikanda part of Dhaka) on 20th Feb. 1940, Gandhiji had put forward this thought and yet his followers systematically used that word.

Congress has fully exploited the term Gandhism both at the first election and thereafter till now. Gandhiji's martyrdom lent further holiness and attraction to the term.

The workers inspired by Gandhiji fall into two groups; one who worked in the political field and the other who did constructive work. It was the first group that took the decision to accept division of the country against Gandhiji's wishes-while he yet lived and scrapped the advice given by him, a day prior to his death, to dissolve the Congress and create in its-place Lok Sevak Sangh (organisation for the service of the people). But people did not seriously take this disobedience to Mahatmaji.

[The people were willing to forget 'Himalayan blunder', stand on the hanging of Bhagat Singh-Rajguru-Sukhdeo, Gandhiji's occasional differences with Congress, Khare-Nariman-Subhash affairs, his volte face on the division of the country-all these in addition to muslim appeasement.]

Really speaking, Independence is the fruit of the efforts of many individuals and groups of people. The

efforts of many individuals and institutions were responsible for preparing the public mind which served as the background for the formation of the Congress. Dr. Rajendralal Mitra and Ramgopal Ghosh of 'The British Indian Association' in Bengal (1851); Dada-bhai Naoroji, Jagannath Shankar Seth, Mangaldas Nathubhai and Naoroji Fardunji of Bombay Association; East India Association; M. Veeraraghavachariyar, Rangayya Naidu, G. Subrahmanya Aiyer and N. Subbarao Pantalu of 'The Hindu'; Sarvajani Kaka, K.L. Nulkar and S.H. Chiplunkar; Justice M.G. Ranade of 'Social Conference'; Surendranath Banerji and Anand Mohan Bose of 'Indian Association'; 'Madras Mahajan Sabha'; Firojshah Mehta, K.T. Felang and Badruddin Taiyabji of 'Bombay Presidency Association'; seventeen workers of Dr. Anie Besant's 'Theosophical Convention'; all these were the fore-messengers of Congress; but the present leaders are trying to wipe out their memory. The present generation is also ignorant of the work in this field of '*Brahm Samaj*', '*Arya Samaj*', '*Prarthana Samaj*', Theosophical Society, Ramkrishna mission and other societies.

Liberal leaders; the *Bharatiya* revolutionaries; the revolutionaries who were active during the first World War in foreign countries; Azad Hind Sena; the naval soldiers who revolted; the leaders of other opposition parties; the

middlemen like Sapru and Jayakar; persons like C.F. Andrews who helped travelling *Bharatiyas*; men in England who were sympathetic to *Bharat* and did propaganda for *Bharat*; all these have really a share in the success. But efforts have been made to commit to the vale of oblivion all active workers outside the Congress. The contribution of some of the revolutionaries was so outstanding that such attempts in their case did not succeed. But others were less fortunate. For example, how many of us today remember the names of our friends in England who worked for and supported *Bharat*? Guy Alfred, George David Yule, Alfred Web, Sir William Wedderburn, Sir Henry J.S. Cotton, Charles Bradlaw, William Sportson Cane, Sir William Digbi, Dr. H.V. Rutherford, Dr. G.B. Clark, J.K. Hardy, Lord Sorensen, Lord Fenner Brockway belong to this class. Because of this attitude of the rulers, the history of the war of independence has become incomplete, distorted and unbalanced.

On the other hand, propaganda was made that the entire credit for independence was that of the Congress and the Congress image in the public mind was very bright. This was further brightened by Gandhiji's martyrdom and the magic of the term Gandhism. As time passed it became clear that these politicians were going away farther and farther from Gandhiji's ideals. But even by the time

Deendayalji had taken in his hands the reins of *Jana Sangh*, the disillusionment of the masses had not even commenced; on the other hand Congress appeared to have become unconquerable in all provinces due to Patel, Nehru, Rajendra Babu, Rajaji and the Congress lieutenants in each province. No other party had so many popular leaders. In addition, the Congress had in it some very able ministers, who were not quite of the same calibre as Sir Vishweshwarayya, C.P. Ramaswami Aiyer, T. Madhavrao or Mirza Ismail but yet ranked high.

Apart from leaders directly involved in politics, there were the constructive workers who specially influenced the people (See appendix 29); but the difference between the politicians and the constructive workers had not surfaced so far. All these people were together under the leadership of Vinoba Bhave and this helped only the Congress. It is true that now-a-days due to government money and patronisation, both the quality and the public-image of these workers have suffered (See appendix 30). Just like *Bharat Sewak Samaj* of Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, the Gandhian constructive workers have been devalued in the public mind (See appendix 31). But after Independence, these people were associated with *Bhoodan* (land-donation) and other similar movements. At that time it was even difficult to imagine the servility

which some of them betrayed during Emergency. Every constructive worker inspired by Gandhiji appeared to the people like a light-house and the number of such persons was large. Dada *Dharmadhikari*, Kaka Kalelkar, Appasaheb Patwardhan, Zakir Hussain, Viyogi Hari, J.C. and *Bharat Kumarappa*, S.J. Bhagawat, Acharya Bhise, Ravishankar Maharaj, Sane Guruji, Acharya Javadekar, T.S. Avinashilingam, Annasaheb Sahasrabuddhe, Gop Bandhu Chaudhari, Navakrishna Chaudhari, the Aryanayakam couple, Thakkar Bappa, Baba Raghavdas, Meeraben, Saralaben, Prem Kantak, Susheela Pai, B.B. Amtussalam, Amalprabha Das, Balubhai Mehta, Babulbhai Mehta, G. Ramchandran, Kalappan, it is difficult for the new generation to imagine the great influence which these persons had on the public mind. At that time the credit of these person's work added to the Congress power.

It was impossible for a new party to have had such influential workers. The work of creating such workers was to be begun. In the early days of *Jana Sangh*, all opposition parties faced this shortcoming. But some of the clever parties tried to make good of this shortage by claiming succession right to Gandhiji and Gandhism. And because most of these were break-aways from Congress, they were partially successful in these attempts. There was no such possibility in the case of *Jana Sangh* and

moreover, even though Gandhism was the current coin, Panditji had decided not to use it. In the first place Gandhiji himself disapproved the word Gandhism. Panditji had no difference with Gandhiji's line of thinking. But the word obstructs the fluidity of the Gandhian thought and this, Panditji did not approve. Gandhiji was proud of being called a *Hindu* and *Sanatan-Dharmi*. Gandhiji's attempt to find solutions of modern problems in the light of the eternal principles of *Sanatan Dharm* constituted Gandhism. So there was no possibility of any fundamental differences with Gandhiji. But Panditji feared that Gandhiji's approach will lose utility for the future if Gandhiji's thoughts are fossilised by trying them down to an 'ism'. What Panditji intended was that, in place of obstructing the flow of Gandhian thought by making it an ism, to evolve into a dynamic thought-system which works on the principles of *Sanatan Dharm* and which is capable of finding new answers to ever arising new problems. This was necessary so that social structure should be congenial to *dharma* and *dharma* should be congenial to the times (See appendix 32). So he chose not to tread the easy path of Gandhism but undertook to evolve, just like Gandhiji, a new age-*Dharma* in the light of the eternal principles.



## Scientific *Hindutva*

It is true that for the Westerners it is rather difficult to understand the concept of '*Dharma*' (See appendix 33). Shri C.E.M. Joad says, "This distinctly *Hindu* conception (i.e. *dharma*) does not admit of summary description."

Justice Shri Ram Jois says, "*Dharma* is a Sanskrit expression of the widest import. There is no corresponding word in any other language. It would also be futile to attempt to give any definition to that word. It can only be explained."

Sister Nivedita says, "*Hinduism* is a fragment in a vast social-industrial-economic scheme called '*Dharma*'. A man may well and rightly be the servant of *Dharma* without calling himself a *Hindu*."

On this background, at least *Hindus* should experience no difficulty in understanding *Sanatan Dharm*. But it is the current fashion among the English-educated

men, dazzled by material progress of the Westerners, to deride as out of date and retrograde any thesis based on the experience of *Sanatan Dharma* (See appendix 34). In Deendayalji's life-time, there had not been published in *Bharat* the literature listed hereunder; this would shock such fashionable and cheap progressives.

'The Tao of Physics' and 'The Turning Point' by Fritjof Capra; 'The Dancing Wu Li Masters' by Gary Zukav; 'Time, Space and Beyond' by Bob Taben; 'God and the New Physics' by Paul Davies; 'Taking the Quantum Leap' by Fred Wolf; 'Wholeness and the Implecate Order' and 'Quantum Mechanics' by David Bohm; 'Space, Time and Medicine' by Dr. Larry Dossey; 'The Reflexive Universe' by Arthur Young; 'Stalking the Wild Pendulum' by Izak Bentov ; 'A place for human Beings' by Pamela Portugal; 'Incredible Coincidences' by Allen Von; 'The roots of Coincidences' by Kolster; 'Nothing by Chance' by Richard Bouk,- All this literature is presently published. And this explains why in Panditji's time, progressivism, not based on any deep study, was more current.

Mahamahopadhyaya Datto Waman Potdar has said at one place, "We should not have been dazzled by the new discoveries and their temporary success of the West in physical sciences and should not have suddenly discarded the principles discovered by *Rishis*-principles which had stood the test of time for thousands of years.

There are things whose good or bad effects take a long time to come to light. And so it is dangerous to rely only on the immediate effects. Human life is extremely complicated and behind various events in life are various chains of reasons -big and small. Conclusions based on superficial observations and thinking are often deceptive. With the lapse of further time, after further experience and further thoughts, the earlier tentative conjectures have to be discarded and newer and nobler conclusions are arrived at. It can not be said that we have examined our ancient wealth of thoughts for its subtleness and permanence. When Westerners studied further and thus became better acquainted with our ancient literature, they have drawn our attention to our precious wealth."

In spite of all this our anglicised Pandits stick to their servile attitude towards the West; and unfortunately the custom then was and persists even today to style these persons as 'progressives' and 'radical'. But this could not go on for long. For example the information given by T.S. Anantu in the 'Autumn 1984' issue named 'The American Review' is such as will make them faint. Do these self-styled progressives at all know about 'Voluntary Simplicity Movement', so named in 1936 by Richard Gregg, the American disciple of Mahatma Gandhi? The survey, made by Stanford Research Institute, of the progress made by this movement up to 1976 is worth reading.

In her book 'The Aquarian conspiracy' Marilyn Ferguson says at the beginning, "A leaderless but powerful net-work is working to bring about radical change in the United States. Its members have broken with certain key elements of Western thought and they may even have broken continuity with history.....Broader than reform, deeper than revolution, this benign conspiracy for a new human agenda has triggered the most rapid cultural realignment in history. The great shuddering, irrevocable shift over-taking us is not a new, political or religious or philosophical system. It is anew mind-the ascendance of a startling world-view that gathers into its framework breakthrough science and insights from earliest recorded thought."

Duane Elgin has presented a comparative table which shows that this 'startling world view' is moving in the direction of 'Integral Humanism'.

The factor that has contributed most to the success of this thought of 'Voluntary Simplicity Movement' is the progress in science in modern times.

The greatest arrogance of science became obvious towards the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the last century. Really speaking Science [विज्ञान=to know] means knowledge and should breed humility. Science makes man think that man is only a

group of molecules and on these molecules depend man's happiness, his ability, his health and so on. This makes Emerson, Thoreau, Gandhi all anti-science. The cosmology presented by modern science is entirely different from the one 'seen' by *Bharatiya* sages and saints. So these great men and saints have been stamped as obsolete. But later on science developed some new theories. In the first quarter of the last century Theoretical Physics introduced two new theories: Relativity theory and Quantum Mechanics. These two theories posed a new challenge to the then cosmology. And the cosmology which developed thereafter is ever approaching closer to the ancient *Bharatiya* cosmology. The statements, given below, of two great spokesmen of twentieth century physics, are very relevant here.

Shri Oppenheimer says, "The general notions about human understanding...which are illustrated by discoveries in atomic physics are not in the nature of things wholly unfamiliar, wholly unheard of or new. Even in our own culture they have a history and in Buddhist and *Hindu* thoughts, a more considerable and central place. What we shall find is an exemplification, an encouragement and a refinement of old wisdom." Shri Niels Bohr says, "For a parallel to the lesson of atomic theory (we must turn) to those kinds of epistemological problems with which already thinkers like the Buddha and Lao Tsu have been confronted,

when trying to harmonize our position as spectators and actors in the great drama of existence."

Dr. Dossey, Dr. Elizabeth Kubler-Ross, Dr. Michael Sabom, Dr. Raymond Moody and Dr. Kenneth Ring have done experiments and developed a new view of man's health which is similar to ancient *Bharatiya* view. Dr. Rupert Sheldrake's new idea of morphogenetic field in Biology and similar thoughts of Karl Pribram and Dr. Robert Ornstein in 'Brain Research' and also new revolutionary theory of Arthur Young in evolution again leads to the same direction. "The following two quotes illustrate how this new view represents a confluence of modern American thinking with ancient Indian insights:

"So approaching the question in different ways, relativity and quantum theory agree, in that they both imply the need to look on the world as an undivided whole, in which all parts of the universe, including the observer or the instruments, merge and unite in one totality. In this totality, the atomistic form of insight is a simplification and an obstruction, valid only in some limited context....

"In the very early phase of development of civilization, man's views were essentially of wholeness rather than fragmentation. In the East (especially in India) such views still survive, in the sense that philosophy and religion emphasize wholeness and imply the futility of

analysis of the world into parts." [David Bohm's 'Wholeness and the Implicate Order', Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980]

Later Schroedinger would write: "What is Life?" In an attempt to reconcile quantum physics and biology, in his two long essays, "My view of the World," he revealed himself as a mystic much influenced by Eastern views. In his first essay, which he wrote in 1925, before he created his equation, he stated : "This life of yours which you are living is not merely a piece of this entire existence, but is in a certain sense the 'whole'; only this whole is not so constituted that it can be surveyed in one single glance. This, as we know, is what the Brahmins express in that sacred, mystic formula which is yet really so simple and so clear, -'Tat Tvam Asi', "This is You'. Or, again, in such words as "I am in the east and in the west, I am below and above, I am this whole world."

"Schroedinger was indeed prophetic, though his prophecy may have been a self-fulfilling one, since he created the mathematical means by which quantum physicists have come to view the world in this way.

"I like to think of this statement, I am this whole universe" as the initial postulate of quantum thinking. I think of it as the one mind seeing itself and accepting the paradoxes of its positions. That anything is at all, is reconciled with quantum jumps.



The position of wholeness taken by Schroedinger I call 'quantum solipsism'. According to solipsism, the self is the only thing that can be known and verified. Nothing else is for sure. According to quantum solipsism, everything depends on you. You create the whole universe; you are the 'universe'. [Alan Wolf, 'Taking the quantum leap', Harper & Row, 1981]

The Belgian Scientist Hya Prigogine, Nobel Laureate, who developed the 'Theory of Self-organising Systems' has restated the principle: 'We are one with nature which was accepted by ancient *'Darshan'* but was rejected by modern science.

The following statement from Einstein is worth considering: "A human being is a part of the whole, called by us 'Universe', a part limited in space and time. He experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings as something separated from the rest, a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest to us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty. Nobody is able to achieve this completely, but the striving for such achievement, is, in itself, a part of the liberation and a foundation for inner security."

Integral Humanism also gives the same directive. In this connection a conclusion of modern psychology is noteworthy. In the West, rethinking has started due to the conclusions drawn by Dr. Bernard Grad of Montrial Macgil University, the conclusions drawn by 'American Wolistic Health Association' and the demonstrations given by some Psychic Healers. Psychic healers Ingo Swan, M.H. Taster, Rolling Thunder, Henry Model, all Americans as also Victor Krivorotov from Russia, Harry Edwards from England, Erigo from Brazil, Felisa Makanas and Josephina Season from Philipines have taken the West by storm.

American Scientist Dr. Robert Becker observes: "changes in Earth's magnetic field are caused by the Sun, the Moon and the planets, all of which in turn affect our nervous system and the spiritual radiation of the astral body and its aura."

Dr. Leonard Ravitz is nearly of the same view.

In 1956 Robert Oppenheimer had warned: "The worst thing psychology might do would be to model itself after a physics which is not there any more, which has been outdated."

The well-known American scientist Cart Rogers appeals to young psychologists, "...there may be a few who will dare to investigate the possibility that there is a lawful reality which is not open to our five senses; a reality

in which present, past and future are intermingled, in which space is not a barrier and time has disappeared; a reality which can be perceived and known only when we are passively receptive, rather than actively bent on knowing. It is one of the most exciting challenges posed by psychology."

The realizations of many scientists of modern science point humanity in the direction of Integral Human *Darshan*. The conclusions of modern science are farthest from our fashionable progressive leaders and nearest to Integral Human *Darshan*.

Not only are the scientists in non-communist countries thinking like this, even communist scientists are slowly moving in this direction.

All know the increasing curiosity in Russia about *Bharatiya* literature and philosophy. *Ved*, *Upanishads*, *Ramayan*, *MahaBharat* have been welcomed in Russia and are being studied there. Three books recently published by Prof. V.S. Kostyuchenkov, associate professor in Moscow University, has especially attracted the attention of *Bharatiya* scholars. He published books in 1970 on Shri Aravind and in 1977 on Vivekanand. Since then Swami Vivekanand is being recognised officially in Russia and so *Bharatiya* communists have also started respecting him. In his latest publication 'The Classic *Vedanta* and Neo-

Vedantism' he has taken a review of the *Vedanta* thinking from *Upanishads* to Dr. S. Radhakrishnan. So it is definite that communists of *Bharat* will have to revise their prejudices. The above things are well-known. But what is not so well-known is that, at the instance of government, laboratories have been set up in Russia to research on the non-physical findings made in *Bharat*. The main subjects of research are telepathy, telekinesis, Kirlian effect, Kirlian photography as applied to medicine, psychic healing, extra-terrestrial civilizations, hypnotherapy.

In their book 'The New Soviet Psychic Discoveries' Shri Henry Gris and William Dick have fully discussed this subject. The book 'Psychic Discoveries behind the Iron Curtain' by Sheela Austrendar and Lyn Schroder is also about the same subject. Actually the government insists that science also must serve communism and its dilecticism [See appendix 35]. And yet these laboratories, supported by government, are functioning. Of all these experiments, the most important one is that in which, in 1965, Joseph Kirlian could take photographs of the human soul or subtle, body or human aura. Also Dr. Konstantin Kobyzev of Moscow University says, "The influence of large periodic radiations of energy from the Sun on to the earth is an exactly established scientific fact." He further says, "Graphs drawn on the date of solar activity-concur with mass movements of people."

Russian scientists do not like the term astrology; they call it Cosmic Biology. Adwerd Nawmov is investigating the effects of Sun-spots on human life and mind. Dr. Luna Kursley and Dr. Semashko have come to the conclusion: "Planetary effects do cause changes in human behaviour and affect the human life on earth."

The article 'Astrological Research in Communist Countries' by Dr. E. Vedavyasa in a special issue of Astrological Magazine edited by B.V. Raman will shock the progressive (?) leaders. Dr. Vedavyasa refers to : the papers of G. Kositsky and Kogan on 'The Effects of Human Thoughts on Space'; experiments on the same subject by Pavlita; Russian and Czech research on Medical Astrology; 'Connection between Astrology and Hathayoga' by the Czech. scientist Lemhenyi Zoltas; the paper on contraception by the Hungarian writer Kurl Kechnitz; the researches and literature of Dr. Yonas and his Astra Research Centre in Czechoslovakia; 'Relation between Astronomy and Ancient Astrology' by the Hungarian writer Barna Balogh. Vedavyasa refers to all this literature and then says, "It looks as though the astrologers of the communist countries have greater sympathy with Astrology and Yoga than our 'Aastiks' of India."

In their book 'The Cycle of Heaven', Playfair and Scott Hill say, "Whatever they choose to call it (bio-field, to-field, energy body or anisotropic body), the Soviets have

put forward a concept that may give scientific support to many of man's traditional mystic beliefs. For instance, Hill learnt in 1976 that they believe bio-plasma to be involved in energy transfer between healer and patient in the 'laying on of hands' process .....A great many laboratory experiments have been carried out to test the bio-plasma hypothesis.....The experiment, supervised by Inyustin demonstrated the apparent transfer from one living system to another through the bio-plasmic medium." And again, "Once again, it seems that the mystics of the East know more about Homo-electromagnetics than the scientists of the West."

In his book '*Kundalini Yoga*' Shri Walimbe says, "What the *Bharatiya Yogis* have been doing for centuries, has now become possible to verify by modern means like EEG, EKG and EMG. Therefore, rapport must be established between modern scientists and expert *yogis*; such is the view of Playfair and Scott Hill: "Thanks to space-age technology, this can now at least to some degree be done without lengthy training and one of the achievements of the biofeedback movement has been to bring yogi and scientist together in the laboratory."

Shri B.N. Deshpande, scholar of *Vedanta*, communism and Kremlinology thinks that, "The science of Yoga is highest culmination of the philosophy and the laws of dialectics developed by the ancient sages of India

in the field of the amazing powers of mind and body by consciously developing intuition as an instrument to superior knowledge and which has been given recognition by modern Soviet science by establishing a new branch of scientific studies called psychotronics (or Yoga-tronics)."

Briefly, as Prof. Haksar says, "At the highest level, scientific temper and spiritual attitude are one and the same." (See appendix 36)

This same thing emerges from the lecture series delivered in 1982 by Dr. Fritjof Kapra under the auspices of Bombay University in response to an invitation by University Grants Commission. Cartesian and Newtonian sciences are outdated. Both the latest science and *Bharatiya Darshan* bring out the fundamental unity in nature. While explaining this he gave parallel quotations from Werner Heisenberg (one of the founders of quantum theory) and Shri Aravind; of the atomic physicist Henry Stapp and Nagarjuna; he also had before his mind the dynamic cosmology of Buddha as described by Dr. Radhakrishnan. He has also noted Shri Aravind's experience similar to the conception of the (four dimensional) space-time continuum and Japanese scholar D.T. Suzuki's criticism of the space-time continuum aspect of Mahayan Buddha theory. The cosmic dance that expresses itself as quantum theory and relativity theory when expressed in a beautiful poetic form constitutes the

dance of Nataraj Shiva. Kapra says, "For the modern physicists, the dance of Shiva is the dance of sub-atomic matter. As in *Hindu* mythology, it is a continual dance of creation and destruction involving the whole cosmos; the basis of all existence and of all natural phenomena. The metaphor of this cosmic dance thus unifies ancient mythology, religious art and modern physics. It is indeed, as Koomaraswami said, "Poetry, but none the less science."

In his second lecture (The Systems View of Life) Shri Fritjof Kapra said, "The world view of modern physics is holistic and ecological. It emphasises the fundamental inter-relatedness and inter-dependence of all phenomena and also the intrinsically dynamic nature of physical reality."

From the systems view point he says, "An important aspect of living systems is their tendency to form multileveled structures of systems within systems. For example, the human body contains organ systems composed of several organs, each organ being made up of tissues and each tissue made up of cells. All these are living organisms or living systems, which consist of smaller parts and at the same time, act as parts of larger wholes. Living systems then exhibit a stratified order and there are interconnections and interdependencies between all system levels, each level interacting and communicating with its total environment."

Then again he says, "The fact that the living world

is organised in multileveled structures means that there also exist levels of mind. In the human organism, for example, there are various levels of 'metabolic' mentation involving cells, tissues and organs and then there is the neural mentation of the brain which, itself, consists of multiple levels corresponding to different stages of human evolution. The totality of these-mentations constitutes what I would call the human mind or psyche. In the stratified order of nature individual human minds are embedded in the larger minds of social and ecological systems, and these are integrated into the planetary mental system, which in turn must participate in some kind of universal or cosmic mind."

While concluding this speech he said, "I hope that my presentation of the systems view of life has made it clear that the new vision of reality is an ecological vision in a sense which goes far beyond the immediate concern with environmental protection. It is supported by modern science, but it is rooted in a perception of reality that goes beyond the scientific framework to an intuitive awareness of the oneness of all lives, the interdependence of its multiple manifestation and its cycles of change and transformation. When the concept of the human spirit is understood as the mode of consciousness the individual feels connected to cosmos as a whole, it becomes clear that ecological awareness is truly spiritual. Indeed, the

idea of the individual being linked to the cosmos is expressed in the Latin root of the word religion 'religare' (to bind strongly), as well as in the Sanskrit "yoga" which means union .....we can say today with considerable confidence, that the ancient wisdom of the East provides the most consistent philosophical background to our modern scientific theories."

Thus science is slowly advancing in the direction of Integral Human *Darshan*. But during Panditji's life-time this direction of the progress of science was not very clear. And yet Panditji did put forward his '*Darshan*' based on *Bharatiya* culture, in the face of the strong but shallow criticism of the so called progressives; this only shows his self-confidence and his deep faith in '*Sanatan Dharma*'. Through this *Darshan* Panditji has shown the way to confused, hopeless humanity suffering from all sorts of calamities. Capra has elsewhere described pointedly as to where humanity stands today. He says, "The Westerners so far favoured rational knowledge over intuitive wisdom, science over religion, competition over cooperation, exploitation of natural resources over conservation and that these factors among others, have led to a profound cultural imbalance which lies at the very root of our current crisis and imbalance in our thoughts and feelings, our values and attitudes and our social and political structures. ...The current crisis is a transition from

sensate culture. As individuals, as a society, as a civilization and as a planetary eco-system, we are reaching the turning point what we need then, there is a new 'paradigm'-a new vision of reality, a fundamental change in our thoughts, perceptions and values."

Panditji is standing at the 'turning point' to deliver to humanity this new 'paradigm'.



## Disciplined Liberty

**H**induisms being the inspiration of thoughts and actions of the Sangh top inspiraters, the scope of their vision has always been national-international related to entire humanity. While from the practical point of view, they wanted to build a small house; their final aim has been to care for the infinite universe.

Many-a-persons know that Dr. Hedgewar worked as the chief of the volunteers at the 1920 Nagpur Congress Session. But very few know an important resolution, sent to the subjects committee by the reception committee, was adopted mainly at Poojya Doctorji's instance. This resolution said, "The ideal of the Congress is to create a democratic State in *Hindusthan* and to free various countries in the world from the exploitation by capitalist nations." The subjects committee -ridiculed the part referring to the freedom of world countries and set aside the resolution.

Later on, Poojya Shri Guruji, while indicating the direction of work to be done on the world level by *Hindu*-organisation, said, "RSS has undertaken to organise the *Hindus* on the basis of their characteristic nationalism and it is an essential part of *Hindu* national reconstruction, but it is also an inevitable pre-stage in the process of realising the dream of world unity and the good of the entire humanity. The *Hindu* thought of world unity can alone be the foundation of a world fraternity. The knowledge that the same soul fills all, can alone inspire men to work for the happiness of whole humanity. It is this *Hindu* thought which alone can give the full and free opportunity to the entire living things on earth to fully develop themselves."

Pandit Deendayalji belonged to this tradition. And so, taking inspiration from and in the light of this thesis, he peered into the physical and mental human ailments on all levels -nation, world nations, entire humanity-and considered it his life-work to find a solution.

They say that a disease properly diagnosed is half cured. On the occasion of the first death anniversary of Panditji an article was published in *Organiser* to pay him a tribute. It contained the diagnosis given by Panditji of Humanity's-ailments on various levels.

Panditji was a Seer. He located and diagnosed the maladies of Humanity. Their solution was his life-mission.

Today the mankind is confronted with a number of basic-and baffling problems. For example:

#### **How to reconcile-**

- .....Individual liberty with social discipline;
- .....Incentive for individual development with urge for equality;
- .....Economic growth with social justice;
- .....Basic organic unity with apparent diversities;
- .....State authority with industrial and civic self-governance;
- .....System with spontaneity;
- .....Social order with Statelessness;
- .....Self-restraint with self-unfoldment;
- ..... Rationalism with consciousness of the office and limitations of Reasons ;
- ..... Specialisation with integrated view;
- ..... Material advance with spiritual elevation;
- ..... National self-reliance with international cooperation;

#### **And again, how to ensure-**

- .....Liberty without licentiousness;
- .....Discipline without regimentation;
- .....Status without privileges;
- .....Unity without uniformity;
- .....Stability without stagnation;
- .....Dynamism without adventurism;
- .....State authority without Stateism;
- .....Technological advance without loss of humaneness;
- .....Material prosperity without crude materialism;

.....Vertical arrangement of societies without their horizontal division;

.....Humanism without homocentricism;

On national level too there are a number of urgent and challenging problems. For example:

#### How to reconcile-

.....Expansion of employment opportunities with up-to-date modern technology;

.....Decentralised process of production with increase in productivity;

.....Nationalisation with public accountability;

.....Pace of urbanisation with cultural background;

.....Micro-planning at lower levels with macro-planning national level;

.....Integration of various natural groups with the preservation of their group characteristics;

.....*Bharatiya* values of life with the modern scientific and technological advance;

.....Demands of the modern age with the *Sanatan* ideals of *Dharma*.

#### How to achieve-

.....Evolution of the World State enriched by the growth and contribution of different national cultures; and

.....Evolution of *Manav Dharma* enriched by the perfection of all the religions including materialism.

It is needless to add that this enumeration is illustrative, not exhaustive.



## A Vital Force

**P**anditji was a modern representative of *Bharat's* ancient Rishi-institution. What Acharya Javadekar called *Yati Varg*, what Acharya Vinobaji called *Acharya Kul*, what Poojya Shri Guruji called *Rishi Sanstha*, was a class of really good people free from any class-consciousness and this constituted a special characteristic of *Hindu* social structure. Shri Guruji says, "If a society is to run well, it must inevitably have in it a group of persons, who properly understand the needs of all sections of the society and who have the ability to maintain proper relationships among the various sections on the basis of a single principle because they are very few and have no axe to grind." (See appendix 37)

On another occasion Shri Guruji said, "The most important thing is that in ancient *Hindu* social structure the State power as also the economic power were supervised by such persons who had no vested interests



of their own. The vital force of the affluence and immortality of our ancient nation has been a continuous train of persons who always remained above the temptation of wealth and power, who had spiritual greatness, who were ever alert and who had the capacity to correct any injustice done by either of these powers." (See appendix 38) This *Rishi*-tradition has continued undisturbed in *Bharat*. Pandit Deendayalji belonged to this category and so with great effort and deep thought he could correctly diagnose the maladies of humanity.

It was his faith that his life-work was to seek answers to all above-mentioned problems. This is because he considered that the life-mission of *Hindu* Nation was to find solutions to these and similar problems. *Hindu* Nation has its own world mission, -a historic responsibility to save mankind from devastation and show the path of real happiness. Thus it is the responsibility of the *Rishi*-institution here to create the correct thought-power in *Hindu* Nation. That this is the world mission of *Hindu* Nation has been declared in no uncertain terms by Swami Vivekanand, Yogi Aravind and Shri Guruji. Even some Western thinkers, who seriously think of humanity's future, have expressed similar expectations and ideas about our nation's this mission. Words of the well-known historian Arnold Toyanbee, given here, are representative of them. He says, "Here (in India) we have the attitude and the spirit that can

make it possible for the human race to grow together into a single family and, in the atomic age, this is the only alternative to destroying ourselves."

"Today we are still living in this transitional chapter of the world's history, but it is already becoming clear that a chapter which had a Western beginning will have to have an Indian ending if it is not to end in the self-destruction of the human race. In the present age, the world has been united on the material level by Western technology. But this Western skill has not only 'annihilated distance', it has armed the people of the world with weapons of devastating power at a time when they have been brought to point-blank range of each other without yet having learnt to know and love each other. At this supremely dangerous moment in human history, the only way of salvation for mankind is an Indian way."

"I want to take up three points.....My first point is that India occupies a key position in the world and has always done so, ever since civilization first began to fan out, east and west, from its original birth place in what is now Iraq. ....My second point is that India is an epitome of the present day world. Some of the principal problems confronting the whole human race today are conspicuously present inside India's frontiers and are being wrestled with today, as Indian national problems, by the people of India and by the Indian government. ....My third

point is that in India there is an attitude towards life and an approach to the handling of human affairs, that answers to the needs of the present situation and this, not only inside India but in the world as a whole."

"If India were ever to fail to live up to this Indian ideal which is the finest and therefore, the most exacting, legacy in your Indian heritage, it would be a poor look-out for mankind as a whole. So a great spiritual responsibility rests on India."

Panditji toiled hard so that the *Hindu Nation* may be able to properly shoulder the responsibility which destiny has assigned to it. This was the aim of his multidimensional work. It was with this aim in view that he wanted to continue development in the various fields of national and international life. The greatest tribute we can pay him is to pick up and continue his line of work from where he left it. The writers of this book will feel their labour amply rewarded if this exposition of Panditji's thoughts inspires at least a few able thinkers and spur them in this direction.



## Appendix

### Appendix 1

From articles, written before the formation of *Jana Sangh*, we can see Panditji's analytical foresight. As an example consider the following:

"This conflict in the Congress will in future give rise to socialist, communist and nationalist conflicts. Which of these factions will dominate Congress is difficult to guess today. Even then it appears that the nationalists will dominate."

"This could have been achieved by dissolving the Congress and by forming a new political party based on a particular ideology. Or another way is by establishing domination of a particular ideology in the Congress, by driving out any opponents or deviationists and by thus forming two political parties viz. the Congress and that of the rest. The first way was suggested by Gandhiji, but it was not accepted by the Congress leaders.

The result was that the second way is being

followed. Every group wishes to exploit the credibility of the Congress and its being in power and so is busy trying to dominate the Congress. Whatever the group which dominates the Congress, but until a clear-cut new party is formed, the people will continue to suffer in the absence of a well-formed opposition party."

[Rashtra Dharm-2nd year issue No. 8, August 1950  
Bhadrapad poornima, 2007]

## Appendix 2

It may be mentioned here that for about two decades, the RSS was in the *Shruti* stage. Up to that time had not been reached the *Smriti* stage which becomes inevitable with a large growth of activities. Taking into consideration the possible future needs, *Maan*. Babasaheb Apte and other top leaders of RSS had started search for such talent in the RSS-fold and had also started encouraging Shri Bhaskarrao Ninave, Bhishikar brothers and others. But at that time it was not considered desirable to collect a large group of writers and literateurs and to propagate RSS through them. If such a plan had been adopted, it was not difficult to put it into practice. Apart from writers in the RSS fold, there was available at that time in Vidharba, a group of budding literateurs, staunchly *Hindu*, as seen from articles in 'Akanksha'-a hand-written periodical run by Shri Keshavrao Vakil. This group contained Sarvashri Vasudevrao Phadnis, R.B. Mavkar,

S.B. Shastri, R.V. Kali, Tatyaji Kalikar, (Balaji Huddar), J.K. (Buva) Upadhye, R. Bobade, of 'Wageeshwari' and 'Saavdhan' groups (for some time, Shri P.B. Bhavne was also in this group). And Poojya Doctorji was on very intimate terms with them all. But at that time the organisation had not reached that stage. Soon after Panditji started life as a *Pracharak*, however, RSS entered the *Smriti* stage.

## Appendix 3

In his article 'Acquitted by history' Shri C.K.N. Raja writes, "*Dharma* in ancient Indian jurisprudence can not be considered a synonym for the Anglican word 'Law' since the former has a wider connotation and application. However, in the absence of an exact equivalent for the word in English, 'Law' can be accepted as coming close to '*Dharma*'."

## Appendix 4

Panditji insisted on the use of *Bharatiya* traditional terms. Some of the terms and ideas are found to be authoritatively explained in the book '*Daishik Shastra*'. The terms '*Chiti*', '*Virat*' are explained in that book. '*Adhilavan Avadharana*' is also a technical term used in *Daishik Shastra* in connection with family planning. The word '*Arthaayam*' is also a technical term and connotes the arrangement in which individual or society is free from the ill-effects of paucity or excess or misuse of wealth.

*Maatridayika* is also such a term. The cultivable land around each village was distributed among the village families; but no family had the right to gift, mortgage, auction or sell that land.

When the family-head dies, the land would belong to his widow and after the widow's death, the land would be returned to the kingdom; the object in such an arrangement being that the land could be given to any other needy family for its maintenance. This system was called '*Maatridaay Pratha*' Shri Badrishah Thuldharia is the author of the book '*Daishik Shastra*'. About this book, Lokmanya Tilak had written to the author, "My view is entirely in accord with yours and I am glad to find that it has been so forcibly put forward by you in Hindi." The book was not widely read, but Panditji appreciated it after some decades.

In addition to terms taken from '*Daishik Shastra*' he had also picked up technical terms from other *Shastras* (sciences) and he used them in study camps. For example:

Consider the terms '*Adey Maatrik Krishi*' and '*Aparmaatrik Udyog*'. The first term stands for farming which (due to canals etc.) does not depend on rain. The second term refers to an industry in which production does not depend on other countries. He was inclined to put into currency such old traditional words and terms as could

be useful even in modern times.

### Appendix 5

In this connection a small event is enlightening. At the time of Kanpur session of *Jana Sangh* on 31st Dec. 1952, all *Swayamsevaks* (volunteers) had gathered together and Dr. Mookherji was addressing them when rain started. A *Swayamsevak* came forward with an umbrella and offered to give him cover. Dr. Mookherji turned down the offer saying, "Why can I not stand in this rain when so many hundreds of *Swayamsevaks* are sitting in rain? Do you not consider me a *Swayamsevak*?"

### Appendix 6

Shri Cooley says, "A State is a body politic or society of men, united together for the purpose of promoting their mutual safety and advantage by the joint efforts of their combined strength. The terms Nation and State are frequently employed, both in law of nations and common parlance, as importing, the same thing, but the term nation is more strictly synonymous with people and while a single state may embrace different nations or peoples, a single nation will be sometimes so divided as to constitute several states."

In the absence of such analytical thinking, it is difficult to understand the following statement of Justice Ram Jois in the case of *Bharat*. He says, "By virtue of the

governance of the same laws on all matters including *Rajadharma*, the entire population of this country constituted themselves into one people or nation notwithstanding the innumerable political divisions constituting separate and independent states or territories under different kings or rulers. Despite the rise and fall of several kingdoms over the centuries and many devastating wars the achievement of maintaining the entire population under one system of law and as one people for generations was the most remarkable achievement of Indian society and its leadership....."

Thus the two notions 'Nation' and 'State' are not the same. Similarly in the notion of 'State' and its technical terms, there is no clarity or uniformity amongst thinkers-very few are conscious of this. For example, consider the following definitions:

"The State is a community of persons, more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite portion of territory, independent of external control and possessing an organized government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience."

-Garner

"A particular portion of mankind viewed as an organised unit."

-Burgess

"A territorial society divided into government and subjects, claiming within an allotted physical area a supremacy over other institutions."

-Laski

"Wherever there can be discovered in any community of men a supreme authority exercising a control over the social actions of individuals and groups of individuals and itself subject to no such regulations, then we have a State."

-Willoughby

"What is commonly implied in the current use of the term 'State' is

- (i) that the aggregate of human beings, thus denoted, is united, if in no other way, by the fact of acknowledging permanent obedience to a common government and having through the permanence of the relations between government and governed a corporate life distinguishable from the lives of its members,
- (ii) that the government exercises control over a certain portion of the earth's surface and
- (iii) that the society has not inconsiderable number of members, though the number can not be definitely stated."

-Sidgwick

"A State is a numerous assemblage of human beings, generally occupying a certain territory, amongst whom the will of the majority or an ascertainable class of persons is by the strength of such majority or class, made to prevail against any of their numbers who oppose it."

-Holland

"A State is a combination or association of men, in the form of government and the governed, on a definite territory, united together into a moral, organised, masculine personality or more shortly, the State is the politically organised national person of a definite country."

-Bluntschli

### Appendix 7

In our country there have been saintly statesmen like Shri Purushottamdas Tandon, Dr. Mookherji, Dr. Ambedkar, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Rafi Ahmad Kidwai, Dr. Sampooranand, Dr. C.D. Dsshmukh. Though quite a few, there have been such men in the West also. For example, Joseph the II of Austria and Friedrick the II of Prussia. Also it has been of George Washington. In 1789, when he was elected President, George Washington told his friend, "I go to the chair of government with feelings not unlike those of culprit who is going to the place of his execution."

Rajwade, the historian, says, "Had *Bharat* had

hundreds of Ramadases, an all-*Bharat* nationalism would have arisen and matured here".

### Appendix 8

Shri P.G. Sahasrabuddhe says in his book 'Ihavadi Shasan', "In *Bharat* nobody put forward the philosophy of (human life during its earthly tenure) secularism as was done in Europe by Marsiglio, Wyclif, Erasmus and Luther, None here wrote books in its support."

In his book 'The Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe', the Irish author William Edward Leki has given the history of secularism.

### Appendix 9

It is generally supported that in the affluent Western countries secularism dominates completely. But this is not true. In the fifth chapter of his book 'Freedom of Conscience in the USSR', the learned author A. Barminkov says, "Bourgeois has declared the principles of freedom of soul, the separation of the Church from the State and of the Church from education; but this has not been put into practice. Having captured power, they (Bourgeois) supported church in-their fight against atheism. To save religion from atheism, several capitalistic countries, even today, separate church from State and use it as a shield. As atheism grows and different religions grow more intolerant, the church is being used to secure

compromises favourable to the exploiter class. In many capitalistic countries, the church is a real and on occasions a legal organ of the State. The States help the church financially and use the church in the interest of the classes.

"In most of the capitalistic countries the constitution permits a particular religion and forbids the others; this is done to favour the chosen religion. As examples, consider the following: In Denmark, Norway and Sweden, Evangelical Lutheran Church is the State Religion. While the Greece State supports Eastern Orthodox Church, in Britain, the Church of England dominates. In Spain, Roman Catholic is the established religion. Whenever a particular religion is made the State Religion, other religions and sects become secondary. With minor changes, this is what obtained in the present world. In 17 countries of middle-east, south-east Asia and Africa, Islam has been legally assigned a special status. In 14 countries of Europe and Latin America, there is complete provision to favour Roman Catholic Church.

In 22 countries only a member of a recognized church can qualify to become head of State. In Argentina, Lyberia and Iran such qualification is necessary for State service. Then what is the significance of the 'freedom of the soul'? Out of political motive and with support of ruling class in Britain, Protestants attack Irish Catholics. In the same way Protestants were tortured in Catholic Spain.

They could not get employment in any State department and were not permitted to teach in schools. In State service, they were not promoted to higher posts.

"Even though in America there has been a formal declaration of the freedom of the soul and of the separation of the Church from the State, functions in most State institutions are celebrated in accordance with religious traditions. A session of American Congress opens with a recitation of Christian prayer. Not only State officials but even the President have to take a religious oath while taking up their official positions. In the constitutions of 42 States there is a prayer addressed to God. In many countries courts do not admit evidence given by atheists. Atheists are not recruited. According to constitution of Delaware State, it is compulsory for all citizens to attend public prayers. In capitalistic countries the freedom of the soul is restricted to only method of worship, but in many countries even this freedom is not there.

"The constitution of Norway makes it compulsory that all citizens must educate their children according to the spirit of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In West Germany the church runs several schools and other educational institutions. According to Greek Law, the education in primary and secondary schools must conform to Greek nationalism and the ideals of the Greek-Christian culture. In Israel, there is a State committee for

religious education and Jehovah-ism has been given the Status of State religion."

It is unnecessary to state here that all characteristics of 'religion' are present in communism. Marx is its Mohamed, 'Das Capital' is its Quran, the highest strata in communist hierarchy is its seventh heaven and dialecticism is its Allah. This is why Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, who had studied different *darshans* [philosophies] has arrived at the conclusion that communism is a religion.

It is worth mention here that in 1945 Stalin revived the Moscow Church and appointed Alexi as its chief priest.

#### Appendix 10

In his famous Uttarpada speech, Shri Aravind (Aurobindo) said, "It is not today that I am saying that nationalism is a faith, it is a *dharma* (religion); rather I mean to say that *Sanatan dharma* is itself nationalism for us. *Hindu* nation was born with *Sanatan dharma*; it lives with this *dharma* and grows with *dharma*. When *Sanatan dharma* degenerates, so also does this nation; and if *Sanatan dharma* could die, with it this nation would have died. *Sanatan dharma* is nationalism."

#### Appendix 11

Regarding this subject Dr. Mookherji was deeply emotional and he used to speak about it as from the bottom

of his heart; The following is a sample of it. While speaking about the Pak-occupied Kashmir in Lok Sabha on 7th August 1952, he said, "Is there any possibility of our getting back this territory (Pak-occupied Kashmir)? We shall not get it through the efforts of UNO; we shall not get it through peaceful methods, - by negotiations with Pakistan. That means we loose it unless we use force and the Prime Minister is unwilling to do it. Let us face facts-are we prepared to loose it?"

#### Appendix 12

Only as an example let us take the case of a small State. Before States-reorganisation it was called Madhya-Bharat. Even today there are, in lime-light in politics some persons who were prominent workers from that time. They need not be separately mentioned. Some are already dead. S. Shri Moreshwar Gadre (Indore), Rajabhau Mahankal (Ujjain), Had Singh Pawar (Badnavar), Shastri (Gwalior), Thakurdas Jethwani (Ujjain), Gaja Maharaj (Mandsaur), Bhaiyyasaheb Bade (Sendhwa), Premchand Jain (Khandwa), Hajarilalji (Shajapur) -All these able workers are dead. Besides these *Maan*. Dadasaheb Dave, *Maan*. Manoharrao Moghe, Shri Manik Chand Vajpayee (Bhind), Smt. Radhabai Nima (Indore) Shri Nathulalji Mantri (Guna), Shri Madanlalji Pande (Shajapur) and Shri Govindrao Dalvi Master (Gwalior)-these persons, who may be presently working in different fields, were at that time the 'Master-



mind group' of *Madhya Bharat Jana Sangh*. Under the guidance of Panditji, Shri Kushabhau Thakare had got together this group through ceaseless hard work. The description of this team of workers in this small State is taken here only as an example. Panditji worked constantly so that this process should continue in all States at all levels.

### Appendix 13

National Conference was there in Kashmir even prior to the formation of *Praja-Parishad*. But in Jammu there were *Sabhas* [conferences] of different castes ('*Biradaries*'); but later on all their office bearers joined National Conference. As the circumstances worsened, there was increasing awakening amongst *Hindus* of Jammu. Sarvashri Maan. Madhavrao Mule, Prof. Balraj Madhok, Dr. Om Prakash Maigi, Jagadish Abrol, Dr. Sooraj Prakash, Shyam Lal Sharma, Durgadas Verma and Radhakrishna Sharma started meeting frequently at the house of Pandit Premnath Dogra and discussed about starting of a new organisation. Later on a meeting of the citizens of Jammu was convened-the venue being Brahman-Sabha; in this meeting the formation of *Praja-Parishad* was announced. The persons who played a prominent role in this meeting were Sarvashri Parashuram Nagar, Rayajada Amarchand, Gopal Datta Maigi, Devendra Shastri, Prof. Rama Krishna, Kaviraj Vishnugupt, Chatar

Ram Dogra, Shrinivas Mangotra, Hansraj Pandotra, Vajeer Harilal, Shivanath Nanda etc. Vajeer Harilal and Hansraj Pandotra were respectively elected the first President and the secretary of *Praja Parishad*.

After 1946, in the first national celebration of the college, the National Conference unfurled its flag with plough on it in place of the tricolour flag. The students demonstrated against this. They were arrested. Students started fast unto death. They were released after 35 days of Anashan-Satyagraha (fast). These students, on long fast were: Sarvashri Chaman Lai Gupta, Tilak Lal Sharma, Ved Prakash Chauhan, Vedmitra, Hardev, Vishwapal, Ramswaroop Chaudhri, Satyapal Gulati, Pavan Singh, Omprakash Gupta, Yashpal Puri, Dwarikanath Gupta and Ghanshyam.

After this Satyagraha, Pandit Premnathji Dogra, Dhanantar Singh Salathiya, Kaviraj Vishnugupt, Shyamlal Sharma, Shivram Gupta, Shivnath Jha-the *Praja Parishad* leaders were arrested. In answer to this again a Satyagraha was organised; the Satyagraha was guided by Shri Roopchanda Nanda and Shri Durgadas Verma. The Satyagraha lasted for 10 months. In the last days of the Satyagraha, a representation of Jammu women came to Delhi. The chief among these were Prof. Shakti Sharma and Smt. Susheela Maigi. The group met leaders of the ruling party as also of the opposition. Then Pandit Nehru

gave a letter for Bakshi Gulam Mohammed. As a result, the Praja Parishad Satyagraha ended and all arrested were released.

The thrilling episode that followed under the leadership of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherji is well-known. In this Satyagraha three *satyagrahis* from Sunderbani and seven *satyagrahis* from Jyodiya became martyrs. By their sacrifice they brought great glory to their birth-places. In addition to this, Melaram of Chhamb, Bheekham Singh and Biharilal of Hiranagar; Shibbaram, Devisaran and Bhagavandas of Ramvan also became martyrs. All these brave men were killed by government bullets. The names of these sixteen martyrs of Praja Parishad will be written in golden letters in the history of the war for Undivided *Bharat*.

The complete history of the struggle waged by Praja Parishad for undivided *Bharat* after independence has not been published. The writings of Prof. Balraj Madhok refer to a few facts, but it is necessary that a complete history should be written.

#### Appendix 14

The report of this speech has appeared in the trimonthly periodical 'Manthan' of the Deendayal Shodh Sansthan in its issue of March 1980. As a sample, some parts of it are quoted herewith : "His election as General

Secretary was due to the qualities and *Sanskars* he had acquired as a *Swayamsevak* and *pracharak*. To become a good worker of Sangh one must have the '*Lok Sangrah*' quality. To acquire this quality a particular life-style is necessary. Absence of egotism, simplicity and honesty are needed. His actions must be consistent with his words. One who can not maintain this consistency can not do *loksangrah*. Having collected people thus, a definite direction has to be given to their lives. The readiness of total sacrifice for society and nation has to be inculcated in them. All this can be achieved only through the personal life and behaviour of '*pracharak*'. People can not be befriended and changed thus by mere high talks and smartness. These latter can not alter men's character."

"Many are tempted to ask as to what Deendayalji would do if he were living today. This question is difficult to answer. Perhaps, in the political mess of today he would have quit politics altogether. Really speaking, he never relished political work. After the formation of Janata Party, one possibility is that having assessed the viability and character of the Janata Party, he would have stayed away from all positions of power; he would have even left the party and returned to RSS work. If he would have been obliged to continue in the political field then, the moment the question of double membership was raised, he would have bade farewell to such politics and would have

unequivocally declared, "I am originally a RSS *Swayamsevak*, RSS is my source of inspiration and whatever I am, I am due to RSS." Supposing that due to pressure of circumstances he would have been forced to continue work in the political field, he would not have wasted his time in Delhi. He would have kept moving from place to place, would have continued his contact with his innumerable colleagues and would have constantly explained to them the circumstances and what the people felt. He was particular to maintain contact with workers and the masses. He would not have participated in current politics. But would have slowly but properly organised the party. This is because he did not look upon a political party merely as a means to power. He would not compromise principles to secure power. He would have remained away from power and built up a well-organised and values-based party, however small the party be to begin with."

"If a nation is to rise, then it needs such leaders who do not care for personal reputation or publicity or even prime-ministership."

#### Appendix 15

For example, consider Panditji's reaction: "When the General Secretary of Swatantra Party announced that his party will not come to terms with *Jana Sangh* so long as *Jana Sangh* does not change its policy towards

Pakistan and Kashmir. I am thankful to Massani for having thus clearly stated his mind. This declaration of his frees us from any conditions of an election pact with Swatantra party; after all the Swatantra leaders' Pakistan and Kashmir policy was a great headache to us."

"It is natural that *Jana Sangh* should not enter into any pact with any party which envisages giving away any part of our country to an aggressor. In deciding what is good or bad, we do not need advice from Shri Massani. The unity and wholeness of our country is a matter of faith with us and in securing it we shall leave no stone unturned."

[Panchajanya, 27 July 1964, page 10]

#### Appendix 16

Dr. Ambedkar's stand was as under: "To say that this country is divided by castes and creeds and that it can not be, one united self-governing community unless adequate safeguards for protection of minorities are made a part of Constitution, is a position to which there can be no objection. But Minorities must bear in mind that although we are today riven by sects and atomised by castes, our ideal is a United India. No demand from Minority should, willingly or unwillingly, sacrifice this ideal."

#### Appendix 17

Babasaheb died on 6-12-1956. A meeting of the working committee of Akhil-Bharatiya Scheduled Castes

federation was held on 31-12-1956 and 1-1-1957. In that meeting Barrister Rajabhau Khobragade was elected President and a presidium was formed. In the presidium were S. Shri Barrister Rajabhau Khobragade, Dadasaheb Gayakwad, G.T. Parmar, M. Ratnam, R.D. Bhandare, K.B. Talwatkar and B.C. Kamble. Later on 3-4 October 1957 in a specially convened session at Nagpur, an adhoc Central Working Committee was formed and it was declared to have this adhoc committee upto 3 October 1958. Barrister Khobragade declared that the time-limit will be up to 3 March 1959. Some of the party seniors did not like this. Babu Haridas Avale, N.M. Kamble, Dadasaheb Roopavate and B.C. Kamble took the stand that since after 3-10-1958 none was an office bearer, so the meeting of the General Council called by Barrister Khobragade on 27-10-1958 was illegal. This technical dispute caused a disruption of the party. Actually groups had even earlier started forming around either some individuals or on the basis of castes and subcastes. This resulted in 13 groups in the Republican party. The policy of each group came to be separately formed and the will to give a united fight by all the depressed tended to vanish. The result was that, in spite of common love for S/c Federation, Republican Party and the blue flag, there was loss of faith in the leadership; this prepared the ground for extremist movements like Dalit Panthers. But the actual rise of Dalit Panthers under the

leadership of Shri Namdeo Dhasal, Shri Raja Dhale and others, did not take place in Panditji's life-time. And so it did not fall to Panditji's lot to say how staunch *Hindus* should bear themselves in the delicate situation arising from the activities of Dalit Panthers. The announcement of the formation of Dalit Panthers was made in a meeting at Bombay (Sidhartha Nagar, Bapati Road) on 9th July 1972 ; S. Shri Namadeo Dhasal, Raja Dhale, Latif Khatik, N.V. Pawar, Avinash Mahatekar, Bhai Shringare were present.

Around 1972-73 a similar movement started in Karnataka under the leadership of S. Shri Basavalingappa, V.T. Rajashekhar Shetty, Krishnappa, Krishnaswamy, Siddalinga-ppa. Dr. D.R. Nagaraj etc. and violent and inflamatory propoganda, directed against Savarnas, was started. The leadership changed hands rapidly from Raja Dhale to Rajashekhar Shetty and thence to Haji Mastan the leader of Muslim Protection Organisation.

But all these events pertain to the period after 1968. From 1956 to 1968, the main persons among Dalit leaders were S. Shri Dadasaheb Gayakwad, D.T. Roopvate, R.S. Gawai, Vasudeo Ganar, Rajabhau Khobragade, Haridas Avale, N.H. Kumbhare, D.A. Katti, B.C. Kamble, Ghanashyam Talwatkar, R.D. Bhandare, N. Shivraj, Sakharam Meshram, Smt. Shantabai Dani and Smt. Ishwaribai. After 1968 the influence of these persons

began to wane and new persons began to appear on the leadership horizon.

### Appendix 18

In his speeches at the Thana meet in 1973, which constitute his 'Magnum Opus', Shri Guruji explained the basic *Hindu* view on economic problems. Deductions that naturally flow from his enunciation are as follows:

- (1) The basic requirements of life must be made available to every citizen.
- (2) Material wealth has to be acquired, so that we can serve God in the form of society, in the best possible manner and out of all that wealth, only the minimum should be used for self-sake, the denial of which will hamper our self capacity for service.  
  
To claim or to make a personal use of more than that, is verily the act of theft against the society.  
यावद् भ्रियेत जठरं तावत् स्वत्वं हि देहिनाम्॥  
अधिकं योऽभिमन्येत स स्तेनो दण्डमर्हति॥
- (3) Thus we are only the trustees of the society. It is only when we become true trustees then we can serve the society best.
- (4) Consequently, there must be some ceiling on the individual accumulation and no person has a right to exploit someone else's labour for personal profit.

- (5) Vulgar, ostentatious and wasteful expenditure is a sin when millions are starving. There must be reasonable restrictions on all consumption. 'Consumerism' is not compatible with *Hindu* culture.
- (6) 'Maximum production and equitable distribution' should be our motto; national self-reliance our immediate goal.
- (7) The problem of unemployment and underemployment must be tackled on war-footing.
- (8) While industrialisation is a must, it need not be the blind imitation of the West. Nature is to be milked and not raped. Ecological factors, balance of nature and the requirements of the future generations should also be taken into account. There should be integrated thinking on Geology, Economics and Ethics.
- (9) Greater stress should be laid on the labour-intensive rather than on capital-intensive industries.
- (10) Our technologists should be required to introduce, for the benefit of artisans, reasonably adapted changes in the traditional techniques of production, without incurring the risk of increasing unemployment of workers, wastage of managerial and technical skills and complete decapitalization of existing means of production and to evolve our own

indigenous technology with great emphasis on decentralisation of the processes of production with the help of power, with family (home) instead of factory, as a centre of production.

- (11) It is necessary to reconcile efficiency with employment-expansion.
- (12) Labour is also one form of capital in every industry. The labour of every worker should be evaluated in terms of share and workers raised to the status of shareholders contributing labour as their share.
- (13) Consumers' interest is the nearest economic equivalent of national interest. Society is the third and more important party to all industrial relations. The current Western concept of 'collective bargaining' is not consistent with this view. It should be replaced by some other term such as 'National Commitment' i.e. the commitment of both the employers and the employees to the Nation.
- (14) The surplus value of labour belongs to the Nation.
- (15) There need not be any rigidity about the patterns of industrial ownership. There are various patterns, such as, private enterprise, nationalisation, co-operation, municipalisation, democratisation, self-employment, joint industry, etc. For each industry, the pattern of ownership should be determined in

the light of its peculiar characteristics and the total requirements of the national economy.

- (16) We are free to evolve any variety of socio-economic order provided it is in keeping with the basic tenets of *Dharma*.
- (17) But changes in the superstructure of society will be of no use if the mind of every individual citizen is not moulded properly. Indeed, the system works worst or well according to the men who work it out.
- (18) Our view of the relation between individual and society has always been, not one of conflict but, of harmony and cooperation, born out of consciousness of a single reality running through all the individuals. The individual is a living limb of the corporate social personality.
- (19) The *Sanskars* of identification with the entire nature constitute the real social infra-structure of any socio-economic order.

In Yugoslavia we find an organisation (socio-economic) somewhat like what Shri Guruji, in Thane Camp, had put forward as the principles on which socio economic reconstruction will have to be done here. The guiding principle in Yugoslavia is: "Self-management is basically a unified process of integration of workers, their labour and resources and the broadest possible basis for

integrating all forms of human labour, all segments of society, for integrating the Yugoslav community on the basis of self-management and national and social equality.

When the followers of Pandit Deendayalji will try to put into practice these ideas of his, they will find Yugoslavia's 'The Associated Labour Act' very useful as a basic experiment.

### Appendix 19

Such fundamental *Darshans* successively express themselves as described by Shri Aravind (Aurobindo) and this applies equally well to Integral Humanism Darshan.

Shri Aravind says, "These (subjective) ideas are likely first to declare their trend in philosophy, in psychological thinking, in the arts, poetry, painting, sculpture, music, in the main idea of ethics, in the application of subjective principles by thinkers to social questions, even, perhaps, though this is a perilous effort, to politics or economics, that hard refractory earth matter which most resists all but a gross utilitarian treatment."

### Appendix 20

The Constitution has adopted a stand different from the Act only in the following:

The Republican form of government.

The independence of Parliament from any kind of external control.

The complete responsibility of the executive to the Legislature.

The inclusion of the princely States and the provinces within the same constitutional framework-and the adoption of the same democratic form of government to both alike.

The definition of citizenship.

The incorporation of the fundamental rights of citizens.

The declaration of the Directive Principles of State Policy.

The abolition of separate electorates and the introduction of universal adult suffrage.

The vesting of the residuary powers in the federal government.

The power of the Union Parliament to amend the Constitution excepting some specified provisions, which require, in addition, the consent of at least half the legislatures of the States.

### Appendix 21

In this connection it is well-known that the objective of Macaulay's educational system was to create "a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, opinions, word and intellect....." Macaulay had proudly said,

"No *Hindu* who has received our English education, ever remains attached to his religion." ... "India was not conquered on the battle-field of Plassy, but on the day when my bill of introducing English education in India was passed."

Such attempts did not cease even after independence. For example, similar work with the same purpose had been started by World Council of Churches established in 1948 by the Dutch Willem Adolf Visser't Hooft.

#### Appendix 22

ज्ञातिराष्ट्रादिसंघानां साकल्यं चरितस्य यत्।

व्यक्तं संस्कृतिशब्देन भाषाशास्त्रात्मकं ननु॥

-Jnyan Koshkar Dr. S.V. Ketkar.

The word 'culture' denotes a trend of impressions on the mind of a society which is peculiar to its own and which, again, is a cumulative effect of its passions, emotions, thoughts, speech and action throughout its history.

-'Why *Bharatiya* Mazdoor Sangh'

"People sometimes ask, 'How do you define *Hindu* culture?' Well, we feel it, though we can not define it. There are some who deny it altogether merely because they can not define it. They say, 'what is the use of a thing which we can not define?' But will this argument stand to reason? For example, the entire course of medical science

is evolved in order to protect life. But even the most modern scientists have not been able to define what 'life' is. But that has not come in the way of the utility of medical science. The outward manifestation of 'life' and its impact on men is sufficient to convince us of its actuality."

-'Bunch of Thoughts'

"Culture or Civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex-whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, moral, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society."

-British Anthropologist E.B Taylor.

"Culture is a historically derived system of.....designs for living, which tends to be shared by.....members of a group."

-American Anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn.

"When nature evolves according to the rules of *Dharma*, it is called culture. Such culture will certainly be able to maintain and ennoble man."

- Deendayal Upadhyaya.

#### Appendix 23

For example, before French revolution the Church office bearers had large establishments. In France such office bearers numbered one and a half lakhs and their individual incomes ranged between 4 to 5 lakhs; and in



addition to this they could collect an equal amount from their faithful flock. Their monasteries were like palaces and were equipped with all means of pleasure. The Church used to collect a sixth part of the people's income. The annual income of the Church was about 15 crores.

On this background, one can understand the feelings of Marx. But conditions in *Bharat* have been different. There never existed here an organised church. There have been individual priests. But an organised dominating priesthood did not exist here. Not having taken this difference into account, even leaders like Pandit Nehru were basing their thoughts on a wrong equation. But it is a matter of some satisfaction that in the evening of his life Pandit Nehru had started rethinking about *Dharma*. He had frankly said, "In our efforts to ensure the material prosperity of the country, we have not paid any attention to the spiritual element in human nature. Therefore, in order to give the individual and the nation a sense of purpose, something to live for and if necessary to die for, we have to revive some philosophy of life and give a spiritual background to our thinking.

We talk of welfare State and of democracy and socialism, but they hardly convey a clear and unambiguous meaning. Democracy and socialism are means to an end and not an end in itself."

"In considering these economic aspects of our problems we have to keep in view the Vedantic ideals of life-force which is the inner base of everything that exists."

In discussions with Nehru by Norman Cousins, Pandit Nehru says, "There is no inconsistency among *Hindu* philosophy, *dharma* and democracy. The heart of *Hindu Dharma* is a brilliant universalism. *Hindu Dharma* can adapt itself to any new circumstances. *Hindu Dharma* is wide enough to accommodate different and mutually opposed disciplines of thought. *Dharma* in *Bharat* will not fail to make any changes necessary in the interest of the common man. In the past *Hindu Dharma* has adapted itself to vast changes."

(This change in Pandit Nehru will remind anybody of the present change in China from Mao's purely materialistic culture to Deng's spiritual culture).

#### Appendix 24

**For example consider what Shri Roy says:**

1. "The crying need of the time is to harmonise ethics with a social philosophy and political practice. The sovereignty of man ...can be deduced only from the fact that man is a moral entity.
2. "Until the intellectual, cultural, spiritual atmosphere of the country was changed, it was not possible to bring about a political and economic reconstruction of the

country."

3. He expresses his dream of an ideal in the words, "...a social reconstruction of the world as a commonwealth and fraternity of free men by the cooperative endeavour of spiritually emancipated moral men."

#### Appendix 25

It will not be out of place to mention here the reply given by Shri T.V.R. Shastri to people who charge RSS with fascism in order to defame it. "A Government or a State can be characterised as 'Fascist', but not a private association to which no one is compelled to belong."

#### Appendix 26

It is true that generally young men were impressed by the dazzling success of Russian revolution, but even then there existed in *Bharat* who refused to be swept away and who did look into the future. For example consider the following.

Lokmany Tilak: "Bolshevism, as preached in the West, can not succeed in India. Let us stick fast to our *Vedanta* and our desires will be fulfilled." Bipinchandra Pal: "The induction of proletariat movement of communist design in India will upset all the moral and spiritual values of life as understood by India's national genius and culture."

Chittaranjan Das: "The soul of Russia must struggle to free himself from the socialism of Karl Marx."

#### Appendix 27

The socialists had many failures; only as examples are quoted here words of Louis Fischer uttered to J.P. Narayan. "At present, I need not tell you, the stratification of Indian society is vertical according to religion and caste. The socialists must turn that vertical stratification over on its side and make it horizontal according to class and economic interests. Only then will it be possible to take the emphasis off of religious divisions and pave the way for Indian social and economic progress."

Any comments are unnecessary.

#### Appendix 28

It is questionable how far the so called Gandhian had understood Gandhiji. In this connection the following example given by Pandit Nehru is enlightening.

"We were surprised to find later how much opposition there was to the Seva Dal among leading congressmen. Some said that this was a dangerous departure, as it meant introducing a military element in the Congress! Others seemed to think that the only discipline necessary was for the volunteers to obey orders issued from above and for the rest, it was hardly desirable for volunteers even to walk in step. At the back of the mind of some was the notion that the idea of having trained and drilled volunteers was somehow inconsistent with the

Congress Principle of non-violence."

Of course the principle, which after independence all changes must be achieved by non-violent, peaceful and constitutional means, was unexceptionable. At the dissolution ceremony of *Abhinav Bharat*, Swatantry Veer Savarkar has said, "Now that we are independent, our first duty is to abandon the anti-State attitudes and means which we ourselves have spread throughout the nation; and we must develop constructive attitudes and discipline."

#### Appendix 29

Actually there have been, both in the West and *Bharat*, social workers unattached to any political party. In the early days of the Christian world there have been Christ, knights of Saint Nazarus, Saint Francis of Assisi. Even in modern times, in the field of service to lepers alone, there are father Damiau, Father Dutton, Dr. Hensen, Dr. R.H. Cochrane, Dr. Paul Brand, Dr. N.H. Antia, Dr. A.F. Coelcho and other Christians. In our own country (in addition to Gandhiji) S. Shri Baba Amte, Dr. Manohar Diwan, Dr. Shivajirao Patwardhan, Dr. Waddekar, Dr. Dharmendra, Dr. H. Shri nivasan, Dr. S.M. Mookherji, Shri Katre of Champa and Shri Bapat were doing excellent work and all this is being done in the spirit of service. They do not, like political workers, take care of the publicity of their service-work, but live lives of service as a mission. Such great men are both here and in the West. To this class

belong Gadage Maharaj and (in the West) Albert Schweitzer and Livingston. Shri Hart says about Baba Amte, "his achievements are far more significant than those of any political leader."

It is natural that political leaders should try to get credit to their party for any good work done by anybody; and during the initial period after independence this tendency was especially strong.

#### Appendix 30

Shri Samartha (Ramdas Swami) says, "A social worker should not approach rulers for aid."

Shri Mac Iver and Shri Paitra, the social scientists, say, "Cultural activity attains its ends more fully when it is free to organise itself, associations that are not dependent on the organisation of the political economic complex, Thus the liberation of cultural association from the control of the political economic organisation is a very significant aspect of social evolution.

#### Appendix 31

Shri S.K. Dey analyses, in his 'Power to the People', the absence of understanding between the *Sarvodaya* workers on the one hand and the employees of community development department on the other. He says, "(1) *Sarvodaya* workers could not get rid of their posture of self-righteousness and (2) The Government Community

Development workers 'had been trained for specific jobs and belonged to a particular cadre with a certain amount of discipline' and could not understand the lack of practical sense, of feeling of responsibility for public funds, of the Gandhians."

### Appendix 32

**Panditji had grasped the point in-**

History without futurology would be fruitless.

Futurology without history would be rootless.

### Appendix 33

तादृशोऽयमनुप्रश्नो यत्र धर्मः सुदुर्लभः।

दुष्करः प्रतिसंख्यतुं तत्केनात्र व्यवस्यति॥

प्रभवार्थाय भूतानां धर्मप्रवचनं कृतम्।

यः स्यात् प्रभवसंयुक्तः स धर्म इति निश्चयः॥

धारणाद् धर्ममित्याहुर्धर्मोण विघृताः प्रजाः।

यः स्याद् धारणसंयुक्तः स धर्म इति निश्चयः॥

(शान्तिपर्व)

धर्मं विश्वस्य जगतः प्रतिष्ठा।

धर्मं सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितम्।

तस्माद् धर्मं परमं वदन्ति। (तैत्तिरीय संहिता)

यतोऽभ्युदय निःश्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः। (वैशंपिक)

अभ्युद-निःश्रेयसे साधानत्वेन धारयति-इति धर्मः।

(माधवाचार्य)

### Appendix 34

Surprisingly tenacious has become the servility of the English-educated amongst us in even changed circumstances. Fact is that ever since the West came into contact with *Bharat*, the curiosity of a few learned men in the West was awakened in *Bharatiya* culture. Schopenhauer, Friedrich Schlegel, Max Muller, William Jones, Paul Dussen,-these learned men had already started praising *Bharatiya* culture. 'The Sacred Books of the East' had been published in 50 volumes. Roth had taken Vedic philology and Eraag Bopp had taken comparative philology for research. A.J.A. Dubois, Princep, Ferguson, Cuningham, Grieson, James Burgess, M. Elphinston, Vincent A. Smith, Fleet, Hultzsch and others, who were the pioneers in Western archaeology and other sciences, have appreciated *Bharatiya* philology, ethnology, arts, history and its tonography. Obvious was also the influence of *Vedanta* on Edwin Arnold, Walt Whitman, Thoreau, Emerson, Edward Carpenter and Paul Brunton. Many had begun to see the similarities between Spinoza's Pantheism, pluralistic monadic idealism of Leibnitz and pietism of Swedenborg on the one hand and corresponding theories in *Bharatiya* philosophy on the other.

Swami Ramatirth had clearly stated, "Christian science, theosophy and American spirituality represent the

direct and indirect legacy of Indian thought." S. Shri Korosi, G. Tumour, Fausboll, R.C. Childers, T.W. Rhys Davids, C.A.F. Rhys Davids, Oldenberg, Stcherbatsky, Poussin, Paul Dahlke and such other learned men were seriously engaged in research on Buddhism. Tolstoy, the great thinker, was greatly influenced by Buddhism and *Vedanta*. Even Karl Marx had recognized the debt that Western religions and theories owe to *Bharat*.

One could also see easily the influence on Carlyle and Ruskin of Kant, Schopenhauer and Fichte who were inspired by *Hindu Darshanas*.

### Appendix 35

According to Soviet government's authorised publication, "The General Secretary of CPSU Central Committee, L.I. Breznev, in his speech at the ceremonial session in Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 7th Oct. 1975, devoted to the 20th anniversary of the USSR Academy of Sciences, said about the party commitment of Soviet Science, 'I would like to dwell especially on one most important question, the party commitment of our science. Whatever discipline the Soviet scientists work in, they are always characterized by a typical feature; their high communist consciousness and their Soviet patriotism. The Soviet scientist bases his whole scientific activity on the scientific ideology of Marxism-Leninism, is an active champion of communism, fights any reactionary

and obscurantist forces. Our scientists subject all their practical activity to the task of realisation of the noble communist ideals."

Stalin also had publicly said, "Medical scientists may not know botany and physics but they must know the science of dialecticism."

### Appendix 36

If all this is taken into account it will be easy to see the point in the following statement made by Prof. Bhalaba Kelkar in his presidential speech at the annual meeting of Marathi Vijnyan Sahitya Sammelan. He said, "If a survey is made from very ancient times to present times and from east to west, it will be found that great scientists are philosophers.

"The ancient *Bharatiya* scientists Dhanwantari, Ashwini Kumar, Kapil, Bhoj, Somdeo, Sushrut, Charak, Kanaada, Aryabhatta, Bhaskar, Patanjali, Wagbhatt and the recent Dr. Bhabha, Dr. N.N. Godbole, Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, Dr. Bhatnagar, Dr. Jagadish Chandra Bose, Dr. Karmarkar, Dr. Gokhale, Dr. Shirodkar, Dr. Khanolkar, Dr. K.K. Date, etc. are all *Bharatiya* scientist-philosophers.

"Aristotle, Democritus, Archimedes, Gallen, Hipocritus among the Western ancients and Dr. Einstein, Dr. Oppenheimer, Newton, Othman Fred Hyle, Joseph Leister amongst the moderns are all scientist

philosophers, Human life evolves along the steps-knowledge of things, science and spiritualism."

In a similar way Gary Zukav says, "What does physics have in common with enlightenment? Physics and enlightenment belong to two realms which are for ever separate. One of them (physics) belongs to the external world of physical phenomena and the other of them (enlightenment) belongs to the internal world of perceptions. A closer examination, however, reveals that physics and enlightenment are not so incongruous as we might think....."

....."Now we shall see how quantum phenomena may be connected so intimately that things once dismissed as 'occult' could become topics of serious consideration among physicists.

".....In short, both in the need to cast off ordinary thought processes (and ultimately to go 'beyond thought' altogether) and in the perception of reality as one unity, the phenomenon of enlightenment and the science of physics have much in common .....

".....The possibility that separate parts of reality (like you and I and tug boats) may be connected in ways which both our common experience and the laws of physics believe, has found its way into physics under the name of Bell's theorem.....The second, Bell's theorem

tells us that there is no such thing as "separate parts". All of the 'parts' of the Universe are connected in an intimate and immediate way previously claimed only by mystics and other scientifically objectionable people."

Although most physicists have little patience (professionally) with metaphors, physics itself became a powerful metaphor. Twentieth century physics is the story of a journey from intellectual entrenchment to intellectual openness, despite the conservative 'prove it to me' nature of individual physicists.....The Wu Li Masters know that physicists are doing more than 'discovering the endless diversity of nature'. They are dancing with Maa Kali, the Divine Mother of *Hindu* mythology."

### Appendix 37

See the following description given by the Chinese philosopher Lao Tze:

"The Sage, wishing to be above the people, must by his words put himself below them; wishing to be before the people, must put himself behind them. In this way, though he has his place above them, the people do not feel his weight; though he has his place before them, they do not feel it as an injury. Therefore, all mankind delight to exalt him and weary not of him. The sage expects no recognition for what he does, he achieves merit but does not take it to himself, he does not wish to display his worth."

### Appendix 38

Even in today's difficult circumstances, there are a few workers in educational field and in other constructive work who have firmly maintained their independence and have not become servile, in lieu of economic help, to government or capitalists! Some Supreme Court judges belong to this class; there have also been 16 High Court judges who had to suffer transfers during the Emergency period. All these judges remained true to their conscience and because of their fearlessness and independence they belong to the tradition of Rama Shastri Prabhune. This is a matter of great satisfaction. [The Supreme Court in the Indian Union has more powers than any Supreme Court in any part of the world].

This statement by Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyer is true only as a bookish principle]. [But all people know how difficult it was for the judges to maintain their independence in the circumstances that obtained after Shri Kumarmangalam's statement in the Parliament on 2-5-1973 about 'committed judiciary'.] Because of such examples, though few, it is felt that if systematic efforts are made to establish cultural values, then it may be possible in the not very distant future to rejuvenate the much desired *Rishi*-system even in present circumstances.

An additional reason which strengthens the hope is that it is a part and parcel of *Bharatiya* culture. In December 1959, in his welcome speech to President Eisenhower, Pandit Nehru had said, "We in India have been conditioned throughout our history in a peculiar way. Our greatest leader of modern times was neither a man of wealth, nor of military power, nor of position; yet the millions of Indians bowed their heads before him and tried to follow his great lead. This is the type of man we honour and I hope this is the type of man we shall always honour, even in the modern world." It is this type of man that is called '*Rishi*'.



## About the Author

### Shri Dattatreya Balkrishna Thengadi

Shri D.B. Thengadi deserves a special mention amongst the gifted leaders in different fields who emerged from the *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh* and who had the benefit of a long and intimate contact with Late Shri Guruji. He was a man of sharp intelligence; he was a studious thinker, skilled organiser and a man with life dedicated to the nation. He was a life-time *pracharak* (propagator) of RSS. He started *Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh* and led it to its present powerful state. He worked for *Vidyarthi Parishad*, *Bharatiya Kisan Sangh*, *Sahakar Bharati* and many other organisations. All the same his active participation in RSS remained undiminished and his basic thoughts about RSS have remained steadfast.

He was popular among the common people due to his simple nature and loving temperament-this in spite

of the great fame he has attained. In spite of the high pressure of organisational work, he has done extensive theoretical writing. Like Pandit Deendayalji, he has also attained a high status as a commentator of the philosophy underlying the *Hindu* way of life. This will be obvious from the essay with which he has prefaced this book; this essay brings out his extensive reading and deep thinking. It may be pointed out that the authors of the various parts of this book have received his valuable guidance. This much activity for a man in his last span of life was really amazing.





## Glossary

**Darshan:** This is a word used to denote ancient *Bharatiya* philosophy, which is based on the direct conscious-perception of reality by persons with highly purified minds. 'Darshan' ranks higher than philosophy in that the latter is based on observation and reason while the former is based on intuition.

**Dharma:** Moral duties and divine law which sustain all creatures. For detail See Glossary in the Part II, Integral Humanism.

**Dalit:** Literally it means 'ground down'. Stands for the repressed section of a society.

**Jnyanakoshakar:** This is a combined word formed from

*Janyan* [knowledge] 'ज्ञान'

*Kosha* [store] 'कोष'

*Kar* [The maker or editor] कर (कर्ता)

The word *Jnyankosh* means an encyclopaedia.

**Ihavad:** The philosophy of life while and on this earth. It pertains to body, mind and intellect and omits consideration of soul.

### **Ekatm Shasan-Pranali:**

*Shasan* = State or administration

*Pranali* = System.

The word *Ekatma* literally means having the same mind or soul.

**Hindutva:** Hinduness.

**Hindutvanishth:** A staunch *Hindu*.

**Guru:** Teacher, Mentor.

**Lok;** Abbreviation for either *Lok-manya* or *Lok-nayak* etc.

*Lok*=people, *Manya*=respected, *Nayak*=Leader

**Lok Sangraha:** *Lok* is people. *Sangraha* literally mean holding together. So *Loksangraha* means persuading a number of people to stand together in same common cause.

**M. or Maan:** Abbreviation for *Maanneeya* which means respectable.

**P.P.:** Abbreviation for *Param Poojya* which means highly respectable.

**Pracharak:** Literally means propagator or propounder.

In this book it stands for the full time selfless RSS worker who is maintained but not paid.

**Praja-Parishad:** *Praja*=Subjects of a nation

**Parishad**=Conference, Sangathan

*Praja Parishad* was the name of a political Party in Jammu in the post-independence period.

**Panditji:** Pandit means a scholar or learned man. 'ji' is added as a sign of respect.

In most places in the book Panditji stands for Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya.

The first Prime Minister of *Bharat* Jawahar Lai Nehru is also referred to as Pandit Nehru.

**RSS:** Short for Rashtriya (national) *Swayam-sevak* (volunteer) *Sangh* (organisation).

**Rishi:** A great sage.

**Rajarshi:** A person who is king as also a sage.

**Sarkaryavaha:** 'Sar' is chief and *karyavaha* is secretary.

**Sanskar:** See English Glossary in part II Integral Humanism.

**Sanatan:** Eternal.

**Smt.:** Short for *Shrimati* Prefixed to a lady's name as a term of respect. Literally it means a prosperous

woman.

**Shri:** Short for *Shriyut*. The prefix is used as a term of respect to any man's name. It is equivalent to Mr.

**Sarvashri:** Sarva=all, Shri=*Shriyut*. Equivalent to Messrs.

**Shruti:** Literally means the listened memory and so came, to mean Vedas where knowledge was memorised by students from Guru's speech.

**Shruti Stage:** It here refers to early stage of RSS when principles etc. of the *Hindu* organisation were propounded by word of mouth only and no printed literature was available.

**Smriti Stage:** Smriti literally means memory. But the word came to indicate a later stage in *Hindu Dharmic* literature when knowledge was propagated by using books.

Vis-a-vis RSS, the word means a later stage in RSS development when books etc. had to be published and used in view of the ever-growing organisation.

**Satyagrah:** Satya (Truth)

*Agrah* (insistence).

The word became popular in Gandhiji's time. It meant peaceful demonstration or defiance of injustice or untruth.

**Savarn:** Varna means class. In ancient *Bharat*, *Hindus* were grouped mainly into 4 classes-

**Brahman** (educators)

**Kshatriya** (Warriors, rulers)

**Vaishya** (Traders, cultivators, cattle breeders etc.) or doing economic activities.

**Shoodra** (Labourers)

These four classes called Savarnas. As different from those above were the others-non-savarnas.

**Sarvodaya:** Sarva (all)

*udaya* (rise).

The upliftment of masses.

**Tithi:** Day of the month by *Bharatiya* callender.

**Vedanta:** The content of the *Upanishads*.

