

## **Editor's Note**

At this critical time, when the clichés and dogmas in the name of secularism, socialism, communism, capitalism, regionalism and communalism, lie in tatters in the face of the violence that has overtaken our society, it is time to take a fresh look at the philosophy of Integral Humanism propounded by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya. His thesis on Integral Humanism, given in a series of speeches in Bombay from 22<sup>rd</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> April, 1965, form the basis of a system of governance that is suited to the Indian nation and its people, regardless of caste, religion or region, as an alternative for all round human development.

Vasant Raj Pandit,  
Secretary,  
Deendayal Research Institute.  
April, 2002.

# INTEGRAL HUMANISM

## Lecture 1

### Our Direction

I am asked to present my thoughts on the subject of “Integral Humanism” in a series of talks beginning this evening. Last January at Vijayawada, the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, adopted the statement of “Principles and Policies” in which the term ‘Integral Humanism’ was also accepted. There have been scattered discussions here and there on the subject. It is necessary that we consider Integral Humanism in all its aspects. So long as the country was under the yoke of the British rule, all the movements and policies in the country had one principal aim, ‘to drive out the foreign rulers and to achieve independence’. But what would be the face of the new Bharat after independence? In which direction were we to advance? These questions were not precisely thought out. It would not be correct to say that no thought was devoted to these aspects. There were people who even at that time had considered these questions. Gandhiji himself had set out his idea of the independent Bharat in his book *‘Hind Swaraj’*. Prior to this, Lokmanya Tilak discussed the philosophical basis of the rejuvenation of Bharat in his book *‘Gita Rahasya’*. He gave a comparative exposition of various schools of thought current all over the world at that time.

Apart from these, the Congress and other political parties adopted various resolutions from time to time which contain references to this subject. However, the subject requires much more serious thought than was devoted to it at that time. It did not attract serious attention then because everyone believed that it was more important to think of the ways to drive out the British and that other things could be discussed later on. It did not seem right to waste time in internal discussions while foreign rule continued. Hence, even if there might have been differences in views, they were shelved for the time being.

As a result, even those who held the view that socialism should be the basis of the future Bharat, worked inside the Congress as a socialist group. They did not attempt to form a separate party as such. The revolutionaries too, were working for independence in their own way. All were agreed, however, that the foremost task was to gain independence.

## Whither Bharat?

Having attained independence, the question naturally ought to have occurred to us, "Now that we are independent, what shall be the direction of our progress?" But it is amazing that serious thought has not been given to this question, and today even after seventeen years of independence we cannot say that a definite direction has been decided upon.

From time to time, Congressmen or others declared Welfare State, Socialism, Liberalism, etc., as their aims. Slogans have been raised. Apart from slogans, they have attached little significance to ideologies or comprehensive and integrated thought-systems, which alone determine the direction one has to follow. I am saying this on the basis of personal discussions. A leading gentleman once suggested during a conversation that a joint front should be formed against Congress, so that a good fight could be given. Nowadays, political parties adopt this strategy. So it was not surprising to put forward this suggestion. However, naturally, I asked, "What programme shall we adopt? If such a joint front is formed, some ideal of the programme is essential. What will be our economic policy? What will be our foreign policy? These questions should also be tackled broadly."

"Do not worry about them. Whatever you like, you can adopt. We are ready to support anything from an extreme Marxist to a downright capitalist programme." The reply came as if this was natural. He had no difficulty in adopting any programme. The only object was that somehow the Congress should be defeated. Even now some declare that the Congress must be defeated even with the cooperation of communists and all the rest.

Recently, elections were held in Kerala. During these elections, the Communists, Muslim League, Swatantra Party, S.S.P., Rebel Congress known as Kerala Congress, Revolutionary Socialist Party, etc., entered into a variety of bilateral or multiple alliances. As a result, it was difficult to imagine whether any of these parties had a definite ideology, principles and aims. This is the situation as far as principles are concerned.

Congress too, is in a similar state. Even though the Congress has proclaimed 'Democratic Socialism' as its goal, the behaviour of various Congress leaders shows one thing clearly, that there are no definite principles, no single direction in the Congress. There are staunch communists in the Congress fold. There are also those who have faith in capitalism and oppose

communism to the teeth. All sorts of people are arrayed on the Congress platform. If there can be a magic box which contains a cobra and a mongoose living together, it is Congress?

We must ponder whether we can progress under such conditions. If we stop to analyse the reasons for the problems facing the country, we find that the confusion about our goal and the direction is mainly responsible for this chaos. I realise that all the 450 million people of Bharat cannot agree on all or even on a single question. This is not possible in any country. Yet there is generally, what is called more or less, a common desire of the people of any Nation. If this popular longing is made the basis of our aims, the common man feels that the Nation is moving in a proper direction, and that his own aspiration is reflected in the efforts of the Nation. This also generates the greatest possible feeling of unity. The truth of the statement is borne out by the response of the people during the Chinese invasion of October/November 1962. A wave of enthusiasm swept across the country. A remarkable upsurge both in action and sacrifice was discernible. There was no barrier between the government and the public or between various political parties. How did this happen? The external threat made us recognise our Self. The government adopted that policy which reflected the widespread feeling of the people, and which enhanced their sense of self-respect with the call for sacrifice. As a consequence, we stood united.

### **The Root Of Our Problems – Neglect Of Self**

It is essential that we think about our national identity. Without this identity, there is no meaning of independence, nor can independence become the instrument of progress and happiness. As long as we are unaware of our national identity, we cannot recognise or develop all our potentialities. Under alien rule, this identity is suppressed. The reason why nations wish to remain independent, is so that they can progress according to their natural bent and can experience happiness in their endeavour. Nature is powerful. An attempt to go against nature or to disregard her, leads to trouble. Natural instincts cannot be disregarded, but it is possible to elevate this nature to the level of culture. Modern psychology informs us how a person begins to suffer from different mental ailments when his various natural instincts are suppressed. Such a person remains restless and dejected. His abilities slowly deteriorate and become perverted. The Nation too, like the individual, becomes a prey to numerous ills when its natural instincts are disregarded. The basic cause of the problems facing Bharat is the neglect of its national identity.

A majority of those who lead the Nation today, as well as those who take an active interest in the affairs of the country, are not sufficiently aware of this root cause. Consequently, opportunists with no principles reign in the politics of our country. Parties and politicians have neither principles nor aims nor a standard code of conduct. A person feels there is nothing wrong in leaving one party and joining another. Even alliances and mergers of parties or their bifurcations are dictated not by agreements or by differences in principles, but purely by gains in elections or in positions of power. In 1939, Shri Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim was elected on the Muslim League ticket. Later on, when he joined the Congress, he resigned in pursuance of the healthy principles of public conduct, sought re-election on the Congress ticket and was once again elected. In 1948, when some Socialists left the Congress and founded the Socialist Party, all those who were members of legislatures resigned and fought elections on socialist tickets. But thereafter, this healthy tradition was forgotten. Now there is complete licence in politics. As a result, in the public mind there is distrust for everyone. There is hardly any person whose integrity is beyond doubt in the public mind. This situation must be changed. Otherwise unity and discipline cannot be established in society.

### **Where Should We Start?**

The Nation is at the crossroads. Some people suggest that we must start from where we left off one thousand years ago, when foreign invaders disrupted our life. But the Nation is not an inanimate object like a cloth, so that weaving can be taken up after a gap in time. Besides, it would not be rational to say that the thousand year old alien rule had interrupted the current of our national life so completely that, from that time to this day, we remained static and inert. The Nation has certainly put its genius to work, in the changing circumstances, to meet the challenges thrown at it. We have struggled to continue our life forward and to wrest independence from the aliens. The current of our national life was not interrupted but has gone on ceaselessly. The task of turning the waters of Ganga back to some previous point would not be wise. The Ganga at Banaras may not be as crystal-clear as at Hardwar. But still it is the same holy Ganga. It has absorbed numerous rivulets with all their refuse. However, these have no separate existence but have become the Ganga. The current of the Ganga must inevitably flow onwards. If this was all that happened, it would still not be a big problem. But there are other nations in the world. They have made phenomenal progress in the past one thousand years. Our entire attention was engaged in

fighting for independence or staving off new hordes of invaders. We have not been able to contribute to world progress. Now when we are free, is it not paramount that we fill this deficiency at the earliest, and stand shoulder to shoulder with other advanced nations of the world?

### **III-Effects Of British Rule**

Upto this point, there is no room for difference of opinion. The difficulty arises when we fail to discern the reasons of the spectacular advance of the West, and its effect, real and apparent. This is further complicated by the fact that Britishers, a representative of the West, ruled this country for a century and during this period, adopted such measures whereby in the minds of our people, a contempt for things *Bharatiya* and respect for everything Western was subtly created. Along with the scientific advance, their way of life, manners and food habits, etc., came to this country. Not only material sciences but also their social, economic and political doctrines became our standards. The effect of all these are clearly discernible today in the 'educated' persons of our country. We shall have to decide whether this effect is good or bad for us. We had taken pride in resisting things British while they ruled us, but strangely enough, now that the Britishers have left, Westernisation has become synonymous with progress. It is true that a narrow sense of nationalism should not be allowed to obstruct the progress of the Nation. However, Western science and the Western way of life are two different things. Whereas Western science is universal and must be absorbed by us if we wish to go forward, the same is not true of the Western way of life and values. In fact, thoughtless imitation of the West must be scrupulously avoided. There are those who consider economic and political doctrines of the West as the epitome of progress and desire to transplant the same in our country. Therefore, when we are trying to decide where we wish to take our country and how, we must also take into consideration the basis of various economic and political doctrines of the West and their present position.

### **The Rise Of European Nations**

Among the various *isms* that affected the West, the principal ones were nationalism, democracy and socialism. At the same time, there have been some who cherish world unity and world peace, and have made some efforts in that direction.

Of these, nationalism is the oldest and strongest. After the fall of

the Roman Empire and decline in the influence of the Catholic Church, Europe witnessed the rise of several nations. The history of Europe in the past one thousand years is the history of the rise of, and conflicts among, various nations. These nations extended their empires beyond the European continent and subjugated other independent countries. Nationalism brought Nation and State together resulting in Nation-States. At the same time, the decline in the influence of the Roman Catholic Church gave rise either to national churches or to a complete disappearance of religious influence on politics. Anyway, the concept of a secular State arose out of this situation.

### **Birth Of Democracy In Europe**

A revolutionary concept which made a deep impact on the political life of Europe is democracy. In the beginning, every nation had a king as its head but there was a gradual awakening in the minds of the people against the autocracy of the royalty. The industrial revolution and international trade resulted in the rise of a business community in all nations. Naturally, there ensued a conflict between these new centres of power and the established kings and feudal lords. The fundamental principles of democracy became the pivot around which this conflict revolved. The origin of democracy was sought in the Greek city republics. The common man was attracted by the lofty ideals of equality, fraternity and liberty of every citizen. France witnessed a bloody revolution. In England too, there were periodic movements. The idea of democracy gained a foothold in the mind of the common man. Royalty was either liquidated or its powers were drastically curbed and constitutional governments were established. Today, democracy has been already accepted in Europe. Even those who have suppressed democracy do not denounce it. Dictators like Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin, too, paid lip-service to democracy.

### **Capitalist Exploitation And Marxism**

Every individual got a vote in the democratic set-up. But real power stayed with those who had led the revolution. The industrial revolution had generated faith in the new methods of production. Instead of working in the freedom of the home, workers had started working in the factories, taking orders from the factory owners. The worker migrated from his home town to dwell in crowded cities. There was no provision for housing. There were hardly any rules in the factory to protect the worker. He was economically weak and not yet organised. He became a victim of exploitation, injustice

and harassment. Those in whom political power was vested were members of the same group who exploited the worker. Hence, there was no hope of redress from the State.

A number of persons led movements in protest against the injustice, with the desire to improve the lot of workers. They called themselves socialists. Karl Marx was one of them. In an effort to lead the movement against this injustice, he studied the entire history and structure and presented his analysis of the situation. He claimed to have given a scientific basis to his theories. All the subsequent socialists might not have agreed with Marx, but they all were considerably influenced by his ideas.

According to Marx's analysis - dialectical materialism - the root cause of exploitation, lies in the private ownership of the means of production. If these means are made the property of the society (for a Marxist, the Society is synonymous with the State), then there will be no further exploitation. But before this, the State should be redeemed from the hands of the exploiters and insured against their influence in future. Towards this end, dictatorship of the proletariat must be established. In order that people may tolerate this dictatorship, it was held as an ideal, that when the exploiter class has been finally liquidated, and no possibility of its resurgence exists, the State will be replaced by a classless, stateless society. Marx also attempted to show that capitalism contained the seeds of its own destruction and that socialism is inevitable.

### **Three Contradictory Ideals**

In some countries of Europe there was a socialist revolution. Even where socialism was not accepted, the politicians had to accept the rights of workers. 'Welfare State' was accepted as an ideal. Nationalism, democracy, socialism or equality (equality is there at the root of socialism - equality is different from equitability), these three doctrines have dominated European social and political thinking. Every now and then, apart from these, the ideals of world peace and world unity were also advocated. All these are good ideals. They reflect the higher aspirations of mankind. But by itself, each stands opposed to the rest in practice. Nationalism poses a threat to world peace. Democracy and capitalism join hands to give a free reign to exploitation. Socialism replaced capitalism and brought with it an end to democracy and individual freedom. Hence the West is at present, faced with the task of reconciling these good ideals. They have not succeeded in

this task to date. They have tried combinations and permutations, by placing emphasis on one or the other ideal. England emphasised nationalism and democracy and developed her politico-social institutions along those lines, whereas France could not adopt the same. There, democracy resulted in political instability. The British Labour Party wanted to reconcile socialism with democracy, but people have raised doubts whether democracy will survive if socialism gains strength. Hence, the Labour Party no longer supports socialism as strongly as the Marxist doctrines advocated. If socialism has been diluted considerably, Hitler and Mussolini adopted nationalism-cum-socialism and buried democracy. In the end, socialism also became a tool for their nationalism, which posed a great threat to world peace and unity.

We may indeed seek some guidance from the Western world, but the fact is that it has no concrete suggestions to offer. It is itself at the crossroads, and unable to decide what is good. Under such circumstances, we cannot expect guidance from the West. On the contrary, we must consider whether in this present state of the world, we can contribute something to resolve its dilemma. Having taken note of the progress of the world, can we add to the common store of knowledge? As a member of the world community, we must discharge our responsibilities. If we possess something that may prove helpful to world progress, we should not hesitate in imparting it to the world. In this era of adulteration, instead of adulterating ideas, we must, on the contrary, scrutinise and improve upon them wherever possible before accepting them. Rather than being a burden to the world, we must attempt to resolve, if possible, the problems facing the world. We must also consider what contributions our tradition and civilisation can make to world culture. We shall consider this tomorrow evening.

22<sup>nd</sup> April, 1965.

## Lecture 2

### Western Versus *Bharatiya* View

Yesterday we had seen that even after 17 years of independence we have still to decide what direction we should adopt to realise our cherished dream of all-round development in the lives of our countrymen. Normally, people are not prepared to seriously consider this question. They think only of the problems which they face from time to time. Sometimes economic problems are viewed with concern and an attempt is made to resolve them, and at other times, social or political problems come to the forefront claiming attention. Not knowing fundamentally the direction in which we all are to go, these efforts are not accompanied by sufficient enthusiasm, nor do they give a feeling of satisfaction to the people engaged in these efforts. These efforts produce only a fraction of the results that they ought to have produced.

### Modern Versus Ancient

However, there are two distinct types of people who do suggest some definite direction. There are some who suggest that we must go back to the position when we lost our independence and restart from there. On the other hand, there are people who would like to discard all that has originated here in Bharat and they are not ready to give a second thought to it. They seem to think that Western life and thoughts are the last word in progress and all of them should be imported here if we are to develop. Both these lines of thought are incorrect, though they do represent partial truths and it will not be proper to reject them altogether.

They, who advocate starting from where we left off a thousand years ago, forget that whether it may or may not be desirable, it is definitely impossible. The flow of time cannot be reversed. In the past one thousand years, whatever we assimilated, whether it was forced on us or we took it with willingness, cannot be discarded now. Besides, we too have original creations in the life of our society. We did not always remain mere passive witness to whatever new challenging situations arose, nor did we merely react to every alien action. We too, have attempted to reshape our life as was required to face the new situations. Therefore, we cannot afford to shut our eyes to all that has happened in the past one thousand years.

Similarly, those who would like to make Western ideologies the

basis of our progress, forget that these ideologies have arisen in certain special situations and times. They are not necessarily universal. They cannot be free from the limitations of the particular people and their culture which gave birth to these *isms*. Besides, many of these are already out of date. The principles of Marx have changed both with the changing times as well as with varying conditions, to the extent that parrot-like repetition of Marxism for solving the problems facing our country, would amount to a reactionary attitude rather than a scientific and pragmatic one. It is indeed surprising, that they who claim to reform the society by removing dead traditions, themselves fall prey to some outdated foreign traditions.

### **Learn, But Do Not Ape Others**

Every country has its own peculiar historical, social and economic situation, and its leaders decide the remedies for the ills that beset the country from time to time, taking into consideration its background. It is illogical to believe that remedies which the leaders of one country decide to try for their problems are likely to be effective as such to all other peoples. A simple illustration will suffice. Even though the basic organic activity is the same in all human beings, the drugs which may be helpful in England may not prove equally helpful in Bharat. Diseases also depend upon climate, water, dietary habits and heredity. Even though the external symptoms may be apparently similar, the same drug does not necessarily cure all persons. Those who apply a single panacea to all diseases must be considered quacks rather than doctors. Therefore, Ayurveda states “ यद्देशस्य यो जन्तुः तद्देशस्य तस्योषधम् ” i.e. for the disease in each place, a remedy suitable to that place must be found. Therefore, it is neither possible nor wise to adopt foreign *isms* in our country in the original form in toto. It will not be helpful in achieving happiness and prosperity.’

On the other hand, it needs to be realised that not all the thoughts and principles that have sprung up elsewhere are necessarily local in space and time. The response of human beings in a particular place, time and social atmosphere may, and does, in many cases, have relation and use to other human beings elsewhere and at other times. Therefore, to ignore altogether the development in other societies, past or present, is certainly unwise. Whatever truths these developments contain must be taken note of and accepted. The rest must be scrupulously avoided. While absorbing the wisdom of other societies, it is only proper that we avoid their mistakes or perversities. Even their wisdom should be adapted to our particular

circumstances. In brief, we must absorb the knowledge and gains of the entire humanity so far as eternal principles and truths are concerned. Of these, the ones that originated in our midst have to be clarified and adapted to changed times, and those that we take from other societies have to be adapted to our conditions.

## **Nationalism, Democracy And Socialism**

Western political thought has accepted Nationalism, Democracy, and Socialism or Equality, as ideals. Besides, now and then, there have been attempts directed at world unity which took the shape of the League of Nations, and after the Second World War, the United Nations Organisation. For a variety of reasons these have not succeeded. However, these definitely were attempts in that direction. All these ideals have in practice proved to be incomplete and mutually opposing.

Nationalism led to conflict between nations which led in turn to global conflict. Whereas if *status quo* is regarded as synonymous with world peace, the aspirations of many small nations to be independent would remain ever unfulfilled. World unity and nationalism conflict with each other. Some advocate suppression of nationalism for world unity, whereas others regard world unity as a utopian ideal and emphasise national interest to the utmost.

Similar difficulty arises in reconciling socialism and democracy. Democracy grants individual liberty, but the same is used by the capitalist system for exploitation and monopolisation. Socialism was brought in to end exploitation, but it destroyed freedom and dignity of the individual.

Mankind stands confused and is unable to decide what the correct path is for future progress. The West is not in a position to say with confidence that, "This alone and no other", is the right path. It is itself groping. Therefore, simply to follow the West would be an instance of the blind being led by the blind.

## **Claim Of *Bharatiya* Culture**

In this situation, our attention is claimed by the *Bharatiya* culture. Is it possible that our culture can point the direction to the world?

From the national standpoint we shall have to consider our culture,

because that is our very nature. Independence is intimately related to one's own culture. If culture does not form the basis of independence, then the political movement for independence would be reduced simply to a scramble by selfish and power-seeking persons. Independence can be meaningful only if it becomes an instrument for the expression of our culture. Such expression will not only contribute to our progress, but the effort required will also give us the experience of joy. Therefore, both from the national as well as human standpoint, it has become essential that we think of the principles of *Bharatiya* culture. If with its help, we can reconcile the various ideals of Western political thought, then it will be an added advantage for us ( मणि - कंचन सङ्गो ). These Western principles are a product of revolution in human thought and social conflict. They represent one or the other aspiration of mankind and it is not proper to ignore them.

### ***Bharatiya* Culture Is Holistic**

The first characteristic of *Bharatiya* culture is that it looks upon life as an integrated whole. It has an integrated viewpoint. To think of parts may be proper for a specialist, but it is not useful from the practical standpoint. The confusion in the West arises primarily from its tendency to think of life in sections and then to attempt to put them together by patchwork. We do admit that there is diversity and plurality in life, but we have always attempted to discover the unity behind them. This attempt is thoroughly scientific. The scientists always attempt to discover order in the apparent disorder in the universe, to find out the principles governing the universe, and frame practical rules on the basis of these principles. Chemists discovered that a few elements comprise the entire physical world. Physicists went one step further and showed that even these elements pulsate with energy. Today, we know that the entire universe is only a form of energy.

Philosophers are also basically scientists. The Western philosophers reached up to the principle of duality. Hegel put forward the principle of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis. Karl Marx used his principle as a basis and presented his analysis of history and economics. Darwin considered the principle of 'Survival of the Fittest' as the sole basis of life. But we, in this country, perceived the basic unity of all life. Even the dualists have believed nature and spirit to be complementary to each other rather than contradictory. The diversity in life is merely an expression of the internal unity. There is complementarity underlying the diversity. The unity in seed finds expression in various forms - the roots, the trunk, the branches, the leaves, the flowers

and the fruits of the tree. All these have different forms and colours and even to some extent different properties. Still we recognise their relation of unity with each other through the seed.

### **Conflict – Sign Of Cultural Regression**

Unity in diversity and the expression of unity in various forms have remained the central thought of *Bharatiya* culture. If this truth is wholeheartedly accepted, then there will not exist any cause for conflict among various powers. Conflict is not a sign of culture or nature; rather it is a symptom of perversion. The law of the jungle – ‘Survival of the Fittest’ – which the West discovered in recent years was known to our philosophers. We have recognised desire, anger, etc, among the six lower tendencies of human nature, but we did not use them as the foundation or the basis of civilised life or culture. There are thieves and robbers in society. It is essential to save ourselves and society from these elements. We cannot consider them as our ideals or standards of human behaviour. ‘Survival of the Fittest’ is the law of the jungle. Civilisations have developed not on the basis of this law, but by consideration of how the operation of this law could be reduced to the minimum in human life. If we wish to progress, we have to keep this history of civilisation before our minds.

### **Mutual Cooperation**

Cooperation also obtains in abundance just as conflict and competition in this world. Vegetation and animal life keep each other alive. We get our oxygen supply with the help of vegetation, whereas we provide carbon dioxide, so essential for the growth of vegetable life. This mutual cooperation sustains life on this earth.

The recognition of this element of mutual sustenance among different forms of life and taking that as the basis of an effort to make human life mutually sustaining is the prime characteristic of civilisation. To mould nature ( प्रकृति ) to achieve social goals is culture ( संस्कृति ), but when this nature leads to social conflict, it is perversion ( विकृति ). Culture does not disregard or deny nature. Rather it enhances those elements in nature which are helpful in sustaining life in this universe, makes it fuller and richer, and curbs others which obstruct or destroy life. Let us take a simple illustration. The relationships such as brother and sister, mother and son, father and son, are natural. These are same both in man as well as among animals. Just as

two brothers are sons of one mother so also two calves have a single mother cow. Where then lies the difference? The animals forget these natural relationships. They cannot build up an edifice of civilisation on these relations. But men use this natural relation as a basis to construct a more harmonious order in life, to establish other relationships flowing from these basic relationships, so as to knit the whole society as a single unit of cooperation. Thus various values and traditions are built. Standards of good and bad are determined accordingly. In society, we find instances of both affection as well as enmity between brothers. But we consider affection good, and aim at enhancing affectionate brotherly relations. The opposite tendency is disapproved. If conflict and enmity are made the basis of human relationships, and if on this basis history is analysed, then it would be futile to dream of world peace resulting out of such a course of action.

## **Nature To Culture**

A mother brings up her children. A mother's love is considered as the highest love. On such a basis alone, we can devise the rules regulating the life of mankind. Sometimes there are examples of selfishness and cruelty of a mother towards her child. Among some species of animals, the mother devours her progeny to satisfy her hunger. On the other hand, among monkeys, the mother carries her child long after its death. Both types of behaviour are found among living beings. Which of these two principles of nature can be made the basis of a civilised life? We cannot but conclude that - that alone which helps to sustain life can be chosen, the contrary cannot lead to a civilised life. Human nature has both tendencies, anger and greed on the one hand, and love and sacrifice on the other. All these are present in our nature. Anger, greed, etc. are natural to man and beasts alike. For this reason, if we make anger a basis of our life and arrange our efforts accordingly, then the result will be a lack of harmony in our life. Therefore the exhortation, "Do not yield to anger". Even when anger arises in one's mind, one can exercise control over it and one should do so. Thus control becomes a standard of our life and not anger.

Such laws are known as the principles of ethics. These principles are not framed by anyone. They are discovered. A suitable analogy is that of the law of gravitation. If we throw a stone, it falls on the ground. This law of gravitation was not framed by Newton. He discovered it. When he saw an apple falling on the ground from the branch, he realised there such a law must exist. Thus he discovered this law, he did not frame it. Similarly,

there are certain principles of human relations. For instance, if one feels anger, one must keep it under control. Such an act will be beneficial to all. These principles of ethics are, therefore, discovered.

“Do not tell a lie to one another; say what you know to be true”. This is a principle. Its usefulness becomes apparent at every step in life. We appreciate a truthful person. If we tell a lie, we ourselves feel unhappy: life cannot go on, there will be great confusion.

A child does not speak untruths by nature. Often, parents teach their child to speak untruths. When the child desires something which the parents do not wish to give him, they conceal the object and tell the child that the desired object has disappeared. The child may be fooled a couple of times, but soon he knows the real situation and learns to speak untruths. The fact that, by nature a person is truthful, is a law that is discovered. Many other principles of ethics are similarly discovered. They are not arbitrarily framed by someone. In Bharat, these principles are termed *Dharma* – the laws of life. All those principles which bring about harmony, peace and progress in the life of mankind are included in this term *Dharma*. On the sound basis of *Dharma* then, we must proceed with the analysis of life as an integral whole.

When nature is channelised according to the principles of *Dharma*, we have culture and civilisation. It is indeed this culture which will enable us to sustain and sublimate the life of mankind. *Dharma* is translated here as law. The English word ‘religion’ is not the correct translation for ‘*Dharma*’.

As pointed out earlier, an integrated life is not only the foundation and the underlying principle of culture, but also its aims and ideals.

## **Happiness Of An Individual**

We have thought of life as integrated not only in the case of collective or social life but also in the individual life. Normally, an individual is thought of in the physical bodily form. Physical comfort and luxury are considered happiness. But we know that mental worry destroys bodily happiness. Everyone desires physical comfort. But if a person is imprisoned, and there he is given the finest of foods, will he be happy? A person does not experience joy on getting nice food if this is also accompanied by a few abuses. There

is a well-known incident in the Mahabharata. When Lord Krishna went to Hastinapura as an emissary of the Pandavas, Duryodhana invited him to enjoy his hospitality. Lord Krishna declined his invitation and went instead to Vidura's home. Overjoyed by the visit of this much-revered guest, Vidura's wife served the banana skins while throwing away the kernel. But Lord Krishna enjoyed even the meal of banana skin. That is why it is said, "Even a modest meal served with dignity and affection, tastes better than the best delicacies served with disrespect". It is necessary, therefore, to take note of mental happiness as well.

Similarly, there is an intellectual happiness which must also be considered. Even after a person gets comforts for the body and prominence, affection, etc., which please the mind, but if he is involved in some intellectual confusion, he is reduced to a state almost similar to madness. And what is madness itself? A lunatic may have all physical comforts, he may be perfectly healthy and properly cared for by his relatives, but he does not possess intellectual happiness. Intellectual peace is also essential and important. We will have to take all these things into consideration.

### **Vote, Bread And Happiness**

Body, mind, intelligence and the soul - these four make up an individual. But these are integrated. We cannot think of each part separately. The confusion that has arisen in the West, is due to the fact that they have treated each of the above aspects of a human being separately, and without any relation to the rest. When there was movement for a democratic structure, they proclaimed, "Man is a political animal", and therefore his political aspirations must be attended to. Why should only one person be the king and all others his subjects? Let everyone rule. In order to satisfy this political man, they gave him the right to vote. Now he did get the right to vote, but at the same time other rights diminished. Then the question arose, "The voting right is nice, but what about food? What if there is nothing to eat?"

They wondered. "Now that you have the voting right, you are the king. Why need you worry?" But man replied, "What shall I do with the State if I don't get any food? I have no use of this voting right. I want bread first." Then came Karl Marx and said, "Yes, bread is the most important thing. The State belongs to the 'haves'. So let us fight for bread." He saw man as primarily made up of body, wanting bread. But those who followed the path shown by Karl Marx came to realise that they had neither bread nor

voting rights.

At the opposite end, there is the U.S.A. There is both bread as well as voting rights. Even then, there is lack of peace and happiness. The U.S.A. tops the list in number of suicides, number of mental patients, and number of persons using tranquillisers to get sleep. People are puzzled as to the cause of this new situation. Man obtained bread, he got his voting right, still there is no peace, no happiness. Now they want back their peaceful sleep. Sound and undisturbed sleep is a scarce commodity in present day America. The thinkers are coming to realise that there lies somewhere, a fundamental lacuna in their system of life due to which they are not happy, even after they have attained so much prosperity and affluence.

### ***Bharatiya Approach To Life***

The reason is that they have not thought of the integrated human being. In our country, we have thoroughly considered this matter. That is why, we have stated that progress of man means simultaneous progress of the body, mind, intellect and soul of man. Often it has been propagated that *Bharatiya* culture thinks of salvation of the soul, that it does not bother about the rest. This is wrong. We do think of the soul, but it is not true that we do not consider body, mind and intellect of much importance. Others gave importance to the body alone. Therefore, our attention to the soul appears unique. With the passage of time, this created an impression that we are concerned only with the soul and not with other aspects of the human being. A young, unmarried boy cares for his mother. But after marriage, he cares both for his wife, as well as his mother, and discharges his responsibilities towards both of them. Now if anyone says that this man has no love for his mother, it would be untrue. A wife loves only her husband at first, but after the birth of a child, she loves both her husband and child. Sometimes an unthoughtful husband feels that his wife neglects him after the birth of their child. But this is generally not correct. If that were true then the wife has certainly slipped in her duty.

### ***Four Purusharthas***

Similarly, while we recognise the need to pay attention to the soul, we do not neglect the body. *Upanishads* declare in unambiguous words नाऽङ्गमात्मा बलहीनेन, लभङ्गः *i.e.* a weakling cannot realise the Self. Again शरीरमाद्यं अस्तु धर्मसाधनम् *i.e.* the body is truly the primary instrument to discharge the

responsibilities that *Dharma* enjoins. The fundamental difference between our position and that of the West, is that whereas they have regarded the body and the satisfaction of its desires as the aim, we regard the body as an instrument for achieving our aims. We have recognised the importance of the body only in this light. The satisfaction of our bodily needs is necessary, but we don't consider this to be the sole aim of all our efforts. Here in Bharat, we have placed before ourselves the ideal of the four-fold responsibilities of catering to the needs of body, mind, intellect and soul, with a view to achieve the integrated progress of man. *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Karma* and *Moksha* are the four kinds of *Purusharthas* (पुरुषार्थ) – human effort. *Purushartha* means effort which befit a man. The longings for *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kama* and *Moksha* are inborn in man, and the satisfaction of these gives him joy (आनंद). Of these four efforts too, we have thought in an integrated way. Even though *Moksha* has been considered the highest of these *Purusharthas*, efforts for *Moksha* alone are not considered to bring benefit to the soul. On the other hand, a person who engages in action, while remaining unattached to its fruits, is said to achieve *Moksha* inevitably and earlier.

*Artha* (अर्थ) includes what are known as political and economic policies. According to the ancients, it used to include Justice and Punishment as well as Economics (दण्डनीति तथा वार्ता). *Kama* relates to the satisfaction of various natural desires. *Dharma* includes all those rules, fundamental principles and ethical codes, in accordance with which all the activities in respect of *Artha* and *Kama* are to be carried out, and all the goals thereof to be achieved. This alone will ensure progress in an integrated and harmonious manner, and lead ultimately to *Moksha*.

## **Importance Of *Dharma***

Thus, even though *Dharma* regulates *Artha* and *Kama*, all the three are interrelated and mutually complementary. *Dharma* helps achieve *Artha*. Even in business, one requires honesty, restraint, truthfulness, etc., which are the attributes of *Dharma*. Without these qualities, one cannot earn money. It must be admitted that *Dharma* is instrumental in attaining *Artha* and *Kama*. Americans proclaimed, “Honesty is the best business policy”. In Europe, they said, “Honesty is the best policy”. We go one step forward and assert “Honesty is not a policy but a principle”, i.e. we believe in *Dharma* not just because it is instrumental in acquiring *Artha*, but because it is a fundamental principle of civilised life.

*Kama* too can be attained only through *Dharma*. Having produced the material things, such as nice food, when, where, how, and in what measure it will be used, can be determined only by *Dharma*. If a sick person eats food meant for a healthy one and *vice versa*, both of them will be at a disadvantage. *Dharma* helps in restraining the natural tendencies of man, whereby he is able to determine what is beneficial to him, apart from what is pleasurable. Hence, *Dharma* is given the foremost place in our culture.

*Dharma* is of primary importance, but we should not forget that it is not possible to practise *Dharma* in the absence of *Artha*. There is a saying, “What sin will not be committed by one who is starving? Those who have lost everything become ruthless”. Driven by hunger, even a *Rishi* like Vishwamitra broke into the house of a hunter and ate the flesh of a dog. Therefore, we are enjoined to see that there is enough wealth created continuously, since wealth also strengthens *Dharma*. Similarly, the government has to maintain law and order and prevent chaos which definitely destroys *Dharma*. At the time of chaos, the law of the jungle prevails where the strong feed upon the weak. Therefore, stability of the State is also essential for the prevalence of *Dharma*.

In order to do this, education, character-building, spread of idealism, and suitable economic structures are all necessary.

### ***Artha And Kama Through Dharma***

*Artha* is inclusive of political aspects of life as well. Excessive power of the State is also harmful for *Dharma*. It was said that a king should be neither too harsh nor too soft with his people. Excessive reliance on harsh measures produces a feeling of revolt in people. When the State usurps the rightful place of *Dharma*, then there is this evil of the preponderance of power of the State. *Dharma* suffers thereby. This is the reason for the decline of *Dharma* in ruthless States.

When the State acquires all powers, political and economic, the result is a decline of *Dharma*. In this way, if the State has unlimited powers, the whole society looks towards the State for everything. Officers of the Government neglect their duties and develop vested interests. These are all signs of the preponderance of powers of the State, whereby *Dharma* suffers a setback. Hence *Artha* should not be allowed to acquire a hold in either of these two ways.

*Kama* too has been considered on the same lines. If the physical needs are neglected, and desires entirely suppressed, *Dharma* does not grow. *Dharma* cannot be observed if one has no food to eat. If the fine arts, which satisfy the mind, are altogether stopped, then the civilising influence on people will not be present. The mind will become perverse and *Dharma* neglected. On the other hand, if greediness of the gluttons of Rome or sensuousness of Yayati prevails, then duties will be forgotten. Hence *Kama* too must be pursued in consonance with *Dharma*.

We have thus considered the life of an individual in a thorough and integrated manner. We have set the aim of developing body, mind, intellect as well as soul in a balanced way. We have tried to satisfy the manifold aspirations of man, taking care that efforts to satisfy two different aspirations are not mutually conflicting. This is the integrated picture of the four-fold aspirations for an individual. This concept of a complete human being, an integrated individual, is both our goal as well as our path.

What should be the relation of this integrated human being with the society, and how the interests of the society should be promoted, will be discussed tomorrow.

23<sup>rd</sup> April, 1965.

## Lecture 3

### Harmony Between The Individual And The Collectivity

Yesterday we considered man as an individual. There are different aspects to an individual's personality, different levels of needs for an individual in order to develop a complete personality. To satisfy the needs progressively but simultaneously at all levels, certain specific kinds of efforts (पुरुषार्थ) are needed. These, too, were considered. But man does not exist merely as an individual. The individual comprising body, mind, intellect and soul is not limited to a singular 'I' but is also inseparably related to the plural 'We'. Therefore, we must also think of the group or the society.

### Theories About Society

It is a simple truth that society is a group of men. But how did society come into being? Many views have been put forward by philosophers. Those propounded in the West and on which the Western socio-political structure is based, can be broadly summarised as, "Society is a group of individuals who, having entered into an agreement among themselves, brought it into being". This view is known as the 'Social Contract Theory'. Individual is given greater importance in this view. If there are any differences in different Western views, these pertain only to the questions, namely, "If the individual produced a society, then, in whom does the residual power remain vested – in the society or the individual? Does the individual have the right to change the society? Can the society impose a variety of regulations on the individual and claim a right to the allegiance of the individual to itself? Or is the individual free in regard to these questions?"

### Individual Versus Society

There is a controversy in the West on this question. Some have advocated the supremacy of the society and from this a conflict has arisen. The view that individuals have brought the society into being is fundamentally incorrect. It is true that society is composed of a number of individuals. Yet it is not created by the individuals, nor does it come into being by the mere coming together of a number of individuals.

In our view, society is self-born. Like an individual, society comes into existence in an organic way. People do not produce society. It is not a

sort of club, or some joint-stock company, or a registered cooperative society. In reality, society is an entity with its own "SELF", its own life; it is a sovereign being like an individual; it is an organic entity. We have not accepted the view that society is some arbitrary association. It has its own life. Society too has its body, mind, intellect and soul. Some Western psychologists are beginning to accept this truth. McDougal has propounded a new branch of psychology called "group mind". He has accepted that the group has its own mind, its own psychology, its own methods of thinking and action.

A group has its feelings too. These are not exactly similar to the individual's feelings. Group feelings cannot be considered a mere arithmetical addition of individual feeling. Group strength too, is not a mere sum of individual strength. The intellect, emotions, energies and strength of a group are fundamentally different from those of an individual. Therefore, at times it is experienced that even a weakling, despite his individual weak physique, turns out to be a heroic member of society. Sometimes an individual may be ready to put up with an affront to his personal self, but is unwilling to tolerate an insult to his society. A person may be ready to forgive and forget a personal abuse to him, but the same man loses his temper if you abuse his society. It is possible that a person who is of a high character in his personal life, is unscrupulous as a member of society. Similarly, an individual can be good in his social life, but cannot be so in his personal life. This is a very important point.

If we analyse this situation, we shall discover that the modes of thinking of an individual and of a society are not always the same. These two do not bear an arithmetical relation. If a thousand good men gather together, it cannot be said for certain that they think similarly of good things.

### **Collective Mentality**

An average Indian student at present is a mild and meek young man. Compared to an average student of twenty years ago, he is weaker and milder in every way. But when a score of such students get together, the situation becomes different. Then they indulge in all sorts of irresponsible actions. Thus, a single student appears disciplined, but a group of students becomes undisciplined. We shall have to consider why this change comes about. This is known as mob-mentality, as distinct from individual mentality. This mob-mentality is a small aspect of mind. When a group of persons

collect for a short time, the collective mentality obtained in that group is known as mob-mentality. But society and social mentality evolve over a much longer period. There is a thesis that when people live together in a group for a long time, then by historical tradition and association, and also by continued intercourse, they begin to think similarly and have similar customs. It is true that some uniformity is brought about by staying together. Friendship arises between two persons of similar inclination. However, a nation or a society does not spring up from mere co-habitation.

### **Why Mighty Nations Of Antiquity Perished?**

It is known that some ancient nations disappeared. The ancient Greek nation came to an end. Similarly, Egyptian civilisation disappeared. Babylonian and Syrian civilisations are a matter of history. Cynthians perished. Was there ever a time when the citizens of those nations stopped living together? It was only the fact that there were wide differences among the people that led to the downfall of these nations.

Greece in the past produced Alexander and Herodotus, Ulysses and Aristotle, Socrates and Plato, and the present day Greece is inhabited by people of the same hereditary stock. There was no interruption in their heredity, because there never was a time when the whole of Greece was devoid of human population and when a new race inhabited that country. Such a thing never happened. Father and son tradition of old Greece was never interrupted. It is possible to trace the ancestry of present day Greeks to the old Greeks, some 250 to 500 generations back. Despite all this, the old Greek nation is non-existent. So also, the old Egyptian nation is no longer there. New nations have arisen in those places. How did this happen? This simple fact is indisputable that nations do not come into existence by mere co-habitation. There was never a time in the lives of the citizens of these decadent nations, when they stopped living in a group. On the other hand, Israeli Jews lived for centuries with other peoples, scattered far and wide, yet they did not lose their identity in the societies in which they lived. It is clear, therefore, that the source of national feeling is not in staying on a particular piece of land, but in something else.

### **What Is A Nation?**

That source is in the goal which is put before the people. When a

group of persons live with a goal, an ideal, a mission and look upon a particular piece of land as motherland, this group constitutes a Nation. If either of the two - an ideal and a motherland - is not there, then there is no Nation. There is a 'Self' in the body, the essence of the individual; upon the severance of its relation with the body, a person is said to die. Similarly there is this idea, ideal, or fundamental principle of a Nation, its soul. Although, it is believed that man takes birth again and again, yet the reborn person is a different individual. They are treated as two separate beings. The same soul leaves one body and enters another, but the former and the latter are two different individuals. The end of a person is nothing but the departure of his soul from his body. The other components of the body also undergo change. From childhood to old age, there is a drastic change. The biologists tell us that in the course of a few years, every cell of our body is replaced by a new one. A variety of changes takes place. Because the soul resides in the body without interruption, the body continues its existence. Such a relation is known as 'The law of Identity' in logic. It is due to this identity that we admit the continued existence of an entity. In this connection, a nice illustration of a barber's razor is sometimes advanced.

Once while shaving a customer, a barber prided in his razor being 60 years old. His father too had worked with the same razor. The customer was surprised, especially because the handle was quite shiny and new in appearance. "Why is the handle so shiny? How have you preserved the brightness for sixty years?" he asked. The barber too, was amused with this. "Is it possible to preserve the handle in a brand new appearance for sixty years? It has been replaced only six months ago" he replied. Naturally, the customer was curious, and asked how old is the blade?" "Three years", was the reply. In brief, the handle was replaced, the blade was also replaced, but the razor remained old. Its identity was intact. Similarly, a nation too has a soul. There is a technical name for it. In the "Principles and Policies" adopted by the Jana Sangh, this name is mentioned. The word is *Chiti* (चिति) According to McDougal, it is the innate nature of a group. Every group of persons has an innate nature. Similarly, every society has an innate nature, which is inborn, and is not the result of historical circumstances.

A human being is born with a soul. Human personality, soul and character are all distinct from one another. Personality results from a cumulative effect of all the actions, thoughts, and impressions of an individual. But the soul is unaffected by this history. Similarly, national culture is continuously modified and enlarged by historic reasons and

circumstances. Culture does include all those things which, by the association, endeavours, and the history of the society, have come to be held as good and commendable, but these are not added on to *Chiti*. *Chiti* is fundamental and is central to the nation from its very beginning. *Chiti* determines the direction in which the Nation is to advance culturally. Whatever is in accordance with *Chiti* is included in culture.

### ***Chiti – Culture - Dharma***

By way of an illustration, consider the story of the Mahabharata. The Kauravas were defeated, and the Pandavas had won. Why did we hold the conduct of the Pandavas as *Dharma*? Or why was this battle not considered just a battle for a kingdom? The praise for Yudhishthira and the dishonour heaped on Duryodhana are not a result of political causes. Krishna killed his uncle Kansa, the established king of the times. Instead of branding this as a revolt, we consider Krishna as an *avatar* of God, and Kansa as an *asura*.

Rama was assisted in his invasion of Lanka by Vibhishana, brother of Ravana. Such conduct of Vibhishana instead of being branded as treason, is considered good and exemplary. He betrayed his brother and his king, even as Jaichand had done later on. He might be branded as a ‘quisling’. But Vibhishana is not called ‘quisling’ by anyone. On the contrary, he is praised highly for his conduct, and Ravana’s actions are disapproved. Why is this so? The reason behind this is not political.

If there is any standard for determining the merits and demerits of a particular action, it is this *Chiti*: whatever is in accordance with our nature or *Chiti* is approved and added on to the culture. These things are to be cultivated. Whatever is against *Chiti* is discarded as perversion, undesirable and is to be avoided. *Chiti* is the touchstone on which each action, each attitude is tested, and determined to be acceptable or otherwise. *Chiti* is the soul of the Nation. It is on the foundation of this *Chiti* (soul) that a Nation arises and becomes strong and virile. And it is this *Chiti* that is manifested in the action of every great man of a Nation.

An individual is also an instrument in bringing forth the soul of the Nation’s *Chiti*. Thus, apart from his own self, an individual also represents his Nation. Not only that, but he also mans the various institutions that are created for the fulfillment of the national goal. Therefore he represents these

too. The groups larger than Nation such as ‘mankind’ are also represented by him. In short, an individual has a multitude of aspects, but they are not conflicting; there is cooperation, unity and harmony in them. A system based on the recognition of this mutually complementary nature of the different ideals of mankind, their essential harmony, a system which devises laws, which removes disharmony, and enhances their mutual usefulness and cooperation, alone can bring peace and happiness to mankind, and can ensure steady development.

### **“Institution” – A Means To Fulfil National Needs**

According to Darwin’s theory, living beings develop various organs as per the requirements dictated by circumstances. In our *shastras*, it was stated slightly differently, that the soul constructs, using the strength of *prana*, various organs as the need is felt for the purpose of continuing life. Just as the soul produced these different organs in the body, so also in the Nation, many different organs are produced as instruments to achieve national goals. Like various departments in a factory, such as buildings, machinery, sales, production, maintenance, etc., nations also produce different departments which are called institutions. These institutions are created to fulfil the need of the Nation. Family, castes, guilds, (which are known as trade unions), etc. are such institutions. Property and marriage are also institutions. Formerly there were no marriages. Later on, some *Rishi* established this practice of marriage. Similarly, *Gurukul* and *Rishikul* were institutions. In the same way, the State is also an institution. The Nation creates it. A lot of trouble in the West is due to the fact that they confused the State with the Nation, they considered the State synonymous with the Nation. Truly speaking, Nation and State are not the same. In our country, the State was produced as per the social contract theory. Formerly there was no State or king. The Mahabharata describes that in *Kritayuga*, there was no State or king. Society was sustained and protected mutually by practicing *Dharma*.

### **State And Society**

Later on, interruption and disorganisation set in, greed and anger dominated. *Dharma* was on the decline and the rule of ‘Might is Right’ prevailed. The *Rishis* were perturbed over the developments. They all went to *Brahma* to seek counsel. *Brahma* gave them a treatise on ‘Law and the Functions of the State’, which he himself had written. At the same time he asked Manu to become the first king. Manu declined, saying that a king will

have to punish other persons, put them in jail and so on; he was not prepared to commit all these sins. Thereupon Brahma said, "Your actions in the capacity of a king will not constitute sin, as long as they are aimed at securing conditions under which the society can live peacefully and according to *Dharma*. This will be your duty, your *Dharma*. Not only that, but you will also have a share of the *Karma* of your subjects, whereby you will gain *Dharma* considerably if your subjects maintain conduct according to *Dharma*". Although it is not explicitly stated here, I believe that if the society under any king committed sin, a part of that too, must automatically go to the account of the king. It is not proper if only good things are shared by the king and not the bad ones; both must be shared in the same proportion. Thus the State came into existence as a contract. This contract theory can be applied to the State, but not to the Nation. In the West, it was exactly opposite. Society as a Nation, according to them, was a contract, but the king claimed a divine right and proclaimed himself the sole representative of God. This is wrong. In our country, the king may have been first recognised in antiquity, but the society as a Nation is considered self-born. The State is only an institution.

### **Multiple Group Loyalties**

Similarly, other institutions like the State, are created from time to time, as the need is felt. Every individual is a limb of one or more of these institutions. A person is a member of his family as well as his community; he may also be a member of some association of his fellow professionals, if he pursues a profession. Above all, he is a member of the Nation and Society. If we consider even the larger sphere, he is a member of the whole of mankind, and then the entire universe. Truly speaking, an individual is not merely a single entity, but a plural entity. He is a part of not just one, but a number of institutions. He lives a variety of lives. The most important is that, despite this multiple personality, he can and should behave in a way which does not bring different aspects of his life into mutual conflict, but which is mutually sustaining, complementary and unifying. This quality is inherent in man.

A person who uses this quality properly becomes happy. On the other hand, one who does not do so reaps unhappiness. Such a person will not have a balanced development in life. As an illustration, a man is the son of his mother, the husband of his wife, the brother of his sister, and the father of his son. A single individual is a father and also a son, he is a

brother and also a husband. He has to maintain all these relations with intelligence, understanding and tact. Where a person fails to do so, there is conflict. If he sides with one party, the other feels wronged. The conflict between his wife and his sister, his wife and his mother, result from his inability to behave properly. Thereupon, some of his relations are strained. He is pained because his duties towards his mother and towards his wife clash. When he can resolve this conflict, and fulfil all his obligations properly, it can be said that his development will be integrated.

We do not accept the view that there is any permanent inevitable conflict among the multi-dimensional personality of an individual, and different institutions of the society. If a conflict does exist, it is a sign of decadence, perversion and not of nature or culture. The error in Western thinking lies in the fact that some people there believe that human progress is a result of this fundamental conflict. Therefore, they consider the conflict between the individual and the State as a natural occurrence, and on the same basis, they also theorised on the inevitability of class conflict.

### **Evolutions Of *Varna* System**

Classes do exist in a society. Here too, there were castes, but we had never accepted conflict between one caste and another as a fundamental concept underlying it. The four castes, according to our conception, are thought of as analogous to the different limbs of the *Virat-Purusha*. It was suggested that the Brahmins were created from the head of the *Virat-Purusha*, the *Kshatriyas* from his hands, the *Vaishyas* from his abdomen and the *Sudras* from his legs. If we analyse this concept we are faced with the question of whether there can arise any conflict between the head, arms, stomach and legs of the same *Virat-Purusha*. If conflict is fundamental, the body cannot be maintained. There cannot be any conflict in the different parts of the same body. On the contrary, 'One Man' prevails. The limbs are not only complementary to one another, but even further, there is individuality, unity. There is a complete identity of interests, identity of belonging. The origin of the caste system was on the above basis, and if this idea is not kept alive, the castes, instead of being complementary, can produce conflict. But then this is a distortion. It is not a systematic arrangement. Rather there is a lack of any plan, any arrangement. This is, indeed, the present condition of our society.

This process of deterioration can set in the various institutions of a

society due to a variety of reasons. If the soul of the society weakens, then all the different limbs of the society will grow feeble and ineffective. Any particular institution may be rendered useless or even harmful. Besides, the need and the usefulness of any particular institution may change with time, place and circumstances. While examining the present state of an institution, we ought, at the same time, to think of what it should be like. Mutual complementarity and a sense of unity alone can be the standard of proper conduct. Family, Community, Trade Union, *Gram Panchayat*, *Janapada*, State and such other institutions are various limbs of the Nation and even of mankind. They are interdependent, mutually complementary. There should be a sense of unity through all of them. For this very reason, there should be a tendency towards mutual accommodation in them, instead of conflict or opposition.

### **State Is Not Supreme**

The State is one of several institutions, an important one, but it is not above all others ( सर्वोपरि ) One of the major reasons for the problems of the present-day world is that almost everyone thinks of the State to be synonymous with society. At least in practice, they consider the State as the sole representative of society. Other institutions have declined in their effectiveness, while the State has become dominant to such an extent, that all the powers are gradually being centralised in the State.

We had not considered the State to be the sole representative of the Nation. Our national life continued uninterruptedly even after the State went into the hands of foreigners. The Persian nation came to an end with their loss of independence. In our country, there were foreign rulers now and then in various parts of the country. At some time, the Pathans seized the throne of Delhi, and then the Turks, the Mughals and the British too established their rule. Despite all this, our national life went on, because the State was not its centre. If we had considered State as the centre, we would have been finished as a Nation long time ago. In some tales for children, it is described how an evil spirit resided in a parrot and to kill the evil spirit one had to kill that parrot. Those Nations whose life centred in the State were finished with the end of the State. On the other hand, where State was not believed central to its life, the Nation survived the transfer of political power.

This had its bad effects also. The late Dr. Ambedkar had said that

our *Gram Panchayats* were so strong that we neglected the throne of Delhi. We did not remain alert as regards the State, as much as we ought to have done, thinking that Nation's life did not depend on the State. We forgot that, though it may be central, the State is definitely an important institution serving some needs of the Nation like a limb of the body. It is possible to pluck a hair without much harm, but along with the hair, if some skin is also removed, and a little further, if the head too is cut off, then there will be great loss for the body. Therefore, the body must be protected. Although the various limbs of the body are not absolutely indispensable, yet each of them serves an important purpose. From the same standpoint, State too, should have been deemed important in the life of a Nation. There were persons who had paid attention to this aspect. It was for this reason that the great teacher of Shivaji, Samarth Ramdas Swami, directed him to establish his kingdom. *Dharma* wields its own power. *Dharma* is important in life. Shri Ramdas would as well have preached to Shivaji to become a mendicant and spread *Dharma* following his own example. But on the contrary, he inspired Shivaji to extend his rule, because State too is an important institution of society. However, to consider something important is different from saying that it is supreme (सर्वोपरि) The State is not supreme. The question arises, then, that if the State is not of fundamental importance, what is it that is absolutely important. Let us consider this question.

### ***Dharma Sustains The Society***

We shall have to examine the reasons why the State was established. No one will dispute that the State must have some specific aim, some ideal. Then this aim or ideal must be considered of highest importance, rather than the State which is created to fulfil this ideal. As a watchman is not deemed greater than the treasure he is supposed to protect, so is the case with the treasurer. The State is brought into existence to protect the Nation, and to produce and maintain conditions in which the ideals of the Nation can be translated into reality. The ideals of the Nation constitute *Chiti*, which is analogous to the soul of an individual. It requires some effort to comprehend *Chiti*. The laws that help manifest and maintain *Chiti* of a Nation are termed *Dharma* of that Nation. Hence, it is this '*Dharma*' that is supreme.

*Dharma* is the repository of the Nation's soul. If *Dharma* is destroyed, the Nation perishes. Anyone who abandons *Dharma*, betrays the Nation.

*Dharma* is not confined to temples or mosques. Worship of God is only a part of *Dharma*. *Dharma* is much wider. In the past, temples had served as an effective medium to educate people in their *Dharma*. However, just as schools themselves do not constitute knowledge, so also temples do not constitute *Dharma*. A child may attend school regularly and yet may remain uneducated. So also, it is possible that a person may visit a temple or mosque without a break, and yet he may not know his *Dharma*. To attend a temple or mosque constitutes a part of a religion, sect, creed, but not necessarily *Dharma*. Many misconceptions have originated from faulty English translations, and the most harmful of them is due to the confusion of *Dharma* with religion.

### ***Dharma* And Religion Are Different**

On the one hand, we used the word religion as synonymous with *Dharma*, and on the other hand, increasing ignorance, neglect of our society and *Dharma*, and greater acceptance of European life, became the outstanding features of our education. As a result, all the characteristics of a narrow religion, especially as practiced in the West, were attributed automatically to the concept of *Dharma* also. Since in the West, injustice and atrocities were perpetrated, and bitter conflicts and battles were fought in the name of religion, all these were listed *en bloc* on the debit side of *Dharma*. We felt that in the name of *Dharma* also, battles were fought. However, battles of religion and battles for *Dharma* are two different things. Religion means a creed or a sect; it does not mean *Dharma*. *Dharma* is a very wide concept. It is concerned with all aspects of life. It sustains Society. Even further, it sustains the whole world. That which sustains, is *Dharma*.

The fundamental principles of *Dharma* are eternal and universal. Yet, their implementation may differ according to time, place and circumstances. It is a fact that a human being requires food for maintaining his body. However, what a particular person should eat, in how much quantity, at what intervals, all these are decided according to circumstances. It is possible at times that even fasting is advisable. If a typhoid patient is given normal food, the consequences may be disastrous. For such a person, keeping away from food is necessary. Similarly, the principles of *Dharma* have to be adapted to changing times and place.

Some rules are temporary and others are valid for longer periods. There are some rules regulating our conduct at this meeting. One of the

rules is that I speak and you listen to me with attention. If in contravention of this rule, you start conversing with one another or addressing the gathering at the same time, then there will be disorder; our work will not progress; the meeting will not be sustained. It can be said that you have not observed your *Dharma*. Thus it is our *Dharma* that we observe the rules by which the meeting proceeds smoothly. But this rule is applicable only as long as this meeting lasts. If the meeting is over and you do not speak even after reaching home, a different problem will crop up. Your family might have to call in a doctor. It is essential to observe the rules of the home once you reach there. The complete treatise on the rules in general, and their philosophical basis, constitute what we mean by *Dharma*. These rules cannot be arbitrary. They should be such as to sustain and further the existence and progress of the entity which they serve. At the same time, they should be in agreement with, and supplementary to, the larger framework of *Dharma*, of which they form a part. For instance, when we form a registered society, we have the right to frame the rules and regulations, but these cannot be contradictory to the constitution of the society. The constitution itself cannot violate the Societies Registration Act. The Act has to be within the provision of the constitution of the country. In other words, the constitution of the country is a fundamental document which governs the formulation of all acts in the country. In Germany, the constitution is known as the 'Basic Law'.

### **Constitution Cannot Be Arbitrary**

Is the constitution too, not subject to some principles of a more fundamental nature? Or is it a product of any arbitrary decisions of a Constituent Assembly? On serious consideration, it will be clear that even the constitution has to follow certain basic principles of Nature. The constitution is for sustaining the Nation. Instead, if it is instrumental in its deterioration, then it must be pronounced improper. It must be amended. The amendment is also not solely dependent on majority opinion. Nowadays, the majority is much talked of. Is the majority capable of doing anything and everything? Is the action of the majority always just and proper? No. In the West, the king used to be the sovereign. Thereafter, when royalty was deprived of its so-called divine rights, sovereignty was proclaimed to be with the people. Here in our country, neither the kings, nor the people, nor the parliament have had absolute sovereignty. Parliament cannot legislate arbitrarily.

It is said about the British Parliament that it is sovereign and can do

anything. They say that “British Parliament can do everything except make a woman a man and vice versa”. But is it possible for the Parliament to legislate that every Englishman must walk on his head? It is not possible. Can they pass an act that everyone in England must present himself before the local authority once everyday? They cannot. England has no written constitution. They have high regards for their tradition. But their traditions too have undergone change. What is the basis for making changes in their traditions? Whichever tradition proved an obstacle in the progress of England was discarded. Those which were helpful in the progress were consolidated.

Traditions are respected everywhere, just as in England. We have a written constitution, but even this written constitution cannot go contrary to the traditions of this country. In as much as it does go contrary to our traditions, it is not fulfilling *Dharma*. That constitution which sustains the Nation is in tune with *Dharma*. *Dharma* sustains the Nation. Hence we have always given prime importance to *Dharma*, which is considered sovereign. All other entities, institutions or authorities derive their power from *Dharma*, and are subordinate to it.

## **We Need A Unitary Constitution**

If we examine our Constitution from the point of view of the growth of the Nation, we find that our Constitution needs amendment. We are one Nation, one people. That is why we did not entertain any special rights on the basis of language, province, caste, religion, etc., but gave everyone equal citizenship. There are separate States. Yet there is no separate citizenship of State and of Union. We are all citizens of Bharat. By the same token, we have denied the right to secede to any individual State. Not only that, the power to demarcate the boundaries of States and to choose their names is vested in the Parliament and not in the Assemblies. This is as it should be, in tune with the nationalism and tradition of Bharat. However, despite all this, we made our Constitution federal, whereby what we have adopted in practice, we have rejected in principle. In a federation, the constituent units have their own sovereignty. But these powers are given to the Union. It has no power of its own. Thus the federal constitution considers the individual States as fundamental powers, and the Centre as merely a federation of States. This is contrary to the truth. It runs counter to the unity and indivisibility of Bharat. There is no recognition of the idea of *Bharatmata*, our sacred motherland, as enshrined in the hearts of our people. According to the first para of the Constitution “India that is Bharat will be a Federation

of States”, i.e. *Bihar Mata, Banga Mata, Punjab Mata, Kannada Mata, Tamil Mata*, are all put together to make *Bharatmata*. This is ridiculous. We have thought of the provinces as limbs of *Bharatmata* and not as individual mothers. Therefore, our Constitution should be Unitary instead of Federal.

## **Decentralisation Of Power**

A Unitary State does not mean concentration of all powers in the Centre, just as the head of the family does not have all the powers with him even though all the transactions are carried out in his name. Others also share the executive powers. In our body also, does the soul possess all powers? Thus, a Unitary State does not mean a highly autocratic centre, nor does it entail the elimination of provinces. The provinces will have various executive powers. Even the various entities below the provincial level, such as the *Janapadas*, will have suitable powers. The *Panchayats* had a very important position. Nobody could dissolve *Panchayats*. Today, however, our constitution does not have any place for these *Panchayats*. There are no powers with these *Panchayats* in their own right. They exist at the mercy of the States only as delegated authorities. It is necessary that their powers be considered fundamental. In this way, the decentralisation of power will be accomplished. The authority will be distributed to the lowest level, and will be fully decentralised. At the same time, all those entities of power will be centred around the Unitary State. This arrangement will embody *Dharma*.

If we carry this concept of *Dharma* even further, not only the State and the Nation, but the nature of the whole of mankind will have to be considered. In other words, the constitution of a Nation cannot be contrary to the natural laws. There are a number of norms of behaviour which are not found in any statute book, yet they do exist. At times, they are even stronger and more binding than any statutory law. The precept that one should respect one's parents is not written in any law. The present day governments which are turning out variety of laws, day in and day out, have not passed a law to this effect. Still, people respect their parents. Those who do not are criticised. If tomorrow there arises a discussion, even in a court, it will be generally accepted that as long as a person does not attain majority, he should accept his parents' decisions.

## ***Dharma Means Innate Law***

Thus the fundamental law of human nature is the standard for deciding the propriety of behaviour in various situations. We have termed this very law as *Dharma*. The nearest equivalent English term for *Dharma* can be 'Innate law', which, however, does not express the full meaning of *Dharma*. Since *Dharma* is supreme, our ideal of the State has been *Dharma Rajya*. The king is supposed to protect *Dharma*. In olden times, at the coronation ceremony, the king used to recite three times – "There is no authority which can punish me". (A similar claim was made by kings in the Western countries, i.e. it was said, "King can do no wrong", and hence there too, nobody could punish the king). Upon this, the *purohit* used to strike the king on his back with a staff saying, "No, you are subject to the rule of *Dharma*. You are not sovereign." The king used to run around the sacred fire and the *purohit* would follow him striking him with the staff. Thus after completing three rounds, the ceremony would come to an end. Thereby, the king was unambiguously told that he was not an unpunishable sovereign. *Dharma* was above him. That is, even he was subject to *Dharma*. Can the people do whatever they please? It may be contended that democracy means just that. The people can do what they please. But in our country, even if people wish, they are not free to act contrary to *Dharma*. Once a priest was asked, "If God is omnipotent, can he act contrary to *Dharma*? If he cannot, He is not omnipotent!" This was a dilemma. Can God practise *adhharma* or is he not omnipotent? Actually God cannot act contrary to *Dharma*. If he does, then he is not omnipotent. *Adharma* is a characteristic of weakness, not of strength. If fire, instead of emitting heat, dies out, it is no longer strong. Strength lies not in unrestrained behaviour, but in well-regulated action. Therefore, God who is omnipotent is also self-regulated and consequently fully in tune with *Dharma*. God descends in human body to destroy *adhharma* and re-establish *Dharma*, not to act on passing whims and fancies. Hence even God, who can do everything, cannot act contrary to *Dharma*. But, at the risk of being misunderstood, one can say that *Dharma* is even greater than God. The universe is sustained because he acts according to *Dharma*. The king was supposed to be a symbol of Vishnu, in as much as he was the chief protector of *Dharma Rajya*.

## ***Dharma Rajya Is Not A Theocracy***

*Dharma Rajya* does not mean a theocratic State. Let us be very clear on this point. Where a particular sect and its prophet or *guru* rule

supreme, that is a theocratic State. All the rights are enjoyed by the followers of this particular sect. Others either cannot live in that country or at best, enjoy a slave-like, secondary-citizen's status. The Holy Roman Empire had this basis. The same concept was existing behind "*khalifat*". Muslim kings the world over used to rule in the name of *Khalifa*. After the First World War, this came to an end. Now efforts are afoot to revive it. Pakistan is the most recent theocratic State. They call themselves an Islamic State. There, apart from Muslims, all the rest are second-class citizens. Apart from this difference, there is no other sign of Islam in Pakistan's administration. The *Quran*, *Masjid*, *Roza*, *Id*, *Namaz*, etc., are the same both in Bharat, as well as in Pakistan. There is no need to tie up State and religion. By such a tie-up, there is no increase in an individual's capacity to worship God. The only result is that the State deviates from its duty. This does not happen in *Dharma Rajya*. Rather, there is freedom to worship according to one's own religion. In a theocratic State, one religion has all the rights and advantages, and there are direct or indirect restrictions on all other religions. *Dharma Rajya* accepts the importance of religion for peace, happiness and progress of an individual. Therefore, the State has the responsibility to maintain an atmosphere in which every individual can follow the religion of his choice and live in peace. The freedom to follow one's own religion necessarily requires tolerance for other religions. We know that every kind of freedom has its inherent limits. I have the freedom to swing my hand, but as soon as there is a conflict between my hand and someone else's nose, my freedom has to be restricted. I have no freedom to swing my hand so as to hit another person's nose. Where another person's freedom is likely to be encroached upon, my freedom ends. The freedom of both parties has to be ensured. Similarly, every religion has the freedom to exist. But this freedom extends only as far as it does not encroach upon the religion of others. If such encroachment is carried on, it will have to be condemned as misuse of freedom, and will have to be ended. Such limitations will be required in all aspects of life. *Dharma Rajya* ensures religious freedom, and is not a theocratic State.

### **Secular State A Fallacy**

Nowadays the word 'Secular State' is being used as opposed to a theocratic State. The adoption of this word is a mere imitation of the Western thought-pattern. We had no need to import it. We called it a 'Secular State' to contrast it with Pakistan. There is some misunderstanding arising out of this. Religion was equated with *Dharma*, and then 'Secular State' was meant

to be a State without *Dharma*. Some said, ours is a निधर्मी State (*NiDharn* - without *Dharma*), whereas others trying to find a better sounding word, called it धर्मनिरपेक्ष (*Dharmanirapekha* - indifferent to *Dharma*) State. But all these words are fundamentally erroneous. For a State can neither be without *Dharma* nor can it be indifferent to *Dharma*, just as the fire cannot be without heat. If fire loses heat, it does not remain fire any longer. A State which exists fundamentally to maintain *Dharma*, to maintain law and order, can neither be निधर्मी (*NiDharn*) nor धर्मनिरपेक्ष (*Dharmanirapekha*). If it is, निधर्मी (*NiDharn*), it will be a lawless State, and where there is lawlessness, where is the question of the existence of any State? In other words, the concept of धर्मनिरपेक्ष (धर्मनिरपेक्षता) (*Dharmanirapekshata* - attitude of indifference towards *Dharma*) and State are self-contradictory. State can only be धर्मराज्य (*Dharma Rajya* - rule of *Dharma*) and nothing else. Any other definition will go against the very *raison d'etre* of the State.

## Legislature Versus Judiciary

In a *Dharma Rajya*, the State is not absolutely powerful. It is subject to *Dharma*. We have always vested sovereignty in *Dharma*. Presently there has arisen a controversy. Whether the Parliament is sovereign or the Supreme Court, and whether the Legislature is higher or the Judiciary. This is like a quarrel as to whether the left hand is more important or the right hand? Both are the limbs of the State, the Legislature as well as the Judiciary. Both have distinct functions to perform. In their individual sphere, each is supreme. To consider either one above the other would be a mistake. Yet the legislators say, "We are higher". On the other hand, members of the Judiciary assert that they have a higher authority, since they interpret the laws which the Legislature makes. The Legislature claims to have given powers to the Judiciary. If necessary, the Legislature can change the Constitution. Hence it claims sovereignty. Now, since powers are bestowed by the Constitution, they are talking of amendments to the Constitution. But I believe that even if by a majority the Constitution is amended, it will be against *Dharma*. In reality, both the Legislature and the Judiciary are on an equal plane. Neither the Legislature is higher nor the Judiciary. *Dharma* is higher than both. The Legislature will have to act according to *Dharma*, and the Judiciary too, will have to act according to *Dharma*. *Dharma* will specify limits of both. The Legislature, the Judiciary or the people, none of these is supreme. Some will say "Why ! People are sovereign. They elect." But even the people are not sovereign, because people too, have no right to act against *Dharma*. If an elected government allows people to go against *Dharma* and does not

punish them, then that government is in reality a government of thieves. Even the general will cannot go against *Dharma*. Imagine what will be the situation, if by some manoeuvring, thieves gain a majority in the government and send one from their ranks as the head of executive. What will be the duty of the minority, if the majority is of thieves and elects a thief to rule? The duty clearly will be to remove the representative elected by the majority.

## Majority Is Not Always Right

During the Second World War, when Hitler attacked France, the French army could not stall the onward march of the Nazi troops. The then Prime Minister of France, Marshall Petain, decided to surrender. The French public supported the decision. But de Gaulle escaped to London where he declared that he did not accept the surrender. France is independent and will remain so. From London, he formed a Government of France in exile and eventually liberated France. Now if the majority rule is to be considered supreme, then de Gaulle's action will have to be condemned. He had no right to fight in the name of Independence. De Gaulle derived his right from the fact that the French nation was above the majority public opinion. The national *Dharma* is above all. Independence is *Dharma* for every Nation. It is the duty of every citizen to preserve its Independence, and to strive for regaining it when it is lost. Even in our country, a majority had not risen against the Britishers; only a few had. Some revolutionaries sprang up, some brave people stood and fought. The Lokmanya declared, "Freedom is my Birthright". He did not declare this birthright with the support of a majority or a referendum of the people. Nowadays, people advocate that the merger of Goa should be decided by referendum, that there should be a plebiscite in Kashmir, etc., etc. This is wrong. National unity is our *Dharma*. A decision concerning this cannot be made by plebiscite. This type of a decision has already been taken by nature. Elections and the majority can only decide as to who will form the government. The truth cannot be decided by the majority. What the government will do, will be decided by *Dharma*.

You all know that in the U.S.A., where Americans swear by democracy, Lincoln did not accept the wrong public opinion on the question of the abolition of slavery. When the Southern states declared their intention to secede, Lincoln stood firm and told them: "You have no right to secede even in a democracy". He fought against this and did not allow them to secede. Nor did he tolerate slavery. He did not show readiness for a compromise whereby there might continue partial slavery to accommodate

Southern states. He did not favour the policy of compromise. He categorically declared that the system of slavery was against tradition, the *Dharma*, the principles which were the basis of the American nation. Therefore the system of slavery had to be abolished. When the Southerners decided to secede, he told them, “You cannot secede”. On this point, there was a civil war and Lincoln did not compromise with *adhharma*.

Here in our country, the situation in this regard is very much like the old Hindu marriage, where a married couple could not divorce even if both the parties wished. The principle was that their behaviour should be regulated not by their sweet will but by *Dharma*. The same is the case with the Nation. If the four million people of Kashmir say that they want to secede, if the people of Goa say they want to secede or some say they want the Portuguese to return – all this is against *Dharma*. Of the 450 million people of India, even if 449,999,999 opt for something which is against *Dharma*, this does not become the truth. On the other hand, even if one person stands for something which is according to *Dharma*, that constitutes the truth, because truth resides with *Dharma*. It is the duty of this one person that he treads the path of truth and changes people. It is from this basis that a person derives the right to proceed according to *Dharma*.

Let us understand very clearly that *Dharma* is not necessarily with the majority or with the people. *Dharma* is eternal. Therefore, it is not enough to say, while defining democracy, that it is the government of the people. It has to be a government for the good of the people. What constitutes the good of the people? It is *Dharma* alone which can decide. Therefore, a democratic government, *Jana Rajya*, must also be rooted in *Dharma*, i.e. *Dharma Rajya*. In the definition of democracy, viz. “Government of the people, by the people and for the people”; ‘of’ stands for independence; ‘by’ stands for democracy; and ‘for’ indicates *Dharma*. Therefore, there is true democracy only where there is freedom as well as *Dharma*. धर्मराज्यं *Dharma Rajya* encompasses all these concepts.

24<sup>th</sup> April, 1965.

## Lecture 4

### Economic Structure Suited To National Genius

Yesterday we had discussed the functions of the State in a Nation. According to the *Bharatiya* traditions, a Nation is an organic living entity which has come into existence on its own and has not been made up of, or created by, any group of persons. A Nation brings forth a variety of institutions to fulfil its needs, as well as to give concrete shape to its inner fundamental nature. The State is one of these institutions, which, though an important institution, is not supreme. In our literature, wherever the duties of a king are referred to, his importance is definitely recognised. This is so, perhaps, to make him realise his immense responsibility. He exercises tremendous influence on the lives and character of the people. Hence, he has to give due attention to his own behaviour. Bhishma has said the same thing in the Mahabharata, when he was asked whether circumstances make a king, or a king makes the circumstances. He categorically stated that the king shapes the circumstances (राजा कलस्ङ्क करणम्). Now some persons interpreted this to mean that he considered the king above all. But this is not true. He did not suggest that the king was above *Dharma*. It is true that the king wielded a great deal of influence, and that he was a protector of *Dharma* in society, but the king could not decide what constitutes *Dharma*. He only saw to it that people led their lives according to *Dharma*. In a way, he was equivalent to the present-day executive.

### King is not Above *Dharma*

In a modern state, the executive has the responsibility to execute the laws properly, but it does not enact laws. When the executive does not function with honesty and efficiency, the laws are entirely disregarded, as we may well see around us. And we can well say today, "Executive is responsible for the present evils to a great extent". After all, why has prohibition failed? Who is responsible for its failure? When those very persons, who have been entrusted with the task of implementing prohibition, start taking monthly pay-offs from the bootleggers, how will the prohibition policy succeed? The executive is therefore, responsible for the proper enforcement of the law. This is the meaning of Bhishma's statement. It would be a mistake to interpret it as an acceptance of proven supremacy of a king. If this were so, how was it that the tyrant king Vena was removed by

the *Rishis* and Prithu enthroned in his place? This action by the *Rishis* was never condemned by anyone in history. On the contrary, it was hailed by everyone. When the supremacy of *Dharma* is accepted as a principle, then through the authority of *Dharma*, the *Rishis* derive a right to remove a king who defaults in his duty. Otherwise, it would have been absolutely illegal to remove a king from his throne. Thus, if a king does not act according to *Dharma*, it becomes the duty of everyone to remove him.

In Western countries, either a king was removed by some other king, or people rejected the sovereignty of the king altogether. Their king was a representative of God and could under no circumstances be removed, at least in principle.

### **Autonomous Institutions In Ancient Bharat**

In our socio-political set up, the king and the State were never considered supreme. Not only that, there were other important institutions (besides the State, which was only one of them), to regulate and to help carry on the social life. Those institutions had been organised both on a horizontal and vertical level, i.e. on regional and occupational basis. We had evolved *Panchayats* and *Janapada Sabhas*. The mightiest of the kings did not ever disturb the *Panchayats*. Similarly, there were associations on the basis of trade. These two were never disturbed by the State; on the contrary, their autonomy was recognised. They devised their own rules and regulations in their fields. The *Panchayats* of different communities, *shrenis*, *nigams*, Village *Panchayats*, *Janapada Sabhas* and other such organisations, used to frame their own rules and regulations. The function of the State was mostly to see that these rules were observed by the persons concerned. The State never interfered with the affairs of these associations. Thus, the State was concerned only with some aspects of the life of the society.

Similarly, in the economic field, many institutions are created. We have to think what should be the nature of our economic structure. We must have such an economic system that helps in the development of our humane qualities or civilisation, and enables us to attain a still higher level of all-round perfection. We should have a system which does not overwhelm our humane quality, which does not make us slaves of its own grinding wheels. According to our concept, man attains God-like perfection as a result of development. Therefore, we have to devise such an economic system, to create such infrastructure and to frame such regulations, in which and by

which, the inherent potentialities of man may find their highest fulfilment. Let us consider this point.

### **Economic System For What?**

An economic system must achieve the production of all the basic things essential for the maintenance and development of the people, as well as the protection and development of the Nation. Having satisfied the basic minimum requirements, the question naturally arises whether there should be more production for greater prosperity and happiness. Western societies consider it most essential, and even desirable, to go on continuously and systematically increasing the desires and needs of man. There is no upper limit in this context. Normally, desire precedes the effort to produce the things desired. But now the position is reverse. People are induced to desire and use the things that have been or are being produced. Instead of producing to meet the demand, the search is on for markets for the goods already produced. If the demand does not exist, systematic efforts are made to create demand. This has become the chief characteristic of the Western economic system. Earlier, production followed the demand; now demand follows the production. Consider the use of tea, for example. Tea was not produced because people desired and wanted it. But tea was produced and we were induced to develop a taste for tea. Now tea is a common man's drink. It has become a part of our life. The case of vegetable ghee is similar. Did anyone ever want to use it? It was first produced, and then we were taught to use it. If whatever is manufactured is not consumed, there will be depression. Some of us may remember the Great Depression of 1930-32. There was abundance of goods at that time, but there was no demand. Therefore, factories had to be closed down. Bankruptcy and unemployment were widespread. Thus nowadays, it is most important that what is being produced must be consumed.

### **New Demand Is Located**

The Editor of *Organiser*, an English Weekly, had gone to the U.S.A. for a visit sometime ago. Upon his return, he related an interesting instance. There is a factory which produces "Potato-peelers", a device for peeling potatoes. The production of this factory outstripped the demand for the device. The management of the firm faced the problem of finding some way by which people might be induced to buy more potato-peelers. They called a meeting of all the sales men of the firm. Among the suggestions put

forward, one was to make the colour of the handle similar to that of potato peel, so that along with the peel, the peeler may also be dumped in the garbage, often by mistake. Thus, there may be greater demand. Also, the product was offered in a more attractive packing.

## **Eco-Destructive Consumerism**

Now this economic structure is not merely consumption-oriented, but is clearly leading to destruction. Throw away the old one, and buy a new one! Rather than satisfying the need and demand of the people, to create fresh demand has become the aim of modern economics. Supposing that we need not worry about the limited supply of natural resources, there is yet the question of balance in nature. There is a cyclic relationship in different parts of nature. If one of the three sticks, which stand with mutual support, is removed, the other two will automatically fall. The present economic system and system of production are fast disturbing this equilibrium of nature. As a result, on the one hand, new products are manufactured for satisfying ever increasing desires, and on the other hand, new problems arise every day, threatening the very existence of humanity and civilisation.

It is essential, therefore, to use up that portion of the available natural resources which nature itself will be able to recoup easily. When the fruits are taken, the fruit tree is not injured; it may even be helpful to the tree. However, in the effort to take a greater harvest from the land, chemical fertilisers are used, which in a few years time, will render the land altogether infertile. Lakhs of acres of land lie barren in America due to this factor. How long can this dance of destruction go on?

The industrialist provides for a depreciation fund to replace machines when they are worn out. Then how can we neglect the depreciation fund for nature? From this point of view, it must be realised that the object of our economic system should not be to make extravagant use, but a well-regulated use of available resources. The physical objects necessary for a purposeful, happy and progressive life must be obtained. The Almighty has provided that much. It will not be wise, however, to engage in a blind rat-race of consumption and production as if man is created for the sole purpose of consumption. Engine needs coal for its proper working, but it has not been produced merely to consume coal. On the contrary, it is only proper, always, to see that with the minimum coal consumption, maximum energy is

produced. This is the economic viewpoint. Keeping in view the aim of human life, we must endeavour to see how, with the minimum of fuel, man proceeds to his goal with the maximum speed. Such a system alone can be called civilisation. This system will not think of merely a single aspect of human life, but of all its aspects, including the ultimate aim. This system will be constructive rather than destructive. This system will not thrive on the exploitation of nature, but will sustain nature, and will in turn itself be nourished. Milking, rather than exploitation, should be our aim. The system should be such that overflow from nature is used to sustain our lives.

## **Western Economic Theories**

If such a human objective inspires the economic system, then our thinking on the economic questions will undergo thorough transformation. In the Western economies, whether it is capitalist or socialist, 'Value' has the most important and central position. All economic theories centre around 'Value'. It may be that the analysis of 'Value' is very important from the point of view of the economist, but those social philosophies which are based entirely on 'Value' are far more incomplete, inhuman and to some extent unethical. Take for example, the slogan commonly heard nowadays, "One must earn his bread". Normally communists use this slogan, but even the capitalists are not fundamentally in disagreement with it. If there is any difference between them, it is only as regards who earns and how much. The capitalists consider capital and enterprise as important components of production, and hence if they take a major share of profits, they think it is their due. On the other hand, communists believe only labour to be the main factor in production. Therefore, they concede major share of production to the labourers. Neither of these ideas is correct.

## **Basic Needs To Be Met**

Really speaking, our slogan should be that the one who earns will feed, and every person will have enough to eat. The right to food is a birthright. The ability to earn is a result of education and training. In a society, even those who do not earn must have food. The children and the old, the diseased and the invalids, all must be cared for by society. Every society generally fulfils this responsibility. The social and cultural progress of mankind lies in its readiness to fulfil this responsibility. The economic system must provide for this responsibility. The economic system must provide for this task. Economics as a science does not account for this responsibility. A

man works not for bread alone, but also to shoulder this responsibility. Otherwise, those who have had their meals would no longer work.

Any economic system must provide for the minimum basic necessities of human life to everyone. Food, clothing and shelter constitute, broadly speaking, these basic necessities. Similarly, society must enable the individual to carry out his obligations to society by educating him properly. Lastly, in the event of an individual falling prey to any disease, society must arrange for his treatment and maintenance. If a government provides these minimum requirements, then only it is a rule of *Dharma*. Otherwise, it is a rule of *adharma*. Describing King Dilip, Kalidas had said in *Raghuvansha*, “Being responsible for the maintenance, protection and education of his subjects, he was their true father. Others were merely instrumental in giving them their birth”. The description of King Bharat after whom our country has been named Bharat, also runs similarly, i.e. “By maintaining and protecting his subjects, he was called Bharat”. This is his country, Bharat. If in this country, maintenance and protection are not guaranteed, then the name Bharat is meaningless.

### **Education - A Social Responsibility**

To educate a child is in the interest of society itself. By birth, a child is an animal. He becomes a responsible member of society only by education and culture. To charge fees for something which is in the interest of society itself, is rather odd. If due to their inability to pay the fees, children are left without an education, will the society be able to endure this situation for long? We do not charge fees from trees for sowing the seed and caring for the sapling. On the contrary, we invest our money and efforts. We know that when the tree grows, we shall reap fruits. Education is a similar investment. An educated individual will indeed serve society. On the other hand, it will not be surprising if people grow indifferent to society which leaves them to fend for themselves. Before 1947, in all the princely states in India, no fees were charged for education. The highest education was free. In the *Gurukuls*, even food and lodging were arranged without any charge. The student used to go to society for *Bhiksha*. No householder would refuse *Bhiksha* to the student. In other words, society used to bear the burden of education.

Similarly, it is rather surprising that one has to pay for his medical treatment. In fact, medical treatment also should be free as it was in this

country in the past. Nowadays, one has to pay even to get an entrance to a temple! There is a charge of twenty-five paise to enter to enter the Balaji temple at Tirupati. However, there is a *Dharma darshan* at noon for one hour, during which period the payment of charges is not required. At other times it is as though *adharmar darshan*, when charges are to be paid. The society should guarantee to all its members, minimum requirements for maintenance and progress of every individual. Now the question arises, if everyone is to be guaranteed the minimum necessities, where will the resources for all this come from?

## **Guarantee Of Work**

It is clear that the resources must be produced by our own efforts. Therefore, where a right to a guaranteed minimum is recognised, any individual who does not share in the efforts to produce is a burden to society. Similarly, any system which obstructs the production activity of the people is self-destructive. Such a system will not enable individuals to fulfil their responsibilities. Not only that, but even if the requirements of an individual are met, while he does not share in the efforts, his personality will not develop fully, and his progress as a human being will be distorted and lopsided. Man has a stomach as well as hands. If he has no work for his hands, he will not get happiness even if he gets food to satisfy his hunger. His progress will be obstructed. Just as a barren woman experiences emptiness in life and consequent dissatisfaction, so does a man without work.

The guarantee of work to every able-bodied member of society should be the aim of our economic system. Today we witness a very strange situation. On the one hand, a ten year old child and a seventy-year old man are toiling and on the other hand a youth of twenty-five is driven to suicide for want of work. We shall have to remove this mismanagement. God has given hands to every man, but hands by themselves have a limited capacity to produce. They need the assistance of capital in the form of machines. Labour and capital bear the same relation to each other as that between man and nature. The world is a creation of these two. Neither of them can be neglected.

## **Capital Formation**

For capital formation, it is essential that a part of production be saved from immediate consumption, and be used for further production in

future. Thus, capital can be formed only by restraint on consumption. This is the basis of capital formation to which Karl Marx refers to as 'surplus value' in his treatise. In the capitalist system, the industrialist creates capital with the help of this surplus value. In a socialist system, the State undertakes this task. In both the systems, the entire production is not distributed among the workers. If production is carried on through centralised large-scale industries, the sacrifice on the part of the worker in creating the capital is not given due recognition. The advantage in decentralisation is in the fact that the worker has a sense of direct participation in the management of the surplus value or capital.

## **Machine And The Worker**

Machines are the most common form of capital. Machines were created in order to reduce the content of physical labour in production and to increase the productivity of the worker. Machines, therefore, are an assistant of the worker and not his competitor. However, where the human labour came to be considered as a commodity to be purchased with money, the machine became the competitor of the human being. The principal drawback of the capitalist viewpoint lies in the fact that by making the machine a competitor of human labour, and thereby displacing and subjecting a human being to privations, the very purpose of creating machines has been defeated. Machines cannot be blamed for this. It is the fault of the economic and social system which cannot distinguish between the object and the instrument. It is only after considering the limitations of the machine that one has to decide upon its usefulness. From this point of view, to import machinery from Western countries, where shortage of manpower was the guiding factor in the design of machines, would be a serious mistake. The merits of machines are not independent of time and place. Machines are a product of modern science but not its representatives. Scientific knowledge is not a monopoly of any particular country. But its application has to take into account the particular condition of each country and its requirements. Our machines must not only be tailored for our specific economic needs, but must also, at least, avoid conflict with our socio-political and cultural objectives.

## **The Seven M's**

Professor Visweswarayya has said in one of his books that, while considering the system of production, one must take into account the seven

M's. These are man, material, money, management, motive power, market and machine. The skill and ability of the workers or those who should be provided work must be considered. Easy availability of the required raw material, and the quality and properties of the raw material available cannot be ignored. We must also think of how much money is available as capital. How this capital can be increased and at what rate? How best can it be utilised for maximum production? How much of it should be put in fixed assets and how much should be kept in liquid form? We must also pay attention to the forms of power available in the country, in addition to the human and animal labour. Wind, water, steam, oil, gas, electricity and atomic power can supply the motive power. Of these, which form of power can be obtained, in what quantity without being uneconomic, must be thought of while deciding upon our methods of production. In the same way, managerial skills are also important and deserve due attention. If the ability to co-ordinate the efforts of a dozen workers is wanting, all of them will remain unemployed. It is also necessary to think of the usefulness of the goods produced to the society. This means that production of any particular commodity cannot be justified economically without the consideration of the market it commands. Taking into consideration all these factors we should design suitable machines. Instead, we find nowadays, that we install the machines first and try to coordinate all other factors afterwards. Other countries of the world did not progress in this fashion. Otherwise, new machines would not have been invented. We are importing the machine and hence we have little knowledge. We shall have to develop a *Bharatiya* technology.

### **Full Employment Is A Must**

None of the seven factors is unchangeable. In fact, each one keeps constantly changing. Those who are entrusted with the task of planning, must think of how the change is directed towards progress, how physical hardship is reduced, and waste of energy is minimised. As an illustration, let us take the low productivity of our worker. It can be increased by using machines, and it is necessary to do so. But if the machine is such that it requires only a few men to run it, then the rest of the people will be thrown out of employment. If the machine has to be imported from other countries at such a heavy cost, that the additional production it causes will be insufficient to make it economic, then such a machine is not suitable to our requirements. Just as to let a part of the installed capacity of a factory remain unutilised, is a losing proposition, so also to let the people of this country

remain unemployed is a losing proposition. Nay, this is even worse. Whereas a machine eats up only the capital invested in it in the past, the unemployed people have to be fed, which is a continuous and unending drain on resources, consumed at double the speed. Therefore, instead of the usual exhortation of “Every worker must get food” we must think of “Everyone who eats must get work”, as the basis of our economy. No doubt the *charkha* has to be replaced by machines, but not necessarily automatic machines everywhere. Full employment must be a primary consideration, and then the rest of the six factors suit this.

## **Man’s Place In The Capitalist System**

The use of manpower and the employment question will have to be thought of in the context of the human being as a whole, as an integral being. The economic theories of the past few centuries and the structure of society based on these theories, are such that there has been a thorough devaluation of the human being. His personality is altogether irrelevant to the economic set up. A capitalist economy recognises only an ‘Economic Man’, whose decisions are all based entirely on calculations of gain and loss, in terms of material wealth. For this economic man, five rupees are always more than four rupees. He works solely to gain more wealth, and exerts himself to get the maximum gain. For him, just like other commodities, human labour is a commodity to be bought and sold in the market. This is free enterprise. It holds all other restrictions and regulations unjust, save the brake of competition. In the race, no one is prepared to stop and give a helping hand to the weak who is left behind; nay, elimination of the weak is considered just and natural. He is an uneconomic, marginal unit, not fit to exist. This is what it advocates. By the elimination of such marginal units, the economic power accumulates in the hands of a few. This is considered normal and natural in a capitalist system. But when monopoly is established, even the check of competition ceases to operate. In such a situation, the incentive resulting from competition is no longer available. Prices are arbitrarily fixed and the quality of products deteriorates.

Even as regards the consumer’s needs, the capitalist is guided not by the necessities and desires of the consumer, but by his purchasing power. The needs of the wealthy and well-fed are attended to, rather than those of the poor and the hungry. As a result, where countless varieties of goods are produced for the needs of the wealthy, even the basic necessities of life for the poor become scarce. The centralisation and monopolisation of production

totally undermine the influence of the consumer. The markets are so organised that the consumer has to go for standard products. This standardisation is on the increase at such a pace, that individual preference of the consumer is ignored. Like the books in the library, even human beings are allotted numbers as consumers. The system which boasts of giving highest importance to the individual, has ironically destroyed all individuality. Clearly, the capitalist system is incapable of helping the development of an integral human being.

## **Socialist System is a Reaction**

Socialism arose as a reaction to capitalism. But even socialism failed to establish the importance of the human being. Socialists contended themselves by merely transferring the ownership of capital in the hands of the State. But the State is even more of an impersonal institution. All the business of the State is conducted by rigid rules and regulations. Generally, there is no place for individual discretion, and even where such discretion is allowed, the slightest laxity in the sense of duty and social responsibility on the part of the administrators, results in corruption and favouritism. The capitalistic system thought merely of the economic man, but left him free in other fields where he could exercise his individuality. The socialist system went much further, and thought only of the 'Abstract Man'. After that, there was no scope for the development of the individual's personality based on diverse tastes and abilities. The needs and preferences of individuals have as much importance in the socialist system as in a prison manual. There is no such thing as individual freedom in the socialist system.

There is no private property in a socialist society. This removes the problems accompanying the institution of private property. However, the incentive for production and conservation of resources, and economy in utilisation, accompany the institution of private property. There has been no alternative arrangement to preserve these. The State is made supreme and the sole authority in all matters. The individual citizen is reduced to a mere cog in this giant wheel. There is no provision to inspire the individual to fulfil his role. As Djilas states, "The class of old fashioned exploiters has been eliminated, but a new class of bureaucratic exploiters has come into existence". Karl Marx put forward, in his analysis of history, that capitalism contains the seeds of its own destruction, and that communism is a natural and inevitable successor to capitalism. This concept may be helpful in fostering faith in the communists about their ultimate victory, but certainly

such a determinist view destroys the urge for reform and dynamism in man. He is no longer the creator of a new order; he is merely incidental to a predetermined historical process. His task is only to accelerate the process. Therefore, even as he tries to organise workers, he cares little for their welfare, but uses them as mere tools for the revolution. The dialectic materialism of Marx, too, operates only so long as the State is not established as supreme after destroying the capitalists. Thereafter, the State puts a stop to the operation of the principle of dialectic materialism. In the name of crushing the counter-revolutionaries, the State becomes more and more totalitarian. The day when the State is to wither away, yielding place to a stateless society remains a mere dream. In fact, according to the Marxist view, to obstruct the process of this anti-thesis, is in itself reactionary. Marx is thus falsified by his own standards.

### **Alternative To Capitalism And Socialism**

Both these systems, capitalist as well as communist, have failed to take account of the 'Integral Man', his true and complete personality and his aspirations. One considers him a mere selfish being hankering after money, having only one law, the law of fierce competition, in essence the law of the jungle; whereas the other has viewed him as a feeble lifeless cog in the whole scheme of things, regulated by rigid rules, and incapable of any good unless directed. The centralisation of power, economic and political, is implied in both. Both, therefore, result in the dehumanisation of man.

Man, the highest creation of God, is losing his own identity. We must re-establish him in his rightful position, bring him to the realisation of his greatness, re-awaken his abilities and encourage him to exert for attaining divine heights of his latent personality. This is possible only through a decentralised economy.

We want neither capitalism nor socialism. We aim at the progress and happiness of 'Man', the Integral Man. The protagonists of the two systems fight with Man on the stake. Both of them do not understand Man, nor do they care for his interest.

### **Our Economic System**

The objectives of our economy should be:-

1. An assurance of the minimum standard of living to every individual and preparedness for the defence of the Nation.
2. Further increase above this minimum standard of living whereby the individual and the Nation acquire the means to contribute to world progress on the basis of its own *Chiti*.
3. To provide meaningful employment to every able-bodied citizen, by which the above two objectives can be realised, and to avoid waste and extravagance in utilising natural resources.
4. To develop machines suited to *Bharatiya* conditions (*Bharatiya* technology), taking note of the availability and nature of the various factors of production (Seven Ms).
5. This system must help, and not disregard the human being - the individual. It must protect the cultural and other values of life. This is a requirement which cannot be violated except at the risk of great peril.
6. The ownership, state, private or any other form, of various industries must be decided on a pragmatic and practical basis.

### ***Swadeshi* And Decentralisation**

These are few general directions which we must bear in mind while developing our economy. *Swadeshi* and 'Decentralisation' are the two words which can briefly summarise the economic policy suitable for the present circumstances. Centralisation and monopolisation have been the order of the day for all these years, knowingly and unknowingly. The planners have become prisoners of a belief that only large-scale, centralised industry is economic, and hence, without worrying about its ill-effects, or knowingly but helplessly, they have continued in that direction. The same has been the fate of *Swadeshi*. The concept of *Swadeshi* is ridiculed as old-fashioned and reactionary. We proudly use foreign articles. We have grown over-dependent upon foreign aid in everything from thinking, management, capital, methods of production, technology, etc., to even the standards and forms of consumption. This is not the road to progress and development. We will forget our individuality and become virtual slaves once again. The positive content of *Swadeshi* should be used as the cornerstone for the

reconstruction of our economy.

### **Discard *Status Quo* Mentality**

For want of time, I have not touched upon the natural aspects of economic structure. But one thing is clear - that many old institutions will yield place to new ones. This will adversely affect those who have vested interests in the old institutions. Some others who are, by nature, averse to change will also suffer by efforts of reconstruction. But disease must be treated with medicine. Strength can be gained only from exercise and hard work. Therefore, we shall have to discard the *status quo* mentality and usher in new era. Indeed our efforts of reconstruction need not be clouded by prejudice or disregard for all that is inherited from our past. On the other hand, there is no need to cling to past institutions and traditions which have outlived their utility. We have considered what the direction of change should be.

We have, in the last four days, thought over the integrated form of Humanism. On this basis, we shall be able to re-reconcile nationalism, democracy, socialism and world peace with the traditional values of *Bharatiya* culture, and think of all these ideals in an integrated form. The mutual conflict among these ideals can be removed and they can supplement mutually. Thereby 'Man' can gain his lost status and attain the aims of his life.

We have discussed here the philosophy. But the members of *Bharatiya Jana Sangh* are not mere philosophers or academicians. We have set out with the determination to make this Nation strong, happy and prosperous through the medium of the *Bharatiya Jana Sangh*. Therefore, we must carry on practical programmes for the national reconstruction on this foundation. We have taken due note of our ancient culture. But we are no archaeologists. We have no intention to become custodians of a vast archaeological museum. Our goal is not merely to protect the culture but to revitalise it so as to make it dynamic and in tune with the times. We must ensure that our Nation stands firm on this foundation and our society is enabled to live a healthy, progressive and purposeful life. We shall have to end a number of traditions and set in reforms which are helpful in the development of values and of national unity in our society. We shall remove those traditions which obstruct this process. Whereas one need not mourn the limitations of the human body, one must undergo the required surgical

operation if any part of the body has a cancerous growth. There is no need to amputate healthy limbs. If today, society is gripped with evils like untouchability, which leads men to treat other human beings as lower than themselves, and thereby threaten the national unity, we shall have to end such evils.

We shall be required to produce such institutions as will kindle the spirit of action in us, which will replace the self-centredness and selfishness by a desire to serve the Nation, which will produce not only sympathy towards our brethren, but a sense of affection and oneness with them. Such institutions can truly reflect our *Chiti*.

*Chiti* is a Nation's soul. The power that energises and activates the Nation is called *Virat*, which in turn is aroused and organised and canalised by *Chiti*. The place of *Virat* in the life of a Nation is similar to that of *Prana* in the body. Just as *Prana* infuses strength in various organs of the body, refreshes the intellect, and keeps body and soul together, so also in a Nation, with a strong *Virat* alone, can democracy succeed and the government be effective. Then the diversity of our Nation does not prove an obstacle to our national unity. The differences of language, occupation, etc., are present everywhere. However, when the *Virat* is awake, diversity does not lead to conflict and people co-operate with one another like the various limbs of the human body or like the members of a family.

We have to undertake the task of awakening our Nation's *Virat*. Let us start carrying on this task of awakening the *Virat* of the Nation with a high sense of pride in our hoary glorious past, taking a realistic assessment of the present and having a great ambition for the future. We wish neither to make this country a shadow of some distant past nor an imitation of Russia or America.

With the support of universal knowledge and our heritage, we shall create a Bharat which will excel all its past glories, and will enable every citizen in its fold to develop his manifold latent potentialities and to achieve, through a sense of unity with the entire creation, a state even higher than that of a complete human being. It is a state in which *Nar* (Man) becomes *Narayan* (God). This is the eternal and continuous divine form of our culture. This is our message to humanity at the crossroads. May God give us the strength to succeed in this task.

**BHARAT MATA KI JAI**

25th April, 1965.