

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya as A Humanist and Economist: An Analysis of His Political and Economic Philosophy

Pukhrambam Julia Chanu¹, L. Bishwanath Sharma²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Manipur University, Manipur, India

²Professor, Department of Philosophy, Manipur University, Manipur, India

Corresponding Author Email: pukhrambamjuliachanu@gmail.com

Abstract —It has been decades that India has got Her independence. Yet, the economic progressive of today is not upto to our expectations. Why our economy did not go forward? Why we have imbalances in our sectorial developments? As we have failed to acknowledge the true essence of Indian consciousness, the country's economy is heedless. Country's economic condition worsened despite ongoing progresses. To overcome these challenges, it is crucial to adopt a new policy that are rooted in Indian realities, enabling Indians to avoid organizational failures and imbalances in our country's economics development.

Keywords: trajectory, turmoil, swadeshi, arthayam.

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

India, renowned for its rich cultural heritage and abundant economic resources, has a long history that dates back to ancient times. However, during the period of British rule, these resources were mercilessly exploited, leading to the devastation of the country's economy. This exploitation was accompanied by devastating famines, exacerbating the already acute poverty faced by the Indian population. Following Her independence from British rule, there arose a pressing need for new economic reforms. It is worth noting that certain aspects of the Indian Constitution have their origins in the British rule, while the Nehru government implemented certain economic policies inspired by the Western model. However, these policies revealed inherent shortcomings and imbalances. The adoption of borrowed ideas and "isms" proved insufficient in ensuring the well-being of the Indian people as a whole. Furthermore, the rapid advancements in scientific discoveries and the invention of new technologies aimed at supporting mankind and society inadvertently led to the excessive exploitation of natural resources. Issues such as population growth, unemployment, malnutrition, food shortages, resource depletion, and excessive reliance on foreign countries for investments and food aid has been hindering India's overall economic advancement. This, in turn, resulted in ideological imbalances within the country. It is widely acknowledged that economic prosperity is a fundamental aspiration of humanity. However, for a political party to effectively uphold the concept of a modern welfare state, it is imperative that they possess a coherent and relevant economic framework that aligns with the nation's needs and aspirations.

It is true that each country across the globe has its own historical, social, and economic environment. However, the solutions that succeeded in one country can not be universally valid or useful in another environment. As such, the programmes and processes of economic development in India should be different from the rest of other countries and elsewhere. He quoted, "Solutions that succeeded in Western economics cannot be transplanted into India, because the parameters are quite different. In the western countries, the economics was moving around the fully industrialised stage and the thinking was socialistic. The theorems deduced from this situation could not be universally valid and may not be useful in all times." (Kulkarni,2021)

Humanism, a philosophy concerned with the well-being of all humanity, has played a crucial role in Indian schools of thought. One of such humanism was the Integral Humanist Thoughts of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, which is significant in the history of philosophy due to their deep connection to Bharatiya culture. To grasp his vision for India, one must delve into his background and philosophical beliefs. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, a remarkable figure and visionary, was born on September 25, 1916, in the village of Nagla Chandrabhan in the Mathura district of Uttar Pradesh. He was a multifaceted individual, being a profound thinker, adept organizer, author, economist, journalist, RSS activist, educator, humble yet principled leader, saintly figure, advocate of high ideals, advocate of simple living, dynamic, determined, devoted, perseverant, and resolute in nature. He was a key figure in the founding of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh (BJS) and served as the 10th President of the BJS national party. His notable works include "Samrat Chandragupta" (1946), "Jagatguru Sankaracharya" (1947), "Akhan Bharat Kyon" (1952), "Bharatiya Arthaniti: Vikas Ka Ek Disha" (1958), "The Two Plans: Promises, Performances, and Prospects" (1958), "Rastra

Jiwan Ki Samasyayen” (1960), “Integral Humanism” (1965), “Devaluation: A Great Fall” (1966), “Political Diary” (1968), among others. In addition to these works, he also published the monthly magazine “Rastra Dharma,” the weekly magazine “Panchajanya,” and the daily “Swadesh” in the 1940s. He was a columnist for the “Organizer” journal. Upadhyaya’s vision of future India, as elucidated in his philosophy of Integral Humanism and the Integral Economic Policy, can bring the right direction for Indian economy which at the same time can give colace to humanity. His thoughts emphasizes self-realization, national awakening, and the holistic progress of mankind. This paper explores Upadhyaya’s humanistic-economic vision for India in light of his philosophy of Integral Humanism.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study utilizes various empirical, scientific, casual, descriptive, and survey sources to analyze the complex relationships between man and resources, man and machines, and man and various societal and national institutions. Additionally, it examines the shortcomings of India’s Five-Year Plans, the nature of Western ideologies, and their impact on Indian political and economic life. Through an analysis of these impacts on Indian national life, the study highlights the relevance of Upadhyaya’s visions in today’s context. These visions can pave the way for a self-reliant Indian economy. It is important to recognize that India’s post-independence trajectory has been shaped by conflicting Western doctrines rather than reflecting the true nature of Indian consciousness. Instead of achieving comprehensive progress and fostering social and economic harmony, India’s national life has become a battleground for conflicting political and economic philosophies. By understanding Upadhyaya’s spiritualistic philosophy, which emphasizes the importance of “Our Own”, India can strive towards a more cohesive and harmonious society.

III. DISCUSSION

III.I. CHALLENGES TO INDIA’S ECONOMIC DIMENSIONS

India has been a paradox of economic challenges despite its availability of wealth. Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya attributes these issues to the blind adoption of Western ideals in social, political, and economic spheres. Notable economists such as Myrdal, John Mellor, Adam Smith, Marx, Ricardo, Hobson, and Burnham have delved into economic analysis, particularly focusing on underdeveloped economies. Various schools of economic thought, including the neo-classical, classical, and Marxian schools, have refined economic theorems through rigorous analytical studies. These scholars emphasize the importance of adhering to natural and economic laws to achieve societal harmony. While the Marxian and neo-classical schools advocate for competition as a fundamental economic principle, practical applications often deviate from this concept and other natural laws. The post-World War II era saw the rise of Keynesian economic policies in Western nations, which, according to Upadhyaya, prioritize ends over means and pose a threat to humanity through resource misallocation for warfare and power struggles. The American economy’s rapid growth, driven by excessive materialistic production and depletion of non-renewable resources, underscores the detrimental effects of a competitive pursuit of prosperity and global dominance. The unchecked mechanization further exacerbates unemployment issues in both Western and Asian countries, including India, which is not immune to these challenges.

We know that Marxism has emerged as an alternative to the negative aspects of capitalism, aiming to address the concentration of means of production in the hands of corporations and their monopolies, which ultimately leads to the exploitation of the already marginalized. The rise of socialist movements in Europe was a result of the revolution against such capitalist systems. However, some economists, such as Prof. Ota Sik from Czechoslovakia and Prof. W. Brus from Poland, who followed the Stalinist ideology, argued that centralized planning, although not conducive to socialism, proved to be inefficient in resource allocation. Prof. Liberman, in his essay on ‘profit’, further criticized the economic foundation of socialist economies, claiming that it was weak. The dominance of capitalist, communist, and socialist models of governance has resulted in the control of people’s consciousness. The emergence of a bureaucratic ‘New Class’ in communist countries has led to frustration and discontent. Furthermore, socialism has degenerated in Russia, adding to the confusion, crisis, and chaos within these schools of thought. As a consequence, people have become alienated from their state and industries, becoming victims of the social and cultural imbalances prevalent in their respective countries.

Upadhyaya, in his work ‘Integral Humanism’, posited the question of how to improve societal conditions when economic structures have neglected the human element. He contended that nations adhering to either Russian socialism or Western capitalism are currently facing crises. Similarly, India has experienced turmoil due to the blind adoption of socialist and communist models in both economic and political realms. The Nehru administration’s failure to foster social cohesion led to the partition of the country. Post-independence, India has struggled to make significant economic progress, with dwindling per capita income, vanishing villages, cultural erosion, and a large portion of the population living below the poverty line. The proliferation

of slums and rising unemployment rates further underscore the country's developmental challenges. Upadhyaya's assertion that "The world is standing at the cross-roads of confusion" (Kulkarni, 2021) highlights the need for a new direction. His integral economic philosophy aims to offer an alternative to capitalism, communalism, and socialism, with the goal of achieving holistic development in India.

III.II. PANDIT DEENDAYAL UPADHYAYA'S INTEGRAL ECONOMIC THOUGHTS

Integral Humanism, a philosophy advocated by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, aims to guide India towards prosperity and development in both material and spiritual aspects. Upadhyaya criticizes the tendency of newly developing countries, such as India, to blindly emulate foreign nations, resulting in a lack of self-reliance, self-respect, and prosperity. The adoption of foreign doctrines and has led to crises and imbalances in the country, failing to promote the well-being of the Indian populace. Upadhyaya, as the leader of a party that values traditional Indian culture, emphasizes the need for indigenous national policies to shape India's future. He asserts that India must chart its own course for progress, rooted in the integral and humanistic essence of Indian philosophy. Upadhyaya's vision of Future-Bharat is deeply connected to his of Integral Humanism, which warrants a thorough examination in both theoretical and practical terms.

1. DEFECTS IN OUR PLANNING

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, in his philosophy, questions "Why planning has failed?" (Kulkarni, 2021). His Integral Economic Policy critically analysed the reasons behind the failure of our planning. According to Upadhyaya, the failure can be attributed to incorrect planning. He argues that our economy is directionless, shapeless, and lacking in speed due to erroneous economic planning, such as misplaced priorities, lack of coherence between goals and available resources, imbalances in different sectors, and excessive reliance on foreign aid. Consequently, he criticizes the planning models adopted by our country. In his book, "The Two Plans: Promises, Performance and Prospects," Upadhyaya not only reviews the First and Second Five Year Plans but also highlights several drawbacks associated with these plans. He asserts that the planners aimed to establish a socialist society and questions why India should be an exception when other countries with similar systems have produced autocratic governments. He argues that socialism, being a confused principle, fails to inspire people to make sacrifices for the progress of the country. The First Five Year Plan primarily focused on agriculture, with little attention given to its ancillary cottage industries. On the other hand, the Second Plan was more industrial-oriented. While the former did not bring about fundamental changes to the system, the latter aimed to alter the system as a whole. Upadhyaya believes that it is inappropriate to make new declarations without effectively implementing the First Plan. Therefore, he emphasizes the importance of sound planning in our economy, which should be generated from the grassroots level to the central level. Adequate planning should be given equal importance at both the village and central levels for comprehensive planning.

Upadhyaya also highlights several reasons for the deficiencies in plans. Initially, the plans exhibit technical flaws. This is due to the lack of adequate resources, as the techniques required to execute the plans have not been ensured in the initial plan. Secondly, the absence of a scientific method to measure population growth, per capita income, and formation ratio results in reliance on assumptions. Thirdly, he argues that the plans lack proper equilibrium across various sectors. For instance, the balance between actual demand and allocation, as well as between goal achievement and projected expenditure, is skewed. Finally, he asserts that the costly nature of heavy industries makes it challenging to achieve cost-effectiveness in our plans. To address these shortcomings, planners should prioritize agriculture and small industries. Instead of imposing socialism in Indian conditions, they should promote the ancient Indian cultural sentiment of Yajna, which signifies sacrifice. Upadhyaya advocates for extending the duration of Five-Year Plans to prevent them from becoming meaningless and unproductive. Regarding industrial ownership, he suggests transferring it to the private sector to alleviate the burden on the public sector.

Capital wastages, price rise, and taxation were subjects of concern for Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, who highlighted the excessive resources wasted in capital-formation. He criticized the luxurious lifestyle of the rich in Western culture, particularly in the capitalist world, where America stands as the richest country. The unrestrained consumption prevalent in such societies has led to a decline in ethical values. Dr. V.M. Dandekar, in his book 'Poverty in India', echoed similar sentiments by emphasizing the need for curbing consumption to address poverty. Upadhyaya advocated for the wealthy to limit their expenses to prevent underdeveloped countries like India from becoming dependent on foreign investments. Neglecting these aspects would hinder the promotion of internal harmony in society and the economy. Upholding the values of Indian culture and teachings from prominent figures like M.K. Gandhi and Swami Vivekananda, Upadhyaya urged against corruption and unethical economic activities that contribute to poverty. He proposed utilizing internal resources logically to eradicate poverty and cautioned against

overreliance on foreign aid and unproductive work. Income disparity, according to Upadhyaya, does not benefit the production of goods for the poor but rather perpetuates inequality.

India, as a nation, possesses a restricted pool of capital resources. Consequently, it is imperative for the country to exercise caution when allocating capital in order to attain optimal benefits. This necessitates a constant evaluation of the Output to Capital ratio. Nevertheless, our endeavors primarily focus on accumulating funds from any available sources, with the success of our planning being measured solely in terms of monetary expenditure. This approach may inadvertently create a deceptive perception of financial prosperity. Furthermore, even when considering purely monetary indicators, we have been unable to achieve satisfactory outcomes. The fundamental principle of conducting business lies in minimizing expenditures while maximizing potential benefits. Unfortunately, we have not been able to accomplish this objective, nor are we sufficiently aware of this deficiency.

2. AGRICULTURE AND NATURE OF INDUSTRIALISATION

As a humanist thinker, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism criticized the centralization of heavy industries in India. He believed that the dominance of heavy industrialization in the supply and demand process was oppressive and dictatorial, limiting production freedom. The Western industrialization approach neglected traditional Indian producers, favouring machines over national growth. Upadhyaya argued that industrial development in India was driven by blind followers and collaborators of foreigners, resulting in an industrial class dominated by brokers, traders, and speculators rather than artisans and craftsmen, stifling the creative potential of Indian citizens. He advocated against promoting such dictatorial industrialization in the country and warned against the dangers of foreign investments manipulating Indian industries and finances. Upadhyaya emphasized the need for newly independent countries like India to be cautious of foreign influence in their political and economic spheres. Additionally, he highlighted the importance of agricultural development as crucial to India's economic growth, stressing that over-reliance on foreign sources and heavy mechanization alone could not address economic imbalances. Upadhyaya believed that increasing agricultural production was essential for generating a marketable surplus and stabilizing industries in India. He said, "We have witnessed wide scale destruction in the village industries, and our man-power has moved away from the villages; good, healthy and competent people have left the villages. Thereby, the agricultural enterprises have been destabilised and the national economy has become imbalanced and further deteriorated." (Kulkarni, 2021)

The country's existing conditions, its cultural values, and its agricultural traditions compelled us to rethink why are our large-scale industries not useful. Upadhyaya point out that because of such industries, small industries and its crafts and skills, which have traditionally existed in India, were rooted out; it deprived the labourers from their natural values of life and culture of the community. As money becomes man's goal, other values of life disappeared. This denied the development of individual's personality. Moreover, in the economic transaction, there were no rationalised interconnection between agriculture and large-scale industries. The heavy pressure on transport expenditure increases costs and prices, which results in an inflationary process. Since the capital intensity in large industries are higher than agriculture, our agricultural production declined. As an agricultural country, about 60% of national income originates in agriculture. Similarly, it offers 70% of employment to people. In this context, Upadhyaya states that without all-round growth of agriculture in India, the national income issue cannot be rationally solved.

Dr. Gadgil (1951) also expressed this viewpoint, "Industries should be decentralised, they should be dispersed and consumers goods enterprises should be promoted in the rural areas. The capital goods industries need not be intensified further; rural enterprises should be modernised so that their production and flow of goods satisfy the maximum demands of the people. Production of luxury goods should be limited to the minimum. We should be careful about this." (Kulkarni, 2021) However, Upadhyaya claims that such wise words of Dr. Gadgil's was not included in the actual planning of India. To promote the defensive power of the nation, to increase the supply of producers and consumers goods, to enable all sections of society to realise minimum standards of living, to ensure employment to all eligible citizens for their minimum needs, to centralise the economy by uprooting economic inequality, etc should be the goals of our industrial development.

3. PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

The economic policies advocated by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya aim to incorporate economic discipline and independence into India's national policies. Upadhyaya emphasizes the importance of arthayam, or economic regulations, as well as pranayam, which contributes to a healthy economy. He opposes the principles of 'Laissez Faire' and 'Survival of the fittest', viewing them as promoting inequality and the exploitation of resources, which he likens to the law of the Jungle. Upadhyaya believes that the state and society have a role in maintaining equilibrium in the economy, particularly in terms of production, distribution, and

consumption. Therefore, the government should take responsibility for regulating the economy through regulations, control, planning, and direction. He argues that self-regulatory discipline is essential to satisfy the basic needs of the people and promote an economy that safeguards democracy and independence. Upadhyaya asserts that neither excessive wealth nor poverty should hinder the progress and social life of individuals. He advocates for equal opportunities provided by the state to all citizens and highlights the interdependence of economic, political, and social independence. Ultimately, Upadhyaya's economic policies aim to establish a system wherein individuals can produce and consume without negatively impacting the economic well-being of others. He quoted, "We must promote an economy that protects democracy and independence by Arthayam" (Kulkarni,2021).

Upadhyaya's philosophy encompassed not only the objective and methodology of production, but also advocated for imposing constraints on the means of production. In the Western world, there exists a prevailing belief that unlimited production and prosperity are indispensable for fostering economic growth within a nation. This belief was also embraced by Indian planners and economists, leading them to introduce modern technology across all sectors of economic activities. However, Upadhyaya challenged this assumption and emphasized that natural resources are finite, and that a nation's economic progress necessitates not only advanced machinery, but also the fundamental minerals, materials, and energy sources. He deemed it imprudent to squander resources in an irrational manner. His economic philosophy urges us to recognize the importance of setting limits on production, both in industries and agriculture. Furthermore, it advocates for a harmonious relationship between production and distribution, while also imposing restraints on consumption. Consequently, his philosophy strives to preserve both production and consumption patterns.

4. MAN AND MACHINE

In contrast to Western theories, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism rejects the notion of man as an 'Economic Man'. Upadhyaya defines man as an 'Integral-Man', emphasizing that man is not merely driven by material needs and desires. Instead, he views man as a powerful spiritual being. While Western perspectives on man are divided and focused on materialism, Upadhyaya's philosophy places value at the forefront. He argues that considering man solely in terms of material values is one-sided, incomplete, inhumane, and unethical. According to Upadhyaya, the human mind should not be consumed by thoughts of money, wealth, and power. However, Western economic theories, whether socialist or capitalist, prioritize the pursuit of monetary value in human behavior. Upadhyaya criticizes modern economics for its inadequacy in recognizing that there are things more valuable than money. This failure has hindered the understanding of various issues in India, such as economic inequality, the protection of cows and bullocks, and the importance of the joint family system. Upadhyaya argues that any economics that neglects the non-economic aspects of study cannot be considered integral economics. Consequently, his philosophy of Integral Humanism rejects these imbalances in economics.

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya also stressed the importance of not subjugating human beings to machines. According to him, machines should not overshadow the significance of man, society, or the economy; rather, they should serve as tools that assist humans in their work. Consequently, he supports the mechanization that aids human labour, but opposes the mechanization that leads to the centralization of production. Upadhyaya believes that the prevalence of large machines and technology is accountable for the disappearance of numerous handloom weavers in India. His comprehensive economic ideology aims to establish Swadeshi development and prioritize small-scale and cottage industries over large industries that do not align with our economic requirements. Further, he elaborated the relationship between man and nature, emphasizing that without nature's assistance, man would be unable to produce or survive. Western perspectives have often distanced man from nature, focusing instead on the dichotomy between man and nature, man and machine, and so forth. However, in Indian tradition, man and nature, as well as man and machine, are always considered together. The primary objective of capitalists is to increase their own wealth, rather than meeting the needs of the common people. They do not prioritize improving the living conditions of their labourers. This insatiable greed for maximum profit and wealth leads to the exploitation of both natural resources and laborers, further complicating the relationship between labourers and nature. Russian socialism, on the other hand, imposes restrictions on the freedom of its citizens, despite guaranteeing the right to work. Upadhyaya believes that both capitalism and socialism neglect the concept of fulfilling man's needs for happiness. Their pursuit of transforming the economic man into the most prosperous man alienates his happiness from his humanity. Additionally, their excessive reliance on science and technology for rapid modernization enslaves them to machines. Consequently, Upadhyaya's philosophy does not support capitalism and socialism, as they concentrate power in the hands of a few. He also opposes the use of technology that is unsuitable for Indian circumstances. Therefore, he considers arthayam as the key to preserving an individual's economic freedom in an economic democracy.

5. PSYCHOLOGICAL MESS AND HUMAN VALUES

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya's ideas shed light on the psychological chaos and decline of human values that can be attributed to existing economic theories. Upadhyaya argued that both capitalist and socialist economies only recognize individuals in terms of their material wealth, leading to a significant devaluation of human values. These systems prioritize material possessions above all else. According to Upadhyaya, the capitalist system, which prioritizes profit and loss, is inhumane and unethical because it focuses on maximizing profits rather than meeting the needs of the people. The greed inherent in this system leads to selfishness and exploitation, creating imbalances in nature and pitting machines against humans, thereby posing a threat to civilization and humanity as a whole. By catering primarily to the well-fed and wealthy, rather than addressing the needs of the poor and hungry, the capitalist system perpetuates inequality and widens the gap between the rich and the poor. This system ultimately erodes individuality.

Furthermore, Upadhyaya argued that socialism, which emerged as a response to capitalism, also fails to recognize the value of individuals in society. He opposed socialism because it does not allow for individual discretion and often leads to corruption and favouritism. Socialism lacks a genuine pursuit of truth and does not prioritize individual integrity. Although Marx criticized the possession of property, wealth, and power, he still viewed individuals primarily as economic beings. Therefore, Upadhyaya rightly asserts that both capitalism and socialism do not provide opportunities for the development of individual personalities based on their unique qualities and abilities. The concentration of power in both political and economic spheres in these systems contributes to the dehumanization of individuals. In the West, communism has become the root cause of numerous problems due to class struggles and unchecked consumption patterns.

6. DECENTRALISATION IN ECONOMY

Upadhyaya's economic policies placed significant importance on a decentralized economy and swadeshi. In order to achieve a decentralized economy, decentralized planning is crucial to ensure the comprehensive development of India. He contended that the gap between urban and rural development was eroding India's national unity and integrity. The centralized development model is incompatible with a democratic society. In Western nations, extensive industrialization often leads to the concentration of power. Socialists argue that they differ from capitalists, but in reality, both groups hold a monopoly on power. Similar to capitalists, the socialist system aimed to shift property ownership from capitalists to the state, resulting in the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of the state. Upadhyaya concluded that both systems devalued human values in society. India's development model should embrace a decentralized, democratic approach to uphold human values and allow society to express its humanistic tendencies in progress. He states, "Decentralisation alone could accomplish this goal" (Kulkarni, 2021). Therefore, he advocated for decentralization over a centralized model for the holistic advancement of Bharat. Just as political power is decentralized from the village level to higher levels, he envisioned an economic system with rural cottage or small-scale industries as its foundation.

7. SWADESHI

In addition to advocating for a decentralized economic democracy, Upadhyaya's philosophy also places great emphasis on the importance of swadeshi, which he considers to be the foundation for the reconstruction of India's economy. According to Upadhyaya, swadeshi does not solely refer to the production of indigenous products, but rather encompasses the adoption of an indigenous approach to development as a whole. He asserts that our reliance on foreign products, including their methods of production, management, thinking, technology, and capital, deteriorates our circumstances and further deepens India's dependence on foreign nations. Upadhyaya firmly believes that this is not the correct path for India's progress. Therefore, similar to M.K. Gandhi, he asserts that Bharat can achieve positive development by reducing its reliance on foreign aid. His philosophy serves as a cautionary reminder to utilize foreign assistance in minimal quantities.

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya's economic vision for future India encompasses his concept of an ideal economy. In order to comprehend this vision, it is crucial to first understand his perception of what constitutes an ideal economy. According to Upadhyaya, an ideal economy is one that incorporates cultural values and norms into its economic policies, ensures freedom and equality in the economic realm, provides employment opportunities for all individuals, maintains financial discipline, promotes decentralization in both economic and political spheres, avoids excessive and irrational utilization of resources, and refrains from exploiting nature in the pursuit of economic activities. Additionally, an ideal economy should embrace appropriate technology and machinery that assist human beings in their work, foster internal harmony, minimize state intervention in economic affairs to a necessary and desirable extent, regulate prices of essential commodities, and reject ideologies such as socialism, capitalism, communism, and rampant consumerism. Furthermore, it should strive to establish a self-reliant economy and agriculture that are independent of the unpredictable forces of nature. Upadhyaya's ideal economy also opposes excessive mechanization,

industrialization, and overproduction, while emphasizing the spirit of swadeshi (self-sufficiency). Ultimately, his vision of an ideal economy prioritizes the preservation of human values, which contribute to holistic development encompassing moral, physical, and spiritual aspects of individuals. His objectives aim to create a sustainable and inclusive economic framework for India's future development.

IV. LIMITATION AND SUGGESTION

Due to limited excess of data, the details in this paper is limited. However, the availability of few works contributed by scholars and authors in the form of articles, collection of books, and Upadhyaya's literatures has greatly helped in writing this paper. On an analysis of review literatures of these books on Upadhyaya's thoughts, the following suggestions can be drawn from his economic philosophy:

1. Nationalisation with public accountability;
2. Decentralised process of production with increase in productivity;
3. Pace of urbanisation with cultural background;
4. Micro-planning at lower levels with macro-planning national level;
5. Expansion of employment opportunities with up-to-date modern technology;
6. Integration of various natural groups with the preservation of their group characteristics;
7. Bharatiya values of life with the modern scientific and technological advance.

V. CONCLUSION

It is evident from the preceding discussion that Upadhyaya's economic philosophy does not align with either capitalist or socialist systems for India's development. The fundamental essence of his economic ideologies is holistic rather than profit-driven; they are centered on values rather than monetary gains. This implies that his perspective opposes the assessment of human life in terms of economic considerations. He prioritizes the well-being of individuals and society, rejecting the notion of money dictating societal norms. Upadhyaya does not endorse the concept of survival of the fittest or the law of the jungle. He emphasizes agriculture over industries, as he believes that large-scale industries alone cannot ensure comprehensive economic progress. He condemns the unrestrained squandering of resources by the affluent and disapproves of widening wealth disparities in society. According to him, social equality should be established on all fronts. Upadhyaya cautions against blindly adopting Western economic theories and advocates for a cautious approach in their implementation in India. He views capitalism as an unethical and inhumane philosophy that prioritizes profit maximization over human welfare. He criticizes socialism for enabling state monopolies and fostering favoritism and corruption. Additionally, he opposes communist economies for their failure to deliver desired outcomes and their stifling of individual initiative through totalitarianism. Upadhyaya advocates for the nationalization of food grains to reduce India's dependence on foreign aid. He asserts that without economic freedom, political freedom loses its significance. It is essential to note that the core message carried by his political and economic philosophy is that the self-governance of an independent democratic country like India can be meaningful only when there is both political and economic freedom; for a country to be strong and prosperous, self-reliant and sufficiency in food grains is a must.

Thus, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya's philosophy advocates for reducing reliance on foreign countries for investments. Although Upadhyaya envisioned a prosperous agricultural sector that will lead India towards self-sufficiency, however, his economic policies focus on safeguarding Indian traditions, craftsmen, and small-scale industries. The goal of his philosophy is to promote a decentralized economy to foster comprehensive development in India. Undoubtedly, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya's economic and political principles are both comprehensive and humane. His emphasis on human development, values, and self-esteem underscores his humanistic approach. Upadhyaya stresses the importance of tailoring economic policies to suit Indian conditions and needs, aiming to shield the country from foreign debt burdens. His vision for the future is a strong and united India.

VI. FUNDING

The author is thankful to University Grants Commission (UGC) for providing research fund as well as to Assistant Librarian of Manipur University for assisting me in plagiarism checking.

REFERENCES

1. Kulkarni, S.A. (2021): *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, Ideology and Perception (Part-4): Integral Economic Policy*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi.
2. Upadhyaya, D. (2016): *The Two Plans: Promises, Performance and Prospects*, Prabhat Prakashan, Delhi.
3. Sanyal, J. (1994): *A Guide to Social Philosophy*, Sribhumi Printing Company, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Kolkata.
4. Upadhyaya D. (2014): *Integral Humanism*, Jagriti Prakashan, Noida.
5. Thengadi, D.B. (2014) : *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, Ideology and Perception (Part-1) : An Inquest*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi.
6. Thengadi, D.B. (1973): “ *His Legacy : Our Mission*”, Jayabharath Publication, Kallai Road, Calicut .
7. Nene, V.V. (2018): *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya ,Ideology and Perception (Part-2): Integral Humanism*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi.
8. Kelkar, B.K. (2016): *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya ,Ideology and Perception (Part-3): Political Thought*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi.
9. Bhishikar, C.P. (2014): *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, Ideology and Perception (Part-5): Concept of Rastra*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi.
10. Deodhar, V.N. (2014): *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, Ideology and Perception (Part-7): A Profile*, Suruchi Prakashan, New Delhi.
11. Bakshi, S.S.N. (2018): *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya: Life of an Ideologue Politician*, Rupa Publication, India.