
Indian Nationalism and Understanding Deen Dayal Upadhyaya's Envision of Indian Nationalism¹

Hriday Narayan²

Abstract:

The meanings and public nature of Nationalism in India have shifted dramatically over the last century. Indian nationalism emerged during the independence movement, which campaigned for independence from British rule. Indian nationalism is a case of territorial nationalism that embraces all of India's diverse ethnic, linguistic, and religious populations. In the Indian political landscape at the time, there was no consensus regarding replacing colonial rule with a nation-state based on and governed by a secular constitution. As a result of the persuasive power of diverse religious and caste-based opinions in the emerging Indian public sphere, there was a great deal of disagreement. This article summarizes the development of nationalism in the world context, examines the background of Indian Nationalism in general, and then attempts to comprehend and analyze Deen Dayal Upadhyaya's philosophy of Indian Nationalism.

Keywords: Nation-State, Nationalism, Indian Nationalism, Hindu Nationalism, Deen Dayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism, Chiti, Dharma

Introduction

Nationalist intellectuals have proposed several forms of nationalism. Nationalism can be an official state ideology or a popular non-state movement manifested through territorial, civic, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious, or ideological aspects. These national self-definitions are utilized to categorize various forms of nationalism. These classifications are not entirely separate; many nationalist groups combine some or all of these characteristics to different extents. Nationalist groups can also be categorized based on factors such as size and geography.

Nationalist liberal, conservative, or postcolonial thinkers from Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) to Marcus Garvey (1887–1940) in Europe and from Mahatma Gandhi to Deen Dayal Upadhyay in India have presented different types of nationalism, which can either be an official state ideology or a popular non-state movement. These types can be articulated

¹ This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2017S1A6A3A03079318).

² Professor, Center for East Asian Studies, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India, Email- hridayn@jnu.ac.in

along various lines, such as territorial, civic, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious, or ideological lines. These self-definitions are used to classify variations in nationalism, which can be mixed to varying degrees by numerous nationalist groups. In addition, the size and geography of nationalist groups can also be categorized. It is important to note that these classifications are not mutually exclusive.

Nationalism in World Context

Visualizing a world without nations and states in the 21st century is unimaginable. The concept of a nation-state was not realized until the late 18th century. Political unity persisted until the French Revolution, encompassing empires, fiefdoms, and tribal associations. During the late 18th century and throughout the 19th century, the political ideology of nationalism emerged. Classical nationalism in world history is defined as community cohesion based on shared ethnic characteristics such as language, beliefs, and traditions.³ Nationalism emerged from 19th-century liberalism,⁴ which favored republican governments⁵ over monarchy and entrusted political power to citizens who acknowledged a national, multicultural state. In this situation, it is referred to as liberal nationalism. The emphasis is on promoting national cohesion by pledging allegiance to a political leader rather than unity rooted in common ethnicity. Throughout the last two centuries, the history of nationalism has included unique patterns. Leaders use various strategies to unite people across the territory to unify groups under one nation-state. The development of national symbols, shared identity, and expressions of loyalty are all visible in nation-states with strong nationalism. The eagle, for example, was a symbol of power in ancient Rome that was resurrected with Christian meaning and is used in both Germany and the United States.⁶

The Enlightenment of the 18th century led people to republicanism, the idea that people should have a voice in their government.⁷ It encouraged the French to demand liberty, equality, and fraternity ideals. This nationalist slogan swept up the French people, ruled by a monarch, and divided them into three Estates-General. When the First and Second Estate locked the Third Estate out of the National Assembly, they reconvened on the tennis court at

³ Gans, Chaim (2003), *The Limits of Nationalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

⁴ "Liberalism in general, the belief that it is the aim of politics to preserve individual rights and to maximize freedom of choice." *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics*, Iain McLean and Alistair McMillan, Third edition 2009.

⁵ The government of Rome was called a republican government. The Founders read that republican government was one in which the people hold the power of government; the people give power to leaders they elect to represent them and serve their interests, and the representatives are responsible for helping all the people in the country, not just a few people.

⁶ <https://derrychen.medium.com/the-west-and-the-eagle-b39cbfe8f8b7>, visited on May 1, 2024.

⁷ Hammersley, Rachel (2020). *Republicanism : an introduction*. Cambridge, UK.

Versailles to make the Tennis Court Oath, which promised unity until King Louis XVI approved a new constitution. Although the king came through on those reforms, he dismantled them almost as soon as he put them in place. It led to the storming of the Bastille on July 14, 1789, officially beginning the French Revolution. National symbols, shared identity, and expressions of loyalty marked the French Revolution. Specifically, the French Revolution used symbols such as the red, blue, and white tricolor flags, representing Paris and France's country as a whole. Even with nations, self-identity can begin with recognizing others' identities; therefore, as France gained status as a nation, so did other regions of Europe on its borders.

The modern state is commonly believed to have come into being with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, although this view is contested. This treaty established the 'Westphalian system' of sovereign states recognizing each other's borders and sovereignty. Some, but not all, observed the rise of nation-states throughout the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Nationalist movements arose throughout Europe, beginning with romantic nationalism⁸ and accelerated by the French Revolution and the conquests of Napoleon Bonaparte. Some of these movements were separatist and directed against big empires; the Greek Revolution is an early example (1821-1829). Others endeavored to unify a split or fragmented territory, as in the unification of Italy under Piedmont-Sardinia sovereignty. These upheavals fostered a national identity and culture: in 1848, liberal demands were frequently identified with European Revolutions. By the nineteenth century's conclusion, most people acknowledged that Europe was divided into nations and placed with one of them. After the First World War, the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Ottoman Empire expedited the emergence of nation-states.

In general, nation-states do not want to refrain from seizing territory. However, nationalist movements seldom agreed on the location of the border. As nationalist movements expanded, they sparked new territorial conflicts throughout Europe, leading to the emergence of nationalism. Nationalism also affected the political life of Europe in the nineteenth century. Where a nation was part of an empire, the national liberation war was simultaneously a fight against earlier authoritarian administrations, and nationalism was united with liberal anti-monarchical groups.

⁸ Romantic nationalism is a kind of nationalism in which the state asserts its political legitimacy as an intrinsic consequence of the unity of the community it governs. This encompasses the language, race, ethnicity, culture, religion, and customs of the nation in its most fundamental sense, as defined by those who were born within its culture.

The traditional hypothesis of the genesis of nation-states in the 19th century is contested. The South American liberation struggles and the American Revolution (American War of Independence) precede most European nationalist movements, which is problematic. Some nations, including the Netherlands and England, appear to have had a distinct national character well before the nineteenth century.

Background of Indian Nationalism

Indian nationalism can be typically seen as territorial nationalism.⁹ Despite India's numerous cultural, linguistic, and religious differences, it includes everyone who calls the country their home. The concept of Indian Nationalism in its modern form developed during the Indian independence movement, which fought for independence from British rule. Although some aspects of Indian Nationalism can be traced back to pre-colonial India, numerous rulers and regimes have unified India throughout history. Ancient texts mention India under the reigns of the emperors called Bharata or Akhand Bharat (undivided India); these regions generally correspond to the modern-day entities of greater India.¹⁰ The Maurya Empire was the foremost to unite South Asia and India (including parts of Afghanistan).¹¹ In addition, dynasties such as the Gupta Empire, Rashtrakuta Empire, Pala Empire, Mughal Empire, Vijayanagar Empire, and Maratha Empire, among others, have consolidated large portions of India under a single rule. India's notion of nationhood is not based solely on the expanse of its territorial sovereignty. Nationalistic emotions and manifestations cover India's ancient history¹² as the foundation of the Indus Valley civilization and the four major world religions - Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, and Sikhism. Indian nationalists envision India expanding throughout the Indian subcontinent along these lines. However, the concept of Indian Nationalism in its modern form was not fully developed until much later. Several anti-colonial coalitions and movements in India contributed to the rise of Indian nationalism by coming together to defy colonial rule. It helped push Indian nationalism to the forefront of public discourse in India. Renowned figures, such as Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, led the Indian nationalist movement from the freedom movement.

⁹ Straehle, Christine; Kymlicka, Will (1999), *Cosmopolitanism, Nation-States, and Minority Nationalism: A Critical Review of Recent Literature*, *European Journal of Philosophy*, 7 (1): 65–88.

¹⁰ Chatterji, Angana P.; Hansen, Thomas Blom; Jaffrelot, Christophe (August 2019), *Majoritarian State: How Hindu Nationalism Is Changing India*, Oxford University Press.

¹¹ Conningham, Robin; Young, Ruth (2015), *The Archaeology of South Asia: From the Indus to Asoka, c.6500 BCE – 200 CE*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 451–466

¹² Acharya, Shiva (2005), *Nation, Nationalism and Social Structure in Ancient India*, Sundeep Publication, New Delhi.

Through the early half of the 20th century, the Indian National Congress party continued to be associated with 'Hindu politics' and concepts of a 'Hindu nation.' Historically, 'Hindu' has been used as an all-encompassing term without a precise definition to refer to India's indigenous traditions and people. In the late eighteenth century, the term 'Hindu' began to be used frequently with religious implications while still being used as a metonym for indigenous practices. The ideologies and political languages of Hindu nationalists were linguistically and socially diverse. Since Hinduism does not represent a distinct religious group, the labels 'Hindu nationalism' and 'Hindu' are problematic in religious and nationalist discourse. As Hindus were identified as a homogeneous group, several Congress leaders were able to incorporate 'Hindu' symbolism into the secular nationalist ideology as a whole.¹³

The diversity of Indian cultural groups and moderate Hindu nationalism occasionally classify it as cultural rather than religious nationalism. Historian Baij Nath Puri pointed out that the Vijayanagar kingdom (1336–1646) emerged due to Hindu nationalist resistance against Muslim immigration and control in the southern region.¹⁴ The empire's administration was also rooted in Hindu Dharma Sastras (Hindu literature), with the Vedas as the primary basis of the existing law. Shivaji's endeavors while building the Maratha Empire are recognized for laying a resilient foundation for Hindu Nationalism.¹⁵ Shivaji, also called Shivaji the Great, was an Indian ruler who belonged to the Bhonsle Dynasty and impacted Hindu nationalists such as Bal Gangadhar Tilak. According to Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, Shivaji's triumph over Aurangzeb's army greatly inspired Hindus across India.¹⁶

Numerous Hindu reform initiatives have their origins in the nineteenth century. These movements led to new interpretations of the ancient books of the Upanishads and Vedanta, focusing on societal change.¹⁷ The most notable aspect of these groups during the colonial era was that they challenged the assumption of the superiority of Western civilization. It increased patriotic ideas, which served as the cultural and ideological foundation for the independence movement in Colonial India.¹⁸ At the turn of the 20th century, ideas of Hindu cultural Nationalism and Indian Nationalism converged due to the influence of Hindu

¹³ William Gould (2004), *Hindu Nationalism and the Language of Politics in Late Colonial India*, Cambridge University Press. p. 3

¹⁴ Baij Nath Puri (1975), *History of Indian Administration: Medieval period*, Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan. p. 273.

¹⁵ An Atlas and Survey of South Asian History. M.E. Sharpe. p. 54.

¹⁶ Bidyut Chakrabarty; Bhuwan Kumar Jha (2019), *Hindu Nationalism in India: Ideology and Politics*, Routledge. p. 67

¹⁷ Bhatt, Chetan, (2001), *Hindu Nationalism: Origins, Ideologies and Modern Myths*, Berg Publishers.

¹⁸ Peter van der Veer, Hartmut Lehmann (1999), *Nation and religion: perspectives on Europe and Asia*, Princeton University Press.

Renaissance movements.¹⁹ Hindu majoritarianism and sectarian communalism were perceived as antagonistic; however, both could be used interchangeably.²⁰ Hindu Renaissance movements had a significant impact on revolutionary activities against British rule. In the first decade of the twentieth century, the movements provided the conceptual foundation for the battles and political groups that arose.

Despite never labeling himself a 'Hindu nationalist,' Mahatma Gandhi advocated for and espoused principles, including Dharma. In pursuit of his social and political objectives, he formulated the concept of 'Rama Rajya' (Rule of Lord Rama).²¹ Gandhi stated that, concerning political independence, he did not wish to replicate the functioning of the Soviet Union, the British House of Commons, Fascist Italy, or National Socialist Germany. Protocols are in place to accommodate their brilliance. He believed that the native reflections must be symmetrical, but it would be impossible to understand what they may involve. He referred to it as 'Rama Rajya,' or the people's sovereignty grounded solely on moral authority.²²

Gandhi highlighted that 'Rama Rajya' represented peacefulness and fairness, stressing that the ancient ideal of Rama Rajya is unquestionably one of true democracy in which even the grassroots citizens might be assured of fast justice without needing an extensive and expensive system.²³ He also highlighted respecting other religions, pointing out that Hinduism has taught him to appreciate all faiths, and that's the key to Rama Rajya.²⁴ Gandhi clarified that 'Ram Rajya' does not refer to Hindu rule. It refers to God's reign and became a crucial idea in Hindu Nationalism.²⁵

Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose was another important freedom fighter during colonial rule. In addition to Gandhi, he cited Vedanta and the Bhagavad Gita as significant influences in the struggle for Indian freedom.²⁶ During his formative years, Subhas Chandra Bose was profoundly impacted by universalism, nationalism, and commitment to social service and

¹⁹ Bhatt, Chetan, (2001).

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Gupta, R.S.A.K. (2021), *Art and Aesthetics of Modern Mythopoeia V2: Literatures, Myths and Revisionism VOL 2*, Visvanatha Kaviraj Institute.

²² Harijan, 2 January 1937.

²³ Young India, 19 September 1929.

²⁴ Harijan 19 October 1947.

²⁵ Elsenhans, H.; Ouaisa, R.; Tétreault, M.A. (2016), *The Transformation of Politicized Religion: From Zealots into Leaders*, Taylor & Francis. p. 124. And Sharma, J.N. (2003), *Alternative Economics: Economics of Mahatma Gandhi & Globalization*, Deep & Deep Publications. p. 134.

²⁶ Narangoa, Li; Cribb, R. B. (2003), *Imperial Japan and National Identities in Asia, 1895–1945*, Routledge.

transformation, as espoused by Swami Vivekananda. Subhas was quite captivated by the innovative interpretation of ancient Indian scriptures.²⁷ Hindu spirituality was integral to his political and social ideas throughout his adult life, notwithstanding his lack of intolerance or dogma.²⁸ According to Gordon, Hinduism was an integral element of his Indianness. His plot against the British colonial government included Hindu symbols and festivals.²⁹

Keshav Baliram Hedgewar of Nagpur was another influential figure in developing Hindu Nationalism. Hedgewar was involved in revolutionary activities with the Hindu Mahasabha, the Anushilan Samiti, and the Jugantar.³⁰ In 1925, he instituted the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), which would serve as the focal point of Hindu movements in independent India. RSS emerged as one of the most influential Hindu organizations in India's social and political spheres.³¹

Following Hedgewar's passing in 1940, M.S. Golwalkar assumed the organization's leadership. After the Muslim League voted for the Lahore Resolution in 1940, which called for a separate Pakistan, the RSS refrained from participating in the independence movement despite its advocacy for a Hindu nation.³² Throughout the 1960s, RSS volunteers were involved in various social and political organizations. The Bhartiya Jana Sangh (BJS), a political party, and the Bhartiya Mazdoor Sangh (BMS), a trade union supported by the RSS, experienced substantial development by the decade's end. In light of this, the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) was established in 1964 by M.S. Golwalkar and S.S. Apte in collaboration with Swami Chinmayananda. The organization was primarily composed of Hindu religious leaders supported by the RSS and sought to unify the numerous Hindu religious factions.

In the 1960s, the RSS volunteers participated in a variety of social and political movements in India, such as the Bhoodan, a land reform movement led by the renowned Gandhian Vinobha Bhave,³³ and the Sarvodaya, headed by another Gandhian, Jayaprakash Narayan.³⁴ The BMS

²⁷ Bose, Sisir; Werth, Alexander; Jog, Narayan Gopal; Ayer, Subbier Appadurai (1996), *Beacon Across Asia: A Biography of Subhas Chandra Bose*, Orient Blackswan.

²⁸ Chaudhuri, Nirad C. (1987), *Thy Hand, Great Anarch: India, 1921–1952*, Chatto & Windus.

²⁹ Gordon, Leonard A. (1990), *Brothers against the Raj: a biography of Indian nationalists Sarat and Subhas Chandra Bose*, Columbia University Press.

³⁰ Chitkara M G (1997), *Hindutva*, APH Publishing.

³¹ Shankar Gopalakrishnan (2009), *A Mass Movement Against Democracy: The Threat of the Sangh Parivar*, Aakar Books.

³² Lal, Vinay (2003), *The History of History: Politics and Scholarship in Modern India*. Oxford University Press.

³³ Suresh Ramabhai (1954), *Vinoba and his mission*, Akhil Bharat Sarv Seva Sangh.

³⁴ Martha Craven Nussbaum (2007), *The Clash Within: Democracy, Religious Violence, and India's Future*, Harvard University Press.

and the Akhil Bhartiya Vidyarthi Parishad (ABVP), a student organization, were also supported by RSS. Additional organizations, such as Seva Bharati, Lok Bharati, and the Deendayal Research Institute, were also promoted. RSS volunteers initiated and sustained these organizations, collectively known as the Sangh Parivar.³⁵ The Sangh Parivar's influence in India's social and political sphere steadily increased in the subsequent few decades. The influence of the Sangh Parivar in India's social and political spheres increased consistently over the following decades.³⁶

Savarkar was among the pioneers of the 20th century who established a definition of 'Hindu' based on his concept of Hindutva or Hinduness.³⁷ An agnostic and rationalist, Savarkar introduced the term 'Hindutva' to disassociate it from any religious connotations that had developed gradually. According to him, a Hindu is an individual who regards India as both his Fatherland and his Holy Land. As a result, he distinguished Hindutva (Hindu-ness) or Hindu from Hinduism.³⁸ This definition did not include Abrahamic faiths (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) and only accepted indigenous religious denominations as Hindu.³⁹

While conferring with Golwalkar, Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, who established the BJS in Delhi on October 21, 1951, subsequently served as its inaugural president. As the political arm of Hindu Nationalism, the BJS shared many ideological tenets with the RSS. By writing 'Bunch of Thoughts,' Golwalkar hoped to promote this secular, nationalism-based definition of 'Hindu.' Their ideals, Hindu Rashtra and Hindutva, will form the basis of Golwalkarism and the RSS. Regarding territorial loyalty, he would also agree with Savarkar. However, he did so with some tolerance. He opined that all that is expected of our Muslim and Christian fellow citizens is that they lose the concepts of their being 'religious minorities' as well as their alien mentality and merge into the unified national stream of this land.⁴⁰

Deendayal Upadhyay, another RSS ideologue, was born on September 25, 1916, and became a member of the RSS in 1937 as a perpetual propagator or a full-time worker (pracharak). From 1951 to 1967, he served as the General Secretary of the BJS. Subsequently, on December 29, 1967, assumed the role of Jan Sangh president, having entered politics through the RSS and presented Integral Humanism as the political philosophy of the old Bhartiya Jana

³⁵ Smith, David James (2003), *Hinduism and Modernity*, Blackwell Publishing.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar (1989), *Hindutva*, Bharati Sahitya Sadan, Delhi.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Elst, Koenraad (2005), *Decolonizing the Hindu mind*, Rupa publication, India.

⁴⁰ M.S. Golwalkar (1966), *Bunch of Thoughts*, Sahitya Sindhu Prakashan.

Sangh in four lectures in Bombay on April 22–25, 1965. He tried to provide a third alternative, rejecting communism and capitalism as methods of liberating individuals from economic and social oppression. The ideology of Integral Humanism, which aims to balance India's rich cultural legacy with contemporary development, is fundamental to his conception of nationalism.⁴¹

Understanding Deen Dayal's Envision of Nationalism

Deendayal Upadhyaya's philosophy of Integral Humanism is profoundly ingrained in his concept of nationalism, which aims to reconcile India's prolific cultural heritage with the most recent advancements. Deen Dayal's idea of integral humanism integrates the individuals with society, nation, nature, environment, and God in the projection of nationalism. The understanding of Deen Dayal's view on Indian nationalism is based on his Hindi speeches and writings, which were published in three volumes: 'The Problems of National Life' (Rashtra Jivan ki Samasyaen) 1960, 'Integral Humanism' (Ekatma Manavavad) 1965; and 'The Direction of National Life' (Rashtra Jivan ki Disha) 1971.

a) The Fundamental Principles of Upadhyaya's Nationalism

Upadhyay was of the firm conviction that the definition of 'nationalism' for Indians is substantially different from that of the West. He believed that the time had come for the West to evaluate Indian nationalism from an Indian perspective rather than their own, which is essentially flawed as a result of the oppressive and colonial nature of Western nationalism. His concept of Indian nationalism is founded on cultural and civilizational identity rather than political or territorial constructs. He underscored that India's unity results from its shared cultural values, traditions, and spiritual heritage, independent of regional and linguistic distinctions.

It is imperative to note that his view on the framework of social and political perceptions of India is not an expression of Hindu nationalism. Undeniably, his apprehensions remain with the Indian nation and its social and economic challenges; however, they are viewed within the context of Dharma rather than Hindutva or 'Hindu-ness.' He does not emphasize Hindu Rashtra or Hindu nation in his speeches or writings mentioned above. Instead, he discusses Dharma-Rajya instead of Hindu Rashtra; for him, the two concepts are vastly different. Additionally, he does not regard Dharma as an exclusively Hindu category but as more secular and fundamental to all human beings.

⁴¹Organizer Magazine, Bharat Prakashan Ltd. Delhi. <https://organiser.org/2022/09/25/94886/bharat/pandit-deendayal-upadhyaya-jayanti-life-quotes-philosophy-contribution-of-one-of-the-greatest-sons-of-bharat-mata/>

Deendayal Upadhyaya, like Golwalkar, believes that a nation's existence depends on its consciousness, which he calls 'Chiti' (Indian consciousness), against Golwalkar's 'Hindu Consciousness'. Both believed that consciousness may increase or decrease to the extent to which consciousness is disclosed or obscured. But unlike Golwalkar, who sees India's consciousness as a 'Hindu consciousness,' Upadhyaya perceives it as centered on Dharma. Golwalkar aimed to strengthen and unify Hindu society, which he sees as a Hindu or Indian nation that is the primary focus of all Hindu devotion. Deendayal seeks to illuminate the fundamental essence of Indian consciousness, its 'Chiti.' For him, 'Chiti' is the yardstick by which all behaviors and attitudes of individuals are evaluated to determine their appropriateness. So, 'Chiti' is the country's spirit, and a powerful and virulent nation emerges from the strength of this 'Chiti.' The activities of every great man in a nation are manifestations of this 'Chiti.'

To comprehend the unique Indian consciousness, one must understand the context of Dharma. Upadhyay provides a comprehensive understanding of Dharma. He clarifies that Dharma is not ritualism as is commonly understood. It is not a visual system of rituals and ceremonies in a temple, mosque, or church. Dharma is not even a philosophical idea, a sect, a singular spiritual path, or even a 'religion' in the Western sense. He takes the etymological and inclusive meaning of 'Dharma,' which signifies 'Dharana' (to hold) that which holds the universe is 'Dharma.' Dharma generally denotes all the customs, codes of conduct, education and culture, tradition, and civilization that hold or control a society. In Santiparva of the Mahabharata,⁴² it is said that Dharma upholds society, people, and all creatures of the world; hence, it is called Dharma because of the capability of others holding and protecting everything in it. So, it can be assumed that 'Dharma' involves all customs and codes of conduct aimed at the welfare of the entire world. Through this secular view of 'Dharma,' he generalizes and connects with the universal idea of Integral Humanism, where everyone is associated with their unique cultural background and creates a sense of belongingness.

Clarifying the notion of 'nation' and 'nationalism,' Upadhyay explains that a nation is not merely a gathering of individuals who have historically resided together nor a mere assembly of human beings who inhabit a particular geographical region. Additionally, a nation is not merely a geographical region. It is not the result of a social contract, nor would it perish if that contract were to be revoked. The nation results from a more profound self-created life

⁴²Mbh. XII, 109.11-13 and also ibid. X.69.58

force(Swayambhu).Undeniably, it has experienced historical expansion; however, it is insufficient to account for it.Language, culture, and literature are fundamental to a nation's unity.However, thesefeatures reflect something even more intrinsic, i.e., the life force that withstands the citizens or consciousness of a nation.It is not its cause butthe characteristics of a nation.The common elements of national life are merely expressions of an inherent consciousness that cannot be artificially created through political means, which is why it is impossible to achieve this.Each nation possesses a distinctive consciousness, i.e., Chiti. That is what sets it apart from others.The nation is alive as long as that consciousness exists; its demise results in the nation's demise.The demise of a nation is not caused by a diminution in population or the loss of territory; instead, it occurs when its consciousness ceases to exist.

Deendayal Upadhayay postulates that the traditional Indian perspective on nation and nationality is derived from a comprehensive point of view that emphasizes creative harmony and posits that everything and everyone isinterrelated.Society derives its meaning of existence from the even more vibrant life of the nation, which finds its ultimate fulfillment in serving the universal interests of humankind.The individual, with his distinct existence, genuine self-regard, needs, and pursuit of happiness, fulfills himself in the more significant life of society.All of these elements of life are intertwined, not in a pyramid, but in a natural, inherent, sacrosanct simultaneity of reverence for life, and these are the values of traditional Indian national life.They shape the Indian consciousness, its underlying life force, and the reason for its existence - its citizens.That consciousness is most clearly expressed in Dharma, which sustains all civilized existence.Dharma is the fundamental energy and the essence of Indian culture.

Upadhayay underscores the importance of nationalism not being restricted to limited political boundaries or economic interests by broadening the concept of 'Integral Humanism' and linking it to Indian nationalism.Instead, it should encompass the comprehensive evolution of society, which should incorporate the well-being of individuals with the prosperity of the community.This method guarantees that nationalism is inclusive and seeks to enhance the nation as a whole.Smooth integration is possible only if there is a perfect harmony between individuals and society.As per Upadhyaya, the faux pas is to embrace a fragmented perspective of social reality, which leads to the division of what are, in fact, integrated and interdependent social units.He claims that Indian thought has never viewed the individual and society as opposing and colliding entities.It has never seen them separately.One cannot live

without the other; they are inseparable. Both have separate requirements that may be met not by subjugating one to the other but via their interdependence. At the same time, dependency is not a state of helpless dependence; in the Indian notion, it is a state of reciprocal synchronization in which one is not viewed as an intimidation to the other but as an intuitive component of one's progress.

Deendayal highlights that 'inter-harmony,' or 'inter-agreeableness,' is preferable to even dependency. Minimal dignity exists; dependency fosters authentic self-esteem. Humans may only reach complete freedom in a social framework where mutual harmony, or agreeableness, governs societal and individual relationships. However, only he can be both agreeable and autonomous. The actual definition of freedom is the ability to live in harmony with others. And that is what Dharma means, i.e., the freedom to use one's innate physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual skills to benefit oneself and others. Dharma is the linkage that unites the person and society, resulting in an integral unity of humanness. It finally leads to the nurture of nationalism, which is an all-inclusive, universal, natural, and secular.

Conclusion

Though Deen Dayal Upadhyaya's concept of nationalism was heavily influenced by Golwalkar, with whom he worked most closely, Upadhyaya, who expressed his ideas in a more moderate language, was more widely accepted. His concept of Integral Humanism is a unique fusion of worldview and local understanding of culture and society, giving it a very secular view. It produced an intriguing paradox. The majority of his philosophical reflections centered on what constituted the Indian nation and why it had failed to become strong and united. He does not consider nationhood in terms of a geographical unit. Still, a sense of limitless devotion in the people's temperaments for their land is a prerequisite to creating a sense of 'my-ness.' Upadhyaya viewed this failure in moral terms, including political corruption, the general public's lack of desire to make India strong and prosperous, the 'degeneration' of society, and the waning of the idealism that had inspired the freedom struggle. Indians were deceived into believing that removing foreign rule was sufficient to achieve independence.

The beauty of Upadhyaya's concept of Integral Humanism is that he, on the one hand, side, avoids using Hindu, Hindutva, or Hinduism in his discussion and understanding of Indian nationalism, but on the other hand, he brings in the philosophical and ideological Hindu ideas of Dharma but focuses on the secular side of it and successfully produces in a universally

accepted form. Thus, the core tenets of Integral Humanism are the unity of the individual, the community, the world, and the supreme authority. Every person has distinct responsibilities and a wide range of tasks. The essence of holistic humanism is integrating these various facets of human life into a continuous interaction with one another.