

# **The Great Political Thinkers In Achieving Freedom - Mythological Features**

**Dr. Sachin Rastogi**

Assistant Professor, (Political Science) M.B.G.P.G. College, Haldwani

The term resistance is generally used whenever we oppose or defend a particular issue. The modern usage of the term has originated from the self-designation of several movements during World War II, especially the French resistance. A resistance movement is a group or collection of individual groups, dedicated to opposing an invader in an occupied country or the government of a sovereign state. It seeks to achieve its objects through either the use of non-violent resistance (sometimes referred to as civil resistance) or the use of armed force. Resistance movements may include any irregular armed force that rises up against an enforced or established authority. Some resistance movements are underground organizations engaged in the struggle for national independence in a country under military occupation or totalitarian domination. Tactics of resistance movements against a constituted authority range from non-violent resistance and civil disobedience, to industrial sabotage and guerrilla warfare. For example, In India, Gandhiji adopted the techniques of civil disobedience in the early 1930s and passive resistance during the Quit India movement in 1942. In this unit, you will learn about the strong and staunch nationalists who resisted not only the British government but also forces within the nation that were stopping them from achieving their personal ideals for the nation.

Savarkar belonged to the illustrious caste of Chitpavan Brahmins that produced Nanasahib of 1857 fame. Also, Wasudeo Balwant and Lokmanya Tilak, who strove for Indian independence belonged to the same community.

Savarkar stated that Britain's claim that she entered war to protect the vital principles affecting human freedom was a political stunt as long as she continued to hold India in political\ bondage. Savarkar discussed the war situation from the Indian viewpoint and its major issues in the context of international politics. Savarkar exhibited clear thinking and with unflagging energy. As regards foreign policy, he opined that it should be based on a very practical stand, on the principle of serving, safeguarding and promoting the national self-interest. He averred that it should not depend on 'isms'. The sound principle, he observed, in political arena is that that no form of government or political 'ism' was absolutely good or bad under all circumstances to all people alike. He propagated a policy of neutrality towards all nations in the world in respect of their internal affairs or mutual relations with each other.

According to Savarkar, all nations look first to ensure their own security and prosperity while dealing with international problems. They make or break pacts with this end alone in view. With the entry of Britain in the War, Savarkar declared that the Hindu Mahasabha felt itself concerned with the issues at stake in the War so far as they were likely to affect the safety and interest of the Hindu nation. So he appealed to the British Government to make an unmistakable declaration of granting Hindustan the status of a self-governing Dominion as an immediate step leading towards the final goal of complete independence and to introduce immediately a responsible Government at the Centre based on the democratic principle of one man one vote.

For Savarkar, the independence of India was 'the independence of our people, our race, and our nation'. Therefore, Indian Swarajya, as far as the Hindu nation is concerned, involves the political independence of the Hindu nation which would enable the people to grow to their full height. However, at the same time he declared at the 19th session of the Hindu Mahasabha held in Ahmadabad in 1937:

Let the Indian State be purely Indian. Let it not recognize any individual distinctions whatsoever as regards the franchise, public services, offices, taxation on the grounds of religion and race. Let no cognizance be taken whatsoever of man's being Hindu or Mohammedan, Christian or Jew. Let all citizens of that Indian State be treated according to their individual worth irrespective of their religious or racial percentage in the general population. Let that language and script be the national language and script of that Indian state which are understood by the overwhelming majority of the people as happens in every other state in the world, that is, in England or the United States of America and let no religious bias be allowed to tamper with that language and script with an enforced and perverse hybridism whatsoever. Let 'one man one vote' be the general rule irrespective of caste or creed, race or religion. If such an Indian State is kept in view the Hindu Sanghatanits will, in the interest of the Hindu Sanghatan itself, be the first to offer their whole hearted loyalty to it. To him, the ideals of democracy and fascism made no difference. He measured the forces of liberty and freedom and the forces of Nazism and Fascism by the same standard. He had, it seems, no clear and deeper conception of a new state; nor had he faith or interest in a new world order. Savarkar's sole obsession was to make Hindus re-animated and re-born into a martial race. However, Savarkar never wanted to use violence without

discrimination. He advised his compatriots to resort to violent means if and when other means fail to achieve the desired object. However, the winds of unending questions never seem to stop: How could a backward country like India stand up against or be compared with England? Where were the arms in Hindustan? Was it possible even to think of facing the British artillery? Indian soldiers in the British army were most loyal to their masters; then how could they be expected to rebel?

Savarkar was of the view that 'without the participation or cooperation of the army, it was impossible for any armed revolution to succeed in bringing freedom to Hindustan'. Savarkar used to stress that the 'Enemy's is difficulty is our opportunity' and the 'Enemy's enemy is our friend'. This 'Mantra' and 'Tantra' (of involving the Army in the struggle) were like time bombs kept under the very throne of the British Empire. Further, during the days of Savarkar's tumultuous propaganda for Hindu militarization, military career was the monopoly of the Muslims, who formed three-fourths of the Indian Army. Both the Muslims and the British Government knew well what Savarkar's militarization movement stood for. It aimed at carrying politics into the military ranks of the Indian Army, and winning over the Army to the side of revolution for the final overthrow of the British yoke. In fact, the ideal of Indian nationalism was a noble one. The Hindus did not find anything objectionable in the ideal of uniting whole of

India into a consolidated political unit. Naturally, it suited well with the Hindu mentality with its synthetic trend, always prone to philosophies with a universal urge. It is also true that the ideal of politics itself must be a Human state: all mankind for its citizens and the earth for its motherland. If all of India with one-fifth of the human race could be united irrespective of religious, racial and cultural diversities, merging them all into homogeneous whole, it would be but a gigantic stride taken by mankind towards the realization of that humanistic political ideal. The new concept of an Indian nationality was founded on the only common bond of a territorial unity of India. The Hindus for one found nothing revolting even in that assumption to their deepest religious or cultural or racial sentiment. It was because their national being had already been identified with that territorial unit, India, which to them was not only a land of sojourn but a home, their Fatherland, their Motherland, their Holy land and all in one! Indian patriotism was to them just a synonym of Hindu patriotism.

The British also, while they favoured the Indian movement as an antidote to any possible revival of Hindu nationalism, took good care in catching the contagion of this new Indian nationalist cult. They knew that if the Muslims also joined that cult whole-heartedly like the Hindus did, then there would really be united Indian nation—a contingency likely to prove perhaps more dangerous to British supremacy in India than a Hindu revival could single-handedly prove to be. Thus, the policy of dividing Indians on communal lines (the notion of religionserving as the basis for the new political process based on popular participation) and giving support to the communalists became, from the end of the 19th century onwards, an important instrument or colonial policy in the efforts to thwart the rising national movement. Since the founding of the Indian National Congress, parallel with its growth through different stages, and as an accompaniment to the process of constitutional reforms, the official policy of active promotion of communalism was developed. This policy was also developed to meet the political exigencies back home in Britain where the growing democracy and labour movement were increasingly questioning imperialism in general and the policy of suppression of the popular national movements in colonies in particular.

The colonial administrators presented communalism as the problem of the defence of minorities. So the defence of minorities became an important part of the theory of imperialists' legitimization of its other components like welfare of the colonized people, civilizing the natives, white man's burden, etc. The imperialist statesmen, officials and ideologues at that stage said that Britain had to continue to rule India because it alone could protect the minorities from domination, exploitation and suppression by the majority.

The aim of the British policy of divide and rule was to check the politicization of the Indian people, to curb their consolidation and unification and to disrupt the process of the formation of Indian nation. Once the anti-imperialist nationalist movement arose, the policy was also directed towards checking its growth, dividing its actual or potential supporters and preventing Muslims (as also landlords' capitalists, etc.) from joining it. However, the official British commitment was not to communalism in itself but its use for their own particular ends. It evolved gradually and changed to meet the changing times and the changing needs of colonial politics. It also differed from region to region. For example, it was not followed as one-sidedly in Punjab as in Bengal or U.P.; nor as actively between 1911–23 as before 1911 and after 1930.

The commitment to Muslim communalism became total only after 1939. After 1937, the British had shifted from balanced to uncontrolled communalism, encouraged total communal division, gave virtually open support to the Muslim league especially in its anti-Congress role and tolerated its efforts to acquire a mass character. As such, the first noticeable characteristic of Muslim political aggression, as Dr. Ambedkar pointed out in 'Pakistan or the Partition of India', was their constantly increasing demands. The second thing was the spirit of exploiting the weakness of the Hindus, like the Muslim's insistence upon cow-slaughter and the stoppage of music before mosques. The third thing

was the adoption by the Muslims of the 'gangster' method in politics. Dr. Ambedkar observed, 'The riots are a sufficient indication that gangsterism has become a settled part of their strategy in politics.' On the other hand, the Congress policy was 'to tolerate and appease the Muslims by political and other concessions'. Here Ambedkar appears to be one with Savarkar in his analysis of the Hindu-Muslim problem and on the point of holding the Congress squarely responsible for it. Unquestionably, the Congress policy in power and politics was grossly pro-Muslim.

The rivalry of Hindu Mahasabha with the Congress had nothing to do with the issue of social reform versus political reform. Its quarrel with the Congress had its origin in the pro-Muslim policy of the Congress. Mahatama Gandhi never realized that this attitude on the issue was whetting Muslim appetite all the more. In 1931, he said, instead of bringing about Swaraj by force it would be preferable to wait till the Congress became equally popular with the non-Hindus. Critics point out that it meant linking the future of Hindus with the satisfaction of Muslims.

Savarkar also maintained that India could not be assumed to be a Unitarian homogenous nation. On the contrary there were two nations in the main: the Hindus and Muslims. He was of the opinion that the Hindus as a nation were willing to discharge their duty to a common Indian state on equal footing. However, if the Indian Muslims followed a policy of communal strife against the Hindus and cherished extra territorial designs of establishing a Mohammedan Rule or supremacy in India then the Hindus would look to themselves and stand on their own legs and fight single handed as best as they can for the liberation of India from any non-Hindu yoke, be it English or Muslim or otherwise.

Savarkar maintained that the Independence of India was in sight; however, he sensed the danger to the integrity of India from the vacillating, servile, deceptive and short-sighted leaders and the Congress policy in respect of the blank cheque offers like the communal award, the Simon Commission (with all non-Indian personnel to go into the question of constitutional reform), the census, the national script, the lingua franca and the national anthem. By the late 1930s and early 1940s, the Government began giving unequivocal recognition to Hindu Mahasabha and the Muslim League as the political powers which must be consulted on an equal footing with the Congress in matters affecting Indian politics. Till then, the Congress and the League were looked upon by the Government as the only two representative bodies, whose opinion was tantamount to Indian opinion.

Referring to absolute non-violence, Savarkar demanded it to be ruled out not only on practical but also on moral grounds. Savarkar's meeting with Subhash Chandra Bose on 29 June 1940 shaped his militarization policy. One cannot deny that Savarkar was the main source of inspiration for the formation of the Indian National Army, whose founder Rasbehari Bose, an Indian revolutionary settled in Japan, was fully committed to Savarkar's mission of militarization and of armed revolution. It was Rasbehari who had informed Savarkar that Japan would enter the War before the end of the year 1940. Rasbehari even formed a unit of the Hindu Mahasabha in Japan after Savarkar became its President in 1937. That was the time when Savarkar once again emerged on the active political scenes after a lapse of 20 years.

Savarkar also made a four-fold contribution to the Hyderabad struggle, also known as Nizam Civil Resistance Movement, to make it the manifestation of Pan-Hinduism, to keep the Arya Samaj as its forefront to expose the anti-Hindu character of the Indian National Congress and to call off the struggle at the appropriate time. During this struggle, there was complete co-operation between the Hindu Mahasabha and the Arya Samaj (founded by Maharishi Dayanand in Punjab in 1876) in spite of the wily hindrances caused by topmost Congress leaders, callous misrepresentations made by the so-called nationalist-cum-Congress press, unsympathetic attitude of the Provincial Congress Ministries and the non-embarrassment policy of Gandhi.

This successful termination of the struggle for the civic, political, economic and religious rights of the Hindus and Sikhs, who were totally suppressed in the Hyderabad State, was a new feather in Savarkar's cap. It added prestige and power to his leadership skills. Hyderabad struggle was the first successful Civil Disobedience Movement in the history of modern India. It was the first successful political manifestation of Pan-Hinduism. It revealed the unique leadership qualities, organizational skills, political acumen and missionary zeal of Veer Savarkar. Gandhi's Quit India Movement coincided with Savarkar's tendering his resignation from the presidentship of the Hindu Mahasabha on 31 July 1942. In his parting message, he asked to 'Hinduize all politics and militarize Hindudom'. However, the resignation sent waves of shocks throughout the Hindu Sanghatanist public in India. How could one afford to lose a personality that could energize the entire youth of the nation? He was a born leader. The role and responsibility which Gandhi and Nehru played and bore in the Congress, which arose over the talents and toils of Dadabhai Naoroji, Surenderanath Banerjee, Gokhale, Tilak and Das, was shouldered alone by Savarkar in the Hindu Mahasabha. It is worth quoting here that 'the Hindu

Mahasabha would have joined the Congress in the 1942 movement if the Congress had solemnly guaranteed that it would irrevocably stand by the unity and integrity of India and that the Congress would not make any pact with the anti-national Muslim League'. The annual session of the Hindu Mahasabha at Kanpur in December 1942 witnessed the return of Savarkar as the President once again.

In the meanwhile, Hindu Mahasabha alongwith Savarkar, Dr. Mookerjee, Dr. Moonje, N.C. Chatterjee, Raja Maheshwar Dayal, Rai Bahadur Meherchand Khanna and Prof. V.G. Deshpande framed national demands which included the immediate recognition of India by the British Parliament as an independent nation, national coalition government with full powers during the war period excepting the military portfolio, so far as the operative part was concerned, and holding of a constitution-framing assembly as soon as the war ceased.

On 10 February 1943, Gandhi began his 21-day fast in the Aga Khan Palace. In total confinement of his charitable attitude, Savarkar made appeals to Gandhi to break his fast. He said, 'His life, Gandhi himself may realize such a national appeal, is not so much his own as it is a national asset, a national property.' Savarkar opened a propaganda front to create a strong Hindu public opinion. He issued an appeal to the Hindus in general and Hindu Sanghatanists in particular to denounce this nefarious proposal for Pakistan uncompromisingly and fundamentally and asked the people to observe the first week of August 1944 as the United India and Anti-Pakistan Week.

Raising concerns for the fate of non-Muslims in the would-be Pakistan, he said, 'What were the thousands of Hindu Sikhs to do when faced by an imminent danger of being massacred in cold blood, looted, burnt alive, forcibly converted, in short, of being exterminated as racial and national being by the most barbarous attacks of an organized, dangerously armed and fanatically hostile foe and especially when the State as such was nowhere in evidence so effectively as to render any the least protection to them? Indian nationalism, secularism, Hindu-Muslim unity were fine words. However, at that particular moment, when the lives of millions of Hindus and Sikhs were in danger, these fine words were irrelevant. Instead of doing some introspection as to why the Congress policy failed, Nehru just blamed the Hindu Sanghatansits. Aggressively demanding a proactive role by the Hindu masses for establishing a Hindu Rashtra, Savarkar said: 'The choice therefore is not between two sets of personalities but between two ideologies, not between Indian Raj and Hindu Raj but between Muslim Raj and Hindu Raj, between Akhand Hindustan and Akhand Pakistan. The Hindu Sanghatanist ideology alone can, therefore, save our nation and re-establish an Akhand Hindustan from the Indus to the Seas.'

Then history took an unexpected and shocking turn! In the midst of an atmosphere of extreme gloom, confusion and disaster, Nathuram Vinayak Godse shot Gandhi with a revolver while Gandhi was going to the prayer ground in the compound of Birla House at Delhi in the evening at 5.30 on Friday, 30 January 1948, five minutes after the talks Gandhi had with Sardar Patel for settling the differences between Patel and Nehru on the question of 'Muslim loyalty' to India. Naturally, this terrible act brought drastic and severe reaction against Hindu Mahasabha and the Rashtriyra Sawayam Sevak Sangh.

Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar was born on 19 February 1906. He was also fondly called Shri Guruji. He was an author and a political activist. The author of two highly controversial books— Bunch of Thoughts, and We, or Our Nationhood Defined— he also held the position of leader of the Rashtriyra Swayamsevak Sangha (RSS).

His ideals and beliefs still live on, a century later, as is evident from the fact that the current Indian Prime Minister, Shri Narendra Modi has included a biographical profile of MS Golwalkar in his book, Jyotipunj, as one of the leaders who have inspired him. Golwalkar breathed his last on 5 June 1973.

Golwalkar was born in Ramtek near Nagpur, Maharashtra and turned out to be the only surviving son of the nine children born to his parents, Sadashivrao and Lakshmibai. Sadashivrao was a school teacher who was frequently transferred in his job to various parts of the country and as a result, Golwalkar completed his education across many institutions of India.

Golwalkar graduated from the Hislop College in Nagpur finally, with a Bachelor's degree in the sciences in 1926. After this, he joined Benaras Hindu University (BHU) in Varanasi to obtain a Master's degree in science. While he was still studying, he met Madan Mohan Malviya and was greatly impressed and influenced by his ideas. Malviya was a national leader at the time and also the founder of BHU.

He completed his Master's degree in 1928 and proceeded to pursue his Ph.D. in marine life at Madras. However, this part of his education was cut short prematurely due to shortage of money. Subsequently, he joined BHU as a professor of zoology and continued there for 3 years. It was during this time that he became the beloved 'guruji' for his students, because of his flowing beard, long hair and unpretentious style of dressing. This style was later adopted by his RSS followers to show reverence to him. After three years of teaching, Golwalkar went back to Nagpur and obtained his LLB degree in 1935.

While in Nagpur, Golwalkar happened to visit the Ramakrishna Mission and he was so deeply influenced that he was ready to renounce the world and take sanyas and also left for the Saragachi Ashram in Murshidabad district of West

Bengal. At the ashram, he became a disciple of Swami Akhandananda, a direct disciple of Ramakrishna and gurubandhu of Vivekananda.

Finally, on 13 January 1937, he was initiated into the order of the Asmrana and also received his 'diksha'. However, his guru was not ready to allow him to become a sanyasi. His guru asked him instead to carry on with his social service. His guru died in 1937 and that is when Golwalkar went back to Nagpur. I believe that I would be in a better position to achieve it successfully being a part of the Sangh."

As soon as he took up his new responsibility as the Sarsanghachalak, Golwalkar started a series of cross-country tours where he met the Sangh workers and propagated the RSS ideology. Due to this and many other initiatives, the Sangh activities flourished under his leadership and there was a considerable increase in the number of shakhas countrywide. To him goes the credit for creating the network of various socio-cultural organisations all over the country, which eventually came to be known as the Sangh Parivar. Organizations like the Bharatiya Jana Sangh (political party), Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh (trade union), Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad (students union), Vanavasi Kalyan Ashram (tribal welfare) and many more such were established by Swayamsevaks who ventured into different fields of public life.

In 1940, RSS opened its branches in Kashmir and Jammu. At this time, Balraj Madhok was appointed as a pracharak for Jammu, and Prem Nath Dogra was appointed the sanghchalak (Director). When a shakha was established in Srinagar in 1944, Golwalkar visited there in 1946. On 18 October 1947, owing to a request made by Sardar Patel (India's then Home Minister), Golwalkar met the Maharaja Hari Singh, to persuade the Maharaja to accede his empire to India.

Golwalkar took along Vasant Rao Oak, the RSS pracharak for Delhi, and Narendrajit Singh, the RSS sanghchalak for United Provinces. Historians believe that the Maharaja was successfully persuaded but formal accession papers were signed much later, on the 26 October, after Pakistanis invaded. The trunks were crammed with blueprints of great accuracy and professionalism of every town and village in that vast area, prominently marking out the Muslim localities and habitations. There were also detailed instructions regarding access to the various locations, and other matters which amply revealed their sinister purport.

Greatly alarmed by these revelations, I immediately took the police party to the Premier's house. There, in a closed room, Jaitley gave a full report of his discovery, backed by all the evidence contained in the steel trunks. Timely raids conducted on the premises of the RSS (Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh) had brought the massive conspiracy to light. The whole plot had been concerted under the direction and supervision of the Supremo of the organization [Golwalkar] himself. Both Jaitley and I pressed for the immediate arrest of the prime accused, Shri Golwalkar, who was still in the area.'

Dayal further recounts that the Chief Minister was reluctant to place Golwalkar under arrest, as he himself would have wanted. However, the Chief Minister promised to initiate discussion of this issue in the Cabinet: 'At the Cabinet meeting there was the usual procrastination and much irrelevant talk. The fact that the police had unearthed a conspiracy which would have set the whole province in flames and that the officers concerned deserved warm commendation hardly seemed to figure in the discussion.' After the discussion, the Cabinet decided to send a letter to Golwalkar demanding an explanation for the evidence that had been gathered against him.

Dayal claims to have drafted the letter, which was dispatched for delivery through two police officers immediately. However, the letter remained undelivered because: 'Golwalkar, however, had been tipped off and he was nowhere to be found in the area. He was tracked down southwards but he managed to elude the couriers in pursuit. This infructuous chase continued from place to place and weeks passed. Came January 30, 1948, when the Mahatma, that supreme apostle of peace, fell to a bullet fired by an RSS fanatic. The whole tragic episode left me sick at the heart.'

After Mahatma Gandhi's assassination in January 1948 by Nathuram Godse, a Sangh member, it was widely believed that RSS was a part of the plot, even though Golwalkar had strongly condemned the murder publicly. Golwalkar was placed under arrest on Feb 4 along with 20,000 swayamsevaks. Besides this, the Sangh was banned for allegedly promoting "violence" and "subversion." After the arrests, Godse announced publicly that he had acted independently of the Sangh and of his own will, thereby vindicating the Sangh of any responsibility for Gandhi's murder. However, his brother Gopal Godse—who was also an accused in the Gandhi assassination claimed that Nathuram was still very much a member of the RSS and was only trying to protect the organization and Golwalkar by taking the complete blame. Finally, Golwalkar was released on 5 August after the statutory six months came to an end.

The government did not lift the ban on RSS even after Golwalkar was released despite Golwalkar's best efforts. Golwalkar negotiated endlessly with the then Home Minister Vallabhbhai Patel. Owing to the ban, the violence and

mass arrests that followed against the Sangh shocked the RSS members, who had heretofore considered themselves to be a part of a patriotic organization.

During his negotiations with Golwalkar, Patel offered that RSS merge with the Congress, but Golwalkar's was not ready for this step. At Golwalkar's refusal, Patel made it mandatory for the Sangh to have a written constitution and made it a pre-condition for any further step. In response to this, Golwalkar launched a satyagraha on 9 December 1948. Again, Golwalkar was placed under arrest, together with 60,000 RSS volunteers. The RSS leaders Eknath Ranade, Bhaiyaji Dani and Balasaheb Deoras gave up on the satyagraha in January 1949 and, in collaboration with Liberal leader T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, created a constitution for the RSS which was as per Patel's demand. The ban was finally lifted on 11 July 1949.

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya was born on 25 September. He was an eminent philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist, and political scientist. He led the Bharatiya Jan Sangha, the predecessor of the modern-day Bharatiya Janta Party. He is also the formulator of the Integral Humanism theory. His thinking was different and the theory served as an alternative framework for politics and governance. His birthplace was a small village in Uttar Pradesh, called Chandrabhan. It is around 25 kms away from the town of Mathura. Chandrabhan has now been renamed as Deendayal Dham. His father was Bhagwati Prasad, a popular astrologer of his time and his mother was Shrimati rampyari who was also a pious lady. However, both his parents passed away when he was a young boy and he was raised by his maternal uncle and his wife. He was an exceptional student and topped his batch in the board exam for matriculation, in his school in Sikar. For this, he received a gold medal from Maharaja Kalyan Singh of Sikar, besides a monthly scholarship of Rs. 10 and Rs 250 more for books. He completed intermediate level from the Birla College in Pilani, which is now the prestigious Birla Institute of Technology and Science. In 1939, he completed his graduation with first division from the Sanatan Dharma College in Kanpur. He wanted to study further and get his Master's degree in English Literature and for this he joined St. John's College, Agra. However, he could not give his first year final exams because his cousin fell gravely ill. Thereafter, on his uncle's persuasion, he sat for the Provincial Services Exam. He qualified but refused to join the Services because he was more inclined towards working with the common man. To this end, he obtained a B. T. degree at Prayag and entered public service.

When he was studying at the Sanatan College in Kanpur, one of his classmates was Baluji Mahashabde, through whom he found out about the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and eventually met the founder, K.B. Hedgewar. At the shakha where he met Hedgewar, he engaged in an intellectual discussion with the leader and impressed everyone around. This gave a boost to his public persona and RSS provided him a medium to fulfil his ambition of public service. And from 1942, he became a full-time member of the RSS after completing his Sangh training at a 40 day camp in Nagpur. He didn't stop there and also completed a second-year training of the RSS, thereby qualifying for becoming a lifelong RSS pracharak. He started work at Lakhmipur as a pracharak and eventually in 1955, became the joint prant pracharak (regional organiser) for Uttar Pradesh.

Deendayal Upadhyaya was a man with lofty ideals and was a brilliant organizer, besides having the capacity to think in turn like a social thinker, economist, educationalist, politician, writer, journalist, speaker, organiser etc., as the situation required. His Sangh leaders considered him to be the ideal RSS swayamsevak because 'his discourse reflected the pure thought-current of the Sangh'. In the 1940s, he launched a monthly publication called Rashtra Dharma, from Lucknow, which aimed to spread the ideology of nationalism. He never let his name appear in the publication as the Chief Editor but in each edition there would be a long, impressive and thought-provoking piece of writing by him which left an indelible mark on the mind of his readers. Subsequently, he also started a weekly magazine called Panchjanya and a daily publication called Swadesh.

After the Bharatiya Jan Sangh was founded in 1951 by Syama Prasad Mookerjee, RSS leaders felt that Deendayal was ready to be in command for merging the Jan Sangh smoothly into RSS. He was appointed as General Secretary of its Uttar Pradesh branch, and later the all-India General Secretary. He was so good at this position and so meticulous in his work that he impressed Syama Prasad Mookerjee enough for him to say: 'If I had two Deendayals, I could transform the political face of India.' When Mookerjee passed away suddenly in 1953, Deendayal had to shoulder the entire responsibility of building up the orphaned organisation and nurturing it into a countrywide movement. For the next decade and a half, he remained the organization's general secretary and in his own meticulous way, built it up slowly but surely. He gathered a group of dedicated, young, loyal workers and inspired in them the idealism which he felt himself and these young workers ultimately formed the backbone of the organization. However, when he stood for Lok Sabha elections from UP, he lost.

Upadhyaya was the proponent of the political philosophy known as Integral Humanism. It eventually became the guiding philosophy of the Bharatiya Janata Party. The philosophy advocates the synchronized and combined program of the body, mind and intellect and soul of each human being. As per Upadhyaya, the main focus in India must be to build a unique economic model which puts the human being at centerstage.

The theory is in opposition to western capitalist individualism as well as Marxist socialism. However, it shows the relevance of western science. It is actually attempting to establish a middle path between capitalism and socialism, while recognizing the merits of both and criticizing the excesses of both.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- [1] Chand, Tara; History of Freedom Movement in India, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi, 2005.
- [2] Chandra, Bipin; Freedom Struggle, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1999.
- [3] Chandra, Bipin; Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India's Struggle for Independence, Penguin Books, New Delhi, 1989.
- [4] Choudhary, S. B.; Civil Disturbances during the British Rule in India (1765 – 1857), World Press Limited, Calcutta, 1999.
- [5] Desai, A. R.; Social Background of Indian Nationalism, Popular Prakashan, New Delhi, 2008.
- [6] Majumdar, R.C.; The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857, Calcutta Oriental Press Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta, 1988.
- [7] Sarkar, Sumit; Modern India (1885 – 1947), Macmillan, New Delhi, 2000.
- [8] Appadorai, A.; Documents on Political Thought in Modern India, Oxford University Press, Bombay, 1973.
- [9] Bali, D.R.; Modern Political Thought (From Ram Mohan Roy to Jayaprakash Narayan), Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1993.