



**MARX AND DEENDAYAL—  
THE TWO APPROACHES**

**D. B. Thengdi**



**DEENDAYAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
NEW DELHI-110055**

# Marx and Deendayal--The Two Approaches

By

D.B. Thengdi

## I MARX

Like Deendayal Upadhyaya, Karl Marx was also a great basic thinker. Though like any other thinker, he also borrowed from diverse sources. He utilised findings of Newton and Darwin for constructing his cosmology, though he rejected the latter's law of natural selection. Besides the theories of Plato, he was influenced by the medieval heretics, Niklas Storch, Thomas More, Campanella, Winstanley, Vesras, Fontenelle, Meslier, Morelly, Diderot and Deschamps in his views on marriage, family, religion and private property. He used Hegelian dialectics and turned it upside down. Feuerbach's method of 'transformational criticism' was adopted by him for inverting Hegelianism. Moreover, the idea of economic interpretation of politics, linkage of the state with class interests and property system coming "through a long line of heritage from Aristotle to Machiavelli, Locke and James Medis" were his arsenals for substantiating his verdict against capitalism. Lassalle's economic view of history came handy for his scientific formulation, (Freud's concept of alienation and existentialism in psychology for elevating his economic determinism to the status of a collective socio-

(economic problem.) He collected the facts of contemporary British economy to attack both the 'Laissez Faire' system and the tenets of Adam Smith's 'The Wealth of Nations'.

However, he was not a blind borrower. Marx's genius transformed ideas. Nothing on which he worked was left in its original form. Though economics, sociology, political theory, history and philosophy are all used in his sweeping analysis, he synthesised all these disciplines into his own basic thought-structure. English utilitarianism, French socialist thought and the beginning of German radicalism were suitably incorporated into his basic framework. All up-to-date knowledge was pressed into service of a single cause.

To be fair, one should not identify Marx with his more fanatic followers who carved a religion out of his thought-system. They have gone so far as to assert that real science must flow from, and further substantiate the Marxian dialecticism. They are making a ridiculous attempt to prove that all scientists are unconscious adherents of dialectical materialism.

According to orthodox Marxists, Faraday's discovery of electromagnetic induction, von Mayer's discovery of the law of the conservation of energy, Einstein's formulation of the theory of relativity, or the construction of quantum mechanics as a physical theory, could not have been possible had Marx not formulated his theory of dialecticism. These fanatics trace the source of the theory of relativity and quantum theory to 'Das Capital'.

But generally, the Western scientists either ignore Marxism or positively reject Dialectical Materialism as

the philosophy of modern science; some of them even actually oppose dialectical materialism which has not yet led to any major scientific discovery. Such assertions are certainly not in keeping with the scientific way of Marx's thinking. What we are concerned with is original Marxian thinking and not its interpretation as presented by his dogmatic followers.

Nevertheless, any thinker can base his thought-system only on the contemporary level of human knowledge. But the frontiers of human knowledge are ever-expanding. Consequently, an absolute truth of today becomes a relative truth of tomorrow. For example, conclusions drawn on the basis of the nineteenth century science are bound to appear outmoded in the light of the twentieth century science.

## II DEENDAYAL

Long back Arnold Toynbee had observed: "On the surface, those Hindus who have adopted one, to them, extremely alien Western culture on the planes of technology and science, language and literature, administration and law, appear to have been more successful than the Russians in harmonising with their native ways of life a Western way that is intrinsically more alien to them than it is to the Russians. Yet the tension in Hindu souls must be extreme, and sooner or later it must find some means of discharging itself."

"Whatever may be the relief that Hindu souls are going to find for themselves eventually, it seems clear that, for them, there can be no relief from the impact of our Western civilization by opening themselves to

the influence of Communism; for Communism—a Western heresy adopted by an ex-orthodox Christian Russia—is just as much part and parcel of the Graeco-Judiac heritage as the Western way of life is, and the whole of this cultural tradition is alien to the Hindu spirit.”

// It must, however, be noted that Deendayal ji was well conversant with all the thought-currents of the West, including the recently evolved New Left of Sartre and Herbert Marcuse.

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

Deendayal ji had an additional advantage of being closely acquainted with different streams of traditional Indian thought. He had fully grasped the implications of the term 'Dharma' which is the characteristic gift of Hindu Seers to humanity. The claim of Shri Dange and Shri Bani Deshpande that most of the basic tenets of Marxism were anticipated by Vedanta may be controversial; but there can be no difference of

opinion about the fact that Marxian thought system would have been considerably altered had Marx been conversant with the Hindu view of life and universe.

Realisation of unity in the midst of diversity, on the rock-like basis of *Advaita Darshana*; understanding of complementarity between the material and the non-material; comprehension of truth along the line of 'Syad-Vada', the art of dealing with immediate human problems in the light of the eternal universal laws; these, among other things, are some of the contributions of Hinduism which could have added valuable dimensions to Marxian thought and probably altered it beyond recognition. Both these thinkers were humanists of the first order, though their humanism assumed apparently different forms on account of differences in their mental backgrounds, sources of inspiration and contemporary world situations.

### III. MARXIAN GOALS

According to Marx, "The goal for man is to realise his humanity, his human nature, and this carries the categorical imperative to overthrow all the relations in which man is debased, enslaved, helpless, contemptible creature". He sought to put an end to dehumanisation and self-alienation which is characteristic of capitalist system. He was sorry to find out "man exists in this world as 'Unmensch' (Unman)". For him, communism was "the actual phase necessary for the next stage of historical development in the process of human emancipation and recovery". Again, "Communism is for us not a stable state which is to be established, an ideal to which reality will have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which

abolishes the present state of things.” The fundamental principle of a higher type of society, Marx thinks, is “the full development of every individual.” The accumulation of wealth at one pole of society involves a simultaneous accumulation of poverty, labour, torment, slavery, brutalisation and moral degradation at the opposite pole. Money is the alienated essence of man’s work and his being. The end and aim of capitalist production is an endeavour to promote to the utmost the self-expansion of capital, meaning thereby the production of the largest possible amount of surplus value and, therefore, the maximum possible exploitation of labour-power by the capitalist. He wanted man to be liberated from the bondage of economics, to leave behind the ‘realm of necessity’, and to enter ‘the realm of freedom’. Under ideal conditions, “the productive labour”, says Engels, “instead of being a means to the subjection of man, will become a means to their emancipation by giving each individual the opportunity to develop and exercise all his faculties, physical and mental, in all directions”. Marx observes; “The main principle which must guide us in the selection of a vocation is the welfare of humanity and our own perfection”.

For this, it is necessary to change the current capitalist value-system, which debases both—the exploiter and the exploited, demolish the structure of capitalism under which a worker no longer feels himself to be anything but an animal; and enable him to separate finally from the animal world, to leave the conditions of animal existence behind him, and enter conditions which are really human. Being liberated from the bondage of material needs, man will cherish the vision

of the 'realm of freedom' beyond which "begins that development of human power which is its own end." Mr. H.S. Sinha has ably shown in his 'Communism and the Gita' that the inspiration of Marx was in ethics, and he used economics as his instrument. But in his zeal to change the world instead of merely interpreting it, he allowed himself, as far as the solutions were concerned, to be completely pre-occupied with the then current maladies of the industrialised West dominated by the inhuman capitalists and the anachronistic church, and tried to generalise his conclusions which were partly valid in the immediate context. Hence his error of judgement regarding the efficacy of the Western parliamentary democratic system, trade unionism and cooperative movement; capacity of capitalism to adjust itself with the changed level of mass consciousness; the role of proletariat; the potentialities of the peasantry; and the inherent strength of social organism, such as, nation and family. But for such lopsided preoccupations, Marx was certainly capable of giving a comprehensive thought to the problems of the entire humanity and working out solutions which could have been more universal in nature.

#### IV INTEGRALISM

Deendayal ji did not suffer from any such inhibitions. As a leader of a national political party he was called upon to offer solutions to immediate national problems and he did it in a commendable way. But this role did not overshadow his thinking process in his evolution of the theory of Integral Humanism. Only a mind that attains universality can conceive of remedies that are universal in character. In fact, his comprehension



was not confined to the human species. He expected human consciousness—without suffering from homocentricism. He had a vision of the world-state enriched by the growth and contribution of different national cultures, and of *Manava Dharma* enriched by the perfection of all religions, including Marxism. He had realised that the identification of an individual with different organisms, ranging from family to the universe, was only an outward manifestation of the evolution of his consciousness.

The more developed the consciousness, the larger and higher would be the organism with which one is identified. But this being a process of subjective evolution, the higher level of consciousness does not preclude the previous lower levels. It is inclusive, not exclusive, in character. One can be equally and simultaneously attached to all the organisms without doing injustice to anyone of them. This is an integral view of things. Every human being must be considered in an integrated way; the body, mind, intelligence and soul of a person must not be thought of as separate entities.

Integralism is the special characteristic of Panditji's Humanism. While he appreciated the utility of appropriate socio-economic order in any scheme for human happiness, he laid greater stress on the moulding and development of human consciousness, in absence of which no social order, howsoever meritorious, can yield its desired results. According to Marx, life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness is determined by life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social

being that determines their consciousness. Panditji, on the other hand, believed that while life or social being and consciousness act and react upon each other, it is consciousness that is more decisive. Integralism and consequent stress on development of consciousness distinguish his approach from that of Marx.

For example, both Marx and Panditji considered statelessness as an ideal condition of any society. Marx also considered the State as an expression of man's self alienation. But because he considered mind as only a superstructure on matter, he conceived of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' as the transitional phase. For Deendayal ji, the effective instrument was Dharma consciousness. The ideals of the nation constitute '*Chiti*', which is analogous to the soul of an individual. The laws that help manifest and maintain *Chiti* of a nation are termed as Dharma of that nation implying that every social organism has its own Dharma.

## V THE TWO APPROACHES

Both of them were against exploitation and the system that gives rise to it, Pandit ji said :

"But one thing is clear, that many institutions will yield place to new ones. This will adversely affect those who have vested interests in the old institutions. Some others who are by nature averse to change will also suffer by efforts of reconstruction. But diseases must be treated with medicine—therefore, we shall have to discard the *status quo* mentality and usher in a new era. Indeed our effort at reconstruction need not be clouded by prejudice against, or disregard for, all that is inherited from our past. On the other hand, there

is no need to cling to past institutions and traditions which have outlived their utility.

Marx advocated bloody revolution for destroying not only the superstructure but also the foundations of the existing social order; Panditji stood for mass awakening, mass education and mass mobilisation through appropriate *sanskaras* with a view to alter the superstructure, leaving intact the eternal foundation of Dharma<sup>1</sup>

Both these thinkers visualised full development of all the faculties of every individual. But while Deendayal ji considered man in an integrated way, Marx, under the influence of the then prevailing objective conditions, treated man as an economic being. In fact, Marx was against the power of money, against the sense of possession. He wanted man to be liberated from the lust for wealth and the bondage of economic factors. But, in practice, he emphasised mainly the economic aspect of human existence. This has caused lopsidedness in his theory.

Deendayal ji was a bitter critic of corruption and perversion in the field of religion. But he did not throw away the baby along with the bathwater. The Western tradition of anti-religious intellectuals and the nauseating picture of the Christian church turned Marx against religion and he declared crusade against all religions about some of which he had no intimate knowledge.<sup>2</sup>

Integral Humanism believes in the plurality in the midst of a single mankind in the form of different national personalities. It simultaneously believes that internationalism is the outward manifestation of the

development of human consciousness from the earlier stage of nationalism. Marxism is the embodiment of national nihilism. 'The proletariat has no fatherland'. According to Lenin, "Socialism's aim is not only to abolish the fragmentation of humanity into small states and to end all distinctions between nations, not only to bring the nations closer together but to bring about fusion". This is based upon the ignorance of the inherent strength of the nation-concept. Let it be remembered that nationalism has always been strong even in countries under communist governments. It has been the case even during periods of actual communist revolution.<sup>3</sup>

It is a shallow view of Russian history which sees Bolshevism as an alien excrescence grafted on the Russian body politic by a handful of power-lusting conspirators without roots in the past. The triumph of the Bolshevik Revolution was in no sense inevitable; but Bolshevism as a movement was an indigenous, authoritarian response to the environment of Tsarist absolutism which nurtured it." "Chinese Communism" Malcolm D. Kennedy observe "is a child of Chinese Nationalism, which means a determination to shake off foreign domination."<sup>4</sup> This also holds good for Communism in Vietnam and other developing countries.

On this point Marx was thoroughly wrong. Consider, for example, the resurgence of nationalism in all communist countries; patriotic uprisings in Eastern Europe; demand for complete internal autonomy by communist parties of the western Europe; conscious efforts in all countries, including India, to reconcile Marxism with national heritage; was between Vietnam

and Combdia, and tussle between USSR and China prompted by the instinct of national self-interest.

Marxism proclaims the disappearance of the 'Bourgeois family'. Engels<sup>5</sup> expounds in detail the Marxist views on the development of family, which is one of the superstructures erected on the economic base. In an ideal society, the management of the individual household would be turned into a branch of social work. The family will lose all its social functions. It will die out. Being purged of its social content, the family will wither away.

Marxism does not view marriage with favour.<sup>6</sup> Though Marx said, "we shall interfere in the private relations between men and women only insofar as they disrupt our social structure," what disrupts social structure is to be decided finally by the Communist State only. Academic discussion on this point seems to be superfluous. Even under communist regime, family has come to stay, and "ollicial and open wife-sharing instead of hypocritical and concealed wife-sharing" could not yet acquire any measure of respectability.

Though Marxism ultimately pleads for the full development of every individual, it negates, in the immediate context, the individuality of men. In practice, equality is turned into equivalence. Individual citizens are components of the state-apparatus. Individual relations between husbands and wives, and between parent and children are to be destroyed. Children need not know their parents, and should be brought up by the state. The individual, family, marriage and the familial rearing of children should not exist.

Such a negation of individuality is bound to result in the destruction of Man. As Igor Shafarevich puts it, the basic problem is really that "the establishment of a social order fully embodying the principles of socialism will lead to a complete alteration in man's relation to life and to a radical break in the structure of human individuality."

## VI 'ISM'LESSNESS

The ideology of Deendayal ji as well as of Marx is essentially humanistic. But unfortunately, the traditional prejudices of European intelligentsia, coupled with pressing requirements of the immediate and lack of adequate knowledge of the Hindu *Darshana*, contributed largely to the imbalance and compartmentalisation in Marxian thought system. Both of them were wise enough not to found any 'ism'. Deendayalji's use of the term 'ism' was a practical concession to the common man's level of understanding which could not comprehend the grand 'ism'-lessness of *Sanatana Dharma*; and Marx is reported to have once remarked, "Thank God! I am not a Marxist." Both of them were, again, mature enough not to present any elaborate blueprint, though they certainly provided the guidelines. Neither of them offered any precise description of the ideal socio-politico-economic institutions and their mutual relationships. This is as it should be. A clear-cut blueprint is necessarily evolved by pragmatic system-builders in course of time on the basis of practical experience and continuous appraisal of the situation. The maxim 'from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs' is quite consistent with the spirit of Intergal Humanism. Both thought-systems consider freedom from

want and production or action for the sake of self-fulfilment, as an ideal condition. The final stage of communism consisting of 'socialised humanity' that is "a classless, stateless, and generally a structureless collectivity of complete individuals who live in harmony with themselves and with each other" is broadly compatible with the ultimate goal of Integral Humanism.

But Marx was at a disadvantage in that he had no heritage to fall back upon, which would readily offer suitable instruments for achieving the end. How to raise complete individual? What precisely would constitute the sustaining force for the ideal society?

## VII THE DESTINATION

The Hindu culture conceives of progress of man as simultaneous progress of the body, mind, intellect and soul. It places before us the ideal of the fourfold responsibilities of catering to the needs of body, mind intellect and soul with a view to achieving, the integrated progress of man. The fourfold '*Purushartha*', i.e., Dharma, Artha, Kama and Moksha, in an integrated way, constitute the ultimate goal of individual life. In this scheme of *Purusharathas*, the Artha and the Kama are sandwiched between the Dharma and the Moksha. The material is happily, and in a balanced way, integrated with the spiritual. And among these the Dharma is basic and supreme. It sustains society in its ideal condition. Dharma renders validity and stability to an ideal socio-economic structure and the various institutions functioning within its framework.

Thus, the Hindu heritage furnishes us with the tools of reconstruction at different levels. This is the

destination envisaged by Integral Humanism. It would be superfluous to inquire about comparative merit of different thought systems. Each system is great in its own way. The problem is how to make them mutually complementary. For us, it should not be an insoluble problem. An aptitude for synthesis, as manifested brilliantly by Vyas and Sankara, has been one of the unique features of our national genius.

#### REFERENCES

1. It is also noteworthy that in the West there prevailed nothing equivalent to Dharma which comprises eternal, unchanging Universal Laws and socio-economic orders changing from time to time in the light of the former.
2. Paradoxically enough, freedom of religion has been incorporated now in the latest constitutions of USSR and China, and religion is raising its head even in Albania which is "the world's first atheist state".
3. Fainsod in his *How Russia is Ruled*.
4. *A Short History of Communism in Asia*.
5. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*.
6. *The Communist Manifesto* devotes some space to wife-sharing.