



**International Journal of Advanced Research in
Education and Technology (IJARETY)**

Volume 11, Issue 6, November- December 2024

Impact Factor: 7.394



Integral Humanism as a Holistic Political and Social Philosophy in Indian Thought

Rojalin Panda, Dr. Vijay Pal

Researcher, Department of Political Science, Sunrise University, Alwar (Rajasthan), India¹

Professor, Department of Political Science, Sunrise University, Alwar (Rajasthan), India²

ABSTRACT: Integral Humanism represents a distinctive and indigenous contribution to Indian political and social thought, offering a holistic framework for understanding human life, society, and governance. Propounded by Deendayal Upadhyaya, Integral Humanism emerged as a response to the dominance of Western political ideologies in post-independence India. It sought to provide an alternative philosophy rooted in India's cultural, ethical, and civilizational traditions while addressing the challenges of modern politics and society.

As a holistic philosophy, Integral Humanism views the human being as an integrated whole, encompassing physical, intellectual, emotional, moral, and spiritual dimensions. It rejects reductionist approaches that interpret human life solely in economic or political terms. Unlike liberal individualism, which often emphasizes material prosperity and personal freedom at the cost of social responsibility, and collectivist ideologies such as socialism, which prioritize the state or class over the individual, Integral Humanism advocates a balanced path that harmonizes individual dignity with social welfare.

In the political sphere, Integral Humanism emphasizes ethical governance, decentralization, and participatory democracy. It regards the state not merely as an instrument of power, but as a means to promote social harmony and comprehensive human development. The concept of Dharma occupies a central position in this philosophy, serving as a moral and ethical guide for both rulers and citizens. Dharma, in this sense, regulates the exercise of power and ensures that politics remains rooted in justice, responsibility, and compassion.

As a social philosophy, Integral Humanism presents an organic view of society, where individuals and institutions function in mutual cooperation rather than conflict. It stresses cultural continuity, social harmony, and collective responsibility as the foundations of a stable and integrated social order. This approach is particularly relevant in the Indian context, characterized by diversity and pluralism.

This paper examines Integral Humanism as a holistic political and social philosophy within Indian thought. It seeks to analyze its core principles, philosophical foundations, and contemporary relevance, highlighting its potential to contribute to ethical governance, balanced development, and social cohesion in modern India.

KEYWORDS: Integral Humanism, Indian Political Thought, Holistic Philosophy, Social Ethics, Governance, Cultural Values.

I. INTRODUCTION

Integral Humanism occupies an important position in Indian political and social thought as a comprehensive and indigenous philosophy that seeks to harmonize material progress with ethical, cultural, and spiritual values. It emerged in the post-independence period when India was actively searching for an appropriate ideological framework to guide its political institutions, social organization, and developmental strategies. During this time, Indian political discourse was largely influenced by Western ideologies such as liberalism, capitalism, socialism, and Marxism. While these ideologies offered certain practical solutions, many thinkers felt that they failed to address India's unique historical experience, cultural diversity, and moral traditions.

Integral Humanism was articulated as a response to this ideological dependence. It aimed to provide a holistic framework rooted in India's civilizational ethos while remaining relevant to the challenges of modern governance. The philosophy was systematically presented by Deendayal Upadhyaya, who argued that political and social systems should be designed according to the nature of society they intend to serve. According to him, the uncritical adoption of foreign models had

created imbalances in Indian society by overemphasizing material growth and neglecting ethical and cultural dimensions of human life.

The central premise of Integral Humanism is that the human being is the focal point of all political and social arrangements. Human life, it argues, is multidimensional and cannot be reduced to economic needs or political rights alone. Any philosophy that focuses exclusively on one aspect of human existence—whether economic prosperity, political power, or social equality—inevitably leads to imbalance and social disharmony. Integral Humanism therefore proposes a holistic approach that integrates the physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual dimensions of human life.

In the political context, Integral Humanism challenges the idea that politics is merely a struggle for power or a competition among interests. Instead, it views politics as a moral and social responsibility aimed at ensuring the well-being of society as a whole. Governance, from this perspective, must be guided by ethical principles and social responsibility rather than narrow ideological commitments or material considerations. This ethical orientation distinguishes Integral Humanism from value-neutral political theories and gives it a normative character within Indian political thought.

As a social philosophy, Integral Humanism emphasizes harmony and cooperation rather than conflict. It presents society as an organic whole in which individuals, institutions, and communities are interdependent. Social stability and progress, according to this view, depend on mutual respect, shared values, and collective responsibility. This approach stands in contrast to theories that interpret society primarily in terms of class struggle or individual competition.

The relevance of Integral Humanism has increased in contemporary India, where rapid economic development has been accompanied by social inequality, ethical challenges, and cultural tensions. Issues such as corruption, erosion of public values, excessive centralization of power, and identity-based conflicts have raised questions about the adequacy of existing political and social models. Integral Humanism offers an alternative framework to reassess these challenges by emphasizing human dignity, ethical governance, and cultural continuity.

Philosophical Background of Integral Humanism

The philosophical background of Integral Humanism is deeply rooted in India's ancient intellectual traditions and ethical worldview. Unlike Western political philosophies that often evolved in response to specific historical and economic conditions, Integral Humanism draws upon a civilizational understanding of life that emphasizes harmony, balance, and moral responsibility. It seeks to interpret politics and society through an indigenous lens, grounded in India's cultural consciousness and philosophical heritage.

A central philosophical assumption of Integral Humanism is that human life is holistic in nature. Indian philosophy has traditionally viewed human existence as an integration of multiple dimensions—physical, mental, moral, and spiritual. Concepts such as Purusharthas (Dharma, Artha, Kama, and Moksha) reflect this integrated vision of life, where material pursuits are balanced by ethical duty and spiritual fulfillment. Integral Humanism adopts this holistic understanding and applies it to social and political organization, arguing that no single dimension of life should dominate others.

Integral Humanism also reflects the Indian philosophical idea of harmony rather than conflict. Many Western ideologies interpret society through the lens of conflict—between classes, individuals, or economic interests. In contrast, Indian philosophical thought traditionally emphasizes balance, interdependence, and coexistence. Integral Humanism views society as an organic whole, where different individuals and groups perform complementary roles. Social well-being, therefore, is achieved not through perpetual struggle but through cooperation, mutual respect, and shared values.

Another important philosophical influence is the concept of Dharma. In Indian philosophy, Dharma signifies the moral and ethical order that sustains both individual life and social institutions. Integral Humanism adopts Dharma as a guiding principle for governance and social conduct. Dharma is not equated with religion; rather, it represents a universal standard of righteousness, justice, and duty. By placing Dharma at the center of political and social life, Integral Humanism introduces an ethical dimension that seeks to regulate power and prevent moral decline.

The philosophy also draws inspiration from the Indian idea of unity in diversity. Indian society has historically accommodated a wide range of beliefs, practices, and social structures while maintaining a sense of cultural continuity. Integral Humanism recognizes diversity as a natural and valuable aspect of social life but emphasizes shared ethical and cultural foundations as the basis of national unity. This perspective distinguishes it from homogenizing ideologies and reinforces its relevance in a pluralistic society.

Integral Humanism is further shaped by a critique of materialism and reductionism. Modern political thought often reduces human aspirations to economic growth, consumption, or political rights. Indian philosophy, however, has consistently warned against excessive materialism and emphasized self-restraint, balance, and moral discipline. Integral Humanism incorporates this critique by arguing that material progress must be guided by ethical values and social responsibility.

In essence, the philosophical background of Integral Humanism represents a synthesis of India's ethical, cultural, and metaphysical traditions applied to modern political and social challenges. By grounding political thought in a holistic understanding of human life, Integral Humanism provides a distinctive and indigenous framework that seeks to harmonize development with values, power with responsibility, and society with moral order.

Theory of Integral Humanism

Integral Humanism was systematically articulated as a coherent political and social philosophy by Deendayal Upadhyaya, who sought to provide India with an indigenous ideological framework suited to its historical experience, cultural traditions, and social realities. His ideas emerged during a period when post-independence India was grappling with questions of national identity, development strategy, and ideological orientation. Upadhyaya believed that the continued reliance on Western political and economic models had created intellectual dependency and failed to address the deeper moral and cultural needs of Indian society.

Upadhyaya's understanding of Integral Humanism begins with a comprehensive view of the human being. He argued that human life is multidimensional and cannot be explained solely in economic or political terms. According to him, human existence includes physical needs, intellectual growth, emotional balance, moral responsibility, and spiritual aspiration. Any political or social philosophy that focuses exclusively on one dimension inevitably leads to imbalance. Integral Humanism, therefore, seeks to integrate all these dimensions into a harmonious whole, making human dignity and well-being the ultimate aim of social organization.

A central pillar of Upadhyaya's philosophy is the concept of Dharma. He interpreted Dharma not as a religious doctrine, but as a universal principle of moral order that governs individual conduct and collective life. In the political sphere, Dharma acts as an ethical restraint on power. Authority, according to Upadhyaya, must be exercised in accordance with justice, duty, and social welfare. This emphasis on moral regulation distinguishes Integral Humanism from ideologies that justify political actions solely on the basis of legality or expediency.

Upadhyaya was sharply critical of Western ideologies such as capitalism and socialism. He argued that capitalism promotes excessive individualism and materialism, often resulting in social inequality and moral erosion. Socialism and communism, on the other hand, prioritize the collective or the state over the individual, leading to suppression of personal freedom and creativity. Integral Humanism rejects both extremes and proposes a balanced approach that recognizes the importance of individual dignity while affirming social responsibility.

Another important aspect of Upadhyaya's thought is his conception of the nation as a cultural and social organism. He viewed the nation not merely as a political entity defined by territory and institutions, but as a living expression of shared values, traditions, and historical continuity. National unity, in this sense, is sustained by cultural cohesion rather than coercive political mechanisms. This cultural understanding of nationhood forms a crucial element of Integral Humanism as a social philosophy.

Upadhyaya also emphasized decentralization and self-reliance as essential for healthy political and economic life. He believed that excessive centralization of power leads to alienation and inefficiency, while decentralization empowers local communities and strengthens democracy. Economically, self-reliance was seen as a means to preserve national dignity and ensure balanced development.

Integral Humanism as propounded by Deendayal Upadhyaya represents a comprehensive and ethically grounded philosophy. His ideas integrate politics, society, culture, and morality into a unified vision, providing an indigenous framework for understanding governance and social life within Indian thought.

Core Principles of Integral Humanism

Integral Humanism is built upon a set of interrelated principles that together form a holistic political and social philosophy. These principles aim to create balance between material progress and moral values, individual freedom and social responsibility, and tradition and modernity. Rather than offering rigid ideological formulas, Integral Humanism provides a normative framework to guide political action and social organization in accordance with human dignity and cultural ethos.

A fundamental principle of Integral Humanism is holistic human development. It asserts that development must address all dimensions of human life—physical, intellectual, emotional, moral, and spiritual. Economic growth alone cannot be considered true progress if it leads to moral decline, social inequality, or cultural alienation. Integral Humanism therefore redefines development as the comprehensive upliftment of human life, where material prosperity is harmonized with ethical conduct and social well-being.

Another core principle is the integration of individual and society. Integral Humanism rejects the assumption that individual interests and social interests are inherently contradictory. Instead, it views them as mutually reinforcing. The individual attains fulfillment within society, and society flourishes through the responsible actions of individuals. This balanced approach avoids the extremes of individualism, which isolates the individual, and collectivism, which suppresses personal freedom.

The concept of Dharma as an ethical foundation occupies a central place in Integral Humanism. Dharma is understood as a universal moral order that governs both personal behavior and public institutions. In political life, Dharma acts as a restraint on power, ensuring that authority is exercised with justice, responsibility, and compassion. This principle emphasizes that legality without morality is insufficient for a just social order.

Decentralization of power is another key principle. Integral Humanism advocates the distribution of political and economic power across local and regional levels rather than its concentration at the center. Decentralization promotes participation, accountability, and responsiveness in governance. It strengthens grassroots democracy and empowers communities to manage their own affairs according to local needs and conditions.

Closely related is the principle of self-reliance. Integral Humanism encourages economic and social self-reliance at individual, community, and national levels. Self-reliance does not imply isolation from the global community but emphasizes independence in decision-making and development priorities. It seeks to build internal capacities and reduce dependence that undermines dignity and sustainability.

Integral Humanism also upholds the idea of organic unity of society. Society is viewed as a living organism in which different institutions and groups perform complementary roles. Social harmony is achieved through cooperation and mutual respect rather than conflict and competition. This principle discourages divisive politics and emphasizes shared responsibility for collective well-being.

Finally, ethical politics and leadership form a crucial principle of Integral Humanism. Politics is regarded as a moral vocation rather than merely a struggle for power. Leaders are expected to act as trustees of public welfare, guided by integrity, service, and accountability. Together, these core principles make Integral Humanism a holistic and ethically grounded philosophy within Indian political thought.

Integral Humanism as a Political and Social Philosophy

Integral Humanism functions simultaneously as a political philosophy and a social philosophy, offering a comprehensive framework for organizing power, governance, and social relations. Its distinctive feature lies in the integration of ethics, culture, and human welfare into both political authority and social life. Rather than treating politics and society as separate domains, Integral Humanism views them as deeply interconnected aspects of a unified human order.

As a political philosophy, Integral Humanism presents a value-oriented understanding of the state and governance. The state is not regarded merely as an instrument of coercion or administration, but as a means to facilitate the all-round development of society. Political power, according to this philosophy, must operate within ethical limits defined by Dharma. Governance is therefore judged not only by efficiency or legality, but by its commitment to justice, welfare, and moral responsibility. This perspective challenges modern political theories that reduce politics to power management or institutional procedures.

Integral Humanism also offers a distinctive interpretation of democracy. While it accepts democratic institutions such as elections, legislatures, and constitutional frameworks, it emphasizes that democracy should be rooted in values and social responsibility. Democracy is meaningful only when it serves the common good and protects human dignity. Mere numerical majority or electoral success, without ethical orientation, is considered insufficient. This view seeks to elevate democracy from a procedural mechanism to a moral and social system.

The principle of decentralization occupies a central place in Integral Humanism as a political philosophy. It argues that excessive centralization of power leads to inefficiency, alienation, and misuse of authority. By contrast, decentralized governance empowers local communities, strengthens participation, and enhances accountability. This approach aligns with grassroots democracy and encourages citizens to actively engage in public life rather than remain passive recipients of state policies.

As a social philosophy, Integral Humanism presents society as an organic and harmonious whole. It rejects conflict-based interpretations of society that emphasize class struggle, competition, or perpetual confrontation. Instead, it views social life as a cooperative process in which individuals, families, communities, and institutions perform complementary roles. Social harmony is achieved through mutual respect, shared values, and collective responsibility.

Integral Humanism places strong emphasis on cultural continuity and social ethics. Culture is seen as the soul of society, shaping values, behavior, and social norms. Social stability and integration depend on preserving ethical and cultural foundations while adapting to changing circumstances. This approach allows for social change without cultural disintegration.

Another important aspect is the emphasis on social responsibility of the individual. Integral Humanism recognizes individual freedom but stresses that freedom must be exercised responsibly. Rights are balanced with duties, and personal interests are harmonized with social welfare. This balance strengthens social cohesion and discourages excessive individualism.

In essence, Integral Humanism as a political and social philosophy offers a holistic vision in which governance, ethics, culture, and human development are inseparable. By integrating political authority with moral values and social harmony, it provides an indigenous and balanced framework within Indian political thought, capable of addressing both political and social challenges in a unified manner.

Integral Humanism in Indian Political Thought and Contemporary Relevance

Integral Humanism occupies a distinctive position within Indian political thought as a philosophy that seeks to integrate tradition with modernity, ethics with politics, and development with human values. Unlike many modern ideologies that emerged from specific Western historical experiences, Integral Humanism evolved from India's own civilizational context. As a result, it contributes an indigenous perspective to Indian political thought, complementing and, at times, critiquing other streams such as liberalism, socialism, Gandhian thought, and constitutionalism.

Within Indian political thought, Integral Humanism stands out for its holistic and non-reductionist approach. While liberal thought emphasizes individual rights and freedoms and socialist thought focuses on economic equality and state intervention, Integral Humanism attempts to balance these concerns by placing the human being at the center of political and social life. It neither absolutizes the individual nor subordinates the individual entirely to the collective. This balanced approach reflects the broader Indian philosophical tradition, which emphasizes harmony, synthesis, and coexistence rather than rigid ideological divisions.

Integral Humanism also enriches Indian political thought by introducing ethics as a central category of politics. In much of modern political theory, politics is treated as a value-neutral activity governed by institutions, laws, and power relations. Integral Humanism challenges this assumption by asserting that politics cannot be separated from moral responsibility. The concept of Dharma provides an ethical framework that guides political authority, leadership, and public policy. This ethical emphasis resonates with other Indian thinkers, such as Gandhi, while maintaining its own distinctive philosophical grounding.

The contemporary relevance of Integral Humanism becomes evident when examined against the backdrop of present-day Indian politics. One of the most pressing challenges today is the imbalance between economic growth and social justice. Rapid development has undoubtedly improved infrastructure and economic capacity, but it has also generated

inequality, regional disparities, and social exclusion. Integral Humanism offers a corrective by redefining development as human-centered and inclusive, insisting that economic progress must translate into social well-being and dignity for all sections of society.

Another area of relevance is governance and political ethics. Issues such as corruption, declining public trust, and moral cynicism in politics have become widespread concerns. Integral Humanism's emphasis on ethical leadership and Dharma-based governance provides a normative framework to address these problems. It reminds political actors that authority is a responsibility entrusted to them for public welfare, not merely a means of personal or partisan gain.

Integral Humanism is also relevant in discussions on decentralization and participatory democracy. Contemporary governance increasingly recognizes the importance of local self-government, community participation, and grassroots empowerment. Integral Humanism strongly supports these ideas, arguing that democracy becomes meaningful only when people actively participate in decisions affecting their lives. This aligns with constitutional provisions for Panchayati Raj and strengthens democratic practice at the local level.

In the sphere of national identity and social cohesion, Integral Humanism offers an inclusive understanding of nationalism rooted in shared cultural and ethical values rather than narrow political definitions. In a diverse and pluralistic society like India, such an approach is crucial for maintaining unity without undermining diversity.

So, Integral Humanism remains relevant as a holistic, ethical, and indigenous framework within Indian political thought. Its emphasis on balance, human dignity, and moral responsibility enables it to engage meaningfully with contemporary political and social challenges.

Criticisms and Limitations of Integral Humanism

Despite its philosophical depth and indigenous orientation, Integral Humanism has been subject to various criticisms and limitations, both at the theoretical and practical levels. A critical examination of these aspects is essential for a balanced understanding of Integral Humanism as a political and social philosophy within Indian thought.

One of the most frequently raised criticisms concerns the conceptual ambiguity of Integral Humanism. Critics argue that its core concepts—such as Dharma, holistic development, and organic unity—are broad and abstract. While this flexibility allows Integral Humanism to adapt to diverse contexts, it also makes the philosophy difficult to define with precision. Unlike liberalism or socialism, which provide relatively clear institutional and economic models, Integral Humanism is often criticized for lacking a well-defined theoretical structure that can be easily translated into policy frameworks.

Another major limitation is the challenge of practical implementation. Integral Humanism presents an idealistic vision of ethical politics, decentralization, and self-reliance. However, in a complex and globalized political economy, implementing these ideals is difficult. Modern governance requires engagement with global markets, technological systems, and international institutions, which can constrain the scope for local self-reliance and decentralized decision-making. As a result, critics argue that Integral Humanism often remains more normative than operational.

Integral Humanism has also been criticized for its moralistic orientation. Its strong emphasis on ethics, values, and moral conduct in politics is seen by some scholars as insufficient to address structural inequalities and power relations. Critics contend that reliance on moral self-restraint of leaders cannot substitute for strong institutions, legal safeguards, and accountability mechanisms. From this perspective, Integral Humanism is viewed as underestimating the importance of institutional design in controlling abuse of power.

Another area of debate relates to its cultural framework. While Integral Humanism emphasizes cultural continuity and national unity, critics caution that cultural concepts must be interpreted inclusively. In a pluralistic society like India, there is a risk that cultural nationalism, if narrowly understood, may marginalize minority perspectives. Although Integral Humanism does not inherently promote exclusion, its application requires careful and inclusive interpretation to uphold social diversity.

From an economic standpoint, Integral Humanism is often criticized for lacking a detailed economic model. While it critiques both capitalism and socialism and calls for a balanced, human-centered economy, it does not clearly outline mechanisms for production, distribution, industrial growth, or integration with the global economy. This makes it difficult

to assess how Integral Humanism would address practical economic challenges such as unemployment, poverty, and technological change.

Finally, critics argue that Integral Humanism is context-specific, deeply rooted in Indian cultural and philosophical traditions. While this is one of its strengths, it may also limit its universal applicability in a global context. However, proponents respond that Integral Humanism does not seek universal dominance but offers an alternative perspective grounded in indigenous values.

While Integral Humanism faces criticisms regarding clarity, applicability, and scope, these limitations do not negate its significance. Instead, they highlight the need to interpret it as a guiding philosophical framework rather than a rigid ideological blueprint.

II. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study of Integral Humanism as a holistic political and social philosophy reveals several important findings that highlight its conceptual strength, normative significance, and continuing relevance within Indian political thought. At the same time, the discussion brings out certain gaps between philosophical ideals and practical application, which are crucial for a balanced evaluation.

One of the key findings is that Integral Humanism offers a genuinely indigenous and holistic framework in Indian political thought. Unlike many modern ideologies that originated in specific Western historical contexts, Integral Humanism draws from India's civilizational experience and ethical traditions. By integrating political, social, economic, cultural, and moral dimensions, it avoids reductionist interpretations of human life. This holistic vision distinguishes Integral Humanism from ideologies that focus narrowly on economic growth, class struggle, or individual rights.

The study finds that human-centered development is the central contribution of Integral Humanism. Contemporary political discourse often equates development with material progress, infrastructure expansion, and economic indicators. Integral Humanism challenges this narrow understanding by emphasizing that development must enhance human dignity, social harmony, and moral values. This finding is particularly relevant in the Indian context, where rapid development has sometimes led to inequality, social alienation, and ethical concerns.

Another important finding relates to the ethical dimension of politics emphasized by Integral Humanism. The philosophy insists that politics cannot be value-neutral and must be guided by moral responsibility. The concept of Dharma, as discussed in the study, functions as an ethical regulator of power and governance. The discussion suggests that this ethical orientation addresses contemporary concerns such as corruption, erosion of public trust, and declining political morality. However, it also highlights that ethical ideals need to be supported by strong institutions and accountability mechanisms to be effective.

The study also finds that decentralization and participatory democracy form a core strength of Integral Humanism. Its emphasis on empowering local communities aligns with constitutional ideals of grassroots democracy in India. The discussion shows that decentralization enhances participation, responsiveness, and accountability in governance. At the same time, the persistence of centralized political practices indicates a gap between philosophical ideals and political reality.

In terms of social philosophy, Integral Humanism's organic view of society promotes harmony and cooperation rather than conflict. This approach offers an alternative to class-based or conflict-oriented theories and is particularly relevant in a diverse society like India. However, the discussion also acknowledges that social harmony must be pursued alongside social justice and equality.

Integral Humanism remains a valuable normative framework within Indian political thought. Its strength lies in providing ethical direction and holistic vision rather than technical policy solutions. When interpreted inclusively and combined with modern institutional practices, Integral Humanism can meaningfully contribute to contemporary political and social discourse in India.

III. CONCLUSION

Integral Humanism emerges as a significant and distinctive contribution to Indian political and social thought, offering a holistic framework that integrates ethics, culture, governance, and human development. Rooted in India's civilizational values and philosophical traditions, it provides an indigenous alternative to Western political ideologies that often emphasize either extreme individualism or rigid collectivism. By placing the human being at the center of political and social organization, Integral Humanism redefines development as a balanced process that includes material progress alongside moral, social, and cultural well-being.

The study highlights that Integral Humanism's greatest strength lies in its holistic and ethical orientation. It challenges value-neutral approaches to politics by asserting that governance must be guided by moral responsibility and social welfare. The concept of Dharma, as an ethical regulator of power, introduces a normative dimension that seeks to ensure justice, accountability, and compassion in public life. In a contemporary political environment marked by ethical decline, corruption, and erosion of public trust, this emphasis on moral leadership remains highly relevant.

As a political philosophy, Integral Humanism contributes to debates on democracy, decentralization, and governance by advocating participatory and grassroots-oriented political structures. Its support for decentralization and self-reliance aligns with constitutional ideals of local self-government and strengthens democratic practice. As a social philosophy, its organic view of society promotes harmony, cooperation, and shared responsibility, offering an alternative to conflict-based interpretations of social life.

At the same time, the study recognizes certain limitations of Integral Humanism, particularly regarding conceptual clarity and practical implementation. The absence of a detailed policy or economic blueprint makes its direct application challenging in a complex, globalized political economy. However, these limitations do not undermine its philosophical significance. Rather, they indicate that Integral Humanism should be understood as a guiding worldview rather than a rigid ideological formula.

In conclusion, Integral Humanism remains relevant as a holistic political and social philosophy in Indian thought. Its enduring value lies in its capacity to provide ethical direction, cultural grounding, and a human-centered vision of politics and society. When interpreted inclusively and complemented by modern institutional mechanisms, Integral Humanism can continue to enrich contemporary political discourse and contribute meaningfully to the pursuit of balanced, ethical, and inclusive development in India.

REFERENCES

1. Upadhyaya, D. (1965). *Integral humanism*. New Delhi, India: Deendayal Research Institute.
2. Sharma, R. (2003). *Indian political thought*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
3. Varma, V. P. (2001). *Modern Indian political thought*. Agra, India: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.
4. Maheshwari, S. R. (2004). *Indian political thought*. New Delhi, India: Macmillan India.
5. Pantham, T., & Deutsch, K. (Eds.). (1986). *Political thought in modern India*. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.
6. Bhargava, R. (2010). *Politics and ethics of the Indian Constitution*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
7. Mukherjee, S., & Ramaswamy, S. (2007). *A history of political thought: Plato to Marx*. New Delhi, India: Prentice Hall.
8. Chandra, B. (2016). *India since independence*. New Delhi, India: Penguin Books.
9. Acharya, P. (2014). Integral Humanism as an alternative development model. *Indian Journal of Political Science*, 75(2), 235–248.
10. Jaffrelot, C. (1996). *The Hindu nationalist movement and Indian politics*. New Delhi, India: Penguin India.
11. Palshikar, S. (2015). *Indian democracy: Meanings and practices*. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
12. Deshpande, R. (2017). Ethics and governance in Indian political thought. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 52(12), 45–52.
13. Sarkar, S. (2008). *Modern India: 1885–1947*. New Delhi, India: Macmillan.
14. Rao, B. S. (2012). Integral Humanism and Indian nationalism. *Journal of Indian Political Thought*, 6(1), 67–79.
15. Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The nation and its fragments*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
16. Mahajan, V. D. (2015). *Political theory*. New Delhi, India: S. Chand & Company.
17. Nanda, B. R. (1990). *Indian political thought: A critical survey*. New Delhi, India: Vikas Publishing House.
18. Parekh, B. (1995). *Gandhi's political philosophy*. London, UK: Macmillan Press.

19. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.
20. Tripathi, D. (2009). Integral Humanism and Indian polity. Indian Journal of Public Administration, 55(3), 421–435.
21. Shourie, A. (2018). Two saints. New Delhi, India: HarperCollins.
22. Basu, D. D. (2021). Introduction to the Constitution of India. Gurugram, India: LexisNexis.
23. Bidwai, P. (2011). Democracy and ethics in India. Social Scientist, 39(9–10), 3–15.
24. Thapar, R. (2013). The past as present. New Delhi, India: Aleph Book Company.
25. Gandhi, M. K. (2001). Hind Swaraj. Ahmedabad, India: Navajivan Publishing House.
26. Datta, V. N. (2011). Modern Indian political thought. New Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

International Journal of Advanced Research in Education and Technology

ISSN: 2394-2975

Impact Factor: 7.394