

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY
PEER REVIEWED

**CULTURAL ROOTS OF ANTYODAYA: DEEN DAYAL UPADHYAYA'S
APPROACH TO SOCIAL JUSTICE IN PLURAL SOCIETIES**

Dr. Goutam Das

Introduction:

Deen Dayal Upadhyaya (1916–1968) stands out as a deep thinker and nationalist philosopher in the history of Indian political philosophy in the 20th century. He tried to articulate a vision for India's growth that was deeply rooted in its own cultural and ethical heritage (Thengadi, n.d., p. 2). Upadhyaya was an important part of creating the Bharatiya Jana Sangh and an RSS supporter. He was against Western ideas like communism and capitalism. Instead, he supported Integral Humanism (Ekatma Manavavad) as a way to balance people's needs with those of society and the country using old Indian ideas (Upadhyaya, 1965, Lecture 1). This way of thinking, which comes from the Upanishads and the Bhagavad Gita, sees life as a whole that helps the body, mind, brain, and soul grow (Upadhyaya, 1965, Lecture 2). Antyodaya, or "uplift of the last person," is at the heart of it. Upadhyaya saw this as a social ideal based on the Indian values of collective responsibility and fairness, making sure that progress in society is measured by the well-being of the weakest members rather than overall numbers (Sharma, 2016, p. 13). Upadhyaya said, "Our slogan should really be that the one who works will feed, and everyone will have enough to eat." "The right to food is a birthright" (Upadhyaya, 1965, Lecture 4), which shows how important Antyodaya thought it was to provide basic needs like food, schooling, and health care as a moral duty rooted in cultural traditions (Upadhyaya, 1965, Lecture 4).

India, which has a lot of different racial, regional, linguistic, and caste groups, has a hard time achieving social justice because of long-standing differences and unfair treatment of some groups (Bajpai & Ahmed, 2022, p. 21). Problems like income inequality and identity clashes make things even more complicated and call for frameworks that are sensitive to cultural pluralism (Waghmore, 2013, p. 23). However, Western ideas of social justice, like John Rawls's veil of ignorance and redistributive liberalism, often fail in these situations because they impose universalist ideals that don't take into account local value systems and group identities (Bajpai & Ahmed, 2022, p. 25). Suryakant Waghmore, a sociologist, says that "Western sociological frameworks overlook the distinct social systems found in India, thereby emphasizing the necessity to incorporate indigenous perspectives for a more nuanced understanding" (Waghmore, 2013, p. 45). He is talking about how models based on secular individualism can push different groups apart and make things more broken rather than bring

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

people together (Waghmore, 2013, p. 45). These imported ideas often put individual rights ahead of community tasks, which doesn't fit with India's history of valuing ethics and connectedness (Sayyed, 2025, p. 5).

This article asks a main question: How does Upadhyaya's dharma-based method reinterpret social justice in a plural world, providing a native alternative that combines moral order with fair growth? Upadhyaya thought of dharma as the eternal rules of life that keep society going and keep everyone happy. Dharma goes beyond narrow sectarianism to include general rules that can be used in any situation (Thengadi, n.d., p. 14). He said more, "Dharma is the sum of all the laws that people believe are eternal and universal and were made to keep people from falling, society from falling, and people from reaching their fullest potential and progress." (Thengadi, n.d., p. 14) This makes Dharma the foundation for justice that brings people together despite their differences (Thengadi, n.d., p. 14). There is a lot of research on Antyodaya's political uses in policy and governance, but not much on its cultural-philosophical roots in dharma. Specifically, not much is known about how this framework deals with pluralism and Western limitations in diverse societies (Sayyed, 2025, p. 3; Sharma, 2016, p. 8). In this paper, we look at Upadhyaya's works, compare them to global theories, and show how they can be used in Indian case studies. We argue that dharma-centered Antyodaya is a strong model for social justice that emphasizes cultural integration and moral upliftment in a time of global polarization.

Theoretical Background and Review of Literature:

Antyodaya, as Deen Dayal Upadhyaya thought of it, is based on the old Indian philosophical practice of Dharma. Dharma is about moral order, righteousness, and the laws that keep people and society in harmony within a holistic view of the world. In this case, dharma is more than just religious teaching. It refers to eternal rules that guide people's actions toward fairness and the well-being of all, and they can be used in a wide range of cultural and temporal settings. "Dharma is a very broad idea," Upadhyaya said in one of his most important talks. It's interested in every part of life. It keeps society going. Even better, it keeps the whole world going. Dharma is what keeps things going (Upadhyaya, 1965, Lecture 3). This meaning of Dharma doesn't see it as a set of rules that can't be changed. Instead, it sees it as an ever-evolving set of morals that helps people of different races, religions, and social classes live together in peace. Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism (Ekatma Manavavad) builds on this by combining Dharma with modern social and political needs. It supports the balanced development of the human personality, which includes the body, mind, intellect, and soul, and criticizes Western materialism and individualism for not recognizing how cultures are connected. In plural settings, this

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

approach stresses how different parts of society can work together to make things better. It does this by drawing on ancient Indian ideas like Virat-Purusha, which says that different castes should work together like parts of a single body, preventing problems that come from differences (Upadhyaya, 1965, Lecture 3). Antyodaya, which means “upliftment of the last person,” is a practical example of this Dharma-based ethic. It makes sure that development is fair and based on local values instead of imported ideas.

A lot of research has been done on Upadhyaya’s philosophy and what it means for social justice. A lot of this research has focused on how Dharma is different from Western ideas like Rawlsian liberalism, which put abstract equality ahead of cultural unity. For example, Sharma and Raj say that Upadhyaya’s framework addresses modern inequality by incorporating cultural and ethical values into policy. They say, “Deendayal Upadhyaya’s theories paint a convincing picture of inclusive and sustainable growth in the 21st century, which is marked by environmental disasters, economic inequality, and a generalized sense of moral disorientation” (Sharma & Raj, 2024, p. 2). This study shows that Integral Humanism has its roots in Bharatiya traditions. In these traditions, Dharma encourages partnership between different groups, which helps keep society together in pluralistic places like India. Also, Modak talks about the philosophy’s overall balance, saying, “The core of human life, according to integral humanism, is finding balance in a variety of areas, such as mental, physical, and intellectual health, as well as fostering equality and accountability among people, families, communities, cultures, and countries” (Modak, 2017, p. 166). He connects it to the ancient Purusharthas (Dharma, Artha, Kama, Moksha) for fair development that respects pluralism without imposing uniform secularism. Singh further explains this as an imaginative reinterpretation of Indian customs for a society after independence. He says, “Upadhyaya’s integrated humanism imaginatively interprets ancient Indian customs within the framework of post-independence society” (Singh, 2022, p. 104), which criticizes capitalist and socialist differences while calling for a national consciousness that crosses caste and religious lines in a variety of settings.

Writings about Antyodaya’s part in social justice show it as a Dharma-based way to help underprivileged groups, which is in line with Upadhyaya’s view of society as a whole. As Purohit and Purohit explain, Upadhyaya cared about the basic needs of everyone, saying, “Deendayal Upadhyaya was concerned with the basic necessities of all the marginalized groups in society... He supported the advancement of the last member of society and the state’s duty to provide for and meet everyone’s basic needs, regardless of caste or class” (Purohit & Purohit, 2022, p. 36). They see this as a humanistic approach based on cultural trusteeship that can help solve problems like caste-based exclusions in

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

pluralism. Kumar and Gajendra compare it to other ideas, saying, “According to Deendayal, the progress of the most disadvantaged parts of society should be used as a measure of any society’s success” (Kumar & Gajendra, 2021, p. 37). They stress the importance of spiritual-material balance for the poorest people, which works in plural societies by supporting restorative justice over adversarial models. As Mantu Kumar says, this also applies to reducing inequality through interconnectedness: “Reducing Inequality: Integral Humanism upholds the principles of creating and distributing wealth, which are carried out through different social schemes like MGNREGA and taxation to help the weakest members of society.” The doctrine says that everyone should have the same rights because all living things are linked (Kumar, 2023, p. 165), which connects it to Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam (world as family) for global diversity. Parmila and Singh support the idea of a worldview focused on people by saying, “Deendayal Upadhyay’s Integral Humanism theory supports a worldview focused on people that aims to achieve balance between the material and spiritual realms.” This idea comes from Indian culture and stresses the “natural union of materialism and spirituality” (Parmila & Singh, 2021, p. 152), calling for moral growth in many areas to fight greed and division.

Chikte sees Upadhyaya as a Dharma-based social thinker who expanded democracy. He says, “According to him, the goal of state policy should be the full growth of an individual—that is, the development of his body, mind, wisdom, and soul” (Chikte, 2024, p. 189). This promotes fairness in plural societies through decentralization and employee rights. According to NITI Aayog, “The fundamental basis of Indian civilization and Dharma influenced the philosophical underpinnings of integral humanism” (NITI Aayog, 2017, p. 1). This shows how important it is for culturally diverse countries to work toward sustainable development goals. In this way, Upadhyaya himself stressed the importance of social responsibility: “Really, our slogan should be that the one who earns will feed, and everyone will have enough to eat.” “The right to food is a birthright” (Upadhyaya, 1965, Lecture 4), which is what Antyodaya meant when he said that justice must come from following the Dharma. Although there is a lot of research on these topics, there is still a big hole in the knowledge. While many studies focus on the political and economic aspects of Integral Humanism and Antyodaya, not as many go into detail about their cultural and philosophical roots in Dharma. This includes how this indigenous framework deals with social justice in plural societies that are becoming more divided. This is something that needs to be looked into further through comparative and textual analyses.

Cultural and Philosophical Roots of Antyodaya:

In Deen Dayal Upadhyaya’s framework of Integral Humanism, Antyodaya has philosophical and cultural roots that go back to ancient Indian traditions, Vedantic philosophy, and the moral

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

imperative of Dharma. These all-stress holistic human development and social harmony over Western materialistic or individualistic views. Antyodaya, which means “advancing the “last person” in society,” is a practical ethic that comes from India’s native cultural ethos. It puts the benefit of the most disadvantaged people at the top of the list to measure real societal progress and promote fairness in diverse, pluralistic settings. The Upanishads and ideas like Chiti (national soul) and Virat (societal vitality) are important parts of Upadhyaya’s philosophy. He saw Antyodaya as an alternative to global ideas that split society into pieces. Instead, he pushed for a unified approach where people’s individual, community, and national goals are all aligned through moral order. Das says, “According to Upadhyaya, every nation has its cultural and societal central idea, termed as Chiti, and each society possesses unique characteristics identified as Virat” (Das, 2025, 60). This cultural foundation makes sure that Antyodaya is more than just economic upliftment. It also includes spiritual and moral aspects to help heal rifts in plural societies, like those caused by caste, religion, or region, by promoting unity through shared history and decentralized government.

Dharma is at the heart of these roots. Upadhyaya doesn’t see it as a sectarian religion, but as a universal moral basis that supports society and the universe and can change with time, place, and circumstances while guiding fair growth. Antyodaya’s philosophical application is based on Dharma, which stresses right action and working together to reduce unfair situations in ethnic settings. He said, “According to Upadhyaya, Dharma is a broad concept, serving as the foundation for sustaining society and the universe, varying with time and place according to circumstances and needs” (Das, 2025, 62). Dharma, which includes Dharma (moral responsibilities), Artha (wealth), Kama (desire), and Moksha (salvation), is said to balance material and spiritual growth. This view criticizes Western models for ignoring the soul’s role in social justice. Kumar and Kumar go into more detail about this mix of cultures, saying that Antyodaya represents “maximum good to all (Sarvodya and Antyodaya)” by using systems that spread power and make sure that different groups have work and resources, which are based on Bharatiyata (Indianness) to keep people from fighting with each other (Kumar & Kumar, 2025, p. 644). An interpretation of Upadhyaya’s quote: “If a vote for everyone is the touchstone of political democracy, then work for everyone is a measure of economic democracy” (Kumar & Kumar, 2025, p. 644). This shows Antyodaya’s philosophical commitment to allowing everyone to take part in plural societies where ethical governance (Dharmarajya) protects freedom, equality, and justice without wiping out cultural diversity.

Philosophically, Antyodaya comes from Upadhyaya’s rejection of both capitalist individualism and Marxist collectivism. Instead, he favored a holistic humanism based on Indian customs that sees

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

society as a whole and uses Antyodaya to measure progress. This way of thinking about social justice helps underprivileged groups like the poor, tribal people, and people who live in rural areas by encouraging self-reliance (swadeshi) and decentralization while still keeping cultural identity in a world of many cultures. Meena and Dhayal think this means “Antyodaya,” which means “the rise of the last person in society.” That is one of the most important parts of Integral Humanism. Deendayal Upadhyaya thought that a country’s real progress could be seen in how well it takes care of its weakest and most disadvantaged citizens (Meena & Dhayal, 2025, p. 66). They relate it to a bigger idea of cultural ethics, which says that development should include “economic well-being, social justice, cultural preservation, and spiritual growth” (Meena & Dhayal, 2025, p. 67). This is a good example for plural societies that are facing polarization because it values ethical inclusion over exploitative growth. Das supports this philosophical depth by saying, “While all these objectives [Purusharthas] are important, Dharma is seen as the main goal, and Moksha as the ultimate goal of humanity and society” (Das, 2025, p. 61). This shows how Antyodaya’s roots in Vedantic harmony promote restorative justice, preventing cultural fragmentation by incorporating moral upliftment into everyday government and community life.

These roots come from Upadhyaya’s idea that society is linked, and that Antyodaya stops decadence by resolving problems through Dharma-based synthesis instead of Western frameworks that are adversarial. Kumar and Kumar talk about the cultural imperative: “Social harmony is seen as the natural result of individuals living according to their dharma (duty) within the larger social framework” (Kumar & Kumar, 2025, p. 645). This means that in plural societies, different groups work together to change systems like caste so that people can have more respect instead of being erased. “The concept of Dharma in Integral Humanism is not limited to religious practices but represents righteousness, moral values, and ethical governance” (Meena & Dhayal, 2025, p. 66), which means that Antyodaya’s ideas can be used to promote social justice by making policies that give local, diverse communities more power. In the end, Antyodaya’s cultural and philosophical roots provide a plan for fair pluralism that is based on India’s eternal values of unity and moral growth.

Antyodaya as a Dharma-Based Social Vision:

Deen Dayal Upadhyaya’s philosophy of Integral Humanism includes Antyodaya. Antyodaya is a deep Dharma-based social vision that puts the upliftment of the most disadvantaged people—the “last person” in society—as the ultimate measure of societal progress and equity. It promotes harmony in pluralistic settings where different racial, social, and economic groups meet. Antyodaya goes beyond just redistributing wealth. It includes spiritual, material, and communal aspects. It makes sure there is

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

social justice by fixing inequalities without destroying cultural diversity or individual worth. It is based on the moral principles of Dharma, which Upadhyaya saw as the basis for keeping society going through righteousness and collective duty. Upadhyaya's framework criticizes Western materialistic ideas and calls for a decentralized, self-sufficient system where Dharma Rajya, a model of good government that balances freedom with moral duties and encourages unity in diversity, guides the policies of the state. "Deendayal said that economic democracy is very important for the development of a country," Kumar and Gajendra say. He thought that Dharma Rajya should be at the heart of a democracy government. The government should look out for the people's best interests. "The Dharma Rajya includes freedom and Dharma" (Kumar & Gajendra, 2021, p. 41), which shows how Antyodaya carries out this vision to make society more open and the well-being of the poorest people the measure of national progress. This method is similar to the old Indian idea of Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, which means "the world as one family." It is adapted to modern plural societies by focusing on moral duties toward the weak, which helps keep society together and supports restorative justice over punitive measures.

Upadhyaya thought that Antyodaya made helping the poorest people, which he called Daridranarayan, a divine duty. This made it an important part of social justice because it got to the root reasons of inequality in many places, like India's complex caste and class systems. Antyodaya supports a real economic democracy based on moral principles, where resources are shared to help the weak and heal divisions in plural environments. He does this by insisting that society can't move forward until everyone's basic needs are met, no matter how productive they are. "He said, 'Even if a person is not able to produce or earn, his basic needs should still be met,'" Kumar and Gajendra write. "The real economic democracy will be the society that is based on these ideas." Kumar and Gajendra (2021, p. 40) talk about how the vision stresses unconditional aid as a Dharma-based duty that stops exploitation and makes sure everyone has the right to take part in society. This social vision also sees whole human development—including body, mind, knowledge, and soul—as necessary for fair growth. This makes Antyodaya a solution to the social and economic problems that still exist because indigenous thought isn't fully followed. Deendayal Upadhyaya shed light on this philosophy by describing why there is social and economic inequality, as Baghel says in his analysis of Upadhyaya. In India was still around? It was because they didn't fully understand Indian ideas. He also said that "Antyodaya is a philosophy that has fought for everyone's good" (Baghel, 2021, p. 14), which supports its role in plural societies by supporting policies that help everyone by fostering moral and communal unity, which stops decay and encourages peace.

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

Upadhyaya's Antyodaya takes a Dharma-based morality a step further by seeing the poorest people as divine. This means that society and the government must put their improvement first as a way to bring about justice and salvation for everyone, especially in places where casteism and poverty are still problems from the past. This goal includes more than just giving people things. It also includes helping people grow spiritually and morally. This way, diverse societies can stay together through shared morals instead of forced conformity. Kumar and Gajendra say more: "Deendayal said that Daridranarayan was his god in his philosophy of Antyodaya." He believed that by helping Daridranarayan (the least fortunate), he was helping God (Kumar & Gajendra, 2021, p. 41). This shows how this way of thinking turns social justice into a holy duty that can be used for many different groups by bringing outcast communities into the mainstream without changing their cultural identities. To put Dharma's focus on sustainable, non-exploitative development into practice, Antyodaya supports indigenous businesses that require a lot of work to fight unemployment and inequality. Dixit et al. quote Upadhyaya: "If we decide in favor of big industries and leave these small industries to their fate or consider them backward and destroyable, then certainly a lot of our capital will go to waste; it is worth mentioning that due to a lack of capital in India, we will have to choose such industries that are not capital intensive but labor intensive so that the workers do not face unemployment" (Dixit et al., 2024, p. 2709). They argue for policies that increase purchasing power and get rid of income gaps in plural societies. In the end, this Dharma-centered view of Antyodaya provides a strong model for social justice, calling for the combination of moral leadership with overall well-being improvement to heal differences and create lasting fairness in society.

Relevance in Plural Societies:

In societies with many different racial, religious, linguistic, and caste identities, Deen Dayal Upadhyaya's Dharma-based Antyodaya provides a culturally appropriate framework for social justice. It focuses on peaceful coexistence and moral leadership to heal rifts and promote fairness without forcing everyone to be secular or individualistic. This way of thinking works especially well in places like India, where past injustices and cultural diversity call for models that go beyond Western universalism and bring people together through shared morals and decentralized power. "Integral Humanism promotes social harmony and unity among different parts of society," as stated in an analytical study. Upadhyaya dreamed of a society where people don't simply identify with their caste, creed, or religion, but instead come together over a shared culture and civilizational heritage. He stressed how important it was for different communities to respect, understand, and work together (Singh, n.d., p. 3). This shows Antyodaya's role in preventing fragmentation by putting the needs of

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

underrepresented groups at the top of a plural fabric, which promotes social cohesion. This idea fits with Dharma's flexibility, letting for changes that value differences while maintaining moral order. This is because Upadhyaya's theory "accepts the idea of Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, seeing the world as a family." Individual goals and societal well-being should be able to live together peacefully (Singh, n.d., p. 2). This makes the theory useful for promoting global diversity at a time when polarization is growing. According to scholarly interpretations, Antyodaya's bottom-up ethic deals with identity-based conflicts by combining spiritual and material development. For example, "Integral Humanism, as propagated by Upadhyaya, is grounded in the ethos of Bharatiya culture, emphasizing the holistic development of individuals and society" (Singh, n.d., p. 2).

This supports policies that are welcoming in a variety of settings. Antyodaya also fights economic inequality in plural settings by focusing on the "last person" in development metrics. It does this by supporting restorative justice through ethical duties, and analysts have said, "It emphasizes the principle of social justice and welfare." In his speeches, Upadhyaya pushed for policies that would help the weak and poor people in society. He believed in the idea of Antyodaya, which means "helping the poorest and most helpless people in society" (Singh, n.d., p. 3). Sharma and Raj argue that Upadhyaya's ideas help "inclusive and sustainable growth in the 21st century, which is marked by environmental disasters, economic inequalities, and a generalized sense of moral disorientation" (Sharma & Raj, 2024, p. 2). They say that these ideas can be used in plural societies that are facing similar problems. Kumar stresses the importance of decentralization for fairness, saying, "Reducing Inequality: Integral Humanism upholds the principles of creating and distributing wealth, which are carried out through different social schemes like MGNREGA and taxation to help the most vulnerable people in society." The doctrine supports equal rights for everyone and is based on the idea that all living things are linked (Kumar, 2023, p. 165). Antyodaya's usefulness in different countries is shown by the connection between Dharma and sharing resources. "The core of human life, according to integral humanism, is finding balance in a variety of areas, such as mental, physical, and intellectual health, as well as fostering equality and accountability among people, families, communities, cultures, and countries" (Modak, 2017, p. 166), which makes sense in many situations because it balances different cultural elements. In the end, Antyodaya's Dharma-centered vision offers a plan for long-lasting justice by encouraging the use of indigenous ethics to promote unity in variety and repair societal fractures.

Conclusion:

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

Integral Humanism and Deen Dayal Upadhyaya's Dharma-based Antyodaya come together to form a timeless and culturally sensitive framework for social justice that works especially well in multiple societies where different identities and unfair situations come together. This method goes beyond Western universalist models by focusing on improving the "last person" through ethical governance and holistic development. Instead, it offers a plan based on India's traditional values of harmony, righteousness, and interconnectedness, which guarantees fairness without erasing culture. Through textual analysis and comparative insights, this article shows that Antyodaya's cultural roots in Dharma promote progress for everyone. They do this by focusing on decentralization, moral order, and spiritual integration over materialistic individualism, which helps to heal social problems in multicultural settings. "The first characteristic of Bharatiya culture is that it looks upon life as an integrated whole," Upadhyaya said, emphasizing how this view is all-encompassing. It has a unified point of view. It may be useful for an expert to think of parts, but it's not useful in real life (Upadhyaya, 1965, p. 10). He said that this all-encompassing view fights perversion and conflict in different societies, encouraging unity because "conflict is not a sign of culture or nature; rather it is a symptom of perversion" (Upadhyaya, 1965, p. 11). These principles make sure social justice by seeing institutions like family, caste, and state as working together, with Dharma as the one who keeps everything going: "All those principles which bring about harmony, peace, and progress in the life of mankind are included in this term Dharma" (Upadhyaya, 1965, p. 12).

Scholars have said that this framework will always be useful, pointing out that it has the ability to reduce inequality and promote unity in the face of global problems. Meena and Dhayal, for example, link Antyodaya to moral improvement in a range of groups, stating that "Antyodaya" means "the rise of the last person in society." That is one of the most important parts of Integral Humanism. Deendayal Upadhyaya thought that a country's real progress could be seen in how well it takes care of its weakest and most disadvantaged citizens (Meena & Dhayal, 2025, p. 66). "The concept of Dharma in Integral Humanism is not limited to religious practices but represents righteousness, moral values, and ethical governance," they say to stress Dharma's role in inclusive justice even more. According to Meena and Dhayal (2025, p. 66), Upadhyaya thought that government should be based on morals rather than material goals. In line with this, Kumar describes Integral Humanism as a Dharma-based way to solve societal problems. He says, "Deendayal Upadhyaya presented Integral Humanism as a solution to conflicts in human life, emphasizing the need for harmony and complementarity between individuals, society, state, and nation" (Kumar, 2023, p. 161). Kumar also says that this doctrine supports interconnectedness for fairness in plural societies: "The doctrine supports equal rights for all, rooted in the interconnectedness of all life forms" (Kumar, 2023, p. 165). These interpretations show that

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

Antyodaya could deal with modern problems like economic inequality and cultural division. This is in line with Upadhyaya's call for a Dharma Rajya where "every religion has the freedom to exist." But this freedom is only real if it doesn't go against other people's religion (Upadhyaya, 1965, p. 22). In the end, Upadhyaya's vision encourages lawmakers and academics to include cultural ethics in development plans. This will help keep the peace in a world that is becoming more divided. Meena and Dhayal say, "Deendayal Upadhyaya's idea of sustainable development, which is based on Integral Humanism, provides a complete framework for dealing with contemporary economic, social, and environmental problems" (Meena & Dhayal, 2025, p. 69). In the future, researchers could test Antyodaya's uses in global plural settings and look into how it works with international models to learn more about how it can change things for the better in terms of social justice.

Bibliography:

1. Baghel, S. S. (2021). Antyodaya and social justice. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Education*, 6(4), 44-48.
2. Bajpai, R., & Ahmed, H. (2022). Pluralizing pluralism: Lessons from, and for, India. *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 20(1), 20-34.
3. Chikte, P. (2024). Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay: As a social thinker. *International Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences*, 14(2), 188- 194.
4. Das, K. (2025). Integral humanism: An introduction to Pt. Deendayal Upadhyaya's philosophy. *The Banyan Tree Journal*, 1, 59-64.
5. Dixit, S. L., et al. (2024). Deendayal Upadhyaya's Antyodaya idea towards poverty alleviation. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(11), 2705-2710.
6. Kumar, M. (2023). Deendayal Upadhyaya's integral humanism. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 13(3), 158-166.
7. Kumar, S., & Gajendra, K. (2021). B.R Ambedkar and Deendayal Upadhyaya on social justice: A comparative study. *International Journal of Sociology and Political Science*, 3(2), 38-42.
8. Kumar, S., & Kumar, D. (2025). Social aspects in Deen Dayal Upadhyay's integral humanism: A review. *International Journal of Social Science & Economic Research*, 7(1), 644-647.
9. Meena, H. K., & Dhayal, S. (2025). Integral humanism and the SDGs: A pathway to balanced human development. *The Social Science Review*, 3(2), 65- 70.
10. Modak, S. (2017). Integral humanism and sustainable development goals. *Madhya Bharti*, 73(1), 164-177.

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

11. NITI Aayog. (2017). National seminar on SDGs and integral humanism. Government of India.
12. Parmila, & Singh, J. (2021). Integral humanism philosophy of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Trends*, 3(2), 152-154.
13. Purohit, S., & Purohit, R. (2022). Concept of social justice and Indian constitution. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 8(3), 36-38.
14. Sayyed, M. A. (2025). Integral humanism: The quest for socio-political identity in Hindu nationalism [Research paper]. ResearchGate.
15. Sharma, A., & Raj, S. (2024). Revisiting Deendayal Upadhyaya's idea of integral humanism: Its relevance in 21st century. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4), 1-7.
16. Sharma, M. C. (2016). Integral humanism of Deendayal Upadhyaya [Occasional paper]. S. P. Mukherjee Research Foundation.
17. Singh, M. K. (n.d.). An analytical study of integral humanism in the philosophy of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya [Unpublished manuscript]. Retrieved from <https://oldror.lbp.world/UploadedData/15806.pdf>
18. Singh, R. (2022). Decoding the integral humanism philosophy of Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay. *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 10(7), 102-105.
19. Thengadi, D. B. (n.d.). Integral humanism: A study. D. B. Thengadi Foundation.
20. Upadhyaya, D. D. (1965). Integral humanism [Lectures]. Deendayal Research Institute.
21. Waghmore, S. (2013). Civility against caste: Dalit politics and citizenship in western India. Sage Publications.