



**THIRD WAY AS THE APPLIED INTEGRAL HUMANISM:  
GOING BEYOND THE BINARIES**

Dr. Prasanna Ambadas Deshpande

Associate Professor, Department of English, Fergusson College, Pune

Email : [shabda11177@gmail.com](mailto:shabda11177@gmail.com)

***Corresponding Author :***

*Dr. Prasanna Ambadas  
Deshpande*

**ABSTRACT**

This paper aims to interpret and analyse Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay's Integral Humanism and Dattatray Thengdi's Third Way as the formulation of a path-breaking breakthrough in India. The paper investigates the efficacy of the culturally relevant frameworks of Integral Humanism and Third Way (IH-TW) in the wake of enterprise culture and neoliberalism whose thought processes did not require a groundwork in the form of any pre-existing ideology (Mukherjee, 2018). 'Scholastic textualisation' of the socio-cultural values in India is not a 'priori' but a 'posteriori' for IH-TW (Chatterjee, 1993).

It also aims to briefly analyse the reconstructions of Marxism in Europe by Marxist thinkers who undertook the deconstruction of Marxist theory (Lukács, 1971; Gramsci, 1975). The baggage of the colonial past was the causal condition for deshaj (parallel for culturally responsive) thinking to be undertaken by Deendayal Upadhyay and Dattopant Thengdi (Nandy, 1983). Hence, they took into consideration the 'trajectories' of the Marxian model of thinking in Indian consciousness (Banerjee, 2005).

The article mainly aims to focus on how Integral Humanism and its applied formulations in Third Way provide insights not only to offer an alternative to 'Classical Marxism' of the Old Left, but also to 'Neo Marxism' as 'theorised' by the New Left (Jameson, 1991; Harvey, 1989).

**Article History:**

Received Date: **26/11/2025**

Revised Date: **05/12/2025**

Accepted Date: **14/01/2026**

Published Date: **27/01/2026**

**Keywords:** Neoliberalism,  
Marxism, Communism,  
Humanism

## **1. Introduction**

Thoughts travel in time and space, and this travel necessitates a mode of transport. Human beings transport their thoughts across spatial and temporal boundaries, and physical journeys undertaken by great minds create spatial trajectories of intellectual thought. For instance, Marx traveled from Germany to England via America, formulating Marxism and positioning himself as a socialist with a vision to transform European societies along the lines of his ideological framework (Lukács, 1971).

The British, in their travels from England to India to establish colonial rule, inadvertently carried the intellectual trajectory of Marx's thoughts, which permeated India without Marx himself setting foot here (Chatterjee, 1993). The intellectual exchange continued when the British returned home, leaving behind enduring intellectual settlements that traveled through temporal, physical, and psychological spaces in India.

Indian thought also traverses time and space, but with a different purpose—not to rule, but to integrate. The Western world's engagement with Oriental Studies, Indology, Ayurveda, Yoga, Indian philosophy (Darshan), and concepts like Dharma, Atman, Moksha, and Purusharthas exemplifies the global intellectual trajectory of Indian thought (Pollock, 2006). These explorations strive to interpret India's rich verbal and cultural texts and showcase the universality and adaptability of Indian spiritual traditions (Sen, 2005).

The intellectual universe, a boundless cosmos of ideas, transcends barriers, whether physical, cultural, or political. Historical attempts to build walls—literal or figurative—eventually collapse under the inexorable movement of thought (Anderson, 1983). Ideas, by their nature, travel freely and endure across time and space, shaping and reshaping the human experience indefinitely.

The Industrial Revolution in Europe was the catalyst for the emergence of Socialism, Communism, and Marxism towards the end of the 19th century (Hobsbawm, 1996). The transformation brought about by industrialisation necessitated new ideas to address the inequalities and social upheavals it created. Europe, characterised by a dichotomous society divided into rigid 'class' structures—comprising a boastful aristocratic class and an oppressed working class—provided fertile ground for the emergence of egalitarian ideologies (Thompson, 1963). This hierarchical stratification prepared the conditions for Socialism and Marxism to gain relevance, offering a vision of an equitable society.

However, the efficacy of Socialism, Communism, and Marxism as universal solutions for social problems began to be questioned by the early 20th century (Berlin, 1963). Even Marx's

<https://eijhss.com/index.php/hss/index>

followers, during the first two decades of the 20th century, began restructuring Socialism into a 'post-Marxist' realm. This shift was fueled by the rigidity of Classical Marxism, which had become overly orthodox, limiting its adaptability and practicality (Lukács, 1971).

The theory-heavy approach of Marxism, as interpreted by its adherents, led to the ossification of its ideological framework, which came to be termed as 'Classical Marxism' or 'Orthodox Marxism' by the 20th-century Marxist thinkers (Gramsci, 1975). These terms reflected a worldview resistant to the incorporation of new or diverse perspectives. Ironically, the ideological tenets that sought to 'liberate' individuals often became illiberal, stifling intellectual and social freedom (Jameson, 1991).

This inflexibility rendered Orthodox Marxism counterproductive, often jeopardising the very 'freedom of the mind' it aimed to champion (Eagleton, 1996). A static, standardised ideology failed to create viable paths for transformative social action. Such pathways, when abandoned, were either reconstructed to adapt to new contexts or disappeared entirely, leaving no trace of the original theoretical frameworks (Harvey, 1989).

### **Situating in the Ideological Context**

Early communism as a political tool, socialism as the ideological apparatus, and Marxism as a worldview had focused mostly on practicing the orthodox theory, finding the real-life parallel to the theoretical obfuscation (Berlin, 1963). The practical and real-life relevance of the socio-cultural values were judged purely in the light of accuracy in emulating the theory. The manifesto had become a scripture, and the documented theoretical constructs—the templates for creating a world order based on the worldview as produced by the founders of those ideologies. Followers took pride in outdoing the founders in acting out theoretical constructs with a degree unanticipated by the founders themselves (Eagleton, 1996).

Marxism failed in theory, and Communism failed in practice. Marx had urged the workers of the world to unite to launch a revolution against the capitalists of the world. Against this call, the workers did unite to engage themselves in body, mind, and soul with the fulfillment of imperialising nationalist aspirations of the European nations through the means of a lopsided industrial onslaught (Hobsbawm, 1996). The Marxian concentration on the 'base' of the economic world as a battlefield for the war between capitalism and communism facilitated neither a successful revolution nor a lasting change.

Communism failed miserably as a practice at the hands of the Bolshevik Communist regime of Russia, led by Vladimir Lenin, making Russia a degenerated worker's state and a totalitarian

state economy (Fitzpatrick, 2008). It made communist ideology a mere instrument of political legitimisation and imperial rule. Stalin did not obstruct the progress of communism within Russia alone, but he caused an indelible ignominy to communism all over the world, especially in Western Europe. Stalin's formations revealed the worst aspects of communism to the world to such an extent that the European socialists found it necessary to envision some 'de-Stalinisation' of communism (Conquest, 1991).

This delinking of socialism from orthodox communism led to what came to be known later as the New Left. The relevance of the revolution-mongering communist activists and politicians rallying against the capitalist class by

provoking the working-class population with the dream of a proletariat regime has declined long ago (Jameson, 1991). As a consequence of this socio-political experimentation, European countries either experienced disillusionment or satiation with it. They also realised during the second decade of the twentieth century that classical Marxism would not be a politically feasible alternative.

A simpler understanding of Marx's 'base and superstructure' theory tells us that this theoretical model considers economy as the base of all human existence and as something that 'determines' the consciousness which gets reflected into the 'superstructure' (Marx, 1859). Culture, faith-systems, and other seemingly non-materialistic intellectual, emotional, and psychological occupations are the 'super-structures'. The nature, role, and functions of the 'super-structure' are 'determined' by the 'base,' that is, by all interactions that happen in the domain of 'economy' (Engels, 1893).

By capitalising on the exploitation of workers under industrial capitalism, Marx's base and superstructure model pitches for the revolution with the proletariats, workers, and peasants to subvert the exploitative capitalist systems (Marx, 1859). This approach establishes the paradigm of workers' subject position as victims. The emphasis laid by Marx on confrontational resistance to worker's interpellated victimhood by launching a 'proletariat revolution' restricts itself to the economic sphere of human societies.

It is essential to understand in this discourse that by the 1920s, the relevance of the 'base and superstructure' model of revolution was questioned, and Antonio Gramsci in Italy and Raymond Williams in Britain, categorically refuted the claim made by Marx (Gramsci, 1971; Williams, 1973). Raymond Williams' 1973 essay, "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory", originally published in *The New Left Review*, is a strong criticism of the 'restrictiveness' of

Marxist ideas in this regard.

Under the influence of Gramsci's subversion of Marx, Raymond Williams asserts that it is not the economy that determines the consciousness, but it is the 'social being' whose thoughts, talks, and acts construct the consciousness (Williams, 1973). In this way, this renarrativisation of Marx's ideas enabled the followers of socialism and communism to apply the communist ideology to culture and to consider culture as a significant source of formulating 'human consciousness' (Gramsci, 1971). In this connection it is significant to observe how Thengdi responded to the modifications of Marxist socialism. Thengdi observes:

Condemnation of Yugoslavia in 1948, exhibition of Russian military might in East Germany (1953), Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968) and Afghanistan (1979); new understanding of the world situation by Pollit, Gollan, Togliatti, Longo, Berlinguer, Carillo and the other leaders of Eurocommunism; the end of a dream of unicentral communist world; deviation from the basic tenets of Marxism by ruling communist parties; desertions by idealists like Koestler, Djilas, Roy, Debray and others; workers' revolts in Poland and other East European countries, public expression of disillusionment by the leaders of the Italian and the Spanish communist parties, and the reactionary rise of indecisive New Left - these are unmistakable indications of the decay of communism, though the house that has taken a century and a half to come up, will take some more time to fall under its own weight.

(Third Way, pp. 209)

The pro-British supporters of communism in British India were in favour of the trajectory of Orthodox Marxism (Chandra, 1994). The early day communists in India had distanced themselves from the National Freedom Movement primarily because they perceived the freedom movement as a bourgeois uprising against British rule (Mukherjee, 2000). For them, the National Freedom Movement did not represent the class of workers and peasants.

The Workers and Peasants Party (WPP) had initially disregarded the National Freedom Movement led by Lala Lajpat Rai, Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, and Bipin Chandra Pal, and later by Mahatma Gandhi, as a bourgeois movement (Sinha, 1976). However, we also see that the founder of the Communist Party of India, M.N. Roy had explicitly demanded that Orthodox Marxism must be kept at a distance to achieve the ideals of an egalitarian society in India (Roy, 1947). Although he condemned the rooting of the National Freedom Movement of India into the spiritual philosophy of deshaj (culturally responsive) Indian thought processes, he acknowledged the fact of the mass support, across the 'class-caste' sections of Indian society, to the movement

led by Gandhi (Mukherjee, 2000).

The concentrated focus of Indian society on the aspiration for freedom from British rule appears to have influenced M.N. Roy's shift from Marxist ideology, as reflected in his 1947 *The New Humanism: A Manifesto*. This text is now considered a succinct moral restatement of Marxism, advocating for an indigenized intellectual framework to restore India's glory (Roy, 1947). In the later stages of his life, Roy emerged more as a revolutionary nationalist thinker than the staunch Communist activist of his early career.

The influence of the work, actions, and views of Sri Aurobindo, Swami Vivekananda, and Swatantryaveer Savarkar were Roy's lasting inspirations (Chattopadhyay, 1988). It is interesting to see that despite his immense intellectual prowess and erudition, initially in support and later in criticising Marxism, the later date communist thinkers and leaders

in India disowned him (Sinha, 1976). Figures like T.M. Tarkunde, G. Parekh, and V.B. Karnik remained his few notable followers (Sinha, 1976).

Had subsequent communist thinkers in India embraced Roy's call for a more culturally relevant ideology, which transcended Marxism, Communism, and Christianity, ideological divisions might have been mitigated. However, many adhered to Eurocentric, divisive interpretations of Communism, resulting in missed opportunities for bridging ideological gaps in the Indian context (Chandra, 1994). Unfortunately, the later date communists oriented themselves more towards the ideological verbosity of a cyclostyle version of Eurocentric policies of divisive Communism.

While India was preparing itself for Swaraj under the leadership of all the veteran leaders, revolutionaries, and freedom fighters, there was another development taking place in the same most crucial decade of the 1920s. This development did not only support the struggle for independence, but it also aimed at something that resonated with Swaraj, something without which Swaraj is never complete. That development was the creation of the organization of the general population of India who are Hindus by the virtue of their way of life, their worldview, their extreme open-mindedness for diversity in faith systems, values, language, culture, culinary, and sartorial practices of life and of the world.

That development was the foundation of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh, popularly known as the RSS (Andersen & Damle, 1987). This is an organization that instills confidence and builds the self-esteem of every Indian today in their pursuit of a resurgent India. The message of love  
<https://eijhss.com/index.php/hss/index>

and respect for India, that is Bharat, that the organization spreads through its focus on incorporation and inculcation of that love into all walks of our social, personal, economic, academic, political, and cultural life cannot only remain as a feeling, a thought, an ‘ism’ or only a philosophy. It envisions a way of life, a day-to-day life experience, and involvement into that diligent and practical means of that love.

However, critics of RSS perceive this narrowly as some vigorous form of ‘nationalism’ by restricting the overall psychological, emotional, and intellectual engagement with India and its resurgence with the limited historically problematic connotations of the word ‘nationalism’ (Jaffrelot, 1996). The word ‘nation’ and the theoretical conceptualization of that word originated later than what the cultural values in the subcontinent have always thought of and expressed as ‘Rashtra’ (Elst, 2001). Hence, the moment of an ‘ism’ getting prefixed to the word ‘nation’ cannot be considered as the moment of the formation of the feelings of reverence and reasoning of India as a ‘nation.’

In short, RSS follows this simpler understanding of the existence of Bharat as a Rashtra with a distinctive and nuanced culture since the times much earlier than the ‘modern’ understanding of the word ‘nation’ is developed in the world with the help of the language which came to be used officially as late as in the 13th century. This nuanced culture with all the diversity, with perennial contemporaneity of values, and a tendency of fluidity between and among all different identities resulting in the Oneness of all existence, is the conviction of RSS (Andersen & Damle, 1987). It is this ‘integral’ approach to the world, life, nature, faith systems, cultures, languages, and to mankind which the RSS inculcates among all.

The foundation of the RSS by Dr. Keshav Baliram Hedgewar took place primarily with the consolidation of this Hindu view of life and of the world. This consolidation naturally requires the organization of the people who are Hindus by virtue of their way of life. So, a ‘Hindu world view’ means a ‘liberal outlook towards everything’ (Thapar, 2018). Such an organization of people, the consolidation of their way and view of life and the cultural values they live with, eventually get formulated as the ‘intellectual framework’ as the ‘thought process’ which inspires those who are associated with such a selfless work for all their life through their everyday life (Goyal, 2016). One such visionary thinker who gave that ‘intellectual impetus’ to the quintessential values of the Hindu way of life is Late Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay. His thesis of ‘Integral Humanism’ is not only a scholastic consolidation of those values which are present not only in theory but are perpetually present first in the way of life of a human being who lives with the inclusive outlook towards life—that is, the Hindu way of life in all its manifestations (Rao, <https://eijhss.com/index.php/hss/index>

2017). Most importantly, Deendayal Upadhyay's speeches, transcribed as the thesis of Integral Humanism, is the 'corrective formulation' of the problems of intolerance and exclusivity rendered by the Marxist-Communist ideologies (Chaturvedi, 2019). The suffix 'ism' in 'Integral Humanism' merely serves the purpose of providing a familiar way to the Western audience.

It is important to note here that in the heyday of the propagation and belief in Classical Marxism and/or communism as the 'highway' of a 'brave new world,' despite its failure in many ways, especially under the influence of the Eurocentric ideological models of progressive and 'modern' thinking, while the Indian 'intellectuals' had started conceiving the image of a 'progressive' society in India, Integral Humanism shows a new path through a concentration on the Bharateeya way of life and a Bharateeya view of the world (Bhatt, 2001). The underlying principle of unity in everything living and non-living is the basic

consciousness of every Hindu (Sharma, 2015). This basic consciousness is reflected in the integrated and inclusive outlook on life and in the everyday life of a Hindu person, whether formally educated into this 'ethos of life' or not (Nandy, 2007).

The Western philosophers reached up to the principle of duality. Hegel put forward the principle of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Karl Marx used his principle as a basis and presented his analysis of history and economics. Darwin considered the principle of 'Survival of the Fittest' as the sole basis of life. But we, in this country, perceived the basic unity of all life. Even the dualists have believed nature and spirit to be complementary to each other rather than contradictory. The diversity in life is merely an expression of internal unity. There is complementarity underlying the diversity. The unity in seed finds expression in various forms - the roots, the trunk, the branches, the leaves, the flowers and the fruits of the tree. All these have different forms and colours and even to some extent different properties. Still we recognize their relation of unity with each other through the seed.

Integral Humanism (pp.13/14)

This distinctive thinking is the quintessential wisdom of the general consciousness of the people of India. They live their life with the manifestations of this thinking integrally by expressing this holistic consciousness as easily as the leaves come to a tree. This generates a mutually cooperating and coexisting way of thinking, way of life, and of the world (Bhatt, 2001). This 'inherently liberal' thinking and living is not a result of any indoctrinated ideology or propagated philosophy. It is the most natural attitudinal, psychological, rational, and emotional outlook and expression of life. It perceives no duality, no dichotomy, no binaries, no sectarian fractionality between or among different manifestations of everything that exists. Rather, it respects

heterogeneity, difference, and duality as the 'source' of commonality, sharing, and harmony (Sharma, 2015). This 'Oneness' of all beings and of everything by the virtue of the 'moment of the truth' of the existence of everything is the Hindu way of living and thinking (Nandy, 2007).

Besides being a very humble and cerebral conceptualization of Hinduness or of Indianness, Integral Humanism is not a pamphlet, thesis, ideology, and philosophy constructed by a recluse intellectual. It is, rather, an expression of a culturally and experientially lived-out practice of life as a whole and of everyday life in all its facets (Rao, 2017). This liberal outlook does not presuppose or preconceive any condition. It rather flows from the practice of life to the 'theoretical' conceptualization as an intellectually palatable expression of that thinking which is 'always already there' in the way of life of the people of India (Chaturvedi, 2019).

In the post-independence period, Indians who still live with the 'colonial hangover' as the 'anachronistic anglophiles,' whose sensibilities are in an 'auto-colonization' mode, are acknowledged as 'intellectuals' in an authoritarian manner. They are identified as those who chase a certain 'glitterati of credentialism' (Thapar, 2018). Certain professions, occupations that are known as 'opinion makers' are the havens of these intellectuals. With credentialism comes a provincial attitude. Those not possessing the 'credentials' in the formal sense, those not belonging to these 'intellectually oriented' professions are regarded as 'substandard' or 'non-academic' individuals (Goyal, 2016). The Eurocentric 'models' of intellectual orthodoxy restricted that status of 'rational thinking' only to those who chase these 'templates' of 'progressive thinkers' or 'eminent historian' or 'eminent social psychologist' as the outcome of self-effacing credentialism. The most common factor connecting such intellectuals and their work is a recognition by the mainstream media, by the publishing industry, and by the political leaders. Additionally, they alone 'qualify' the status as 'intellectuals' in the general sense who adopt a certain derisive tone of even the most innocuous aspects of the Hindu way of life or the way of life of the general population of India (Chakrabarty, 2008).

### **Problematising the Dichotomy and Theoretico-Cultural Justification of Integral Humanism**

Edward Shils, a noted Sociologist of the Chicago School, observes:

'the truth of the matter is that the British not only ruled India for a long time but they also took partial possession of the Indian mind'. Every ideal towards which the imaginary Indian was drawn was taken from Britain: 'The novels he reads, the science he studies and practices, the principles of administration which he applies, the economic policy which he recommends or seeks to carry out, all come from the foreign metropolis.'

There is a ‘disparity’ between the cultural values with which the people live their everyday life and the ‘intellectual’ renderings of the knowledge traditions of India on the part of the intellectuals who take pride in emulating the British and European standards of excellence, often by denigrating the indigenous, native, and cultural practices of the common people (Sen, 2005; Nandy, 2009). These values of life and culture, expressed in cerebral, emotional, and everyday terms, are lived out by the people themselves. They are never conscious of such theorization as a prerequisite for perpetuating or inculcating such values (Paranjpe, 1984). There is no need for indoctrinated deliberation of certain ideological standpoints for these values to manifest. This is the fundamental distinction between the ‘theoretical conditions’ of Marxism, Socialism, and Communism, which insist on theoretical constructs as a priori, and the Hindu way of life, conceptualized as a posteriori, emerging organically from lived experience (Chakrabarty, 2000). Far from being ‘prescriptive theoretical conditions’ for the ills of the human world, the academically palatable conceptualization of the Hindu way of life—Integral Humanism—continues to be lived out, albeit unconsciously, as the general ethos of life (Thengadi, 1984). Indeed, practice in India becomes the source of theory, not the reverse. The vast body of ancient literature, from the Vedas and Upanishads to the Puranas and Bhakti movement literature, as well as Dharmashastra, are descriptive rather than prescriptive (Sharma, 2013; Halbfass, 1991). Life flows into these texts, rather than the texts dictating life.

Textual dominance over life is preposterous; conversely, life flowing into texts ensures prosperity for both. Anomalies arising from departures of virtue are corrected in practice before their textualization. Texts seldom prescribe a singular remedy for the ills of life. Finding textual parallels for practice helps perpetuate values recognized by those who live them as *auchitya* (appropriate behavior). Conversely, seeking real-life parallels for theoretical constructs is a reductive approach, potentially fuelling totalitarianism or, in reaction, perpetual insurgency (Chaturvedi, 2011). Integral Humanism offers an alternative not only in the Indian context but on a global scale, addressing the contentious

possibilities of Marxism, Socialism, and Communism through coordination, cooperation, and concurrence among different identities and values (Jaffrelot, 1996).

An overemphasis on theoretical constructs, as seen in Marxist or Communist frameworks, leads to autocratic dominion, fitting all realities into ideological molds. This phenomenon, often described as a Eurocentric obsession with theorization, has led to numerous historical examples of totalitarian regimes (Eagleton, 1991). The Third Way, an alternative articulated through Dattopant Thengadi’s writings in the 1980s, challenges this dichotomy. It builds upon Integral

<https://eijhss.com/index.php/hss/index>

Humanism, offering insights into the complex realities of a pluralistic society like India, characterized by its diversity in religion, language, and culture (Thengadi, 1986; Panikkar, 2001).

While Integral Humanism encapsulates the underlying oneness of all existence, the Third Way provides its functional and applied dimensions. During the Cold War, when traditional Communist ideologies were at their peak, Indian thinkers emphasized samanvaya (coordination) through inclusive action rooted in samyak (balance). This philosophy consolidates Hinduness as the unifying principle of oneness, offering intellectual and emotional space to differences and diversity (Bharati, 2000).

The polytheistic, multilingual, and culturally diverse society of India has provided a remarkable example of coexistence that astounds the Western world. The writings and lectures compiled in the Third Way theorize this culturally generated liberalism, rooted in the ethos of the Republic of India, or Bharat. This framework not only affirms the values of inclusivity but also offers a vision of harmonious coexistence for the globalized, postmodern world (Chatterjee, 1993; Appadurai, 1996). Dattopant Ji writes in the opening chapter of the Third Way, *The Hindu Approach*,

The Bharatiya culture evolved a co-ordinated system of materialistic as well as non-materialistic values of life which together served as an incentive for individual development. As is well known, the artha and kama constituted the materialistic values which were blended finely with non-materialistic values of dharma and moksha. The material aspect was neither ignored nor glorified. Consequently, the incentive was also of two types - materialistic as well as non-materialistic; material gains and enjoyment, and social status and recognition based on the non-materialistic values. Everyone was free to follow either of the two with the provision that the sphere of enjoyment and that of social status would invariably be in inverse ratio. The higher the social status, the narrower the sphere of enjoyment; the wider the sphere of enjoyment, the lower would be the social status. There was perfect equality in society in that the total quota of enjoyment and social status put together would always be the same for every individual, though the ingredients of the quota would differ from man to man depending entirely on one's own voluntary choice.

(Third Way, pp. 06)

It is in this way we find that the 'coordinated systems' of different values of life resonate with consumption and conservation coexisting as mutually complimentary and complementary aspects of the culture of artha and kama if they are pursued in evenness, as the four

purusharthas—the four goals of human life—by Dharma. Likewise, the individual and the social can also come at a meeting point if their ‘shared’ space of ‘complementarity’ is considered. The Hindu approach throbs with this complimentarily shared space of commonality despite difference. This approach does not adopt a divisive and exclusive logic of one form of reality being different from another as necessarily opposed to one another, but, rather, it maintains the difference instead of aiming to eliminate it by creating a ‘this versus that’ or ‘us versus others’ dichotomy. Panikkar (1993) observes that such a perspective underscores the Hindu inclination toward "non-dualism," nurturing coexistence rather than conflict in diverse systems of thought and action.

This dichotomous thinking is the obsession with the entire body of Abrahamic, Judaic, and Semitic thinking. Marxism and Communism, although rejecting faith systems, still follow the dichotomous fractionalization of reality and identity. Hence, consumption along with conservation is unimaginable or unthinkable to such ideologies, whether communal or secular. The relevance of the Third Way in this regard is monumental because it not only provides an alternative to the divisive and dichotomous renderings of reality under the influence of orthodox Marxism or classical Communism but also proves the contemporary verbosity of the ‘poststructuralist’ turn of cultural Marxism as a mere cultural tautology in the Indian context. Integral Humanism aligns deeply with India’s civilizational ethos, presenting a harmonious alternative to the dualisms that have fractured global ideologies.

The post-Marxist communist theories of the likes of Antonio Gramsci and the followers of his theories of ‘subaltern’ and ‘hegemony’ replicate Marx’s model of base and superstructure into the domain of culture. That is, in simpler terms, the ‘proletariat’ in Marx’s terms becomes the ‘subaltern’ in Gramsci’s interpretations. Thus, the economically exploited ‘proletariat’ is a victim of the callousness and cruelty of the capitalist class in Marx’s terms. Likewise, the culturally dominated ‘subaltern’ is a victim of the authoritative and hegemonic dominion of the culturally superior class in different human societies. Ives (2004) highlights that "Gramsci’s cultural theory extends Marxist analysis but remains tethered to the structural binaries inherent in its methodology." Gramsci did not forgo the ‘burden of the binaries’ in his ‘re-narrativization’ or ‘modification’ of Marx. He merely changes the ground of revolution from economic condition to the cultural condition. ‘Capitalist versus the proletariat’ dichotomy changes to ‘elite versus the subaltern.’ Yet again, the suffix of Marxism in the expression of ‘cultural Marxism’ restricts the scope of the ‘cultural’ with the obsessive and inescapable doctrine of dichotomous thinking.

Let us find out in what succinct manner the Third Way offers a robust alternative to this  
<https://eijhss.com/index.php/hss/index>

contemporary form of communism as cultural Marxism. Thengdi (1980) outlines how the Third Way departs from the ideological dichotomies, rooting itself in India's lived experience of cultural pluralism and harmony, emphasizing practice over prescriptive theories.

The western thinking was based upon 'either-or-ism'; the Hindu on 'as-well-as-ism'. The thinking there was compartmentalised; here integrated. For them, man was a mere material being; for us he was a physical-mental-intellectual-spiritual being. They were subservient to Artha-Kama; we had a drive towards Purushartha Chatushtaya. For them, society was a club of self-centred individuals; for us it was a body with all individuals therein as its limbs. There, the goal was happiness for oneself; here it was happiness for all. It was a case of acquisitiveness vs 'aparigraha' or non-possession; profit-motive vs service motive; consumerism vs restrained consumption; exploitation vs 'antyyodaya' (unto the last); rights-oriented consciousness of others' duties vs duty-oriented consciousness of others' rights; the rape of Nature vs the milking of Nature; and constant conflict between an individual, the society and the Nature, vs the complete harmony between an individual, the society and the Nature.

दुरिताचे ततति जावो, तवश स्धि सूर पाहो,

जो जे वाछील तो ते लाहो, पाताजात ॥३॥

Diminish the darkness of ignorance from the minds of all, let the world experience the rise of the Sun of self-dharma, that is, faith in righteousness and Swa-dharma that is, Self's Dharma. Grant any living being whatever it demands (righteously).

This inclusiveness is presented in the applied form by Dattopant Thengdi in his Third Way. Thus, a vast range of human aspirations pertaining to Economy to Environment and technology to science; or from politics to culture and education to industry fall in the ambit of this Third Way of Integral Humanism. Here is what he suggests on how Integral Humanism be disseminated into technology. Here again Thengdi ji adopts an amalgamating view of integrating traditional technologies with modern technology wherever they could be brought on a 'shared ground'. He says, "It is necessary to conduct research in modern as well as traditional, indigenous technology with a view to-

Scrutinising the traditional technology to ascertain what portions of it are adaptable to modern conditions;

Developing our own indigenous technology in consonance with our socio-cultural pattern taking this precaution that it should lead to decentralisation of the process of production; exploring the possibilities of converting home, instead of factory, as a production unit with the help of power and atomic energy.

Introducing for the benefit of our village artisans and craftsmen, appropriate modification in the traditional techniques of production, without enhancing the risk of (a) increase in unemployment, (b) wastage of available managerial and technical skills, and (c) complete decapitalisation (partial decapitalisation is understandable) of their existing means of production. (Third Way, pp. 88)

### **Implications**

To conclude, one can say that a close reading of Integral Humanism, which flows into the Third Way, serves as the permanently contemporary and eternally relevant alternative to all sectarian, divisive, and exclusive thinking and practices. These practices are spearheaded by market-driven globalization as global capitalism and Marxism-driven global communism as the universalizing, homogenizing model of provincial policies for all the aspects of our economic, social, cultural, and political life and its manifestations. As Kumar (2020) notes, the harmonious and inclusive ethos of Integral Humanism aligns deeply with India's civilizational ethos, fostering coexistence amidst diversity. This shows that the Hindu way of life emerges as the intrinsic approach connecting all the people of the world as humans living with their distinct identities, pursuing and possessing peace and prosperity for all.

The intellectual and academic community needs to engage itself with a massive dissemination and incorporation of Integral Humanism and its applied formulations in the Third Way into various academic approaches. The contemporary significance of 'publish or perish' needs to be engaged with a lot of positivity towards the changing academic scene. Panikkar (1993) emphasizes the urgency of creating an intellectual space that resists divisive paradigms and fosters integrated approaches to knowledge and learning. The applicability and relevance of the non-capitalistic and non-compartmentalizing thinking of Integral Humanism as the Third Way needs to be explored with reference to the academic disciplines like Law, Mass Communication, and other disciplines under Humanities, Language, and Literary Studies.

Such an incorporation will further support the aim of enhancing the quotient of relevance and significance of critical approaches to these academic disciplines. It will also offer a robust alternative to other provincial and inadequate critical theory approaches to the study of these

disciplines because the prominence of Cultural Marxism in these theories merely repeats the failed model of ‘theory’ determining the ‘practice’ of learning and of living. Ives (2004) argues that the limitations of Gramsci’s Marxism demonstrate the inadequacies of cultural determinism in addressing the complexities of modern societies.

A thoroughly scholastic and academically palatable research and application of Integral Humanism and the Third Way will be a sure way to offer a much-desired and long-awaited alternative of culturally generated theoretical interpretability of the knowledge texts to the ideologically founded theoretical templates of cultural Marxism. Most significantly, the integrated approach to the New Humanism—A Manifesto—a moral restatement of Marxism by M.N. Roy, the founder of the Communist Party of India, and the Third Way of Integral Humanism will also explore the possibility of eliminating the perceptive dichotomy of the ‘Left versus Right’ condition in the provincialist political rhetoric. As Thengdi (1980) suggests, this integrated framework can help India and the world reach the ‘shared ground’ of a collaborative approach between the followers of both approaches. This will ensure the independence of the minds of the mankind. Let us end this endeavor of the present article with a starting point in Dattopanta’s own words,

The only starting point of our national reconstruction could be the regeneration and rejuvenation of Hindu Culture and Sanatana Dharma.

**References:**

1. Banerjee, S. (2005). *Make Me a Man! Masculinity, Hinduism, and Nationalism in India*. SUNY Press.
2. Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton University Press.
3. Gramsci, A. (1975). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.
4. Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Duke University Press.
5. Lukács, G. (1971). *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. MIT Press.
6. Mukherjee, S. (2018). *Political Thought in Modern India*. SAGE Publications.
7. Nandy, A. (1983). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*. Oxford University Press.
8. Thengdi, D. B. (1998). *The Third Way*. Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh Publications.
9. Upadhyay, D. (1965). *Integral Humanism*. Deendayal Research Institute.
10. Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. <https://eijhss.com/index.php/hss/index>

Verso Books.

11. Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton University Press.
12. Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Wiley-Blackwell.
13. Lukács, G. (1971). *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. MIT Press.
14. Nandy, A. (1983). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*. Oxford University Press.
15. Pollock, S. (2006). *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. University of California Press.
16. Sen, A. (2005). *The Argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian History, Culture, and Identity*. Penguin Books.
17. Berlin, I. (1963). *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*. Oxford University Press.
18. Eagleton, T. (1996). *The Illusions of Postmodernism*. Blackwell Publishing.
19. Gramsci, A. (1975). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.
20. Harvey, D. (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Wiley-Blackwell.
21. Hobsbawm, E. (1996). *The Age of Revolution: 1789–1848*. Vintage.
22. Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Duke University Press.
23. Lukács, G. (1971). *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. MIT Press.
24. Thompson, E. P. (1963). *The Making of the English Working Class*. Penguin.
25. Berlin, I. (1963). *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*. Oxford University Press.
26. Conquest, R. (1991). *The Great Terror: A Reassessment*. Oxford University Press.
27. Eagleton, T. (1996). *The Illusions of Postmodernism*. Blackwell Publishing.
28. Fitzpatrick, S. (2008). *The Russian Revolution*. Oxford University Press.
29. Chattopadhyay, H. (1988). *M.N. Roy: A Political Biography*. Progressive Publishers.
30. Elst, K. (2001). *Decolonizing the Hindu Mind: Ideological Development of Hindu Revivalism*. Rupa Publications.
31. Mukherjee, A. (2000). *Communism in India: A Political and Intellectual History (1919–1951)*. OUP India.
32. Roy, M.N. (1947). *The New Humanism: A Manifesto*. Renaissance Publishers.
33. Sinha, N.K. (1976). *The Left-Wing Movement in India*. Manisha Granthalaya.
34. Chaturvedi, S. (2019). *Integral Humanism and Its Relevance in the Contemporary World*.  
<https://eijhss.com/index.php/hss/index>

Academic Publishers.

35. Nandy, A. (2007). *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*. Oxford University Press.
36. Rao, S. (2017). *Pandit Deendayal Upadhyay: Integral Humanism*. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
37. Sharma, A. (2015). *Hinduism and Human Rights: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford University Press.
38. Thapar, R. (2018). *The Past Before Us: Historical Traditions of Early North India*. Harvard University Press.
39. Chakrabarty, D. (2008). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press.
40. SHARMA S. The Chicago School goes East: Edward Shils and the dilemma of the Indian intellectuals, circa 1956–
41. 67. *Modern Asian Studies*. 2020;54(6):2087-2111. doi:10.1017/S0026749X19000465
42. Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press.
43. Paranjpe, A. C. (1984). *Theoretical Psychology: The Meeting of East and West*. Plenum Press.