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Abstract- Marx propagated Scientific Socialism was buzz word throughout the world in 19th and 20th century. With its success in 1917 Russian revolution, the philosophy attracted men throughout the world. However, with the collapse of Soviet Union, the world is looking for a new philosophy to guide it through the turbulent times. An important constituent of Marxist ideology was its anti-religious stance. In India, the current government of Bhartiya Janta Party is following the path suggested by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya through his philosophy of Integral Humanism during 1960s which lays emphasis on ‘Dharma’. So, it becomes important to analyse Marx’s ideas on religion viz-a-viz, the concept of Dharma propagated by Upadhyaya.
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INTRODUCTION
Historically, the concept of public or collective ownership of property and natural resources has long been associated with Socialism, Marxism and communism.[1] Karl Marx emerged as the most influential socialist thinker in the 19th century.[2] Marx and his friend Frederick Engels founded doctrine of scientific socialism.[3] It is important to note that Socialism has been propagated before and after Marx. But after Marx no one has been able to make any distinctive mark with regards to objectives and main premises.”[4] Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya of Bharatiya Jana Sangh, was a profound philosopher and has been the source of ideological guidance and moral inspiration for the ruling Bhartiya Janta Party in India. He was one of the rare thinkers of modern India who could carve out an alternative roadmap for the overall development with a truly Indian model of thinking. Since religion has its influence in the society, it is important to analyse views of these prominent personalities, wherein one discards religion in the interest of society and the other proposes ‘Dharma’ as the basis of society.

I. DISCUSSION

Marx & Engels had propagated their theory on the basis of dialectical materialism and made historic interpretation of the future suggesting inevitability of socialism after passing through the stage of class struggle between proletariat and bourgeois in capitalist society. After passing through the stages of dictatorship and withering away of the State, ideal stage of Communism was envisaged.

On the other hand, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya gave his theory of Integral Humanism in which he tried to comprehend and articulate the true meaning of the ‘human being’ on the basis of Indian thought process. He saw man being born out of the integration of individual, society, nature and the Almighty. He sees no conflict between an individual and society. Human being is neither a physical entity nor spiritual one, but instead expresses a union of both these two.

In light of the above background, it is important to analyses the main premises of Marx’s scientific socialism which shed light on his views regarding God and religion viz. a viz. Deendayal Upadhyaya’s premises of Integral Humanism:

1. Dialectical Materialism

Marx was influenced by Hegel, who had given the theory of dialectic idealism. In philosophy, Marx took his theory of dialectics removed its idealism, prepared theory of dialectical materialism. Then he applied it to human society and created, theory of historical materialism.

According to Hegel, the moving principle of the world is ‘contradiction’. Each stage of history has been termed ‘thesis’. At each stage the thesis itself produces its opposite termed as ‘antithesis’ from within itself; the seeds of destruction are its own internal contradictions. But the antithesis which attempts to remove contradictions of the thesis is itself destroyed and replaced by the synthesis which combines the valid elements of both thesis and anti thesis. This synthesis in turn becomes the starting point for the whole process to repeat again and this continues until final synthesis, the perfect stage is reached. This has been described as Hegel’s dialectical theory of historical evolution. [4]
However, Marx and Engels criticized the concept of idealism from Hegel's philosophy. According to Hegel history is a rational process not meaningless chance. He saw the idea of spirit or mind making itself real in history. On the other hand, according to Marx and Engels material world determines our ideas rather than our ideas determining the material world. In other words, nature of material world determines the change.

According to materialist premise, all knowledge is derived from the senses. The stress is on the dialectical development of human knowledge, socially acquired in the course of practical activity, as against Hegel’s mechanistic view that knowledge derives exclusively from given sense impressions. Only through practical interaction with the things and by framing the ideas corresponding to their practice, individuals can gain knowledge. The only means to test the correspondence of idea with reality—i.e. truth is Social practice. Thus, he turned the Hegelian theory of the Idea or Spirit and Matter upside down and substituted his materialism in place of Hegel’s idealism in the dialectical principle of evolution.

Thengadi tells further that Hegel took this concept of dialectics from Indian philosophy –‘Sankhyadarshan.’ It is an accepted fact that the German translation of ‘Sankhyadarshan’ used to be present on the table of Hegel. Irfan Habib acknowledges the Hindu influence on Hegel and Marx, however he remarks about their limited understanding. “He (Hegal) had only a limited number of authoritative sources at his disposal; and he was not a person with an open mind, capable of sympathizing with all alien ways of thinking with loving understanding, but was an armchair scholar, inclined to abstractions, interpreting the outside world according to his pre-conceived pattern.”

In contrast to Marx, who discarded the importance of mind and spirit, Upadhyaya considered that man is a composite of body, mind, intellect and soul. All 4 need satisfaction in order to derive happiness. The fulfillment of four fold aspirations related to body, mind, intellect and soul is predicated on sensuous pleasure, mental satisfaction, peace & knowledge and realization of self.

For fulfillment of needs of man, for satisfaction of his desires and holistic development, 4 purusharthas (objectives) in the form of action have been considered – dharma, artha (wealth), kaama(desires) and moksha (liberation). All 4 complement each other and cannot be achieved in isolation. Fulfillment of artha (wealth) and kaama (desires) on the basis of dharma is considered as development of humanity and the living of such a life is provides moksha (liberation).

Another important point is that Upadhyaya believes in cooperation and not in conflict. He says- “Mutual co-operation sustains life on this earth.” The recognition of this element of mutual sustenance among different forms of life and taking that as the basis of an effort to make human life mutually sustaining is the prime characteristic of civilization. To mould the nature (Prakriti) to achieve the social goals is culture (sanskriti) but when this nature leads to social conflict it is perversion (Vikriti).

2. Religion and ‘Dharma’

In his works- Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, Marx famously called religion "the opium of the people." In that religion was not only used by those in power to oppress the workers, but it also made them feel better about being oppressed when they couldn't afford real opium.

He thought that if the comfort blanket of religion was taken away, at last the workers would have to do something about their terrible condition. In Marx’s dream of a communist revolution, religion would be abolished, and the workers would be so happy being equal they simply wouldn't need it anymore.

Reasons for Marx’s antagonism to religion

i) Early life

Marx’s both parents were Jewish. When Karl was about an year old, his father was baptized in the Evangelical Established Church in order to continue his professional career. At the age of six, Karl was also baptized. His Jewish background exposed him to prejudice and discrimination. This early life experience is likely to have contributed towards Karl’s psychology which led him to question the role of religion in society and work for social change.

ii) European History

In Europe, Pope became the centre and whole of the Christian world came under him. Two kinds of rebellion took place against central authority of Pope –i) the mediation of Pope between a person and God/ religion is not acceptable and ii) no outside influence was acceptable, maybe it comes in the area of religion which resulted in Nationalism.

Parmeswaran tells that Marx condemned religion because the religions he knew were institutionalized religions based on a hierarchical basis. Such religions had closed systems wherein their followers had no right to question or to choose. Moreover they fostered formidable priest craft. Priests stood as middlemen between the worshipper and the worshipped, keeping God at a safe distance and thereby creating opportunities for exploitation.

iii) Anti religious stance considered progressive and scientific

In the early 1600s, a certain Italian astronomer came into conflict with the Catholic Church over his support of the Copernican view that the Earth revolves around the sun. Galileo, himself a Catholic, was tried for heresy in 1633 by the Roman Inquisition, which forced him to recant his views and live out his days under house arrest. It wasn't until 2000 that former pope John Paul II issued a formal apology for the church's treatment of Galileo.
So one of the reasons why Marx opposed religion was because he believed that religion was opposed to science and that it hindered the progress of science. He says:“History of religion is the history of fight against the development of scientific thought. The church persecuted greatest scientists with blind cruelty, torturing them, burning them at the stake, forbidding or destroying their works. The Catholic church, whose instruments was the inquisition, was particularly zealous in this respect. For centuries, the church played an extremely reactionary role and fought pitilessly against the scientific conception of the world and against the democratic and socialistic movement.”[16]

iv) Religion seen as support to bourgeoisie and aristocracy

Marx attacks Christianity in The Communist Manifesto- Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. Has not Christianity claimed against private property, against marriage, against the State? Has it not preached in place of these, charity and poverty, celibacy and mortification of the flesh, monastic life and Mother Church? Christian Socialism is but the holy water with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat.[17] Ambedkar analyses Marx’s opposition to religion and finds that it is based on experience of Christianity felt by Marx. He says:“This charge is based upon the Sermon on the Mount which is to be found in the Bible. The Sermon on the Mount sublimes poverty and weakness. It promises heaven to the poor and the weak.”[18]

So, on one hand Christianity encourages the exploiting behaviors of aristocracy and bourgeoisie and on the other side asks people to remain exploited as it is path of heaven.

v) Religion supported status –quo, Marx had adopted Socio-conflict approach

Religion had a huge impression on Marx, since earlier thinkers saw religion as a social phenomenon. Religious beliefs and ceremonies held great importance to men and were celebrated enthusiastically. It led to disciplined way of life to all sections of society such as its rules were taken care by individuals as obligations. It acted as a cementing force providing social unity.[19] Marx adopted ‘social-conflict approach’ while analyzing religion and found that religion leads to maintaining the status quo, since it talks about rewards in after-life rather than in this life. This approach pacifies the masses, as attention is deflected from existing inequalities.[20]

Marx thinks – ‘Man makes religion, religion does not make man’. He describes religion as the self-consciousness and self-esteem of man who has either not yet won through to himself, or has already lost himself again. However, he professes that man has his existence in this world. At the same time he acknowledges that there is suffering in this world, whose effect is diminished by the presence of religion. He says:“Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness.” He urges that instead of this illusory happiness why not bring a person out of these religious boundaries and work for his real happiness?[21]

Criticism of religion is criticism of society. Religion is result of the conditions of the society. Hence, it cannot disappear until the conditions of which it is an ideological reflection disappear.[22] Marx understood that religion teaches morality, values, and beliefs to a society and provides a basis for the evaluation. It serves a function and purpose. However, Marx finds that religion does not provide the proper reason for the basis. Each religion has set of guidelines, which are being adhered without examining the rationale behind them.

As such, religion was masking the truth and misleading followers. When the picture of society and life is seen through in lines with religion, people get blinded to the realities of life. Therefore, he considers religion, as a false hope and comfort to the poor. This temporary comfort to poor is ultimately aiding in the process of alienation.[23]

vi) Marx saw man as a material being, God unnecessary

Marx was thinking how an abstract human being could exist. He says:“Man is the world of man, state, society.” He thinks that since world is not seen in correct perspective, the conception of God was a necessity, but now the time has come to invert it upside down. Once world is seen correctly, God would not be required.

In the Paris Manuscripts, in 1844, he writes:“Since the real existence of man and nature has become evident in practice, through sense experience, because man has thus become evident for man as the being of nature, and nature for man as the being of man, the question about an alien being, about a being above nature and man -- a question which implies admission of the unreality of nature and of man -- has become impossible in practice. Atheism, as a negation of God, has no longer any meaning, and postulates the existence of man through this negation; but socialism as socialism no longer stands in any need of such a mediation.”[24]

Marx explains here that man and nature exist together and in between them there is no place for the mediator called God. If God is not there, there is no alienation. When a person declares that he is atheist, he is in turn accepting the existence of God. So he wants to say that Socialism is the relationship between man and nature with no place for God. His main target was theology not religion. He described theology which means the formal study of God, as the worst enemy of the awakened spirit. There can be three stages of human history in reference to God –In the first stage, humans recognize themselves as a local community and local gods. In second, in the era of money and exploitation, God Almighty rules over all. In third and final stage, there is no use for Him, as humans freely govern their own lives.[25]
vii) **Uniqueness of Scientific Socialism**

Socialism had existed even before Marx, however it was aligned with Christianity. In 1820s, in France, the first influential socialist movement named Saint-Simonians preached a ‘New Christianity’ and its members liked to call themselves as apostles of Church. Their socialist successors, named Fourierists ‘dreamt of ‘return to the Christianity of Jesus Christ.’ In 1840s, Communism was identified as the true Christianity according to Jesus Christ by the prominent communist Étienne Cabet. Pierre Leroux, coined the term socialism and explained it as ‘religious democracy.’ In 1843 even Engels had been under the influence of Frenchmen’s mysticism, however after working with Marx, he later dismissed the religion of the early socialists as superficial rhetoric or childish enthusiasm. [26]

Marx wanted his socialism to be different from others. So, one of the means adopted to make his philosophy which he termed ‘Scientific Socialism’ unique, distinct, scientific and logical was opposition to Christianity, which in turn led to discarding the concept of religion and God.

**Dharma, not religion**

Upadhyaya clarifies that Dharma is not religion. Confusion has arisen as Westerners could not find appropriate English word for Dharma and used religion to denote it. [27]

Upadhyaya describes Dharma with its ten signs-

*Dhṛṭīḥ kṣamā damo’steyam śaucamindriyanigrahaḥ |
Dhṛividyā satyamakrodho daśakam dharmaṃksanam]*

(Fortitude, forgiveness, abstinence, non-theiving, cleanliness, control over one’s sensory organs, intellect, learning, truth and shunning anger.) [28]

Dharma is different from religion as religion is synonymous to sect (pantha). A sect is born in relation to a particular community; its level of progress, social conditions, the special problems of the period are taken into account in framing rules of behavior, the do’s and don’t and the modes of worship. The propounder of these rules etc is called the prophet and the book which contains the injunctions he has laid down is called the holy book. Thus Jesus Christ and Mohammad are the prophets of Christianity and Islam respectively and Bible and Quran are their holy books. But Dharma cannot be bound by a particular community or period or a set of circumstances. One prophet, one holy book and one set of commandments can circumscribe a sect but not Dharma.

Upadhyaya tells that Dharma is a wide concept that is concerned with all aspects of life and sustains the world. He says—“The which sustains, is Dharma.” [29] Dharma guides man on path of both worldly well being and salvation. Dharma gives priority to the worldly well being. A sect is concerned with an individual’s path to God. Dharma does not turn its back on God but it stresses the proper maintenance and progress of the society. Dharma does not make fate in God’s existence obligatory. One may or may not believe in God, but no one can have freedom of theft, dacoity, hatred jealousy or any immorality. One may observe penance or not, may or may not have belief in traditional ideas of sin and merit, but must observe social laws and social do’s and don’t’s.

Soni clarifies the concept- Dharma means the basic principle of integration of the four powers—man, society, universe and God. It is the Dharma that upholds, sustains and nourishes. It leads to complete development. There is no synonym of the word Dharma in English. When we say, putra (son) dharma, sevak (servant) dharma, swami (owner) dharma etc. here ‘dharma’ refers to ‘duty’; and when we say raj (rule) dharma, the English translation of ‘dharma’ is ‘law’. Alien (parayee) woman is mother, alien money is soil, also has been considered as ‘dharma’, here English translation becomes ‘ethics’; but when we say dharma of fire, water, air, earth etc, its English translation is ‘nature’. But when moksha (liberation) dharma is said, it denotes the way of worship for attainment of God, in fact here ‘dharma’ means ‘religion’. This way, it can be said that dharma is related to complete existence. And this type of dharma is the fountain of feelings, thoughts and values and Dharma has been regarded with utmost importance in Indian Social life.

Dharma helps intellect to decide which activities should be undertaken. It forms basis for deciding right & wrong. Indian society is Dhrampradhaan, where everything revolves around dharma. Everything according to dharma is desirable and anything against dharma i.e. adharma is sinful. [30]

3. **Experiments to remove God’s identity**

i) **Russia**: Immediately after October revolution in 1917, the People’s Commissariat for Enlightenment was established. Its purpose was to remove all religious references from school curriculums. [31]

Most organized religions were not outlawed. Main target of the anti-religious campaign was the Russian Orthodox Church having the largest number of followers. [32] As a result of the influence of Marxian teachings and attitude of Communist Party, a movement called “Renovationist Schism” took place within the Russian Orthodox Church. It was a struggle between the conservatives who would die rather work with the Bolsheviks and reformers who wanted to blend Orthodoxy with Marxist teachings. In the initial years of Bolshevik regime, Lenin tried to topple the power of the Church by placing renovationists in positions of power. After the Socialist party could not emerge victorious, the socialists gave up trying to take over the Church from within and resorted to the blunt use of force. They believed that as a result of their “socialist reforms,” people had given up their loyalty to the Church and its clergymen. [33]

The process of destruction of churches and monasteries and turning them into public toilets started. Their land and property was appropriated. Thousands of bishops, monks and clergy were murdered. Specialist propaganda units like the League of the Godless were formed. Christian intellectuals were sent to camps. Theological schools were shut, and church publications banned. The Soviets thought that when the church had been deprived of its power, religion would quickly wither away. [34]
In 1932, “Five Year Plan of Atheism” was started.[35] USSR had around five million militant atheists at that time. Measures like setting up of anti-religious universities, training centers for teaching the methods for attacking religion – were organized.[36] It was planned that all churches and prayer houses would be closed by 1932-1933, all religious traditions, literature and family – by 1933-1934. For this, first action was to influence youth by total anti-religious propaganda, which was scheduled by 1934-1935. Elimination of clerics by 1935-36 was the last action. [37] By adopting this methodology, the very concept of God would disappear from Soviet Union and not a single house of prayer shall remain in USSR by May 1, 1937.[38] In order to test the effectiveness of his measures to eradicate religion from mind’s of people, a question regarding religion was included in 1937 census. The answer came as a surprise. Amongst 30 million illiterate USSR citizens over 16 years of age, 84% said that they were firm believers of religion. Corresponding figure amongst 68.5 million literate citizens was 45%. These were high numbers, given the amount of energy spent against religion.

It resulted in more aggressive efforts. In 1935-1936, around ten thousand churches were closed, the figure in 1937 was eight thousand and in 1938, over six thousand churches were closed. Only 350-400 pre-revolutionary churches were open by the time Second World War. [39]

By the start of the Second World War, Church or any other organization was no more a political threat to the Soviet state. In its struggle for existence, the Orthodox Church had promised its support to the Communist government in 1927. Moreover, there were very few Churches at the time of invasion of Germany. As a result, Stalin no more viewed the Church as his political opponent. Instead terrified by the German challenge, now Stalin thought to utilize the religious appeal for propagating patriotism and placating allies to earn their good will. Now Orthodoxy became politically useful for Stalin and he withdrew his anti-religious measures. Smoklin writes: “With the start of the war, atheist periodicals and publishing houses were shut down, most antireligious museums were closed, and most of the institutions charged with atheist work were dissolved.”

Although Stalin felt that he had control of the Orthodox Church and now it could be used to strengthen his domestic authority and foreign policy, but in reality, in everyday life, it was not an easy task to control religious beliefs and practices outside the church. [40]

ii) China: In China, the Marxist stance against religion influenced the harsh crackdown on religion during the Cultural Revolution between 1966 to 1976. All religions were attacked, which led to practicing of worship in private and secrecy by the masses. It resulted in creation of underground religious movements which meant that officially there was no recognized religion. During this period till Mao died in 1976.[41] Since 2010, the government approves all the religious texts even those of primary schools.

Inspection of religious schools is a regular phenomenon. Informal schools and Quran groups which were instrumental in propagating religious education are under scanner. People are asked to choose between religion and profession. Advertisements for government positions openly state the preference to a candidate who does not believe in religion and do not participate in religious activities. Further, those who attend mosques are warned against loosing job. Communist Party encourages official atheist line to its Party workers, State officials and even students of State –run schools.[42] The Chinese Communist Party whose membership exceeds ninety million prohibits members from holding religious beliefs. Party membership and religious beliefs are considered incompatible and it is expected that the members discourage their families from publicly participating in religious ceremonies. These regulations are not strictly enforced but the party periodically takes measures to draw a mark as clear line on religion. In 2017, the party’s official newspaper warned CCP members from putting faith in religion, calling it “spiritual anesthesia.”[43] Still people are turning towards religion in China. The reason for turning towards Buddhism is because, it provides a way to deal with alienation and stress that arises from urban life in modern China. Moreover, the only logic of earning more and more money does not answer all questions of the mind. In fact, many Chinese feel money is creating more problems instead of solving them. They understand that only religion can satisfy a mind filled with questions like “Where we come from and where we are going.” At other times there will be questions which logic will not be able to answer.[44]

iii) Poland: Thengadi tells that in 1980 Catholic Pope went to the Communist country of Poland. Out of the population of six crore, three crore came to see him. When Pope visited his home town Crakow in Poland, some ten lakh people gathered for community prayer. Watching the gathering Pope could gather the courage to openly denounce famous Marx saying: “Man is nothing more than a means of production”.[45]

iv) India: In 1940’s the General Secretary of Communist Party of undivided India P.C. Joshi asked fellow communists to read Ramayana and Mahabharata in order to understand India. In 2018, Kerala Communists decided to observe Ramayana month and its current General Secretary, Sitaram Yechury was pictured offering floral kulush during worship of Goddess Maha Kali.[46]

So it is visible that despite attempts to follow Marx’s philosophy negating religion, Communists did not find it practical and had to put faith back in religion and God. It is pertinent to note here that towards the end of his life, Marx had once remarked: “Thank God! I am not a Marxist.” This statement shows that even Marx’s acknowledgement of God.

4. Communism and Dharam Rajya

According to Marx, after the triumph of proletariat during the class struggle with bourgeois, dictatorship of proletariat would be established which could also be called as stage of socialism. After the brief period of dictatorship of proletariat, when the conditions would be transformed to an ideal state of Communism, withering away of the State would take place. Marx dreamt that a day would come when his socialism (with state ownership of property) would be replaced by communism (in which the state would no longer exist). Anyhow, Marx’s wishes never came true. In fact, quite the opposite has occurred: In every instance, Marxist socialism has created bigger and more intrusive governments than ever before. [47]
Here the important question which arises is that without the law enforcement, what would be the motivation for an individual or society to take care of other person beyond own selfish interest? Why would one sacrifice for the other? Why a strong person would not grab from weak? Communist regimes of USSR and now China have failed to answer this question. So the condition appropriate for loosening State controls did not arrive in any of the countries. In USSR, dictatorship ceased only after its collapse. In China, dictatorship has become more powerful than any period in history.

However, Upadhyaya looks at Indian text and tells the situation when the Stateless society can prove to be a reality. Upadhyaya narrates that there is an instance in Mahabharata wherein it has been described that formerly there was no State or King, no punishment, no punisher, all the people protected each-other and the society was governed by law. [48]

Dharm is the fundamental law of human nature and also the standard for deciding the propriety of behavior in various situations. Upadhyaya says –“Since Dharm is supreme, our ideal of the State has been Dharm Rajya (State of Dharma).” [49]

5. Theocratic Godless state and word ‘Secularism’ not acceptable to Upadhyaya

During his famous lectures on Integral Humanism, Upadhyaya clarified that Dharma Rajya does not mean theocratic state. Defining theocratic State he says –“Where a particular sect and its prophet or guru rule is supreme that is a theocratic State.” Theocracy is born when all power is concentrated in the hands of State. Describing its other characteristics, he says-“All the rights are enjoyed by the followers of this particular sect. Others either cannot live in that country or at best, enjoy a slave-like, secondary-citizen’s status.” He cited example of Holy Roman Empire, the muslim kingdoms in the name of Khalifa and newly created Pakistan as theocratic States.[50]

Upadhyaya advises against tie up of State and religion. He says-“By such a tie-up there is no increase in an individual’s capacity to worship God. The only result is that the State deviates from duty.” In contrast, Upadhyaya suggests that it is the responsibility of the State to maintain an atmosphere in which every individual can follow the religion of his choice and live in peace. The freedom to follow one’s religion necessarily requires tolerance for other religions. However, Upadhyaya understands that freedom has limits, such that one’s freedom should not intrude on the other person’s freedom. He says-“Where another person’s freedom is likely to be encroached upon, my freedom ends.”[51] He wants that freedom of both parties is ensured. In a similar way he suggests that freedom of all religions be ensured and freedom of each religion be limited, such that it does not encroach upon the freedom of other religion. He says Dharma Rajya ensures such freedom and is therefore not a theocratic State.

Upadhyaya thinks that although it is correct to oppose theocratic State but does not think that it was necessary to adopt the word Secular State because hindi translation of Secular is ‘ni dharama’ i.e. without dharma or ‘dharma nirpeksha’ which means indifferent to dharma. Since dharma is not confined to religion and dharma is a the basic force for our existence, Upadhyaya opposes the terminology of Secular State. He says-“A State can neither be without Dharma nor can it be indifferent to Dharma.” So he finds the concept of Dharmnirpekshta contradictory to the concept of State, which is there to maintain law. [52]

CONCLUSION

Marx had developed antipathy towards religion as a result of the struggle he experienced during his early life in his own family wherein his family had to convert to Christianity, so that his father could pursue his career. Moreover Church’s history of atrocities and purges further eroded his views regarding religion. Marx understood that religion provided stability to social life and was a powerful influence in maintaining status quo. Like medicine it suppressed the pain arising out of sufferings propagated by society as religion provided hope for better life after death. Socialism had been propagated even before Marx, but it was aligned to Christianity. Also there was a war going on between Christianity and Church for centuries. Marx wanted to be different, logical and scientific, being anti-religious provided fulfilled the criteria. Christianity supports bourgeois by removing the guilt of aristocrats and by promising heaven to the poor and the weak, it sublimes poverty and weakness. So it can be seen that his opposition is to Christianity, but since he did not have knowledge of other religions, he condemns religions without any differentiation, thinking them all to be same. By not attacking only Christianity and instead opposing all religions, he tries to give universality to his theory. He does not find place for God in evolved scientific societies. Dialectical Materialism forms basis of his theory which is formed after replacement of spirit or mind as the centre of action with matter from Hegel’s Idealistic materialism. However, the communist experiments to make their countries Godless or devoid of religion has failed despite strict controls and disincentives of being religious as is visible from the experience in USSR, China, Poland and even India.

On the other hand, Upadhyaya considers an individual as an integration of body, mind, intellect and soul, whose holistic happiness can be achieved through four purushhrthas (objectives) of dharma, artha, kaama and moksha. Dharma is base of all the purushharths. Dharma is not restricted to religion, it encompasses everything, and it sustains everything. Its meaning varies as per the usage of the word. It means, law, nature, duty, ethics, religion etc. Dharma helps intellect to decide which activities should be undertaken. Indian society is Dhrampradhaan, i.e. everything according to dharma is desirable and anything against dharma i.e. adharma is sinful. The concept of ideal State of Communism can only be achieved by way of dharma, which Upadhyaya describes as Dharam Rajya. This Dharam Rajya is not a theocratic State i.e. a State attached to a particular religion. In fact, Dharam Rajya provides enough freedom to worship as per their own choice. Upadhyaya is against the tie up between State and religion, but at the same time does not favour the word ‘Secularism’ which means ‘ni dharama’ i.e. without dharma or ‘dharma nirpeksha’ which means indifferent to dharma since dharma is the basis for a State and a State can neither be without Dharma nor can it be indifferent to Dharma.
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