Re-envisioning Public Administration in India through Deendayal Upadhyaya's Integral Humanism: A Normative, Ethical, and Decentralized Governance Framework

Dr. Sapna Kumari Sharma
Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, INDIA

Corresponding Author: sapna.gc@gmail.com

ORCiD

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8170-8111

www.sjmars.com || Vol. 4 No. 1 (2025): February Issue

ABSTRACT

This research paper explores the concept of Integral Humanism as a missionary normative model, as formulated by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya, that can re-invent the idea of the public administration in India. It is on this background of inherited Weberian and colonial bureaucracies of India that is characterised by hierarchy, impersonality and rigid procedures, which ensures that the paper posits that Integral Humanism presents a culturally based, but ethically sound alternative. The analysis of five pillars of the Integral Humanism, namely dharma (moral order), integrated personhood, subsidiarity and decentralisation, Antyodaya (welfare of the last person), and selective modernisation shows that the theory advocates ethical governance, human dignity, participatory democracy, and inclusive development. The paper places Integral Humanism in the context of the discussions of the theory of public administration, decentralisation reforms, welfare governance, and indigenous knowledge systems by conducting a comprehensive literature review and theoretical analysis. It brings out how the philosophy adds to the global governance ideas of polycentric decision-making and network governance and their limitation of Western administrative paradigms that fail to take into account the cultural sensitivity and human-centered ethics. Simultaneously, the paper critically evaluates conceptual, operational and institutional tensions of the application of a culture based normative system in a constitutionally pluralistic and administratively multifaceted country. This research paper concludes that in spite of the transformative potential of Integral Humanism to ethical and people-centred governance, its practical implementation needs institutional design attention, anti-politicisation protection, and administrative tools, evaluation systems, and decentralised capacity building development. On the whole, it can be concluded that Integral Humanism can be used as a corrective and complementary paradigm that would add values to the theory and practice of public administration in India.

Keywords- Deendayal Upadhyaya, Dharma, Governance, Gram Swaraj, Integral Humanism, Public Administration.

I.   INTRODUCTION

Indian public administration operates at a crossroad of constitutional requirements, traditional Indian administrative practices and a well-developed heterogeneous socio-cultural environment. The nascent Indian state maintained the existing colonial administrative systems to a large extent since independence, and the most notable was the Weberian paradigm of bureaucracy that is defined by hierarchy, rule-boundedness, impersonality, and centralization (Gulick & Urwick, 1937). Therefore, post-colonial administrative system was a pre-monitor of efficiency, uniformity and

procedural rationality at the cost of contextual responsiveness or cultural grounding. Although these institutions provided stability in the infant years of the nation-building, scholars promptly came to realise that a system imported by the Western administrative customs was not necessarily compatible with historic Indian patterns of collective organisation, community government and values.

Since the early fifties, Indian intellectuals, policymakers and social theorists have started asking themselves the question as to whether an administrative apparatus, however constitutional in its foundations, represented sufficiently the civilizational ethos of India. Critics argued that the administration of areas that is not based on culture is likely to result in alienation, bureaucratic distance, and ineffective policies especially among the rural and marginalised groups. It is in this context that the role played by Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya comes into play. In 1965, Upadhyaya proposed a radically different way of governing human beings in his political-philosophical system, Integral Humanism (Ekatma Manav Darshan) in a series of lectures (Upadhyaya, 1965).

Integral humanism is not only based on as a metaphysical ideology, but a normative system of governance, and government. Its most fundamental premise is that human beings are unified personalities in which material, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual needs need to be balanced. Governance should, thus, be people-centred and holistic, which is not technocratic or largely economic. Upadhyaya predicted dharma, not as a form of religious ritualism but as a universal moral order, as the fundamental principle of statecraft and government. This, he claimed is a moral basis that guarantees justice, moral behavior, accountability, and equity in the administrative procedures. Integral Humanism attempts to replace the alleged value-neutrality of governance with the necessity of grounding it on dharma and demands that governmental organizations be proactive in contributing to societal wellbeing and social solidarity (Bharatiya Janata Party, 2015).

The other pillar of administrative philosophy of Upadhyaya is that of decentralisation which is closely related to the Gandhian concept of Gram swaraj. He argued that the cultural and political traditions of India were decentralised by nature with the village acting as self-governing units in the past. In this regard, to make administration responsive and participatory, the power should be decentralised to the local levels. Integral Humanism also prefigures the end-purpose of government, namely the uplift of the final and most vulnerable, which is Antyodaya. The said moral commitment offers an ethical justification to welfare programmes, inclusive development, and focused interventions to marginalised groups (Kumar & Sharma, 2022). Antyodaya is used as an administrative criterion of evaluating policy efficacy; an administrative system succeeds in reaching the most excluded persons. The legacy of this value can be seen in policy programs that are instituted during the tenure of Upadhyaya, like the Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Grameen Kaushalya Yojana and the Antyodaya schemes.

II.   RESEARCH PROBLEM, KEY QUESTIONS, AND AIM OF THE STUDY

The paper has placed the concept of Integral Humanism in the current debates on the subject of public administration by putting forward three research questions that relate to each other, (1) What does Integral Humanism offer to the normative theory and practice of Indian public administration? (2) How is it possible to make its core principles, namely dharma, human-friendly policy, decentralisation, and welfare work in administrative structures and processes? (3) What are the strains when culture based normative systems meet the constitutional obligation of pluralism, legality and democratic protections of India? Answering these questions, the paper will aim at proving that Integral Humanism can provide a unique and culturally-based approach to the understanding of the public administration, one that will be supplementary, critical and enriched with respect to the already existing administrative theories.

III.   LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature applicable to the study of the topic of Integral Humanism as a normative approach to public administration in India falls into three general and overlapping categories, (1) literature about Integral Humanism and Deendayal Upadhyaya, (2) the history of the theory of public administration and (3) decentralisation and Indian governance reform. Both clusters are adding conceptual, historical, and analytical resources that would assist in placing the ideas of Upadhyaya in a broader administrative discussion.

The primary sources and interpretative literature about Integral Humanism make up the first cluster. The original lectures suggested by Upadhyaya in 1965 are still the canonical basis of perception of the doctrine (Upadhyaya, 1965). His idea of dharma, the conceptualisation of personhood, the decentralised government, and Antyodaya have been reviewed by modern scholars, who study indigenous political thought. The collections of Upadhyaya and digitised archives of his writings have been collected and digitised by institutional organizations like the Deendayal Research Institute (DRI) and the BJP e-library, allowing new academic interest to be taken. Nonetheless, the scholarly explanations are not consistent. When some consider Integral Humanism as a welfare-based indigenous approach that can add depth to the discussion of development (Bharatiya Janata Party, 2015), others believe that the concept is a civilizationally-specific doctrine directly connected with the ideological past of the Hindu nationalism (Hansen, 1999). This discussion, that is, normative

appreciation versus ideological critique, constitutes an important context against which its validity with respect to public administration is to be evaluated.

The second group includes basic and contemporary literature in the field of theology of public administration, and this literature gives some theoretical basis on how Integral Humanism concurs or contradicts the dominant administrative paradigms. Classical theorists including Wilson, (1887), Gulick & Urwick, 1,(937) and Weber, (1946) theorised the idea of the public administration as rational, hierarchical, rule-afflicted and mostly value-neutral business. These initial models prioritised efficiency, impersonality and organisational discipline and it gave the foundation of the postcolonial bureaucratic system in India. However, in the late sixties, scholars had started to question the notion of administrative neutrality. Frederickson and others were the spearhead of the New Public administration (NPA) movement that put an emphasis on social equity, moral responsibility, and citizen-centred governance (Frederickson et al., 2018). A managerialist and market-like approach to bureaucratic inefficiency in 1990s was championed by New Public Management (NPM) in the form of (Hood, 1991). Later governance literature and network governance literature, such as Rhodes, (1994) and Ostrom, (2010)turned to the concept of decentralisation, participative decision-making, and a polycentric administrative setup. Such varying theoretical paths explain the value contradictions of Integral Humanism as a normative administrative system especially those which involve efficiency and equity, centralization and subsidiarity, neutrality and cultural sensitivity.

The third cluster brings in the concept of decentralisation, reforms in Indian governance, and policy literature, thus associating the concept of Integral Humanism with the real life institutionality. The 73rd 74th Constitutional 1992 amendments institutionalised Panchayati Raj and urban local bodies giving constitutional authority to the focus of Upadhyaya on local self-governance (The Constitution (Seventy-Third Amendment) Act, 1992, 1993). The challenges of effective devolution, local capacity building and accountability as highlighted by comparative governance literature by world bank and the fiscal federalism literature (Shah, 2001) are directly applicable to the operationalisation of Gram Swaraj. Furthermore there exist modern Indian welfare programs named after Upadhyaya including the Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Grameen Kaushalya Yojana (DDU -GKY) and the Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana-NULM that refer to his concepts of Antyodaya and inclusive development (Kamble, 2024). Policy studies of these programmes show that they are conceptually consistent with Integral Humanism, and are confronted with practical challenges of implementation, monitoring, and local coordination. Integral Humanism is a mixture of theory and practice that connects philosophical ideals to the cogs of the governance and welfare machinery. It provides a normative perspective rooted in culture in the evaluation of the public administration and at the same time casts doubt on the pluralism, the institutional viability and the clarity in operations. These overlaps of the literatures make Integral Humanism a useful but controversial model of a larger discussion of administrative ethics, decentralisation, social justice, and government based on cultural foundations in India.

IV.   THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: ADMINISTRATIVE NORMS AND INTEGRAL HUMANISM

Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya has developed an value-oriented normative system of public administration in India called Integral Humanism (Ekatma Manavvad) published in 1965. Instead of viewing administration as a technical exercise or a marketplace dealing, which is neutral, Integral Humanism views administration as a practice of value, sensitive to human dignity and cultural continuity. Its theoretical basis can be grouped into five pillars that are interrelated, namely, dharma, integrated personhood, subsidiarity and decentralisation, Antyodaya, and selective modernisation. Combined, these values imply a unique administrative philosophy based on morals, fairness and cultural preservation.

4.1. Dharma as Moral Order

Upadhyaya dharma concept is the key point of his administration theory. Quite on the contrary, dharma is a universal moral system which supports justice, fairness and common good (Upadhyaya, 1965). Dharma serves as a supra-legal moral code in the context of the administration of the state, as a moral ideology to ensnare the policymakers and civil servants to a higher level than the stipulated minimum by the rules, policies, or procedures. This suggests a sense of integrity in social conduct, fairness in service provision, and sound decision-making with consideration of the weak and in the best interest of the populace. These aspects are reflected in current research on administrative ethics. According to Denhardt et al., (2014), value-oriented public administration should go beyond the efficiency to focus on public service, ethical duty, accountability, and fairness. This is in line with what Upadhyaya claims that ethical governance is central to the public administration. Dharma, therefore, gives a moral context with the help of which administrative discretion, policy priorities, and institutional culture ought to be practiced.

4.2. Integrated Personhood: Holistic Human-Centered Governance

The conception of the human person on which Integral Humanism is based is an integrated one, a unity of body, mind and intellect, and spirit. Upadhyaya maintained that a governance system based on economic indicators or material indicators (like GDP) is unable to reach the entire range of human needs (Upadhyaya, 1965). This view echoes current discussions in the field of public administration that criticizes over technological or economistic approaches. Similar

positions on human dignity, equity, and social justice are also based on the human appeals of Upadhyaya who demanded an administrative ethos based on a concept of an integrated human being.

4.3. Subsidiarity and Decentralisation (Gram Svaraj)

One of the central aspects of the Integral Humanism philosophy is the belief that decentralised, participatory, and local-based governance is the way to go. Upadhyaya regarded Gram Svaraj or village self-governance as the most usual site of Indian democracy where Indian cultural norms and social solidarity can be found to be at their best (Upadhyaya, 1965). This idea is very similar to the contemporary theories of polycentric governance. Ostrom, (2010) claims that decentralised governance systems are better than centralised governance systems because they are responsive, less costly in transactions, and legitimate as they engage the citizen in the decision-making process. The development institutions like World Bank, (2005) also stress that decentralisation enhances the accountability at the local level and enables the policies to be influenced by the local priorities. In such a way, Integral Humanism meets global systems of governance that favour subsidiarity, whereby administrative power must be as low as possible in order to act effectively. This is institutionalised in the Indian context in the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments which grant Panchayati Raj Institutions power (The Constitution (Seventy-Third Amendment) Act, 1992, 1993).

4.4. Antyodaya: Welfare of the Last Person

The distributive focus of the Integral Humanism is granted by the principle of Antyodaya, or the uplift of the poorest of the poor. Upadhyaya posited that the effectiveness of governance should not be judged by its contribution to the overall growth but rather the effect that it has on the poorest members of the society. This notion resembles the normative promises of New Public Administration, where social equity has become the central element of the administrative practice (Frederickson et al., 2018). In modern India, various welfare programmes such as the Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana (DAY-NULM) and DDU-GKY openly adopt this philosophy in their attempts to focus on inclusion, livelihoods and human development. Antyodaya thus is an ethical requirement on judging ethicalness and justice of administrative action (Kamble, 2024).

4.5. Selective Modernisation: Technology with Cultural Integrity

Integral Humanism does not oppose modernisation, it simply promotes selective modernisation or the application of technology and management methods, only when they are applied in the interests of human dignity and continuity of cultures (Upadhyaya, 1965). The New Public Management framework by Hood, (1991) facilitates efficiency and performance by promoting the managerial reforms whereas Rhodes, (1994) advocates network governing and collaborative administration. What Upadhyaya adds to this argument is that the efficiency of technology should be offset with the ethical and cultural factor, otherwise the state may turn too technocratic or market-oriented.

Collectively, these five pillars are bundled into a normative architecture of public administration which puts an emphasis on ethical governance, human dignity, decentralized decision-making, social justice, and culturally sensitive modernization. Integral Humanism therefore offers a distinctively Indian administrative reform agenda with its basis on civilizational values, but able to be consonant with modern principles of governance.

V.   INTEGRAL HUMANISM AS APPLIED TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.

Integral Humanism provides a normative and value-based platform that can be fruitfully converted into the administrative practice in India. Unlike most theories of public administration focusing on structural efficiency, managerial skills or on institutional rationality, Integral Humanism previews moral responsibility, social equity, local empowerment and cultural sensitivity. Dharma, personhood through integration, subsidiarity, Antyodaya, and selective modernization are principles that allow a multidimensional perspective of administrative processes, institutional design and policy instruments to be re-examined. The paper further explains how these principles affect four major areas namely administrative ethics, decentralized governance, welfare delivery and policy modernisation.

5.1. Administrative Ethics and Governance on Dharma

One of the major contributions made by Integral Humanism to the sphere of public administration is that it insists that the administration be based on dharma, meaning a moral order that is not defined by legal formalities and managers checklists. This can be applied practically to administrative ethics, which is a professionally area of administration that is gradually realizing the shortcomings of procedural adherence and the necessity of greater value investment (Denhardt et al., 2014). Upadhyaya, (1965) opines that a dharma-based government develops integrity, kindness, impartiality and responsibility- values that develop decision making as well as service provision. The administrative ethics can be impacted by dharma in a number of ways.

To begin with, it makes civil servant moral agents, rather than just functionaries. Dharma based principles can be incorporated in ethical guidelines, code of conduct and training programmes to encourage justice-oriented decision making. This complies with the world tendencies towards ethical governance, integrity systems and value systems to the general public (Frederickson et al., 2018). *Second*, dharma is an ethical justification of anti-corruption reforms which not only views corruption as a legal crime but also as a moral one, which erodes the trust of the population and the harmony of the society. By institutionalizing ethical responsibility and even-handed treatment on the administration of the populace,

the tools of governance represent dharma. *Third,* dharma focuses on the fair treatment of citizens and this imposes on discretionary judgement on welfare, policing, education and resource allocation. This justifies contemporary demands of people-centred and justice-based governance. The dharma in this way adds greater richness to the administrative ethics because of its basis on a culturally appealing and universally understandable moral paradigm.

5.2. Decentralised Governance and Subsidiarity.

The high level of advocacy of decentralisation and local self-government developed by the idea of Gram swaraj is a powerful means of institutional direction towards democratisation of public administration and has provided an important avenue in the democratisation of the institutional framework of governance. Upadhyaya, (1965) contended that sustainable governance has to take form of socially cohesive groups like villages which have strong community norms and mechanisms of collective decision making. This vision is comparable to contemporary concepts of polycentric governance (Ostrom, 2010), which stress on the fact that complex societies are more efficient when such centres as decision-making are spread out over several and overlapping centres as well as distributed across levels as opposed to having them concentrated in one place. Similarly, the World Bank, (2005) has recorded that through decentralisation, service delivery has been enhanced, responsiveness and accountability are enhanced as the government will be closer to the people.

In India, this principle is institutionalised in the 73 rd and 74 th Constitutional Amendments which give the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) and Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) the power. Nonetheless, there is still unequal implementation with looming issues of ill fiscal devolution, insufficient capacity and bureaucratic supremacy (Shah, 2004). Integral Humanism offers a strong normative case to go further with reforms in these fields; in its argument that disintegration is not a technical adaptation but a move towards the culturally drawn administrative constructions. Key applications include:

Empowering Gram Sadhas towards participatory planning.

- As part of the PRIs, fiscal independence became more advanced by promoting local taxation and formulaic grants.
- Train local officials on administrative training in order to combine cultural sensitivity and managerial competence.
- Advocacy of social responsibility instruments (e.g., community surveillance, open forums) which is in line with the concept of community responsibility held by Upadhyaya.
- Subsidiarity-oriented governance, therefore, is turned into a viable measure to improve responsiveness and empower marginalised communities.

5.3. Welfare Administration and Antyodaya.

Perhaps the most unusual administrative input of the Integral Humanism is the principle of Antyodaya, which means uplift of the last person. It is compatible with the equity-based promise of New Public Administration (Frederickson et al., 2018) and offers the moral justification of welfare programme design. In practice, Antyodaya means that administrative success must be assessed in the terms of progress in the situation of the most excluded, poorest, and vulnerable groups instead of general economic indicators. This school of thought has a direct effect on welfare targeting, resource allocation and monitoring. It has been operationalised in several current welfare programmes:

- Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Grameen Kaushalya Yojana (DDU-GKY) is on skilling and employability of young people (marginalised families) based in rural areas.
- Deendayal Antyodaya Yojana National Urban Livelihoods Mission (DAY NULM) is a programme that works with urban poor households by training them on livelihood, women self-help groupings as well as micro-enterprises.
- Subsidised food grains are being given to the poorest households under the Antyodaya Anna Yojana (AAY).

These programmes are indicative of the insistence of Upadhyaya on relevant, humanitarian administration yet there are issues of leakages, bureaucratic unwieldiness and poor awareness which continue to be challenges in implementation. One should incorporate Antyodaya in the administration of the country by enhancing the process of identification at the grassroots level, bettering the grievances redressal systems, and increasing the transparency levels.

5.4. Policy Modernisation and Cultural Sensitivity.

Integral Humanism advocates selective modernisation, which, usually, means that administrative application of technology, managerial, and international best practices cannot be considered without considering the correspondence of the cultural values and the human good (Upadhyaya, 1965). This style opposes the thoughtless modernisation and total traditionalism. Modernisation has many applications in the area of public administration:

A. Equity-focused e-governance.

The platforms enhance accountability through minimization of delays, reduction of red tapes, and delivery of benefits to citizens in a direct manner. Nonetheless, a dharma-based and Antyodaya-focused prism demands that digitally marginalized groups should be made accessible, that cultures should be appropriately addressed, and dignity should be safeguarded.

B. Human-specific protections of managerial reforms.

These reforms that are caused by NPM (Hood, 1991) usually focus on efficiency, performance measurements, and contracting. Integral Humanism proposes that these measures are combined with care to ensure that they do not weaken the community organization, local responsibility, or both the welfare obligation.

C. Policy design: Cutltural Senstive.

Education, health and environmental programmes should be in tandem with the local systems of knowledge and cultural practices. This congruency increases toleration, involvement and sustainability and thus is in line with the philosophical model and network-governance perspectives of Upadhyaya (Rhodes, 1994). As a result, modernizing the policy becomes a moderate exercise that embraces the innovation without compromising the morality and cultural congruence.

5.5. A Human-Centered Decentralized, Moral Administrative System

Integral Humanism practiced makes available an administrative model that is identified by:

- Leadership that is ethical and in the spirit of integrity.
- Organisation that is people centred and decentralised.
- Preference to the poor and most vulnerable persons.
- Culturally sensitive policy formulation.
- Human dignity: The technology is devoted to human dignity.

This model renders public administration outside of the boundaries of managerial efficacy and incorporates this into the moral and cultural existence of the culture.

VI. CRITICAL DISCUSSION

Regardless of its conceptual richness and normative attractiveness, Integral Humanism as a theory of public administration has several theoretical, institutional, and empirical problems. Although its focus on moral obligation, decentralisation, holistic human well-being, and cultural embeddedness can provide corrective information on the technocratic or efficiency-focused models, a range of contradictions arises in the process of trying to implement Integral Humanism into the constitutional, administrative, and socio-political realities in India.

6.1. Pluralism Vs. Cultural Particularism

One of the main arguments is whether it is possible to practice Inclusivity in a culturally plural and constitutionally secular society using the ethos of Indian civilizational principles and such concepts as dharma, Antyodaya, and Gram Swaraj. The writings by Upadhyaya place a stronger emphasis on cultural unity and similar civilizational identity but scholars like Hansen, (1999) have suggested that such structures could be implicitly inclined towards majority cultural icons and narratives thus could have led to marginalization of minority worldviews. The dilemma, hence, is in the ability to make sure that the administrative assimilation of cultural principles does not undermine the constitutional values of equality, secularism, and pluralism.

Although dharma is taught as a universal moral law and not a religious principle (Upadhyaya, 1965), its application in the administration should be very keen to differentiate ethical governance and the culturally oriented moral demands. This calls on constitutional protections, institutional checks, and continuing discussion of the ways the cultural values can add to ethical standards in administration without undermining the protections of the minority or liberal democratic standards.

6.2. Conceptual Abstraction and Operational Ambiguity.

Integral Humanism is also largely a normative philosophical approach, which does not provide administrative tools, but only general principles. Dharma, integrated personhood, and cultural harmony are some of the concepts that offer ethical guidance but do not have specific operational instructions. As a result, the policymakers and administrators are at times challenged to transform these principles into quantifiable indicators, performance models, or operating policies. Indicatively, how cultural sensitivity or holistic human development can be operationalised in bureaucratic practices, and what should be the measure of administrative performance as per Antyodaya principles, other than conventional welfare indicators, are some of the questions. These concepts may only be symbolic goals without specifications to ensure the transformation into practical standards. Researchers in the field of social and cultural sciences warn about an excessive degree of abstraction, saying that a set of values must be supplemented by procedural structures (which enable consistent execution) (Denhardt et al., 2014). To incorporate Integral Humanism into the contemporary administration, it will thus be required to use certain policy instruments like ethical impact assessment, decentralisation scorecards, or indicators based on the Antyodaya.

6.3. Administrative Possibility and Institutional Constraints

Aggression of Integral Humanism is faced with a number of institutional hindrances of the administrative system of India. Despite the constitutional principle of decentralisation (73 rd and 74 th Amendment Acts), decentralisation is still not becoming a reality. Most of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are characterized by poor fiscal autonomy, administrative capacity, bureaucratic control and political intervention (Shah, 2006; World Bank, 2005) thus compromising the subsidiarity and community-based government of the entire idea of Integral Humanism. Equally, administrative ethics should be propagated on the basis of dharma and this necessitates accountability mechanisms, grievance systems, training curriculum, and performance appraisal that is not fully integrated in the Indian bureaucratic systems. Researchers of public administration believe that strongly hierarchical bureaucracies do not readily accept normative changes without structural adjustments and incentives (Frederickson et al., 2018).

Furthermore, the size and heterogeneity of the administrative apparatus in India complicate the task of homogenising the cultural or communal value on a scale that does not jeopardize the lack of uniformity and misunderstanding. Therefore, although Integral Humanism does propose the morally based, culturally responsive administration, institutional reality can curtail its breadth without addressing the full issue of administrative reforms.

6.4. Traditional vs. Modern Governance Requirements

Integral Humanism focuses on selective modernisation and technological and administrative innovation is allured only in accordance with the cultural values and human welfare (Upadhyaya, 1965). Nonetheless, new technologies, regulatory frameworks, data-driven decision making, and performance-based systems of management, many of which are based on the international administrative approaches, New Public Management (Hood, 1991) and network governance (Rhodes, 1994)are frequently demanded by modern governance.

Although digital forums enhance efficiency and openness, they might increase inequality unless they are designed with the Antyodaya in mind of the last person to the queue. Likewise, managerial changes based on focusing on the cost-reduction or outsourcing might clash with equity and human dignity obligations based on dharma. Therefore, although Integral Humanism offers moral principles, it is essential to balance a trade-off between the tradition and modernisation, which is a challenge that should be carefully designed within the institutions.

6.5. Threats of Politicisation and Ideological Appropriation.

One of the primary issues is that Integral Humanism may be politicized. Since Jana Sangh was affiliated with the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) and some scholars observe that it may be used to advance their partisan interests in its administrative application (Hansen, 1999). This threatens to turn a normative structure into a tool of political ideology which could erode the concept of administrative neutrality which is the fundamental adage of Weberian bureaucratic theory (Weber, 1946). To deal with these risks, Integral Humanism in the government should be adopted by following:

- Institutional processes that are non- partisan.
- Judicial review and constitutional control.
- Academic legitimacy and self-assessment.
- Pluralistic meaning of dharma and values.

In the absence of these protection measures, there is the risk of a misunderstanding or misappropriation of the framework using it against its original purpose as a universal ethical philosophy.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper has made an in-depth investigation on the concept of Integral Humanism as a normative, ethical and decentralised model that can transform Indian public administration. Based on the main concepts of dharma, integrated personhood, subsidiarity, Antyodaya, and selective modernisation as introduced by Upadhyaya, the argument presented in the study is that the Indian public administration has to go beyond the historical system of dependence on value-neutral, hierarchical, and colonial modes of bureaucracy in order to be responsive to the various cultural, moral, and socio-economic reality of the contemporary India.

One of the major lessons that can be gained in the course of this research is that Integral Humanism forces administrators to consider governance as not a mechanical or technocratic task but the one that involves ethics and is human. The idea of dharma provides a permanent premise of ethical leadership, responsibility and equity whereas Antyodaya redefines the performance of the administration in terms of the uplifting of the most disadvantaged and marginalised. Likewise, subsidiarity and Gram Swaraj highlight that responsive governance should be restructured around the bottom, by means of empowered local governments, and engagement by the community. All these pillars form a model of governance that is based on the principles of civilisation but compatible with contemporary needs of administration.

Nevertheless, there are obstacles in the practical application of the Integral Humanism. Cultural foundation of the philosophy makes the issue of pluralism and inclusiveness in the secular and diverse Indian polity. It is conceptual and abstraction, which makes it difficult to develop quantifiable administrative instruments, ethical indicators, and policy frames. Also, the institutional factors of hindrance in the operationalisation of decentralisation and ethical government are institutional constraints (lack of fiscal devolution, bureaucratic inertia, and unequal administrative capacity). There is also a constant danger of politicisation, which requires strong protection that will preserve the neutrality of the administration and constitutional principles.

Nevertheless, these obstacles notwithstanding, there is still a great paradigm of redefining governance as a moral, participatory, and people-centred practice through Integral Humanism. Its future applicability is hinged on long-term research, policy innovation, reforms in civil service training and institution willingness to reconcile cultural ethos and constitutional pluralism. Integral Humanism can play a great role in the development of an ethical, inclusive, decentralised, and holistically-oriented administrative system when used wisely.

REFERENCES

[1] Bharatiya Janata Party. (2015). *Pt. Deendayal Upadhyaya*. Bharatiya Janata Party. https://library.bjp.org/jspui/bitstream/123456789/2782/1/5%28A%29.%20Pt_Deendayal_Upadhyaya_English.pdf

[2] Denhardt, R. B., Denhardt, J. V., & Blan, T. A. (2014). *Public Administration: An Action Orientation* (Seventh). Wadsworth. https://nibmehub.com/opac-service/pdf/read/Public%20Administration_%20An%20Action%20Orientation.pdf

[3] Frederickson, H. G., Smith, K. B., Larimer, C. W., & Licari, M. J. (2018). *The Public Administration Theory Primer* (3rd edn). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494369

[4] Gulick, L., & Urwick, L. (Eds). (1937). *Papers on the Science of Administration* (0 edn). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203509241

[5] Hansen, T. B. (with Internet Archive). (1999). *The saffron wave: Democracy and Hindu nationalism in modern India*. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press. http://archive.org/details/saffronwavedemoc0000hans

[6] Hood, C. (1991). A Public Management For All Seasons. *Public Administration*, *69*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.1991.tb00779.x

[7] Kamble, S. A. (2024). The Antyodaya Philosophy: Government Plan to Rural Development and Rural livelihood security. *AKSHARASURYA*, *4*(06), 119-to. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13725490

[8] Kumar, S., & Sharma, P. K. (2022). Deen Dayal Upadhyaya: Achieving self-reliance through integral humanism. *International Journal of Applied Research*, *8*(7), 188–193.

[9] Ostrom, E. (2010). Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. *Global Environmental Change*, *20*(4), 550–557. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.07.004

[10] Rhodes, R. A. W. (1994). The Hollowing Out of The State: The Changing Nature of The Public Service in Britain. *The Political Quarterly*, *65*(2), 138–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.1994.tb00441.x

[11] Shah, A. (2004). *Implementing Decentralized Local Governance: A Treacherous Road with Potholes, Detours and Road Closures* (No. 3353; The Policy Research Working Paper). World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/349441468761683659/pdf/wps3353.pdf

[12] Shah, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Local Governance in Developing Countries*. The World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-6565-6

[13] The Constitution (Seventy-Third Amendment) Act, 1992 (1993). https://rdp.punjab.gov.in/media/documents/The_Constitution_SeventyThird_Amendment_Act_1992.pdf

[14] Upadhyaya, P. D. (1965). *Integral Humanism*. Deendayal Research Institute. https://www.dri.org.in/ebook/Integral_Humanism.pdf

[15] Weber, M. (with University of California Libraries). (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (H. H. Gerth & C. W. (Charles W. Mills, Trans.). New York : Oxford university press. http://archive.org/details/frommaxweberessa00webe

[16] Wilson, W. (1887). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, *2*(2), 197–222. https://doi.org/10.2307/2139277

[17] World Bank. (2005). *East Asia Decentralizes*. The World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-6059-0