CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Framework

The first is an introductory chapter providing a background and a guideline for the reading of the thesis. It consists of six sections. Section I states the nature and scope of the study. The next section is a survey of some of the important works on Roy, which provide the points of reference and difference with this study. The third section provides a brief biographical account, while Section IV briefly traces the journey of Roy's ideas. The fifth section is a preliminary elucidation of his theory of Radical Humanism. The chapter ends with a statement of the nature of the problematic of this study.

SECTION I

Nature And Scope

M.N. Roy is one of the most important and outstanding thinkers of modern India. His was a chequered political career, the range of which is truly fascinating. Roy began as a nationalist revolutionary of the terrorist variety, then turned to Marxism and finally gave it up for something which was his own creation -- Radical Humanism.

Roy's greatness, however, lies not in the fact that he had
such a varied political career, and one so full of adventure, but in that he is one of the few seminal thinkers that modern-day India has produced. For Roy, towards the end of his intellectual journey, finally attempted the creation of a 'system' in the tradition of system-builders such as Plato, Hegel and Marx explaining man, nature, man's relation to nature, and society -- in short, an explanation of the totality of existence. Therefore, an in-depth study of the fundamental concepts of Roy's system, is both necessary and justified.

Secondly, Roy's theory of Radical Humanism is a 'modern theory' formulated in the modern intellectual tradition. Roy's ideas have been associated with science and rationalism, both of which are modern-day concepts. A debate on the contemporary relevance of his ideas and values, therefore, becomes meaningful.

As an Indian intellectual, Roy's acquaintance with and understanding of the Western intellectual tradition is remarkable. As M.P.Rege, the erudite scholar from Maharashtra, rightly points out, the most distinguishing feature of Roy, when compared with his contemporary intellectuals, was that he took his stand in the cultural tradition of humanism and tried to extend it to India. It is not that other intellectual contemporaries were not exposed to western ideas, points out Rege, but their range was limited as compared to Roy's.

Thirdly, though there have been several studies on Roy, they
do not share the concerns of this study. Some of these are biographical studies. Others have been concerned with Roy's political career and ideas. Yet, those studies which have concerned themselves with Roy's ideas have generally been concerned with only one or two aspects of Roy's theory. There has been no in-depth study of the key concepts that form the foundation of his system called 'Radical Humanism'. Our concern here is primarily to carry out a systematic analysis and critical evaluation of the fundamental concepts of Roy's theory of Radical Humanism.

We shall not be concerned, in this study, with either tracing Roy's political career or the totality of his thought. We shall be concerned with analysing only those concepts which provide the anchorage to his 'system'; for we are concerned with Roy the 'thinker' and not Roy the politician or 'activist'. Therefore, Roy's political positions and programmes, as such, are not the concern of this study. We shall refer to those aspects which are relevant to our understanding the core of his 'system'; hence, what is required is a rigorous analysis of the underlying concepts. This study does not claim to have achieved this task entirely, but it is a modest attempt in that direction.

In order to maintain a tight-knit, logical analysis and trace the flow of Roy's argument, we have not interpolated it with other citations. We have quoted other scholars only where we have thought it necessary, either to indicate a point of difference or to emphasize our agreement with an interpretation.
A Brief Survey Of Studies On Roy

Various scholars have carried out studies on Roy. Some of these are in-depth studies, while others have been more sketchy, although often perceptive. We shall take stock of some of the major studies that are relevant to our purpose. It is interesting to note that the interpretations of Roy attempted in these works cover a wide range. Some have seen him as a 'renaissance man' of India, others have identified him as a 'humanist'; some consider him a 'liberal', while others hold that he is a 'Marxist revisionist'. A few scholars have located Roy in the western intellectual tradition, while others have tried to show him as being rooted in the Indian intellectual tradition.

We are not interested in the political evaluations, as such. However, it might prove revealing to acquaint ourselves with them for they often provide us an insight into the complex structure of Roy's thought which allows such diverse evaluations.

Studies On Thought

In this classification, the most important works are by G.P. Bhattacharya (1971), B.S.Sharma (1973) and M.Shiviah (1977). Three
other books by K.C. Jena (1968), Sadanand Talwar (1978) and V.M. Tarkunde (1983) may be mentioned here. There are two long, analytical articles which are relevant—one by Dennis Dalton (1970) and the other by Sudipto Kaviraj (1986). A third article by B. Banerjea (1982) is interesting for it projects Roy as a 'renaissance man'.

G.P. Bhattacharya's *Evolution of Political Philosophy of M.N. Roy* is one of the early works on Roy and is a comprehensive account of the evolution of Roy's ideas. It traces Roy's ideas from the early nationalist days, through his Marxist years, to the last phase, the Radical Humanist years. Bhattacharya's study provides an overall account and a perceptive evaluation of Roy's ideas and may be considered an important contribution to the understanding of Roy's political career. Though G. P. Bhattacharya has been an 'insider', associated with the movement, he has been able to present an objective and balanced evaluation of Roy's ideas.

According to Bhattacharya, though Roy claimed to go beyond Communism, Marxism and Liberalism, he ended up in a Liberal position. Through his analysis of Roy's New Humanism, Bhattacharya comes to the conclusion that Radical Humanism is Liberalism applied to the age of Socialism. According to Bhattacharya, Roy's most outstanding contribution lay in developing an intellectual movement on the basis of rationality and science.\(^5\)
B. S. Sharma's book *Radical Humanism of M.N.Roy: An Evaluation* is a good introductory work, which attempts to analyse and examine Roy's claim for Radical Humanism as a system of philosophy. Though sketchy, it is a rather perceptive account and provides clues to probe further in understanding Roy's theory.

Sharma writes in the preface that Roy's materialism, his argument of biological evolution and theory of knowledge, are all based on Engels *Anti-Duhring*, which most Royists have not "cared to read". Therefore, most Royists, according to Sharma, suffer from an erroneous view that Roy's ideas are original and profound. However, the problem is that Sharma does not reveal in his book what and how Roy has borrowed from Engels' formulation. We are left unsatisfied at the end and never really know whether, B.S. Sharma's contention is valid or not. To be fair, however, B.S. Sharma has given us a perceptive insight into the logical problems of Roy's theory. He has indentified correctly some of the problems of Roy's system, viz. (i) Roy's theory lacks a dialectical approach, because of which he is unable to explain several things; (ii) Roy's application of the laws of the physical world to the realm of the social world are unrewarding. In conclusion, Sharma rightly argues that Roy's theory is ultimately a variant of Liberalism.

The next study worthy of mention is Dr. D.C. Grover's *M.N.Roy: A Study of Revolution and Reason in Indian Politics*. The title itself
is indicative of the thrust of the study. Grover sees Roy's ideas on revolution as a very significant contribution to the understanding of the social processes in India. Thus ".... making reason ingredient to revolution Roy shows a right path at a time when India is engaged in the gigantic task of economic reconstruction." Grover fails however, to explain what this really means, how really reason is made an ingredient of revolution, and what this implies in terms of concrete action.

Grover is of the opinion that Roy's method of revolution is the most appropriate one, given the Indian conditions. Grover writes,

"Scanning the Indian scene, Roy comes up against the rock-bottom of political wisdom that education is the essence and condition of revolution and reconstruction. Revolution by consent does not operate through the politics of power, but through the politics of freedom." Grover considers the 'Liberal Metamorphosis of Roy' as a step towards freedom. Though Roy had been able to ultimately arrive at a correct perception of politics, argues Grover, he failed to make a mark in Indian politics. Therefore, Grover is of the opinion,

"The tragedy of Roy is the tragedy of liberalism in Indian politics in spite of its correct perception of the dependence of a political order on appropriate values." 

The other important and much more analytical study is that by M.Shiviah, *New Humanism and Democratic Politics*. The main concern of this book is Roy's theory of the State, as is explicitly stated in the preface.
Shiviah is of the opinion that the

"... bulk of Roy's political thought, either by way of interpretation and exposition, or by way of criticism, deals with the same or similar problems: the origin and nature of the state, the state and revolution, the structure of the state in the post-revolutionary era, the withering of the state, etc...."\[10\]

The book is a well documented study of Roy's political ideas on the State and revolution.

Shiviah has also undertaken a study of the philosophical foundations of Roy's theory, Roy's understanding of the history of man, society and state. Shiviah is of the opinion that Roy's advocacy of scientific philosophy must be supported. He clarifies, however, that he is loyal to science, as such, and not necessarily to Roy's philosophy. Yet he is in broad agreement with Roy's philosophy of materialistic monism.\[11\] Shiviah is also in basic agreement with Roy's social philosophy, though he does maintain some differences. Shiviah explains that his differences are observations, more in the nature of 'notes' towards a better understanding of the social processes.\[12\]

To Shiviah, Roy's philosophy and perspective of history are something very original. He writes,

"We see here scholarship of a high calibre. Its sweep, literary brilliance and originality are of an order that is associated with savants who blaze new intellectual and spiritual trails. It was therefore, rightly acclaimed among humanist circles as an important contribution to humanist literature."\[13\]

We do not agree with Shiviah on this point, as will be noted in the course of our arguments to follow.
Lastly, three other works referred to in our study are books by K.C. Jena, Sadanand Talwar and V.M. Tarkunde. The former two, though concerned with an elaboration of Roy's political ideas, are not very analytical. Tarkunde's book *Radical Humanism* is an elaboration of the ideas of this philosophy of which Tarkunde claims, "From its inception, I felt Radical Humanism to be my own philosophy." Therefore, the book is an elaboration of what Tarkunde considers to be his own understanding of Roy's philosophy of Radical Humanism and is not a study of M.N. Roy's ideas, as such.

Dennis Dalton's article "M.N. Roy and Radical Humanism: The Ideology of an Indian Intellectual Elite" in *Elites in South Asia*, B. Banerjea's article titled "M.N. Roy" in *Thinkers of the Indian Renaissance* and Sudipto Kaviraj's article "The Heteronomous Radicalism of M.N. Roy" in *Political Thought in Modern India* are three interpretative articles, each representing an analysis which is completely different from the others.

Taking Banerjea's viewpoint first, the very title of the book is indicative of his interpretation. Roy is seen as one of the last spokesman of the 19th century 'abortive' renaissance of India. Banerjea arrives at this opinion through an analysis of Roy's political programme. According to Banerjea, Roy's programme of renaissance was a cultural, educational venture, directed at locating and revitalising the more scientific systems of Indian thought. These scientific materialist schools
of thought, like the Lokayat, Sankhya, etc., have been submerged by Brahminism and its systems of metaphysical schools.\textsuperscript{13(b)}

Banerjea points out that Roy had sought to revive the "lost currents" of materialist thought and that is why he can be seen as a renaissance man. It is the European model of the renaissance that is Banerjea's point of reference. He considers Roy's programme of 'revival of scientific thought', therefore, as being essentially a step towards completing the 'aborted' renaissance in India. Reviving the past has been considered as an essential feature of the renaissance by scholars of the old schools. Banerjea seems to be of a similar view, and therefore he considers Roy's programme of reviving the old materialist schools of thought as being a renaissance activity.

In review, Banerjea's conclusion seems to be based on a rather simplistic understanding of the renaissance. Further, in the context of the controversy that rages around the Renaissance (and Banerjea seems to be aware that there exists such a controversy) it is doubtful whether such an interpretation can hold.

Dennis Dalton's interpretation is at complete variance with, in fact opposed to Banerjea's. Dalton is of the opinion that Roy was basically rooted in the Indian intellectual tradition. Dalton argues, "... while Roy was without roots in Indian nationalist politics, he nevertheless remained deeply grounded in Indian culture as a whole. Indeed, it was the very depth of these roots that
led Roy, after his excursions into Marxism, back to a way of thinking which has much in common with Vivekananda, Aurobindo, and Gandhi. The thought and culture of the Indian nationalist tradition and the type of intellectual experience it nurtured, was a complex blend of structure, change, challenge, response and counter-response. From this cultural complex, more than from anything else, Roy, as a youth in nationalist Bengal, received his early and decisive orientation.\textsuperscript{14}(Emphasis ours)

To substantiate his claims, Dalton tries to establish what he considers to be the similarity between Roy's concepts of freedom and power with those of Vivekananda, Gandhi and Aurobindo. Dalton argues that Roy was initially concerned with only economic and political freedom, and only later on realised the need and importance of spiritual freedom. And this concept of spiritual freedom, Dalton argues, has firm roots in the Indian tradition.

This interpretation, however, does not seem to be plausible. For, spiritual freedom to Vivekananda, Aurobindo and Gandhi meant moksha or mukti (as Dalton himself points out) which is in keeping with the Hindu tradition. Roy's notion of spiritual freedom was far removed from this. Roy belonged to the materialist tradition, as is evident from his theory. Therefore, spiritual freedom, for Roy, meant something closer to what Marx meant; and this is far removed from what Dalton makes it out to be. Consequently, we do not agree with Dalton when he says, "The former Marxist revolutionary has thus turned moralist, preaching the goal of spiritual freedom familiar to his tradition."\textsuperscript{15}

The third and the most recent interpretative study is that
of Sudipto Kaviraj. Kaviraj's main contention is that Roy's radicalism was heteronomous, being fraught with an insidious dependence. Kaviraj argues,

"His opposition to British imperialism was uncompromising, but the language in which he articulated this opposition could, in some senses, be called heteronomous...."^®

Kaviraj has very correctly identified a 'Eurocentricity' in Roy's thought which the nationalists rejected instinctively, and which may explain Roy's unpopularity.17

Roy saw India, argues Kaviraj, (and we are in agreement with him) as the theatre where the history of Europe would be repeated. Earlier, it was the proletarian revolution on the model visualised by Marx in 19th century Germany, and later, when he had changed his way of looking at history, the renaissance was to Roy the greatest achievement of European history. And India would re-enact the renaissance to achieve the same level of civilisation.

**Biographical Studies**

One of the earliest biographies of M.N. Roy is by Samaren Roy, *The Restless Brahmin* (1970). It is limited, however, to the early years of Roy's life, when he was involved with the nationalist terrorists. The work is useful for providing details about Roy's formative years and informs us of the influences that might have shaped him. The title itself is suggestive of the author's thrust -- he sees him as a Brahmin in search of a brahminic heaven on earth.18
As a sequel to this early biography, Samaren Roy has recently published another book titled The Twice-Born Heretic (1986). This volume traces the development of Roy from a Hindu nationalist to a Marxist revolutionary. It covers the period from 1916 to 1930. The book is interesting for it presents some facts from Roy's life for the first time. There is a long chapter on Roy's first wife, Evelyn Trent. Roy has not mentioned her at all in his Memoirs, nor in any of his other writings. Samaren Roy, by gathering details from different sources, has penned an interesting portrait of her and their life together in the 1920s.

The other biographical account is J.B.H. Wadia's M.N. Roy: The Man (1983). Wadia had been a close friend and associate of M.N. Roy and is able, therefore, to give us several insights into Roy, the man. As V.A. Naik rightly points out in his foreword to the book, "However incomplete he may consider his effort at what he has termed 'Royana', he has rendered valuable service in highlighting the lovable personality of Roy, the Man".

A third biographical account M.N. Roy: Philosopher Revolutionary (1959) is a collection of articles by several people and edited by Sibnarayan Ray. It is an assorted collection, including even some of Roy's statements. It also consists of some articles on Roy's ideas which are reprinted from the journal Radical Humanist.
SECTION III

Biographical Account

Manavendranath Roy was born on 21st March, 1887 in Arabalia, West Bengal. He died on January 25th 1954. Narendranath Bhattacharya, for that was Roy's real name, was the son of a school teacher, a reformist of some kind. He was educated in Harinavi school and later jointed the Calcutta National College. It was during this period that Roy was attracted towards nationalist ideas and was greatly influenced by Prabash Chandra De, a prominent figure in the underground revolutionary movement. Roy got involved in this underground movement and soon left his education to pursue a political career. He was involved several times in cases of dacoity, such as the famous Garden Reach and Beliaghat cases, and was arrested in 1915. However, on his release on bail, his comrades sent him off to collect arms from the Germans who had promised to help the revolutionaries. Roy left India under the pseudonym of C. Martin. It was this mission for arms that took the young inexperienced Roy to different countries -- Java, Phillipines, Japan, Korea, China -- and finally brought him to the shores of U.S.A. in 1916.

Roy's coming to U.S.A. proved to be fruitful and decisive for him in many ways. As Roy himself states,

"...it helped me to turn my back upon a futile past, futile because it was narrow-visioned and to peer, still hesitatingly, into the unknown future of a new life which happened to be full of worthwhile adventures, rich experiences and ultimately disappointed also. It was the beginning of an exciting journey in a new world."
In U.S.A. Roy came into contact with several Indian revolutionaries, the most important being Lala Lajpat Rai. Through Lala Lajpat Rai, Roy came into contact with several American Socialists and this exposure to new ideas began to change Roy. He was attracted to Socialism and could no longer be swaddled in the old ideas of a nationalist revolution. In 1916, however, Roy had to flee U.S.A. to avoid being arrested and identified as a German agent in the Indo-German conspiracy. Roy fled to Mexico and stayed there till his departure for Moscow via Berlin in 1919. It is while he was in the U.S.A. that Narendranath Bhattacharya, alias C. Martin, changed his name once again, this time to M.N. Roy, a name which stuck to him till the end of his life.

In Mexico, Roy got involved with the Socialists and even joined the Mexican Socialist Party. He began to edit the party organ there and played an active role in the Socialist politics. While in Mexico he met the Bolshevik Emissary, Michael Borodin, and was introduced to Marxism. It was this attraction to Marxism that took Roy to Moscow in 1920 to attend the Second Congress of the Comintern. And it was here that Roy came into contact with Lenin and several leading revolutionaries of different countries. Roy made a favourable impression on Lenin and the other delegates of the Comintern, and participated actively in the debates on the question of the 'colonial countries'. Roy was elected to the Executive Committee of the Comintern in 1922. He was sent to head the revolutionary base in Tashkent to train revolutionaries and raise a Liberation Army for India. The emigre Communist Party of India was founded there
in 1921. Roy was then appointed as director of the Communist University in Moscow which had been set up to train novices. Later, in Zurich, Roy edited two journals *Vanguard of Indian Independence* (1922-24) and *Masses of India* (1925-28) which were sent surreptitiously to India to spread Marxist ideas.

In 1926, Roy was sent to China on a special mission to advise the Chinese Communist Party on matters of strategy. He returned to Moscow in 1927, after the debacle in which several communists lost their lives. Roy was expelled soon afterwards from the Comintern i.e. by 1928. There are different opinions regarding Roy's expulsion from the Comintern. Roy himself attributes it to his independent thinking. As he notes,

"I was not declared a 'renegade' and placed outside the pale of the official International so long as I did not speak out my disagreement. The gag of silence was imposed upon me, the all-mighty apparatus depriving me of all the means of expression. In other words, for the unpardonable crime of independent thinking I would have been quietly buried into oblivion, had I not dared raise my voice."  

These differences Roy expressed in a journal published by Brandler, a comrade who had already been expelled from the Comintern. Roy's publishing the article in such a journal was, naturally, not approved by the Comintern.

Roy returned to India by the end of 1930 and was immediately arrested in connection with the Meerut Conspiracy Case. He was sentenced to jail for six years and was released only in 1936. Thereafter, Roy stayed in India for the rest of his life.
For the next decade, from 1936 to 1946, Roy was actively involved in the building up of revolutionary forces to fight the British. During this time, he considered himself to be an unorthodox Marxist. He was no longer a member of the Communist International, and therefore, was under no compulsion to obey the dictates of the Comintern. Roy then joined the Indian National Congress, with the purpose of winning over the radical section of the Congress. However, his plans failed and he broke away from the Congress to form his own party in 1940—the Radical Democratic Party. Unfortunately for Roy, even this party failed to make a dent in the national political scene. It was dissolved in 1948. Henceforth, Roy held that the Radical Democratic Party would function only as a movement to propagate the ideas and philosophy of New Humanism. It is to the movement of 'renaissance' that Roy devoted the rest of his life, till his death in 1954.

SECTION IV

A Brief History Of Roy's Journey Of Ideas.

We now turn to an examination of the significant points of Roy's intellectual journey from Nationalism through Marxism to Radical Humanism. Our attempt here is not to analyse each of these in exhaustive detail but only to present a brief enumeration. This is done with a view to providing a background for understanding Roy's final and mature theoretical formulation—Radical Humanism.
Roy began his political career while still a student, as a nationalist. Bengal, which was his home, was seething with anti-British sentiments. The province which had earlier produced great reformists like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, and was now the cradle of Liberalism, had turned at the same time into a place which bred the most extreme form of nationalist terrorism. G.P. Bhattacharya has rightly pointed out that,

"Parallel to the Liberal politics there flowed in Bengal, another stream of political-cum-cultural movement which in the course of time, became formidable. This movement, initiated by Raj Narain Bose,(the maternal grandfather of Aurobindo Ghosh) and nurtured by his follower, Naba Gopal Mitra, the founder of the Hindu Mela, was raised to the level of religion by Bankim Chandra, the author of the Anand Math and the Vande Matram hymn. Swami Vivekananda gave it a philosophy and Shri Aurobindo developed it into a mighty force in the field of political practice...." 

The eminent scholar Partha Chatterji like many other historians, characterises this trend of nationalism as revivalist. Among these diverse streams of nationalism the one which proved to have the greatest influence on the young Roy was the thought represented by Bankim Chandra. It would prove useful, therefore, to understand what exactly it symbolised. Chatterji has an interesting point to make.

Chatterji argues that Bankim Chandra sought a synthesis of the East and West, and his brand of nationalism also attempted a solution to the crisis. But Bankim's solution, argues Chatterji, was
elitist for the synthesis of the East and West could be carried out only by scholars and learned men. This brand of nationalism, which was based on Hindu sentiment, appealed to the newly rising middle class. It provided the ideological basis for the middle class to capture power.

The early terrorist group to which Roy belonged was based on this brand of nationalism. Bankim Chandra's *Anand Math* was the source of inspiration for the 'Anushilan Samiti' to which Roy belonged. The elitism of Bankim's solution, points out Chatterji, was manifest in its exclusive kind of organisation. It displayed a contempt for the peasantry, the lower castes and Muslims. The 'Anushilan Samiti', which claimed itself to be a committee for the promotion of culture, required its members to achieve full 'self-development', physical and intellectual. Through the dedicated efforts of these purified 'sanyasins' good could be achieved, 'good' in their case being national independence.

Shiviah describes the internal discipline of the group,

"The vows and oaths prescribed for new entrants to the order required utter dedication to the cause of the freedom of Bharat Maha, addressed to and spoken of in the most reverential language."

Roy himself records these early days in his *Memoirs*,

"...Bankim Chatterji's *Anand Math* was our common source of inspiration. Therein we found our revolutionary ideal. As a matter of fact, we had distributed amongst ourselves the roles of the prominent figures of that drama. They were 'Sanyasins'. We had taken the vow to follow their footsteps."
To add to this, Roy came from a priestly family and had been exposed to the scriptures in the course of growing up, as were most boys from Brahmin families. He was greatly influenced by Vivekananda, especially his ideas on 'Karma Yoga' and the mission of the Vedanta. As V.B. Karnik informs us,

"Naren and his friends were avid readers of the 'Bhagwad Gita', the 'Anand Math' of Bankim Chatterji, the 'Bhavani Mandir' of Aurobindo Ghosh and of other revolutionary literature of the period. But what impressed them most were the books of Swami Vivekananda."

According to some scholars, this initial influence of the scriptures was lasting, and Roy's turning at the end of his political career to the problems of morality and spiritual freedom are seen by them as proof of this. Samaren Roy is also of a similar opinion. According to him, Roy retained the impact of the teachings of his Swami Sivnarain that ".... Brahminism devoid of it's ritualism and superstitions could be a great heritage for India...." Samaren Roy is of the opinion that Roy's mission in life was to rescue Indian society from the ills of ritualism and superstition. He sees Roy as a restless Brahmin in search of a Brahminic haven on earth.

The purpose of elaborating the above-mentioned arguments of Partha Chatterji and Dennis Dalton is to suggest that these early influences (which were elitist) were to have a long and lasting effect on Roy, and surface many years later in his programme of Renaissance.
The successful overthrow of Tsarist power in Russia, in 1917, created a positive attitude towards Marxism everywhere. It was in such an atmosphere of admiration for the Russians and enthusiasm for revolution that Roy was "...sucked up in that electrified atmosphere." Roy, who was then in Mexico, was introduced to the 'intricacies of Marxian dialectics' by the Bolshevik emissary Michael Borodin. This is how Roy, who had already been exposed to some Marxist ideas through his own reading, came to appreciate Marxist philosophy. Even in his interaction with Borodin, Roy records that he put up a last resistance to Marxist philosophy from the point of 'cultural nationalism'. This however, could not hold out for long as,

"The Bolshevik dialectician, with his keen psychological insight, did not find it difficult to show that I was defending a point of view in which I no longer believed, that it was a sheer diehard prejudice."  

Roy's conversion to Marxism, however, was complete before he left for Moscow in 1919. As Roy writes,

"I no longer believed in political freedom without the content of economic liberation and social justice. But I had realised that intellectual freedom -- freedom from bondage of all tradition and authority -- was the condition for any effective struggle for social emancipation.... But I had lost faith in the original mission with which I had left India., I still believed in the necessity of armed insurrection. But I had also learned to attach greater importance to an intelligent understanding of the idea of revolution. The propaganda of that idea was more important than arms. With the new conviction, I started on my way back to India round the world." 

Thus, Roy no longer believed in liberation from British imperialism alone as being revolutionary. His horizons having widened, he
now realised the need to fight social injustice too. As Roy explains this metamorphosis, "It was a mutation in my political evolution: a sudden jump from a die-hard nationalism to Communism."{40}

Roy's Marxist phase can be classified into two phases. The first phase lasted from 1920 to 1930 and the second phase from 1936 to 1946. The intervening years i.e. 1930-36 were spent in prison.

In this first phase, Roy subscribed to orthodox Marxism as was spelt out by the Third International. Writing in the Vanguard of Indian Independence in 1922 Roy states,

"....we believe in the laws of Economic Determinism. Our movement for national liberation is also subject to this law. The more the movement grows conscious of the economic motive underlying it, the more powerful does it become."{41}

Roy had differences regarding the way revolutions should be conducted in the colonies. Broadly, of course, Roy agreed with Lenin in principle on the question of the colonies, which flowed from Lenin's theory of imperialism.{42} From his analysis of imperialism, Lenin had drawn the conclusion that successful revolts of the colonial people against the imperial powers were necessary for the overthrow of capitalism in Europe. The colonial countries, represented the weakest links in the world imperialist chain, and therefore, it was much easier to strike there first. The world revolutionary forces must, consequently, support the national liberation movements. The national
liberation movements were led by the progressive forces of the rising bourgeois class, as opposed to the feudal reactionary forces which the imperial powers supported.

Roy presented a supplementary thesis to Lenin's thesis, with specific reference to India. The main point of difference was the role of Gandhi. Roy explains his differences with Lenin,

"I pointed out that the bourgeoisie, even in the most advanced colonial countries, like India, as a class, was not economically and culturally differentiated from the feudal social order therefore, the nationalist movement was ideologically reactionary in the sense that the triumph would not necessarily mean a bourgeois revolution. The role of Gandhi was the crucial point of difference. Lenin believed that, as the inspirer, and leader of a mass movement, he was a revolutionary. I maintained that, as a religious and cultural revivalist, he was bound to be a reactionary socially, however revolutionary he might appear politically...."

This differentiation between the political and cultural that Roy makes at the beginning of his Marxist phase is something that can be seen as growing consistently in his later years. These seeds of differences planted then, mature later in his Radical Humanist days.

Thus, the differences between Lenin and Roy were basically on strategy, or as Roy put it, "It was the question of ways and means." Roy suggested that the national bourgeoisie was not all revolutionary, and therefore, a distinction should be made between the 'revolutionary' and 'reactionary' bourgeoisie, and further, that it is only the 'revolutionary' bourgeoisie that should be supported. Roy's suggestion of being more categorical and discriminating in the classification of the bourgeoisie was accepted by the Congress of the Commintern.
The term 'national revolutionary' was finally substituted for 'bourgeois democratic'. Besides this verbal expedient, no changes were made in the thesis that had been presented by Lenin and accepted by the Comintern. The Congress adopted both the theses, but later Roy's thesis was hardly ever referred to by the Comintern.

The Second Marxist Phase

Roy's second Marxist phase begins with his dissidence from the official line and this led to his expulsion from the Comintern in 1928. Roy's return to India in 1930 did not, however, allow him to plunge into active nationalist politics. For he was immediately arrested and was in jail till 1936. So 1936-1946 is really the phase of Roy's unorthodox Marxism.

During this period, Roy differed from the official line once again on matters of strategy. For now, after his return to India, Roy realised that the situation was vastly different from what he had been given to understand while he was abroad. In the wake of the altered picture, Roy now held that the right strategy for the Communists was to penetrate the National Congress, led by Gandhi, and try to win over the radical Left forces within it. This was precisely what Lenin had been advocating earlier and Roy had then differed with this very position.

The official communist line now advocated dissociation from the Indian National Congress which, according to the Comintern,
had now turned reactionary. Roy argued that such a policy was sectarian and would only isolate the Communists from the broad masses organised under the Congress. Roy still considered Gandhi to be reactionary, but now he realised the importance of Gandhi as a mass mobiliser. Writing in *Independent India* in 1938, Roy argues, "Gandhi is the embodiment of the primitive, blind, spontaneous spirit of revolt of the masses." It was this spirit of revolt of the masses organised against imperialism that had to be harnessed under the leadership of the Communists. By changing the leadership of the Congress, Roy hoped to make it a revolutionary organisation.

In this second phase of Marxism, Roy emphasised that Marxism is basically a philosophy and not a technique of revolution. He remarks, "....I fail to understand what is 'Marxian technique'. Essentially Marxism is a philosophy...." The fundamental principle of this philosophy, Roy argues, is that being determines consciousness. Roy explains that Marxism, as a philosophy, is also different from all hitherto existing philosophies for it does not just explain life, it shows the way of remaking it. Roy makes this principle the basis of his new position. Roy's reading of the Indian situation now changes radically. Since, being determines consciousness, Roy comes to the conclusion that because India is intellectually still in the 16th or 17th centuries, the consciousness of the people too is backward. Roy explains, "In India, we are having our political being in the social atmosphere of the seventeenth or sixteenth century. Our political consciousness, therefore, must be determined by that peculiar nature of our social being...."
The idea that the proletariat is the most revolutionary force, Roy argues, cannot therefore easily become popular. It cannot become popular because its material base is not ready. It would be un-Marxist, according to Roy, to assert that the proletariat is the most revolutionary class in India.

Roy equated feudalism with the religious mode of thought and hence, he insisted on transcendence over it as essential. Roy argued that since India was still in the feudal stage of development, a new mode of thought was required that could liquidate the religious mode of thought. Roy argues,

"Things must be connected directly. A certain mode of thought is liquidated by another mode of thought which follows it. The religious mode of thought (in Europe) was liquidated by the rationalist mode of thought which resulted from a change in social environment brought about by the development of science...."

Therefore, Roy held that unless the religious mode of thought is dissolved, no other philosophy or idea can be understood. The intervening period in the Indian context before Marxism required 'philosophical radicalism'. This, Roy argued, would form the intervening link in thought that connected the past with the future.

Commenting on this, M. Shiviah rightly states,

"To unite the revolutionary forces in India, it was necessary to have not a suitable socio-economic platform but also an ideological platform. Before they could understand the Marxian philosophy parallel to the economic, certain ideological preconditions must be created. Historically, in Europe, the task was accomplished by the philosophical radicalism of the eighteenth century which dissolved the religious mode
of thought. In India also the religious mode of thought must be dissolved first. *In this rather mechanical scheme of history*, India according to Roy, both socially and culturally was in a stage comparable to that of France before the French Revolution, though chronologically she lived in the 20th century." (Emphasis ours).

Roy's understanding of Marx's proposition 'being determines consciousness' is very mechanical. Roy's mechanical approach comes through, for example, in this argument,

"... that idea cannot enter in our mind in the scientific process of ideation; at best it is an idealistic proposition. Instead of looking at the thing as it is, and letting environment react on our consciousness thereby determining the process of our thought, we would be cramping our mind with what we have read in books."

Roy then gave up the official line that the proletariat was the vanguard of the revolution in India. Instead he now argued that the middle class was the most revolutionary class given the conditions in India, and therefore, the revolution should be led by none other than the middle class. Roy's argument was that since India was still a backward country and industrially undeveloped, the working class was also weak. Therefore, it could not carry out the task of a democratic revolution which was necessary historically.

The other difference from the official Marxist position that begins to emerge in this second phase, is that Roy now starts talking of the need of a renaissance. After his release from prison, in his address to the United Provinces Youth Conference in 1937, Roy states
his new position,

"As human activities ordinarily are determined by preconceived ideas encumbered with the present creed, that nationalist movement will never advance towards the goal of political independence. The creed is loyalty to traditions of a dead past. Reactionary social orientation has transformed the ideal of political freedom into a formal profession.
"If the historical necessity of a social renaissance is not admitted political revolution becomes a matter of idle talk. A political revolution takes place only as a prelude to a social renaissance."

From the above speech it is quite clear that Roy had moved away from the orthodox Marxist understanding of Indian history. This understanding of Indian history can be viewed as the beginning of the differences that finally led to his giving up Marxism itself. Roy had now begun to argue that the 'subjective factor' is the most important factor in history. G.P. Bhattacharya explains the lesson that Roy learnt from his experience on arrival in India, "The most important and decisive factor in a revolution is the subjective factor."

One of the most important factors that led Roy to this conclusion was Gandhi and Gandhism. According to Roy, the basis of Gandhi's popularity was the cultural backwardness of the masses. This made them easy prey to his spiritualism. To combat Gandhi, who was the main stumbling block in the path of revolution, Roy believed that the medieval mentality or the cultural backwardness of the masses must be radically changed. Or as Bhattacharya has put it, "In other words, the subjective factor must be created."
But, Roy's understanding of Gandhi was extremely naive and simplistic. Bhattacharya has very correctly observed that,

".... Roy was too crude....to comprehend the diverse factors that accounted for the popularity of Gandhism in India. He ignored the strategical significance of Gandhism and made a wrong analysis of the Gandhian philosophy. Therefore, all his attempts to undermine the influence of Gandhism in Indian politics failed."\(^57\)

But already another factor was underway that would lead to Roy's changed understanding of history—the post-war foreign policy of Soviet Russia and also the Anglo-Soviet alliance during the war. This alliance between a socialist country and a capitalist country Roy perceived as something that could not be explained by the old argument. Roy interpreted it as an alliance of the forces that are "....desirous of defending modern civilisation."\(^58\)

In England which was a capitalist country, Roy pointed out, the working class, who also stood for democratic values, joined hands with the ruling class to defend these values. This convinced Roy that the subjective factor was more important and determining in history than class.

The foreign policy of Soviet Russia after the war was also one of the reasons that made Roy turn away from Marxism. Russia's foreign policy, according to Roy, was now dominated by nationalistic considerations and this implied the giving up of the spirit of Marxism, which was essentially international.\(^59\)
Thus, the period between 1936 and 1946 is for Roy a period of flux, of disbanding old ideas and the formation of new ones, that ultimately take shape in his theory of Radical Humanism. Since it was a period of transition, Roy's thoughts seem terribly confused. Bhattacharya has rightly observed this,

"... Roy's interpretation of Marxism during this period was muddle-headed. In the name of Marxism he expressed his own ideas born of his experience, but they remained clumsy because of his attempt to integrate them with the Marxist doctrine...."

**Radical Humanism (1947 - 54)**

Roy makes a complete break with Marxism by the end of 1946. At the conference of the Radical Democratic Party in December 1946, a manifesto incorporating the fundamental principles of New Humanism were discussed. They were formally adopted in 1947. The principles of Radical or New Humanism are contained in the famous 22 Theses. Roy retained this theoretical position till the end of his life. We have enumerated below the essential features of the new 'system' that Roy claimed to have formulated.

**SECTION V**

**Radical Humanism / New Humanism**

Roy describes New Humanism thus,"...New Humanism...."
is Humanism enriched, reinforced and elaborated by scientific knowledge and social experience gained during the centuries of modern civilisation.... As a political philosophy, Roy argues, it is directed towards answering the fundamental problem of politics that of the relation of the individual to the State. Roy writes,

"Ever since the days of Plato, the fundamental problem of politics has been the relation between the State and the individual....... An endeavour to find a way out of the present crisis, therefore, must begin with a re-examination of the fundamental problem of the relation between society and the individual, between the individual and the State."  

Roy proceeds to explain the philosophy of New Humanism thus,

"New Humanism is meant to be a complete system. (It is)... based on the ever expanding totality of scientific knowledge...... It will be a logical integration of the knowledge about the various aspects of existence, showing how it is in the nature of man to be rational and moral, and therefore capable of building a free harmonious and just social order."  

The inspiration for his new theory, Roy explains, is derived from "....the traditions of Humanism and moral Radicalism...."  

According to Roy, Humanism is an intellectual tradition based on the belief that man is the measure of things. It holds that man is central to the scheme of life; man is an end in himself and not the means to any superior ends. It holds that man is the maker of his destiny and is not under the control of some supernatural power like God. It believes that man determines things by his own will and is not determined by any Divine Will. Humanism recognises the dignity and sovereignty of the individual.
This Humanist tradition, Roy posits, was submerged during the Dark Ages by the dominance of religion. Man was made subordinate to God. Therefore, man lost faith in himself. But then came the Renaissance, and religion was overthrown by a revival of Humanism. Roy writes,

"The Renaissance was a humanist revival, it invoked the humanist tradition of the pagan culture of the Greco-Roman antiquity. Individualism is an equally ancient principle of libertarian thought. The Renaissance declared the dignity and sovereignty of the individual on the authority of the Sophists, Epicureans, Stoics...."^63

Roy carries the argument further. In periods of crisis, he argues, humanism raises itself to save mankind, as was seen in the period of the Renaissance. Roy perceives New Humanism as playing a similar role; it is a response to the need created by a spiritual crisis. Roy confidently asserts, "....a humanist revival, that is, restoration of man in his proper place of primacy and sovereignty, is the only way out of the crisis."^66

The other source of inspiration in the formulation of Roy's new theory is the 'Radicalism' of the nineteenth century. As is clear from his statement,

".... The nineteenth century Radicals, actuated by the humanist principle of individualism, realised the possibility of a secular rationalism and a rationalist ethics. They applied to the study of man and society the principles and methods of the physical sciences...."^67

Radicalism also implied for Roy, starting from the root of things and therefore, social theory must start from the root of mankind—the individual.
Though Roy rejects the moral conclusions of the Radicals of the nineteenth century, on the grounds, that it projects a relativist ethics which ultimately leads to moral nihilism, he retains the method, namely, applying the method of physical sciences to the study of human problems. This, according to Roy, is the only way of understanding reality.

Roy argues that positive knowledge of nature and of human beings having advanced today, it is possible to have a scientific approach to the problem of human life. The problem of what is man, what is society, and the relation of the two, can now be answered scientifically. Roy explains, "The knowledge of man, of biology, physiology and psychology, warrants the assertion that man is a rational being." 68

Man being rational, Roy proceeds to argue, he has an innate desire for a harmonious and peaceful society. Roy writes,

"A moral order will result from a rationally organised society, because, viewed in the context of his rise out of the background of a harmonious physical Universe, man is essentially rational and therefore moral. Morality emanates from the rational desire for harmonious and mutually beneficial social relations." 69

Thus, Roy holds that the nature of man, and of society, having been discovered by the advance of the physical sciences, the problem facing political philosophy has been solved. It is this conviction of Roy's, that is elaborated in his theory of New or Radical Humanism.
From the elaboration of New Humanism presented above, two principles emerge as basic -- individualism and naturalism. M.P. Rege has correctly observed that, both these principles have been incorporated in Roy's philosophical system.70

The Philosophical Foundations of New Humanism

At the outset Roy states that his philosophical system is a 'materialist' system. In fact, Roy does not consider philosophy as different from materialism. He states,

"Strictly speaking, philosophy is materialism, and materialism is the only possible philosophy. For, it represents the knowledge of nature as it really exists—knowledge acquired through the contemplation, observation and investigation of the phenomena of nature itself....It simply maintains that the origin of everything that really exists is matter; that there does not exist anything but matter, all other appearances being transformations of matter, and these transformations are governed necessarily by laws inherent in nature."

Thus the paradigm of Roy's system is set by 'materialism'. Within this framework he has attempted to construct an ontological, an epistemological and an ethical theory.

Ontological Theory.

According to Roy, man is a natural creature, inseparable from nature. Roy argues that human nature is determined by natural, biological evolution. This is clear from his argument,

"Man did not appear on earth out of nowhere. He rose out
of the background of the physical Universe, through the long process of biological evolution. The umbilical cord was never broken; man, with his mind, intelligence, will, remains an integral part of the physical Universe. The latter is a cosmos—a law-governed system. Therefore, man's being and becoming, his emotions, will and ideas are also determined: man is essentially rational ...." (Emphasis ours)

Roy held that human nature is not static but ever changing, being as it is a part of the evolutionary process. In *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution* he argues, "It is a hackneyed saying that human nature never changes. The truth, however, is just the contrary. To change is human nature. Otherwise, there is no sense in regarding the history of civilisation as an evolutionary process." But, if Roy conceived human nature as ever changing, he also maintained that there is something in man which is constant, which he traces to the process of evolution. These constant factors in human, Roy held, were reason and the urge for freedom. Both these, Roy maintains, are biologically determined and innate. Thus, Roy's concept of human nature is based on naturalism, or to be more precise, on a biologism.

**Epistemological Theory**

Truth, in Roy's framework, is the knowledge of the material, objective, physical world and not some metaphysical reality. Roy denies the existence of any 'other world'; therefore, knowledge, is the knowledge of this material, natural world. Roy clearly states,

"Truth, therefore is not a metaphysical concept. It is a matter of human experience. It is a matter of fact. Truth is corres-
Idealism as an epistemological theory, Roy maintains, stands defeated and is to be rejected outright. This is because of the advance of science, which has made it possible for us to know how man perceives. Roy explains,

"Epistemologically, idealism stands rejected. The old problem of perception, which baffled philosophy for ages, has been solved by modern Materialism with the aid of the latest knowledge of physiology...."73

Roy goes on to explain that with the advance in psychology and biology, man has been established as the highest developed organism of nature. This highly developed creature of nature, man, perceives reality through his senses. Roy spells out the process of man's acquiring knowledge. He maintains that knowledge is acquired by man's consciousness, which is a property common to all biological life. It means an awareness of all external reality. This awareness is a product of the biological evolution which culminates in the formation of the human brain, which physiologically is called the mind. So, according to Roy, the mind is the highest expression of the property of life called the consciousness: thought is the product of the mind's awareness of external nature.76

Roy holds that consciousness, cognition, mind, ideas, are all different forms of matter, which is the ultimate reality capable of
producing life. Roy argues,

"... Consciousness, cognition, mind, idea follow in the course of biological evolution. The world of experience as a whole is real; transcendental reality is a figment of imagination. Mind as well as matter, the physical world as well as the world of thought and ideas, are equally real...."

Roy goes on to explain what ideas are, and how they originate. He writes,

"... ideas are neither sui-generis nor of any metaphysical origin. They originate in the human brain, which is a lump of a specific physico-chemical combination resulting from the entire process of biological evolution. The origin of ideas is scientifically explained by tracing it in pre-human biological impulses.... The discovery of the physical origin of the mental phenomena solves the problem of dualism which has baffled philosophy through the ages...."

The urge for knowledge, according to Roy, is born out of the biological urge for freedom. For man is struggling against the forces of nature, against the blind evolution of which he is a product, to be free and control the forces of nature. In order to control nature, man develops science and therefore science is the search for truth. Roy says, "The search for truth, therefore, is intimately associated with the quest for freedom...."

**Ethical Theory**

Man is rational and therefore moral, by which Roy implies that man, who is a natural creature, is determined by nature. And nature, Roy argues, is a law-governed causal system. Further, this
law-governed system is a moral order. Roy states this clearly, "The Universe is a moral order governed by laws inherent in itself. Man grows out of that back-ground." Since man is a part of nature, he is also determined, therefore, he is rational, and consequently moral. Thus, man according to Roy, is innately and constitutively rational, and therefore, moral. Reason, which is causality, is also morality.

Ethical values, according to Roy, are determined by nature. He writes"...all ethical values are derived from the biological heritage of man...." Roy holds that all ethical values are determined by nature because ".... the psyche is a daughter of the mother earth...." Roy argues, "Man's struggle for freedom is a continuation of the biological struggle for survival on a higher level. Therefore, freedom must be defined as a progressive disappearance of the many-fold impediments to the unfolding of the potentialities biologically inherent in man...."

Thus, for Roy, man attains freedom when he conquers nature and is able to control it for his own use.

Having argued that rationality is morality, and that this is an ontological fact, Roy believes he has evolved a correct moral theory.
For as he says,

"Moral values are placed on a firm foundation when they are referred back to the innate rationality of man. They need no other sanction than conscience which is not the voice of God, but results from rationality. The discovery of the physical basis of reason and the rationalist secular sanction of morality frees Humanism from the mystic connotations traditionally associated with it...." (Emphasis ours).

Thus Roy says "....we can have objective standards of morality....The understanding of the essence of man, the discovery of the fact that man is essentially rational, solves the problem...." (Emphasis ours).

To conclude, Roy perceives no distinction between morality and ontological reality. For reason, according to Roy, is a fact of nature.

SECTION VI

An Outline Of The Problematic To Be Studied

Having undertaken a brief survey of the theory of New Humanism and an attempt to understand the philosophical foundations of this theory, we can now define the nature of the problematic which this study addresses itself to.

We wish to argue that, reason, renaissance and revolution are the three fundamental concepts of Roy's system, on which is based his theory of New Humanism. An analysis of these concepts enables us to unravel the very core of Roy's system of New Humanism.
We wish to further argue that reason is the central concept upon which then is built the rest of the theory. This is apparent from the purpose behind Roy's construction of the new theory. Roy's purpose is to rehabilitate 'reason', basically to provide a solution to the crisis which he maintains is confronting the world. This crisis Roy identifies and qualifies as a 'moral crisis', a crisis of culture. The genesis of this crisis, according to Roy, lay in the consequences brought about by modern 'scepticism'. Scepticism had created a doubt about reason and its ability to be the guide to right action. In Roy's words, "The baby had been thrown out with the bath-water." And this was the source of the moral crisis. For there was no longer any basis for morality. The only way out of this crisis, Roy argues, lay in the rehabilitation of reason, and demonstrating it as a fact of nature, and therefore, in man.

Thus reason emerges as the key to Roy's system. It acquires an ontological and ethical value. Reason, according to Roy, is a biological function in man, an ontological fact of nature; and because man is a natural being he is also rational. Reason in nature is causality, and in man, reason is the echo of the harmony of the universe. Consequently, Roy deduces that man is moral because he is rational. Thus, by ontologising reason, Roy attempts to solve the moral crisis. Reason thus acquires a normative value and becomes the basis of his ethical arguments.
Since the crisis facing the world and the solution to it lies, for Roy, in the realm of consciousness and ideas, it logically follows that the method to be adopted, in other words the way in which it can be actualised or implemented is through a process of education. Therefore, for Roy, a 'renaissance', which is basically a movement in the realm of ideas and culture, is the only way of bringing back 'reason' to the central place of life. The concept of renaissance is thus closely linked with the concept of reason. And therefore, we wish to argue, it becomes a fundamental concept of Roy's 'system'.

This leads us to the third concept of Roy's system, viz. 'revolution'. For Roy, the revolution, we wish to state, is brought about by a change in the ideas. For it is ideas that determine history. A reassertion of reason brings about a revolution, or in other words, a renaissance brings about a revolution. The renaissance is Roy's political programme and is also his substitution for a 'political revolution'. It is essentially an educational programme which seeks to bring about change in the consciousness of people.

Having elaborated Roy's system of Radical Humanism, we shall now proceed to the analysis of the three concepts -- reason, renaissance and revolution. Each of these concepts will be analysed individually in the subsequent chapters.

The next chapter will be a discussion of Roy's concept of reason.
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