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RADICAL HUMANISM

The humanistic phase of M.N.Roy starts from 1946 when he establishes ‘Radical Democratic Party’, which is different from Communism and works for a higher ideal, the ideal of achieving human freedom. He realizes the need for a new kind of socio-economic-political philosophy, as he realizes the danger of Marxism on the one hand and deficiency of parliamentary democracy on the other. To meet the situation he has formulated the philosophy of “Radical Humanism” or “New Humanism”.

Roy’s weekly journal “Independent India”, which he had started in 1937, renamed as “The Radical Humanist” to propagate his idea on society and social reconstruction. He has also prepared a number of theses summarizing his humanistic philosophy, which outline the principles of personal and social aspects of that philosophy. They trace the basic values of freedom, rationalism and morality to man’s biological evolution and emphasize the in severability of political and economic freedom, and indicate how the comprehensive ideal of freedom could be achieved. Roy says, “The new philosophy must be able to destroy what remains of the moral sanction of the statuesque, by providing an idea of a new social order to inspire all those disgusted with the present state of
affairs. It must also indicate new ways of revolution appropriate to the needs of the time. While the steps for social transformation must differ from place to place, in accordance with prevailing conditions, the movement for freedom, if it is to succeed, must outgrow its sectarian class character and be inspired by the humanist spirit and cosmopolitan outlook. It must, further, take the initiative of organizing the people into democratic bodies to provide the basis of the post-revolutionary order. Roy holds that this new philosophy is, drawn from the traditions of Humanism and Moral Radicalism.

Roy introduces his philosophy to meet the crisis of his time and to recognize the society according to need. The crisis of the world as Roy maintains is more than economic, political or cultural crisis. It is the crisis of existence, because he thought that the whole of human existence has been, thrown into chaos and confusion. The reason of this crisis according to Roy is that human affairs are no longer, directed and controlled deliberately through the exercise of individual reason and judgment. The solution as suggested by Roy is to start from an understanding of human nature. If human nature is creative and capable of taking rational initiative, then conditions can be changed. Roy says, "New Humanism has grown out of the experience of a perennial crisis,"
which has become all-pervasive, affecting the entire existence of man, and it is that very crisis which has inspired some of the bolder spirits of our time to rethink mankind's entire history and tradition and come to the conclusion that, unless man can recover his confidence in himself, society can not be reconstructed as a harmonious abode for all."

Revolution to him is a romantic idea, which means radical reconstruction of society. Any effort for a reorganization of society must begin from the unit of society – from the root, i.e., from man. Such an effort to develop a new philosophy of revolution, based on the entire stock of human heritage, and to elaborate the theory and formulate the principles of the practice of political action and economic reconstruction is called by Roy Radicalism. Radicalism thinks in terms neither of nation nor of class. Its concern is man and conceives freedom as freedom of the individual. Therefore, it can also be called New Humanism. It is new, as it is enriched, reinforced and elaborated by scientific knowledge and social experience gained during the centuries of modern civilization. Humanism as Roy holds is cosmopolitan which does not run after the utopia of internationalism. "A cosmopolitan commonwealth of free men and women is a possibility. It will be spiritual. Community, not limited by the boundaries of National States- Capitalist, Fascist, Communist or

(132)
any other kind- which will gradually disappear under the impart of cosmopolitan Humanism. That is the Radical perspective of the future of mankind."^5

Radical Humanism is scientific humanism with a radical outlook. Its conclusions are derived by adopting the approach of science to the understanding of man, his relations with other human beings and his place in the world. The postulates, which constitute the approach of science, are also postulates of the philosophy, which is known as materialism or monistic naturalism. Monistic naturalism is the philosophical base of Radical Humanism^6.

MATERIALISM:

Monistic naturalism implies that the animate world, including the *homo sapiens*, must have originated from inanimate matter. This philosophy is called materialism. For rationalist philosophical thought and fruitful scientific investigation, materialism has been the most plausible hypothesis. The basic principle of materialism can be stated in many ways: that the world, physical as well as biological, exists objectively, is self contained and self-explained; there is nothing beyond and outside it; its being and becoming are governed by laws inherent in itself; laws are neither mysterious nor metaphysical, nor merely
conventional; they are coherent relations of events; consciousness with its manifestations and derivatives, is a property of that which, in a certain state of organization, distinguishes existence from non-existence.

Roy holds that Philosophically, Materialism concedes objective reality to ideas. He says, "Materialism has been so badly misinterpreted and vulgarised by its protagonists that as soon as you say that you are a materialist, you are taken for a man without morals, without principles, a Jesuit and a cut-throat". It is the only logically perfect philosophy, because it alone makes monism possible. It represents the knowledge of nature, as it really exists. He emphasizes that materialism is not the monstrosity as it is generally supposed to be. It is not the cult of eat, drink and be merry, as it has been depicted by its ignorant or malicious adversaries. Materialism does not mean the denial of the creative role of ideas. Roy subscribes, in general, to the philosophy of materialism—a philosophy, which regards nature as primary, matter independently real, and mind develops out of it. The term matter however, has not been use in the old "classical sense, i.e., in terms of ultimate constituents, called atoms, existing in space and time as the early philosophers conceive it. In the light of modern scientific knowledge, matter has been identified with energy. According to this view, the mass and motion of a thing are simply due to electrical charge. Space and time, too, are derivative categories,
representing respectively ‘the geometrical and chronological functions of material existence’\textsuperscript{10}.

The classical concept of substance and causality are also different from Roy’s point of view. The classical materialism identified substance with mass, which loses its absoluteness according to the theory of relativity. Again, Roy concedes that causality is not applicable to the domain of the subatomic world, since the position and momentum of a particle cannot be precisely determined and measured. This was interpreted by, Eddinton as the principle of indeterminism. However, Roy contends that the difficulty of measurement cannot affect the concepts of causality and determinism on which materialism is supposed to be based. Roy maintains that the element of unpredictability in the behaviour of a single atom does not affect the principles of predictability in the masses of atoms and for this; he relies on the statistically approximate nature of the atomic world\textsuperscript{11}. Therefore, Roy concludes that, the term ‘matter’ cannot be use in the classical sense. To distinguish his approach from classical view of materialism, he suggests the use of “physical realism”. Thus for Roy “matter” has been reduced to electrical energy which is observable phenomena and a measurable entity. The concept of causality and determinism are still applicable to masses of atoms but not to the subatomic world.
Roy's materialism is also different on the one hand from mechanistic materialism and on the other from dialectical materialism. He himself calls his materialism as Humanist materialism. Mechanical materialism, which manifests in the ideas of Feuerbach signifies that development is mere repetition, decrease or increase amounting to quantitative change only. It advocates that every development is only a continuation of the old and what is new is only in appearance. It is just a new combination or harmony. The development is itself caused by external actions and with these assumptions the advocates of mechanistic materialism start with an elaborate concept of strict determinism governing the process of interaction. The essence of this doctrine is that it reduces all the motion of matter to mechanical motion, i.e., to this simple change in the place of particles as a result, of the action on them of external forces. Again opposed to this, is the dialectical materialism of Marx. According to it, everything is in motion and interdependent. What causes motion is the self-motivating capacity of the matter. The law of inner contradictions prevails and as a result, progress arises as a struggle between opposite forces. Changes takes place quantitatively that assume a qualitative form at a particular stage. Every stage of change, which is called revolution, shows both a form of synthesis and a form of higher
development that leads to the reaction of the forces of inner conflict. The common between these two varieties of materialism, is that everything that exists is an exemplification of the laws of motion of matter. Apart from this superficial commonness, the difference between the two is of fundamental nature. "Dialectics, unlike mechanism, regards the world as a complex processes, in which things arise, exist and pass away, whereas in mechanism, they look on world as a complex of ready-made things, each with its own fixed properties and interacting with other things." An English writer sums up this distinction as—"In mechanical materialism evolution is the path taken by material things under the pressure of their environment. In dialectical materialism evolution is the development of matter from within, environment helping or hindering, but neither originating the evolutionary process, nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal. Matter to the dialectical materialist is active not passive and moves by an inner necessity of its nature. Therefore dialectical materialism is more interested in motion than in matter."

Roy as a materialist develops his ideas through three different stages. Roy, in the first phase looks like a dialectical materialist having full faith in Marx when he was an orthodox Marxist. In the subsequent
phase, becomes a critic of Marxian materialism and moves closer to the mechanistic materialism of Feuerbach. Finally, Roy as a materialist in the humanist phase, becomes a materialist of his own kind, where he is neither like a Marxist nor like a Feuerbachian, he is like a scientific naturalist having his full faith in the laws of the motion of matter and at the same time laying emphasis on the role of ideas that makes him a materialist of his own peculiar variety. Thus his impressions change with the new and still never orientations\textsuperscript{15}.

Thus, Roy's metaphysical theory is materialistic monism or monistic naturalism. While according to the former, matter is ultimate reality and to later, ultimate reality is Nature. However, it can claim absoluteness only in epistemology. His philosophy is monistic because Roy considers dualism to be the greatest difficulty faced by the philosophers. That is why he rejects economic determinism of the dialectical materialism of Marx. Economic determinism as Roy considers, being a dualist concept, cannot be necessarily relate to Materialism. Moreover, determinism is a logical concept. It is inherent in a determined process; no extraneous factor intervenes; because in that case, the process becomes delicate, while monism is inherent in the logical concept of determinism. As materialism alone makes Monism possible, so for Roy it
is the only prefect philosophy. It simply maintains, "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 mechanical laws inherent in nature." In this connection, he also clears the point of difference between metaphysics and materialism. To him, former starts from an assumption, the latter insists upon dealing with concrete things; while the former is bound by an invariable hypothesis and by axioms deduced there from, the letter does not accept any hypothesis or axiom unless it can be verified by empirical knowledge. Thus, he claims his philosophy of materialism as supported by scientific view is empirically verifiable.

Roy maintains that until the nineteenth century, biology was largely dominated by vitalism and teleology. The mystery about the origin of life was believed to be beyond the reach of science. At that time it was generally held that behind the veil of that mystery was transcendental realm of creative force which knows no law except its own, and which is never be comprehended by human understanding. That time, the term ‘organic’ or ‘living’, which was regarded as anti-thesis of ‘matter’, stood for a spiritual being. Further, it was maintained that the
purpose of a creative power pervaded the animal kingdom. Every particular organism was supposed to be created to fit into its allotted place in a grand scheme of divine providence. The more advanced was the knowledge about the wonderful phenomena of organic nature, particularly of man; the stronger became the anthropomorphical atavism. It was argued that such a wonderful machine could be created and run only by an equally wonderful machine, however, immensely more perfect. Roy also maintains that upon the discovery of cell, physiology, which is the modern science of the phenomena of motion (life) in animals and plants, also adopted the mechanistic view. But the morphological sector of biology - the science dealing with the origin and growth of the forms of organic beings – persistently held on to teleology. A miracle remained the cause of the organic world and it did not make any difference whether the miracle was performed by a personal God or the mysterious vital force. Finally, Darwinism drove teleology out of its last strong hold morphological biology. As Russell maintains, “What Galileo and Newton had done for astronomy, Darwin did for biology.”

Roy explains the origin of life and therefore, man through the evolutionary theory of science. Scientists have estimated that our planet earth is about 5,000,000,000 years old. It has further been, ascertained
from the study of fossils that life has existed on the earth for at least 1,000,000,000 years. This would mean that it took about, 4000,000,000 years of the earth's separate existence before life originated. Scientists have developed an acceptable hypothesis about how life might have sprung up in the conditions, which prevailed in the earlier period of the earth's history. They describes the conditions which facilitated the creation of animate from inanimate matter have ceased to exist for a long time. The main factor in this development was the gradual increase of oxygen in the earth's atmosphere. After life originated from inanimate matter, its subsequent development into various genera and species has been, adequately explained by the theory of biological evolution. Charles Darwin brought out the main components of the theory, in 1859. On the basis, of abundant and unimpeachable evidence, Darwin showed that different existing varieties of plants and animals were the product of natural selection. All forms of life were involved in a struggle for existence, and only those forms survive which were adapted to their environments21.

Roy explains, Darwinism made us acquainted with the causality of the process of continuous development, which runs throughout the organic world. In this context, he mentions Haeckel's definition about
Darwinism, which he defines as "the mechanical explanation of organic forms, or the true cause" Roy says "Darwinism, once for all and definitely, defined the position of man it establishes the grand work of a non-miraculous history of the development of the human race. Darwinism explained the mechanism of the evolution of organic forms from the lowest to the highest. The conclusive establishment of the evolutionary process is the complicated human organism, which is the highest form in the evolution of organic matter. Life is not, a mysterious immaterial force. It grows out of inanimate matter in a certain state of organization. Intelligence is a physiological function; brain is the organ of the thought, and thought is the function of brain. Therefore, the vital phenomena are not manifestations of the mystic metaphysical force. They do not testify to a spiritual essence of man. They can be traced back to the lowest form of organic matter. Thus, life grew out of chemical energy resulting form inorganic compounds. Here Roy accepts Haeckel's hypothesis of spontaneous generation as explaining how the first organism grew. He writes, "There is no difference between organic and inorganic matter. All living bodies are formed out of such chemical elements as carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, sulphur, potassium, sodium, etc. No such elements have been found in vegetable and animal bodies as are absent in the inorganic substances. When a certain combination of a number of
chemical elements produces the phenomenon of life, it enters into the organic domain.23"

Roy goes on to state that, once the primitive form of life appeared, it started its own course of evolution. In the course of evolution, Roy infers that matter has the capacity to organize itself into complex, conscious knowing, thinking beings. However, he admits that we do not know as yet how the capacity of matter do produce, life operates. However, he claims, this question as an epistemological not a metaphysical one. He takes it for granted that consciousness and mind are functions of organic matter. He tries to solve the matter–mind problem through this evolutionary process. As materialism does not exclude emergence of novelty, the possibility of mind knowing or contemplating the material world presupposes causal connection between matter and mind. He also claims that knowledge is possible because mind results from matter. In this context, Roy tries to explain the concept of spirit. To him materialism does not deny the empirical fact that purpose is associated with embodied spirits, it only exposes the absurdity of the notion of disembodied spirit. This empirical spirit grows out of the material matrix of the process of evolution. Therefore, Roy concludes that Materialism supported by modern scientific knowledge can solve the old
problem of psychophysical parallelism and also reconciles the conflict between rationalism and naturalism or romanticism\textsuperscript{24}.

Roy also tries to differentiate between ‘object’ and ‘thing’ through his materialistic theory. ‘Object’ is epistemological category while ‘thing’ is ontological. ‘Objects’ are always ‘things’ that are perceived, but things are not always objects of perception or knowledge. Things may exist without attaining the epistemological state of being ‘objects’, just like “America existed before it was discovered; so did the planet Uranus”. Again, according to Roy, the objectivity consists in being the perceived aspects of parts of things, which stimulates the perceiver, but incompleteness of knowledge of a thing does not affect its objectivity. Therefore, he concludes, “while epistemologically objects are mind dependent, existentially they are independent”\textsuperscript{25}.

Describing the possibility of knowledge Roy states, “Epistemology must be simply guided by the facts that mind exists and that knowledge is conditional as much on the existence of mind as on that of matter”. Therefore, mind is real as a part of physical world, and as an empirical category, makes the decisive contribution to the formulation of a correct theory of knowledge. He also claims it as an objective theory of
knowledge because it objectifies self itself. However, this self is always an embodied self, the knowing mind can never be conceived as a disembodied spirit. Like mind, our bodies, organs of sensation, the nervous system, the brain, and the entire cognitive apparatus are parts of the physical world. There is constant interpenetration and interdependence between mind and matter. Knowledge is the result from perception, which is ‘organic reaction to physical contacts’ – ‘a casual connection between mind and matter’. Therefore, all knowledge is empirical, whether it may be conceptual thought or highly abstract theoretical structure of mathematical physics. Even introspection or self-contemplation is not purely subjective according to Roy. Again, he maintains that knowledge is not identical with thought. Thought is mind’s property whereas, knowledge is possession and knowing is an act of mind. Knowledge is, of what exists outside the mind, hence is not identical with mind ontologically. Experience is the foundation of knowledge, but knowing is not a purely empirical process. As Roy says “it is selecting, interpreting, systematizing, coordinating, of empirical materials – sense data – in a rational, logically coherent explanation of perceptual facts”. Thus, Roy tries to explain the epistemological question with the help of his metaphysical doctrine of Materialism.
Roy accepts materialistic philosophy to explain human history, and history to Roy a progressive process, which is based on, renaissance. "The Renaissance" says Roy "was the revolt of man against God; as such, it heralded the modern civilization and the philosophy of freedom, Materialism". He claims "only the materialistic philosophy, call it by any other name you may prefer such as physical Realism, Scientific Rationalism, Materialist Monism- can trace this red thread of unity running through the entire cosmic system of being and becoming. Unless that is, done, we cannot explain History. If we cannot explain man, if we cannot show that man is instinctively, naturally, rational being, history cannot be explain. History is a rational process because; it is, made by man. If you can never know how man will behave in a given situation, you can not make a science of history."

In the discussion on materialism, M. N. Roy admits the contribution of several thinkers i.e. from Greek thinkers to Indian thinkers. Among the Greek thinkers, he mentions the contribution of Thales, the father of philosophy, then Anaximander, Anaxagoras and Heraclitus. Roy maintains that the idea of materialism still clear in the philosophy of Protagoras who twisted knowledge towards man as its centre. For Protagoras knowledge can be taken as the creation of the
sense and other human faculties and therefore, is a strictly human
to the experience and enterprise. By this, Protagoras meant that proper study of mankind is man. Roy elaborates the idea of Protagoras, which states, “man is the measure of everything”.

Socrates in the ancient period, Diderot in later and thinkers like Lenin and Marx in the modern period have been, fascinated by the principle of Materialism. M. N. Roy accepts Diderot as the leading materialist of history. In Diderot, reason and romanticism combined to produce a perfect and rational human philosophy. He made materialism a human philosophy. He took all the aspects of human existence into consideration. There was nothing, that could enslave the human spirit and this was the fundamental aspect of materialistic philosophy.

M.N. Roy traces out the development of the materialist school of philosophy in India, in the 7th and 8th century B.C. Dissatisfaction with the Vedic Natural Religion gave rise to speculations about the origin of things and there rose thinkers who represented distinct materialist tendencies. They challenged the authority of Gods by trying to explain the being and becoming of the world in a rationalist and materialist way. In this connection, Roy mentions two prominent Hindu philosophies—Vaisesika and Sankhya. There were indications of materialist through
even in the Upanisads, particularly in the Rig Veda, the creation Hymn, which concludes the dialogue between the parents of mankind— the twin brother, Yama and Yami. Again, the Vedas and Upanisadas refer to Swabhava-vadins (naturalist) and their doctrines, which are examples of materialist philosophy of India. Lokayata Darsana or Carvaka is the prominent materialist system in India. Carvaka conception of the emergence of life (consciousness) as an outcome of four material bodies—earth, water, fire and air is similar to the modern view, which holds that life is the product of inanimate matter. The fundamental principles of lokayata darsana are recorded by Krishna Mishra, a younger contemporary of Buddha as— "In it only perceptual evidence is authority. The elements are earth, water, fire and air, wealth and enjoyment are the objects of human existence. Matter can think. There is no other world. Death is the end of all". However, Roy denies the so-called 'eat, drink and be merry' conception of materialism which has reference in the philosophy of Carvaka in the words 'wealth and enjoyment are the human experience'. Roy as a rationalist gives importance in human reason, so also in morality, which is based on the rationality of man.

M. N. Roy refers to the thinker Kapila who visualized the world as a primal material condition. He had referred the reality of thought, to the reality of external world. Roy explains Kanada, the profounder of
Yaiseska philosophy made no room for the soul in the metaphysical or spiritualistic sense of the term. To him, intelligence is a quality of atoms that constitute the physical body. Consciousness is the product of a complication of atoms and soul is merely the disposition of organism, which is a combination of matter. Roy therefore concludes that “As everywhere, originally, in India also philosophy was materialistic. The materialistic outcome of the speculations of the rebels against the Vedic natural religion, contained in the three systems of philosophy proper, namely, Vaiseska, Sankhya and Nyaya, provided the inspiration for the greatest event in the history of ancient India- the Buddhist Revolution”.

In the modern period, Roy has mentioned the name of so many materialists who have profoundly influenced the thinking of mankind. Roy traces the name of Helvetius, Condillae, Lorenz Oken, Lamark, Darwin and a number of other thinker and scientists. Again, Hobbes, Hegel, Marx and Engels greatly influenced in the career of M.N.Roy. However, M.N.Roy’s contact with some of the great communist thinkers led him not only on the road of materialism but also to existentialism.

Man is the centre of Roy’s materialistic philosophy. He gives much importance to human feelings, and ignores the selfish motive to attain personal gain. He says, “If we want to put man in the centre of the stage
and measure all social progress by the degree of progress and freedom enjoyed by the individuals in society. We shall have to discard this vulgar concept of the economic man and replace it by the concept of a moral man, a man who can be moral because he is rational. This can be done, consistently with materialist philosophy. Thus, Roy refutes Marx concept of ‘Economic Man’ and replace it with ‘Moral Man’. Because Roy thought that morality is the basis of social progress of man. “For a more rational reconstruction of the social order of this world, we should not have to break away from a materialist philosophy.” Roy claims that materialism is the only philosophy, which has tried to explain the world without having to transcend this physical universe. It does not really discard epistemological Idealism, but points out that, ideas are not born by themselves in air irrespective of man’s physical existence. Materialism traces ideas to the common denominator of physical existence. But at the same time, Roy says, “Intelligent Materialism refuses to run counter to the accumulated store of scientific knowledge by denying an objective reality to ideas, by denying the dynamics of ideas, once they are conceived by man”. Roy maintains that therefore, 20th century humanist Radicalism proposes to make a synthesis between the history of material progress and the dynamics of ideas and this synthesis is possible on the basis of, philosophic Materialism, because itrecognizes the objective
validity of ideas, provides a new philosophy which can satisfy the modern man.

Roy claims that Materialism is the only possible philosophy rejecting other idealistic interpretation of the origin of the world. Other philosophy takes the man outside the physical universe, into the wilderness of a mystical metaphysics over which God presides. The result of such explanation is the end of human freedom, on which Roy concentrates mostly. Such explanation cannot free us from the "freezing grip of fate". That is why Roy says, "All system of philosophy other than Materialism are dishonest religion; they smuggle religiosity in through the backdoor; Perhaps their founders and profounder do not realize that; but that does not alter the significance of their intellectual gymnastic". He hoped that when such philosophers either non-materialist or anti-materialist acquired intellectual honestly, they must echo Kant's famous declaration: philosophy ultimately reaches a point where it must yield place to faith. In this context, Roy admits the admirable intellectual honesty of Kant. He says, "Perhaps that admirable intellectual honesty of Kant is to be traced to materialist point of departure of his philosophy also".

Roy considers materialism as human philosophy, which can explain all aspect of human existence. Roy accepts it as the foundation of
his philosophy of Radical Humanism. Roy says, "created by man, on the basis of collective human experience, Materialism, .......... was a human philosophy which took all the aspects of human existence into consideration, and attached equal importance to every manifestation of human spirit and every form of man's creativeness". Thus though Roy accepts scientific view to explain his materialistic evolutionary process, yet, he explains it philosophically. "I am a confirmed, unmitigated, materialist, philosophically." Explaining reason, human brain etc. he takes into consideration the scientific explanation, but he explains it in his own way. "Not finding a rational explanation of reason in biology, I go farther. The entire physical Universe is a determined process of becoming. Therefore, I identify reason with determinism in nature. All biological process, including man's mental activities, take place in the context of the physical Universe, being integral thereof. So reason is a property of physical existence. It neither metaphysical nor a mystic category."

Roy's materialism is centered in the supremacy of man. He is a materialist with a passionate belief in the efficiency of ideas and ideals, that is, in the creative power of man. This is the distinctive belief of his materialistic humanism.
SPIRITUALISM:

Spiritualism and religion have played a very important role in the human history. Roy as a materialist rejects both spiritualism and religion. As Roy places man, in the centre of universe and explain man’s evolution through the scientific evolutionary theory. So, there is no place for any immoral soul or spirit and any supernatural power or God.

Generally, it is believed that there is an eternal substance within us, which is called soul. But Roy rejects such immaterial, eternal mystic substance. He explains the existence of such soul with the help of evolutionary theory. He holds that man is essentially rational and reason is the product of man’s evolutionary process. Like western thinkers, he identified soul or self with mind. He says, “The Self is always an embodied self. The knowing mind can never be conceived as disembodied spirit”. [Science and Philosophy –M. N. Roy, p. 200]

Therefore, the so-called soul is the creation of human reason. “Once upon a time, man had reason to invent a soul; they must believe in their own invention.” 43 Again about the ‘transmigration of soul’ Roy explains that one comes to believe it through the simplest process of thought, which is a mental act involved in reason. Soul as an immortal essence of man, naturally survives physical death. Therefore, to Roy transmigration of
soul is a dogma, which is deduced from the assumption of an immortal essence of man. He claims immortal soul is a very primitive idea, of which origin is not spiritual elevation, but ignorance. Such conceptions are still prevailed among the primitive races and he gives examples of such beliefs. The aboriginal inhabitants of Malay peninsula believe that souls are red, no bigger that grains of maize; for other Malay races, they are vapory, shadowy filmy essence, about as big as one’s thumb. He maintains that even the ‘Sukshma Shareer’ of the Hindu scriptures is believed to be the same size. Some conceives soul as a sort of fluid diffused through every part. The backward masses of Japan considers the soul as a small, round, back thing, and the Australian Bushman believes it to be a small thing dwelling in the breast.

Roy claims that the thorough study of human history shows that there is no place, for any extraneous and mystic element like soul, which could have entered into man. It is sometimes believed that the soul as something Divine and so all man’s higher emotions. But, modern science elaborately explains man’s emotions, which is the result of physico-chemical processes. So Roy maintains that if the soul is identified with man’s emotions, then it is reduced to a part of man’s psychophysiological nature.
Again, the conception of soul as ‘Sukshma Shareer’ of Indian Scriptures conceived the soul as the size of a thumb. Roy claims that then the soul must be embodied, it cannot be disembodied. Such soul can be transmigrated as the scriptures held. He says, “Death is destruction of a morphological organization of matter. Matter is immortal. But the dogma of Sukshma Shareer asserts that the organization of matter survives – in miniature. There would be no sense in saying that matter survives death.” So Roy concludes that empirical defense of transmigration is a hopeless undertaking. Moreover, the scriptures say that to see in to the past and future, one must be endowed with ‘divya dristi’. But, the ‘divya dristi’ or spiritual vision, as Roy maintains, is not satisfactory, because this conception can explain only, ‘why some can see what others cannot’; but it does not explain ‘why everybody cannot remember past life’. Therefore, transmigration is an article of faith.46

In this connection he traces the conception of ghost, dream-spirits etc. These are some of beliefs of primitive men. These beliefs are the basis of the anthropological theories of the origin of religions. Anthropologists divide these into two categories- Hypothetical Animism and Psychological Animism47. Regarding the origin of religion Roy says
that religion is the creation of human reason. However, it is not the
creation of any single individual. It is an expression of man’s struggle
against nature. Man struggled to free himself from the spiritual bondage
and wanted to study a rational meaning of the relationship between Man
and the spiritual values. So Religion is an expression of man’s urge for
spiritual freedom. Roy maintains that religion is the out come of human
quest for knowledge and truth. “Essentially, it is a rational system of
thought, limited by the inadequate store of positive knowledge. When the
available store of knowledge is not sufficient for setting up theoretically
variable working hypotheses, human spirit thirsting for knowledge
necessarily falls back on imagination. The result is religion.” To Roy
religion is a belief in the Supernatural and ignorance is its foundation.
Belief in supernatural power or God is the central theme of most religion.
Man’s feeling of insecurity is the basis of such belief and suggests the
remedy of such belief is education. He says, “We shall show them that
they are not so helpless as they have been taught to believe, that they are
the makers of their destiny. As soon as they will realize that this world of
misery is very largely their own creation, a result of their voluntary
subjection, resignation and passivity, they will begin to see that they can
recreate it as a better world with less misery.” In this point, Roy is
closer to Buddha. Man can overcome any problems, miseries and other
obstacles of their life by themselves without dependence on any supernatural power. Thus, Roy rejects not only religion but also God. Because Roy claims that after the rise of modern science, all philosophical reason, for the existence of religions disappears. Roy says "If in one period of man's spiritual development the religious mode of thought is an intellectual and moral need, because it gives a pathological expression to his instinctive rationality, in a subsequent stage the disappearance of that mode of thought is equally necessary". Therefore, worship, prayer etc. are meaningless, as there is no supernatural power. These are the object of faith. For Roy faith in the supernatural is characteristic of a pathological stage of intellectual development of man, which can be defeated by innate rationality of man, during the spiritual progress of mankind.

However, he is equally conscious of the impact of religion on man, whether eastern or western thought. The impact of religion is immense, in the social and cultural history of the world. Religious institutions also played a great role on man. Taking advantage, the religious institutions exploited the freedom of mind and intellect. M.N. Roy believes that this was the greatest disservice the religious institutions have rendered to human history. Religion, which was associated with the power of magic,
made the cage of iron where the intellect was lost in stupor. He is particularly against the spiritual authority and religious sanction that exploited the masses

'Spiritualism' is regarded as the distinguishing mark of Indian philosophy. It is believed that 'western civilization is materialist' and 'Eastern culture is spiritual'. But Roy claims that "What is claimed to be the 'special genius' of Indian culture, is not special at all". In India, spiritualism is taken in the religious point of view, but Roy characterizes it as human ideology, which will present in every stage of social evolution. It will be also shown that the modes of thought change in accordance with the variation of social environments, and therefore no particular way of thinking can be eternal and immutable characteristic of any people. The reason of this departure as Roy mentions is that advance of civilization i.e. the progressive conquest of nature by man has enabled the western countries to think more in terms of reason and positive knowledge than in terms of faith and metaphysical fantasies. The gigantic transformation of the conditions of life experienced by the western peoples during the last two hundred years has created the gulf, which separates them ideologically from Indian people. Therefore, Indian culture is not spiritually superior to western culture. In this context, Roy
also criticizes the fourfold object of human life i.e. Dharma, Artha, Karma and Moksha as mentioned in the Indian scriptures. Roy interprets them differently from the Indian scriptures. Conception of spiritual superiority of Indian culture according to Roy is a harmful self-description, which has no place in the ideology of a great people in the process of a renaissance54. Roy claims that even today superstitions, sanctified as religion, dominate the mentality of the Indian masses. Roy’s solution to this is that Indian people should freed their mind from the so-called ghosts of dead past. Such as Karma, fate, transmigration, un-attachment, immortal spiritual essence, providential ordinance etc. without the conviction that man makes his own destiny, Indian people can not conquer the future55.

Roy also believes in ‘spirituality’, but in different sense as conceived by Indian culture. He explains it with the evolutionary progress of man. Psyche is the umbilical cord, which binds man, with all his spiritual attributes, to Mother Nature- the physical world. He says, “Spiritual values are physically determined; the psyche is a daughter of the Mother Earth”. Thus, he accepts spirituality in the sense of spiritual values. He admitted that wider range of studies shows that religions like Buddhism, Islam and Christianity were standard-bearer of revolutions,
because in their own time, they were considered as pioneers for opening new vista of vision. However, later on, religions and religious institutions exploited the freedom of mind and intellect of man. So Roy replaces religion and super-naturalism with spiritual values.

Therefore, he concludes that spiritualism and religion arises for the need of human mind, in the process evolution of human development. Even Roy feels that the ideas of God, might have been a ever for humanism. God was created for the sake of man himself. The desire to live is the essence of human nature. So when human society was in despair, God became a tool to make man happy. Roy says, “For the sake of further spiritual development – intellectual growth, moral uplift and cultural progress- they must burst”.

Roy’s interpretation spiritualism is different from Indian culture. His spiritualism is based on, materialism. His explanation of ‘psyche’, “spiritual freedom” of man is to some extent correct in the modern scientific age, as the religious superstition, no doubt makes obstacles in the path of progress. Spiritual values of Roy may be the influence Buddha philosophy upon him. His view is similar to Buddha’s concept of “Four Noble Truth” which explains, cause of human miseries and its solutions. Roy like Buddha identifies “Spiritualism” with moral values.
As a positivist, Roy believes in positive knowledge acquired through experience. So he rejects any other sources of knowledge. That is why he criticizes the ‘Divya dristi’ of Indian culture, which is another form of initiative knowledge. But experience alone can not be the only source of knowledge, as Roy believes and the possibility of intuitive knowledge can not be disputed. Again, Roy’s criticism of superiority of Indian culture is not totally regard as correct. Even his interpretation of civilization, is also rejected with the arguments, put by him. The ideological differences of society cannot be regard as the standard of civilization. Even today, peoples of most of the western countries influenced by Indian culture. May be this is because of Roy’s stayed abroad most of the time of his life, which influences him to make such conclusions. However, Roy’s solutions that man can free himself from religion and so-called spirituality through education, which is the key of human progress, can not be disrupted all together.

HUMAN NATURE:

The fact that man is a part of nature is of basic importance to the philosophy of Radical humanism of Roy. It adopts scientific approach to the understanding of human nature. What ever we call human nature,
man’s attributes and potentialities, can be strictly deduced from the background of the evolving physical universe. Human being as a part of nature must follow the law-governed ness of the universe like other material object. This universal principle of universe is called by Roy ‘Natural laws’, which he derives from man’s experience. Man discovers the natural law by becoming conscious of the casual relation in nature. Human nature therefore determined by those laws of Nature.

Roy maintains that to change is human nature. He says if there is anything constant in human nature, it is not to believe, but it is man’s rationality, his reasoning capacity, which urges him to find reasonable explanations of everything. Human nature, according to Roy, is essentially rational which he derives from man’s biological evolution. Reason of man is the expression of the orderliness of nature or echo of harmony of the universe. Thus, the rise of modern science represents reassertion of the fundamental trait of human nature- the spirit of enquiry. As human nature is essentially rational, so man naturally wants to know and to explain. He is not a passive observer of nature. His very being brings him in contact with his physical environments compels him to act and arouses in him the desire to acquire knowledge of them. This makes him alive to the necessity of such knowledge. From this, Roy concludes
that human nature can evolve, can be changed, and this continuous change in human nature is the manifestation of the unfoldment of the human personality. Therefore, human nature being subject to the evolutionary process has elements, both constant and changing.

Roy reconciles both psychology and physics in explaining human nature. Identifying reason with determinism of nature, he explains all mental activities like instinct intuition impulse etc., “There is an unbroken chain connecting the elementary indefinable of psychology with physics; it runs through physiology, cytology and chemistry. Once the rationality (determinateness) of the mysterious phenomena of instinct, intuition, impulse, etc., is revealed, the chain can be traced to the other direction also – to the highest expressions and greatest creations of the human mind”. Deduced from same origin, every man possesses similar instinct and urges, and that is the reason he has given for the possibility of human brother hood. Even he explains morality in connection with reason or rationality, which for him is a product of evolutionary process.

Roy’s theory of rationalist psychology and ethics has their essential attributes namely rationality, morality and freedom. These are the three main values of scientific humanism. Roy’s scientific Humanism claims
that these values arise from certain mental attributes acquired by man in
the course of physico-biological evolution. These three attributes of
human nature as mentioned by Roy are causally connected. The basic
concept of human nature is rationality or reason. Again, as man is rational
therefore, he is moral. Another content of human nature is man's urge to
freedom, and Roy places 'freedom' as supreme value.

REASON:

The essential principle of Radical Humanism or Scientific
Humanism of M. N. Roy is that human nature is essentially rational.
Supporting modern evolutionary theory he holds that man is the outcome
biological evolution. Biological evolution is also a rational process. Roy
derives the rationality of man from the rationality of the physical
universe. The physical universe is a law-governed system and this law
governess and orderliness of the physical universe may be called reason
in nature. Man has a highly developed brain, so, he is conscious of this
reason in nature. Consequently, being conscious of this rational world,
man himself has become rational. Man becomes rational because he finds
that the nature is a system where nothing happens without a cause.
Subjective rationality of man thus is intimately, related with objective
rationality of nature. Thus Roy remarks, "The reason in man is an echo
of the harmony of the universe”⁶⁵ This rationality of man therefore secular in character.

Through reason, Roy also explains his theory of knowledge. The experience of a law-governed world or rational orderliness of Nature has made the thinking process of man also law-governed and rational knowledge arises, when mind comes in contact, with the physical world. Mind is however not a mysterious entity. It is a complicated state of consciousness and consciousness is the function of organic matter. As a product evolutionary process, mind is connected with matter and for this reason, knowledge is possible according to Roy. He writes, “If mind was entirely different from matter, there could be no interpretation. Knowledge is possible because mind results from matter”. Knowledge is derived from outside world; it is the relation between mind and the world. Therefore, experience and observation are the sources of knowledge. However, to it he has also added, “It is selecting, interpreting systematising, coordinating of empirical materials – sense date – in a rational logically coherent explanation of perceptual facts”. Therefore, there is no place for any divine intuition in Roy’s rational process of knowledge⁶⁶.
Roy maintains that in the process of intellectual evolution of man, reason appears earlier than faith. Instinct is the primitive form of reason. “At the later stage of intellectual evolution, it still represents the automatic, physiological functioning of reason, which itself is a biological property of higher organizations. In the rudimentary form, it can be traced even in higher animals.”67 So reason is inherited by the human species as a primitive instinct from its immediate animal ancestry. “Reason is the simple instinctive, notion that every object of experience is connected with some other object or objects which may or may not have been already experienced.” Biological evolution is therefore is a rational process.” From instinct to reason, there is a casual chain of mental evolution. Conceptual thought at human level is a result of mental evolution from anthropoid ape. Conceptual thought depends on language. Memory is the ultimate basis of conceptual thought which animal do possess. Through this long process, reason evolves and to Roy the residues of humanness, is the biological heritage of reason68. “Reason forbids man to do, that which is distinctive of his life; and not to omit that which he thinketh it may be best preserved” 69. Thus to Hobbes, as M. N. Roy mentioned in his book Reason Romanticism and Revolution vol. II, Reason and instinct (desire) are not antagonistic, both being biological properties, the origin of neither is transcendental nor shrouded in mystery.
Human creativeness is the result of these two basic urges—reason and instinct.

"Life is neither an inexplicable category called intuition, nor is it a mysteriously purposive urge; it is a determined physical process. In metaphysical terms, it is the unfolding of reason in nature. But reason itself is not a metaphysical category."\(^{70}\) The rationality of man is secular in character and it is also not to be confused with any mysterious divine spark in human beings\(^{71}\). Because its roots can be traced in the lifeless physical nature. It is as Roy says ‘the rhythm of the cosmos’\(^{72}\)

Roy supports Hobbes rational individualism, which states that human nature is selfish, in the sense that self-preservation is the basic biological urge, which gives birth to reason\(^{73}\). He says that instinct of self-preservation and struggle for existence led to the foundation of civil society. Rationality can subordinate man’s selfishness to enlightened self-interest, which is a social virtue\(^{74}\).

Roy holds that, as human beings are essentially rational, if we persistently appeal to their reason they will ultimately respond. Because they can rule themselves only through the application of their reason.
This is to him is a truly revolution without which no social change in the direction of freedom is possible. Guided by reason, illumined by creative imagination, spiritually free men would alter the conditions of the world better. This view of life is called by Roy Romanticism, which do not rule out the use of reason in the guidance of human affairs.

To Roy, Morality finds its sanction in the rationality of man. Man is moral because he is rational. As a biological being, all men are similarly constructed, and therefore are likely to react in approximately the same way under similar circumstances, and to Roy morality in public life is possible by cultivating this ability. Therefore, a secular rational morality is possible and the possibility of a secular rational morality opens up a new perspective before the world.

Roy maintains that conception of soul and religion are the outcome of instinctive rationality of primitive man. He says, "Belief in God and soul is not inherent in human consciousness. It is not human nature to believe in the super-natural". But due to the intellectual and moral need of primitive man religion arises, because it gives a pathological expression to his instinctive rationality. However, all philosophical reason for the existence of religion disappears after the rise of modern science.

(168)
Again regarding the origin of soul, he says, “Once upon a time man had reason to invent a soul; they must believe in their own invention”. But to him, this idea of immortal soul is very primitive idea which is not the acquisition of man when he reaches a high spiritual level. The origin of soul is not due to the spiritual evolution but because of ignorance. Roy maintains that the ideas of God soul etc. are the result of man’s query about nature, and “the rise of modern science represents re-assertion of the fundamental trait of human nature- the spirit of enquiry”. Thus, science reveals the truth about human nature.

Therefore, to Roy reason is supreme in man. Man’s nature is not to believe; but to acquisition, to enquire and to know the truth. All ideas and ideologies are the expressions of reasoning power of man, which are not all correct. When the light of truth makes his innate rationality more manifest, he can discard old hypothesis based on ignorance. That is why Dr. B. C. Sharma commented on Roy “So complete was Roy’s faith in reason that the possibility of any experience not accountable in terms of reason is completely denied by him.”

However, Roy explains all aspects of rational faculty, his explanation regarding ‘innate rationality’ to some extent confusing. Roy
as an empiricist explains that man becomes conscious about his innate rationality through experience, in his struggle for existence. "The notion of the Natural law is empirically derived; there is nothing mysterious about it. The regularities of nature are the facts of man's experience. The notion of Natural Law, therefore, results from the innate rationality of man." But the confusing matter in this context is 'innate rationality'. Roy tries to reconcile 'experience' and 'reason' in explaining human nature and also in man's acquisition of knowledge. In this point his view is similar to some extent with Kant, who also thought that knowledge is possible through 'reason' and experience'.

Again, Roy does recognize the possibility of changing human nature through education, but does not believe in the possibility of human nature finding a new level of experience like religious or intuitive experience beyond that of 'reason' and 'sense perception'. But if one accepts evolution as the governing principle of human lives, as Roy does, there is no reason why the possibility of any other experience should be denied.
MORALITY:

One of the specific features of the philosophy of Roy’s New Humanism is its approach to the problems of ethics and morality. To Roy, the present crisis of the modern world is moral crisis and moral degeneration. Modern mankind may not be able to survive this crisis unless there will be a development towards a higher form of social conscience in a growing number of men and women. Roy thought that until now, the sense of morality, the appreciation of ethical values has been associated with the assumption that it is human nature to believe. Even morality is traced back to certain inexplicable and un-analyzable factors like, intuition, instinct, the sub-conscious of psychoanalysis, or the ‘élan vital’ of the philosophy of Bergson. All these and several other notions, entail the same fallacious conclusion that man cannot be moral by himself. It is believed that ordinary men and women can be moral only under spiritual or temporal compulsion. But New Humanism of Roy boldly says that, “since man is rational, he can also be moral by himself.” To Roy Morality is the ability to judge what will be the correct response to a given situation. Judgment is obviously, guided by reason. “Therefore, a rational man, a man who is consciously rational, who regards reason not as something extraneous, but as part of his
biological being, can declare that he is moral because by his rational thinking he behaves in a particular way and not in any other way.86

Morality is another constant of human nature according to Roy. It is a dictate of conscience, which is a biological function. Conscience, he explains, "is not a mystic inner voice nor a divine presentment, but a biological heritage- an emergent novelty of the process of evolution."87 At the level of consciousness, it reflects the law-governed ness of the universe through human intelligence and as such morality is another name for man's rationality. Man's rationality and moral sense, which are causally connected, are the expressions of cosmic harmony. From this it follows that it is a nature of man, as a biological organism, to be rational and moral, and as such he is capable of living with others in peace and harmony.88 "Morality and rationality are the two sides of the same coin."89 Man is potentially rational, because man arises out of the background of the physical Universe, which is a harmonious law-governed cosmos. Therefore, man's thinking process, man's emotions and feelings must also be guided and informed by certain laws. "Most of us are not conscious of this, but since those processes are operating in us, we can conscious of it. Therefore, we say that man is essentially rational. And therefore rational ethics is possible". In fact, the consciously moral
behavior of man must result from his rational thinking. That is the basis of a secular ethics according to Roy.90

Roy's concept of morality is similar to that of Kant as both regarded morality as rational. But Roy has mentioned that Kant regarded passions and sensual desires which are biological function as evil by themselves, as they compelled man to go against the motive force of human existence namely duty. Therefore, the foundation of morality is to constant struggle against the evils inherent in his biological being, so that he can do the dictates of duty and obey law. Roy criticizes Kant's morality as dogmatic because of his doctrine of two worlds. Kant held that there was a world of science and a world of morals, and reason made this division. Since reason could legislate for both, it must be superior to either. Therefore, Reason is Super Sensual. Thus to Roy Kant's critical philosophy did end in religion. However, Kant's philosophy rationalized the dogmatic doctrine of incarnation, original sin and atonement, but justified them as symbols of the dual nature of man; literally and chronologically; they belonged to the phenomenal world, morally to noumenal. But Roy holds that though Kant's morality rehabilitated religion by shifting its basis on dogmatic morality sanctioned by Super-Sensuous Reason, but, at the same time, it was an attempt to shatter the

(173)
intellectual and cultural values resurrected by the “Revolt of Man” to inspire modern civilization.  

To Roy morality is rational but not a supernatural, mystical or metaphysical attribute of man. Roy admitted that, Epicurus already held the view that he wanted to be truthful, virtuous and kind, simply because it gave him pleasure to be so, and not in obedience to someone else, so he denied the existence of Gods. Roy says that the desire to be moral is inherent in man, because this desire results from man’s innate rationality. Man cannot be moral unless to be moral is inherent in him and unless the urge for moral responsibility is natural and essential in man himself. He does not admit that certain men are inherently superior to other men. Every man is capable of knowing, as well as of behaving morally, if he is given the opportunity of developing his personality.

Discussing the origin of moral values, Roy maintains that even among higher animals there are rules of conduct, which are biologically inherent by man and find expression as the sense of morality. He writes, “One knows from experience what is good for him and what is bad for him. Therefore, he generalizes that what is good for him is good for all like himself, and what is bad for him is bad for all. That is the origin of
morality". Nobody wants that his property should be stolen by others. Therefore, no body should steal the property of other people. Thus non-stealing becomes the moral value. Moral values are based upon rational or enlightened self-interest. This rationalistic ethics is secular in character because it is based upon the innate rationality of man and does not derive its sanctions from any supernatural authority. Moral conduct based upon the fear of God or state is not true morality. To be real, morality must be voluntary and spontaneous and man can be moral spontaneously and voluntarily, if the sanction of morality can be traced to the innate rationality of man.

Roy divides moral values into two categories- changing values and basic values. Changing values are depended upon social conditions. But there are some other moral values which, despite being enriched and amplified in the course of human experience, must be accepted as basis human values. Only these moral values are eternal and immutable, because these are not causally dependent upon the material conditions of life. These types of moral values are dependant on rational justification. "To be moral needs to be human," Roy, says, "values are Sui generis; they are born in our conscience; they are not deduced from facts; they are farts." According to Radical Humanism, moral values are derived from
natural moral impulses. Self-awareness, awareness of one's own feelings and thoughts is a distinguishing attribute of human mind. So, when an individual experiences within himself an impulse of kindness or compulsion and says to himself that it is good impulse, a moral value is born. Kindness, honesty, truthfulness and on a higher level of sophistication, justice and equality, are moral values. They are moral because they promote co-operative social existence. Morality can be described as conduct impelled by those moral impulses and values.\(^98\) Man will be moral if he respects himself and remains loyal to his own conscience. Man therefore, must be made conscious of his own self, if the problem of morality is to be solved. It is also true that in some cases immorality results from some objective condition such as poverty. This can be solved by changing environment. But in all cases immorality can not be explained by the environmental factor. Much depends upon the character of man, so unless the character of man is reformed, the basic moral problems cannot be solved. To Roy, solution of this problem is the training of the will and education in values. This training will be secular in character and would awaken the conscience of man. In an atmosphere of corruption and dishonesty, Roy retains his faith in man because he thought that man is essentially rational and potentially moral.\(^99\) For this reason, M.N. Roy considers basic moral values are unchanging. He says

\(^{(176)}\)
“Morality will be a soul killing virtue, if it can not cohabit with pleasant, the enjoyable and beautiful”. 100

To Roy morality ultimately is an appeal to conscience and “man’s consciences nothing more mysterious than the measure of the consciousness of his social responsibility”. The only way to make man moral, is to make him conscious of his own rationality and social responsibility. 101 A man with a sense of social responsibility cannot be immoral, because his own conscience will keep him on the path of morality. 102 Roy says “only moral man can constitute a moral society, only rational man can constitute rational society”. 103 According to Radical Humanism, reason has also a social role. It expresses the irrationality and injustice of established traditions and institutions, social, economic and political, and thereby improves the moral standards prevailing in a society. 104 Roy says, “A radical humanist begins from himself.” The individual being the starting point of New Humanism, its practice must necessarily starts from the action and behavior of individuals. “A number of individuals who feel necessity of a world populated with rational and moral beings will begin by themselves becoming moral and rational individuals. Naturally when a hundred of them will be guided by the same ideal and will be engaged in the same
practice, there will be co-operation among them. A humanist movement will develop among such groups of Humanists. They will not entertain and pursue a distant ideal of a better society, but they will create, and constitute by themselves, the epitome of the rational and ethical society, that New Humanism visualizes.” He also maintains that he does know how long it will take to change the world by creating moral society. He says, “The shortest way of changing society will be to change myself and become a moral human being”.

105

Roy identifies moral instinct with the urge for freedom. Regarding supreme value Roy says, “I regard freedom as the supreme value from which all human values are derived.” Freedom is the supreme value because the urge for freedom is the essence of human existence. Since all ethical values are derived from the soulless animal heritage of man, they need no sanction, which transcends human existence. Morality is a human attribute of animal heritage. To be moral man need not be a slave of God or of his own prejudice, one need only to be human. Humanist morality is therefore evolutionary. The basic incentive of organic becoming is the straggle for survival. It goes throughout the long process of biological evolution until in man it becomes the conscious urge for freedom – the supreme human value. This urge enables man to acquire knowledge and
conquers his environment by knowing it. To Roy truth is a value, which is content of man's knowledge. Though it is a value, it is not derived from facts. It is a fact and is objectively real. Quest for freedom, knowledge and truth – that is the hierarchy of Humanist axiology. Values are interrelated, logically as well as ontologically. That is why he says “freedom can not be attained by immoral means, nor an enlightened man ever been a liar. Freedom, Knowledge and Truth are values to be appreciated together by living them”. So, V.M. Tarkunde one of the followers of Roy’s Radicalism says, “For a rational individual, there can not be any incompatibility between freedom and morality. On the contrary, it is only a rational and moral individual, who can live freely in an organized society”.

**FREEDOM:**

The concept of freedom in M.N Roy's philosophy plays an important role. Freedom, morality and humanism are the three main pillars of his philosophy. His love for freedom is unique. From his early days until his death, the ideal of human liberty is his purpose, ambition and goal. “If rationality is the foundation and morality the superstructure built upon that, freedom is the coping stone of Roy’s philosophical edifice.” His concept of freedom begins with the freedom
movement of India and takes the completed form with the freedom of man. It included physical, intellectual, moral, etc. i.e. completed freedom of man.

Ancient literature of Greece and of India and also the other parts of the world, show that similar ideas regarding struggle for freedom and quest for knowledge are developed. "Man was not born free. Man was born to be free. To be free is the essence of human life". Men is not born free, because he is a slave to his circumstances in which all the forces of nature are weighing him down. So man has to struggle against nature if he wants to live. In the second theses of Roy's Principles of Radical Democracy, he says; "Quest for freedom and search for truth constitute the basic urge of human progress. The quest for freedom is the continuation, of a higher level of intelligence and emotion of the biological struggle for existence. The search for truth is a corollary thereof. Increasing knowledge of nature enables man to progressively free from the tyranny of natural phenomena, and physical and social environments. Truth is the content of knowledge."

Knowledge is the power of man to understand and control nature. "Freedom requiring knowledge; knowledge, giving the power to be
While discussing the point in the meeting, preliminary to the Third All-India Conference of Radical Democratic Party, Bombay, December 25, 1947, M.N. Roy mentioned that, in the negative sense, the struggle for existence, is quest for freedom; because the struggle for existence is the striving of the organism to free itself from the tyranny of nature. Quest for freedom is purposive. So, when the struggle for existence takes place with purposive ness, at the human level of evolution, it is called quest for freedom. Thus, quest for freedom becomes identical with the struggle for existence, where latter is progressive as well as purposive. "Therefore freedom must be defined as progressive disappearance of the manifold impediments to the unfolding of the potentialities biologically inherent in man." He had admitted that in this point, his philosophy is different from orthodox Marxist theory.

But a question can be raised, as M. N. Roy mentioned in his second thesis "search for truth is a corollary to quest for freedom", because Freedom is a human ideal, whereas truth is a metaphysical category. He was aware of this question and explained its cause as to how we can deduce one from the other. To him truth is not a metaphysical concept, but a matter of human experience. It is a matter of fact, which is correspondence with objective reality. Roy holds that on the human level,
the biological struggle for existence and survival is no longer, carried on through mechanical adaptation. It consists in positive efforts for the conquest of nature. Mechanical evolution ends, when man discovers his ability and then purposive ness becomes the basic feature of the subsequent biological evolution. This purposive ness differentiates man from his immediate ancestors. With it, the blind struggle for existence becomes the conscious quest for freedom. From that, humble beginning man comes to the modern scientific age with its modern technology, powerful instruments for conquering nature. All these are invented by man not for mere existence but as a quest for freedom. Science, which is a search for truth is thus, a by-product of man's quest for freedom. Therefore, the search for truth is a corollary to the quest for freedom. In this process, expanding knowledge of nature increases man's power to conquer nature that is, quest for freedom. Knowledge is always acquaintance with reality. Truth being correspondence with reality is the content of knowledge. Thus, freedom, knowledge and truth can be woven harmoniously in the texture of one philosophy. \textsuperscript{114} It is a distinctive feature of a truly revolutionary social philosophy results from the discovery of the inter-relation between freedom and truth. \textsuperscript{115}

Thus, freedom to Roy is a process. It is a continuation on a higher
level of intelligence and emotion, which is related to man's biological struggle for existence. It has a great emotional potency. This is because man and his pursuit of happiness depends upon the nature and efficiency of those means which culture gives man in his struggle with the environment to attain freedom.\footnote{116} Thus, freedom should be understood in the context of happiness. To promote human personality and to safeguard man's happiness, freedom should be the basis of human consideration. He conceives freedom as the driving force through which man can standardize his life.

M. N. Roy is not satisfied with physical freedom alone. At the beginning of his political career he is influenced by Marxism and Communism, the chief belief of which, is man's economic needs and economic destiny.\footnote{117} The faith of Marxism is, "Society will be free by freeing every of its members"\footnote{118} M. N. Roy asserts, that economic freedom is not the only freedom, but to him without economic freedom, much of life will be not only difficult but impossible.\footnote{119} So, the economic structure of state, according to Roy, is to be such as to afford to all individuals, the highest possibility for the satisfaction of the human urge for freedom. It should eliminate the possibility of exploitation of man-by-man. At the same time, he maintains, for this purpose full advantage of
modern science and technology must be taken. But later on he changes his view and gives much importance on intellectual freedom of man. He agrees with Laski when he said that freedom is more of a part of civilized living rather than certain specific economic and social privileges. It is a kind of positive concept without which any kind of cultural and civilized living will be impossible. Therefore, he values intellectual freedom as one of the most desirable for human happiness and cultural progress. Thus he becomes a life long fighter against all those forces which make man mentally and intellectually slavish. To him will to freedom and rationality are two basic traits of human nature and all progress in human history follows from this human nature. The will to freedom supplies the urge and reason shows the way. One supplies dynamism and other gives direction. Thus, human progress is possible both for controlling power of reason and the driving power of emotional urge. Above all, freedom of thought, ideas is the urge to all human activity and progress.

His indifference attitude towards God and religion is a result of his love for intellectual freedom. So to Roy one of the meanings of freedom is the freedom from believing any spiritual concept like God, "because if man is not spiritually free, he cannot conquer freedom on this earth." His theory of spiritual freedom is based on, his practical experience and
observations. So for him freedom is not a mere imagination or a speculation. He says, “I deduce my conclusions not from books but from experience……. Ever since my boyhood, I have fought against injustice and for freedom when I realized that God presented the greatest obstacles on the path of human freedom, I rejected God and since then I have fought against those who claim to derive their authority from God”. The desire for freedom in social and political life, being an expression of the basic human urge for spiritual freedom. This can be satisfied, only by actions according to general principles deduced from a worldview, which does away with the necessity of assuming a supernatural power or metaphysical sanction. Only man as a part of self contained, self-operating, self-sufficient world can claim to be free. He denies any supernatural power like God. To him this spiritual freedom is possible only through the evidences provided by modern scientific knowledge. The capacity to be free is in each individual; being conscious of it, he became free and a free society will be the creation of such spiritually free men.

To him Religion itself is an expression of man’s urge for spiritual freedom. History of religions from animism to teleological rationalism reveals the tendency. There was a time, when man had not sufficient
knowledge and hence no power over his environments. At that time, man’s only possible freedom was of running away from life. Because he knew that, his enemy is stronger than him, so he ran away without fighting and enjoyed freedom in imagination and peace outside the world of human society. But according to Roy, real spiritual freedom is not to run away from the world. None can run away from the life today. Today we have to fight for our freedom. In that fight, we shall find our spiritual liberation. "In proportion as I feel that I develop the power to resist the temptation of following that way of least resistance and to overcome those enemies which are trying to thwart and overwhelm man in his fight for freedom, to that extent. I have unfolded by human potentialities and to that extent I am spiritually free."\(^{131}\)

M.N.Roy regarded freedom as the supreme value, which is the source of all human values. Freedom is the supreme value because the urge for freedom is the essence of human existence. It is never in the danger of being mystified because it can be traced all the way down the process of biological evolution; "indeed it is coincident, if not actually identical, with life".\(^{132}\) Freedom is not granted as a gift by any authority or by any body. Individual alone could experience freedom. Man is therefore truly; the measure of things. In this point, his view is similar to
the famous opinion of Greek philosopher Protagoras, 'man is the measure of all things.' Freedom and progress in society can be measured, as the freedom and the progress of the individual. The main point of his departure from Marxism lies in this point, as it minimizes human freedom. Roy writes, “Collectivism, economic reorganization, abolition of private property in the means of production – none of all these are the measure; the measure can only be man; that society which gives the greatest measure of freedom to the individual, the freest society”. To Roy freedom of society means the totality of the freedom of the individuals. That is why if we reduce individual freedom, the totality of freedom is also reduced. Thus freedom can be enjoyed by an individual only in society, and this requires that a freedom individual, must be an autonomous moral being. “An individual who is incapable of moral behavior of his own volition can not be a free person.” Thus, to him freedom cannot be attained by immoral means.

M.N. Roy did not consider freedom as a utopia. So he is very careful to define its scope and limits, “Freedom is not a beautiful castle built in the air of imagination. It rest on the triple pillars of humanism.” With the practical insight into the domain of the modern world, he fabricated a structure of freedom where he places intellectual freedom at...
the apex. He also realizes the problems associated with the concept of freedom, with the very down of human culture and history. His approach is scientific and rational.\footnote{137}

M.N. Roy places individual at the centre of his social and political philosophy and considers freedom as the freedom of the individual. However, he is also conscious about the limits of liberty for the individual. To him the individual does not have the freedom to do whatever he likes, this would negates the basic purpose of freedom and society.\footnote{138} The state should interfere only for the welfare of the community. He has no dream to make everyone free and allow absolute utopian freedom. He expresses a very realistic attitude regarding political freedom of man. To him the presence of foreigners would not enslave a nation. Even the mere presence of nationals would not make a nation free. “It makes no difference whether the relation of exploitation is between men born in the same country or those born in different countries.”\footnote{139} His view is very realistic and applicable in the present day context. Thus, he has struggled for real emancipation of the masses, which alone would make a nation free in every aspect of life. He also confronts with another problem of freedom in the domain of socialism. Socialism has needed a degree of sacrifice from the individual. To him this sacrifice meant a
degree of bondage. For this reason, perhaps, he changes his view regarding economic freedom of Marxism. He wants to free himself from the Marxian orthodoxy.

M.N. Roy wants to make his New Humanism a theory of freedom. To him civilized existence of society is possible only through freedom. Because, man is the measure of everything and quest for freedom and search for truth constitute the basic urge of human progress; the need for freedom is the most vital and important. He considers freedom as a positive concept. It is the positive quality of human behaviour. It is an activity spontaneously planned, efficiently executed, and enjoyed in its results by all those who have contributed. Freedom gives man the power to anticipate and establish values by guidance of which man can engage in social and communal activities and does reach new goals and enjoy them with enlightened pleasure. Thus Freedom is not an abstract concept. It means the right of individuals to choose how best each can unfold his or her creativeness and thus make the greatest contribution to common welfare and social progress. M.N. Roy opens a new vista of valuation as far as freedom is considered in the context of modern political philosophy. It is thus, Radicalism is more a theory of freedom than anything else.
Roy’s concept of freedom is a broad concept, which includes different aspects of the term in relation to man. After being free, Man must be able to enjoy the freedom. He should not only win over the physical obstacles, he must be able to enjoy economic sufficiency and security and be able to live in a social psychological atmosphere free from all kinds of cultural and intellectual regimentations. He must be able to realise that he has freedom. 145

Roy tries to reconcile mechanism with teleology. While explaining human evolution he adopts mechanical evolution. However, Roy explains that after man discovers his ability to reason, it becomes purposive. Purposiveness becomes the basic feature of subsequent biological evolution. “On the Sub human level, that is a very largely mechanical struggle. But quest for freedom is purposive. When the struggle for existence takes place with purposive ness, on the human level of the evolution, we call it quest for freedom.”146

MAN AND SOCIETY:

Radical Humanism of M. N. Roy, as a social philosophy starts from the root of society i.e. from man. In the twenty second theses of
Radical Humanism Roy says, "Radicalism starts from the dictum that 'Man is the measure of everything' (Protagoras) or 'Man is the root of mankind' (Marx) and advocates reconstruction of the world as a commonwealth and fraternity of free men, by the collective endeavour of spiritually emancipated moral man". Explaining this Roy says that he does not say anything new, he has just explained what Protagoras had said already more than 2500 years ago and which was more explicit in the philosophy of Marx. Roy says, "First comes man, then mankind, the individual is antecedent to society".  

Regarding the origin of the relation between individual and society there are two different views as Roy has mentioned. The first one takes society as given and then to find out the ways and means for adjusting the individuals relation to society. This view gives priority to society and regards individual as a part of society. The other view is just reverse to it. It regards the individual as basic unit and society as the creation of man. Roy accepts the second view regarding the relation between man and society, because he thinks it to be empirically sound. He says, "Man created society for his purpose, and logical corollary of this view is that social relations- political, economic, ethical, spiritual- all the various kinds of social relations must be adjusted so as to promote the purpose of
the life of the individual". The second view is logically consistent as it accepts the scientific theory about the descent of man. This theory explains, as Roy maintains that as soon as the human species come to existence, it felt the need for corporate life. In order to combat the forces of nature and defend themselves against various adversaries, they felt the need of some organization, and that is how society was, created. In this connection, Roy holds that his method to this problem is logical. He says, "I am inclined to take a logical approach to the problem rather than what is called empirical or pragmatic approach".\textsuperscript{148}

This second view, which Roy has accepted, is opposed to the early seventeenth century conception of social concept. In this context, another question raises by Roy is the purpose of human life, because he thought that a social organization and various social relations would be harmonious and ethical only to the extent that these relations will promote the purpose of human life. However, he has equally conscious that on the sub-human level, life has no purpose yet the roots of the purpose of human life can be traced in the sub-human biological evolution. At that time, human purpose is struggle for existence. However, after the appearance of the human attributes of will and intelligence, this struggle is, carried on a higher level. Then mechanical
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adjustment transformed into intelligent choice, which presupposes judgment. He deduces the functions of morality and all ethical values from that capacity of judgment. This conscious will and intelligence become the urge for freedom to Roy. Thus, struggle for existence on the human level becomes conscious struggle for freedom and the creation of society itself is an expression of that free urge. Therefore, society had created to fight against the various forces of nature, wild animals and other natural enemies, which would have destroyed human species. \(^\text{149}\)

Thus society originates for human needs.

Like Hobbes, human nature for Roy is essentially egocentric, and it is for the satisfaction of the individual's urge for freedom that social obligations are accepted. Again, regarding this transformation of man's egocentric to altruistic nature Roy explains that, since the individual interest is promoted by collective interest, individual selfishness becomes enlightened selfishness or collective selfishness. Therefore, the feeling of self-interest should not be destroy, but it should be extended to a wider field. \(^\text{150}\)

Again in order to exist in a society and built up a society which would help him to live and grow as an individual, the human being had to
adjust himself to the needs and desires and sentiments of other human beings also. In the course of time, civil society, and later on political society was, created and subsequently, it had to be economically organized. Therefore, society becomes more and more complicated. However, Roy explains, all this was, done with the original purpose of helping man to develop the potentialities inherent in him as a biological organism. Explaining the relation between individual and society Roy tries to reconcile all aspects of human needs, i.e. economic, cultural, educational and also political needs. That is why Roy holds that the first purpose of any social organization is to guarantee every member the prerequisites of physical existence. “Thereafter, every body being biologically endowed with mind, the ability to acquire knowledge, this capacity has to be cultivated. The process of this cultivation leads to organized cultural and educational activities. That is the second purpose of a social order, (the first included economic organization).” Roy is equally conscious about the inequalities of human beings, due to which conflict arises when a large number of people live together. So the necessity of a political organization i.e. state arises to control the conflict among people which may develop violent form. Therefore, the purpose of society is to explore the free development of human personality i.e. intellectual, moral and spiritual development of human being. Otherwise,
fullest freedom of the individual and a harmonious social order is not possible\textsuperscript{151}.

Therefore, according to Roy to explain the correct relation between individual and society, we have to start with the essence of human nature. As Roy's method is logical, he starts from the hypothesis that as a product of evolutionary process human nature is rational and therefore the original creation of society was a rational act. Thus, to Roy man is the archetype of society and the worth of any society is, determined by the standard of the individuals. "A good society can be created only by good men. A rational society, a moral society only by rational and moral men."\textsuperscript{152} Roy says, "A point has no existence except in space. Similarly, while individuals cannot, exist independent of society, yet society is no more than an integration of individuals, and if you want a good society, you must have good individuals. Until now, we have put the cart before the horse, and said that we must have a good society in order to have a good man. That led to the theory that in order to reconstruct society, we must have capture power first, and that this end justifies all means. At that point, all "goodness" goes by the broad. To make a good society even bad means are justified. But bad means spoil good men. In the process, good men become bad. And bad men can not make a good
Many civilizations had passed away for the main reason that they would not produce good man, and ultimately failed. As society is constituted by individuals so, they should be able to play their due part with due attention. Therefore, to bring about good society, one has to begin educating man.

According to Roy, theory of revolution for any social change should be based on human nature. As by nature man is rational and moral, so revolution should be based on it. In order to bring about revolution only man's freedom is to be awakened. As by nature, man is rational and educable, so this can be done by educating people. Writing about Roy's theory of revolution, G.D. Parikh wrote, "Establishing a sound foundation for a belief in the educability of the human being, it emphasizes his intellectual and moral liberation as the starting point of all endeavours of social reconstruction." In the twentieth thesis of Radical Humanism Roy says, "Education of the citizen is the condition for such a reorganization of society as will be conducive to common progress and prospering without encroaching upon the freedom of the individual". Thus, Roy gives much importance on individual's intellectual capacity and education. However, to Roy, education must be given a top place in any culture, but mere expansion of knowledge and education will not be
enough. Education should not "intellectual tyranny" which leads man to slavery. Education should be based scientific knowledge in which religious education should not be included. Because he thought that religious education, deprive men's rational thinking and also narrow down their outlook. 

Roy maintains that, morality of man is an outcome of man's innate rationality. So, a moral order will result from a rationally organized society. Morality emanates from the rational desire for harmonious and mutually beneficial social relations. So social change is possible if man desire it, which is possible through rational morality. He claims that if "a small group of men, or a few individuals, can act rationally and behave morally and feel the necessity of creating a generally rational and moral atmosphere, it is possible that other men and women, as individuals, can also share that feeling. It is not necessary for us to wait until the kingdom of human comes on earth, but we can by our own efforts begin here and now creating the kingdom of man on earth." So he has suggested his followers not to preach morality but to practice it, because, in order to introduce morality in public life, some people must begin with practicing the ideas – they will preach. So, to bring about social change Roy says "Therefore the shortest way of changing society will be to change myself"
and become a moral human being. If I succeed, I shall have the confidence that others can and will do the same”. However, he is ignorant about the time, how long it will take to change the world and creating a moral society, because “all revolutionaries, may not believe in creating moral society”. However, he is confident about it that epitome of rational and ethical society is possible through humanist movement. Thus he has rejected the view maintain by some social philosophers of his time that unless social atmosphere change human nature cannot change.

Roy tries to establish such a social reconstruction through his social philosophy. Radical Humanism presupposes economic reorganization of society to eliminate the possibility of exploitation of man-by-man. Because Roy thought that for unfolding man’s intellectual and other finer human attributes, individual as a member of society has to satisfy material necessities. So the foundation of society will be based on, such an economic reorganization that will guarantee a progressively rising standard of living. The economy of such social order will be based on production for use and distribution with reference to human needs, and the economic life of society must be progressively freed from the paralyzing and corrupting control of vested interests. Therefore, he has proposed to establish a new society through his philosophy, which being
founded on reason and knowledge will necessarily be planed. “But it will be planning with freedom of the individual as its main objective. The new society will be democratic—politically, economically as well as culturally.” 160. The economy of the new society as Roy has proposed will be co-operative which will consist of a network of consumer’s and producer’s co-operatives, and the economic activities of the society shall be conducted and co-ordinated by the people, through these institutions. Again, this co-operative economy shall take full advantage of modern science and technology and effect equitable distribution of social surplus through universal social utility services. The culture of the new society will grow in an atmosphere of individual freedom and morality and the function of the state will provide maximum scope and incentive for all forms of creative endeavour. So, the primary task of his humanist movement will be “to bring about a cultural renaissance by propagating the philosophy of New Humanism and through its application to political, economic and other social problems”161.

In this context, Roy realizes the need of education, because education of the citizen is the condition for such a reorganization of society.162 So, the main task of radical humanists will be to educate the people in the democratic value of freedom, equality, rationalism, co-
operation and self-imposed discipline, and to set up appropriate institutions based on these values\textsuperscript{163}. Therefore, any theory of revolution, which restricts human freedom, has to be rejected by Roy. One of the reasons of Roy's departure from Marxism rests on this point. Because Roy believes that Marx's "classless society" minimizes human freedom for economic equality of society. Roy claims that a Marxist conception of freedom means slavery for the individual and a society composed of voluntary slave can never be free"\textsuperscript{164}.

The State is the political organization of society. Roy holds that just as society was a creation of man, the state was a result of a common realisation of the necessity of co-operation for the security of all concerned, and for the administration of public affairs\textsuperscript{165}. Roy traces the problem arises in the political field as ever since the days of Plato, the fundamental problem of politics has been the relation between the state and the individual. "This problem baffled the political thinkers to such an extent that modern political philosophy poses the individual as the anti-thesis of society. But it is thought that, the individual as the anti -thesis of the society then social progress is not possible, except at the cost of individual freedom, which cannot be harmonized with social organization. And, then the entire human history has been a failure. To
meet the problem Roy has proposed to re-examination of the fundamental problem of the relation between society and the individual, the individual and the state."\textsuperscript{166}

Roy maintains that political thought has gone from one fallacious doctrine to another because of the failure to reconcile this relation. The reason of this failure as Roy has mentioned, is the ignorance about the origin of man and also of society. He has suggested that if society is, regarded as the means for attaining the end of freedom and progress of man, then only this problem can be solved\textsuperscript{167}. But Roy claims that in the modern world, particularly since the middle of nineteenth century, the individual has completely disappeared, not only from the frankly reactionary political thought but also from the so called progressive and liberating political ideologies \textsuperscript{168}. Thus, the end has been forgotten and means has become all in all. A false conception of the place of man in the society is the cause of crisis that prevails in the modern society, which divorced ethics from political practice. Therefore, Roy says, “Unless we can go to the root of this crisis, we can not overcome it.”\textsuperscript{169}

Roy maintains that essentially state is the political organization of society and rejects Marxian interpretation of state. Roy originally as a
Marxist, believes in Marxian doctrine 'man is the root of mankind'. However, he is not agreed with Marxian interpretation of private property and state. For Marxist the means of production should not be own privately, but by state and then there will be economic equality and political equality will result automatically. The state according to Marxism is the instrument of class in power and when there will be no class, state will automatically disappear. It is, also assumed that, a very highly industrialized society need not to be politically organized. But Roy claims it as Marxian Utopia, which can never be reached, and if freedom of the individual is possible only in that Utopia, man can never be free. To the assumption Roy adds 'a collective ego’ and holds that, society was to be reorganized to promote collective social progress.

Radical Humanism of M. N. Roy holds that social progress is largely due to this co-operative spirit of man and not due to any struggle whether between individual or between classes. The individualism of Roy thus may be called co-operative individualism. This co-operative individualism must be differentiated from the atomized individualism of the liberals and the collectivism of communists. The social world with its political system and economic order is however, wholly created by man for the promotion of its welfare. And the welfare of society is the sum
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total of the welfare enjoyed individually by its members. Therefore, to Roy State, which is the political organization of society and all other institutions and organization of society are created by man for promoting his own freedom.¹⁷¹

Roy’s solution to the crisis of modern society is philosophical revolution. His philosophical revolution starts from man, as he thought, “Man is the maker of history”. Thus, Roy’s aim of revolution is not changing the society, but educating the man to change the society after they have become good. In this context, Roy refers to Vico’s thesis that humanity is its own creation, that “the social world is certainly the work of man”. Man created society, state, various other social organization and institutions for his own welfare, and whenever the established social order stands in the way of his further development, he tries to change it and set up a better social system and thus history of man goes on.¹⁷² Roy says, “From time to time, the march of history is obstacle by the requirements of the established social order, which set a limit to human creativeness, mental as well as physical. The urge for progress and freedom, born out of the biological struggle for existence, asserts itself with a renewed vigour to break down the obstacle. A new social order conducive to less hampered unfolding of human potentialities is
visualized by men embodying the liberating ideas, and cultural values created in the past. A new philosophy is born out of the spiritual heritage of mankind, to herald a reorganization of society.”173 Roy finds such a philosophy in Radical Humanism through which he tries to solve the crisis of his time particularly in India. He starts his revolution from India to entire humanity. Through his new method of integral Humanism, he tries to bring out a social change in India. He thought that this Humanist movement will attract rational man and women who want to improve the public life of their cities, town and villages and spreading out from there, of the country as a whole174. So he claims, from an individual, then a smaller group, it will spread to entire humanity and a future rational and moral society will begin to grow. Thus, he regards man as the archetype of society and the potentiality of evolving the entire social pattern is inherent in every human being. Therefore, Roy says, “Man of the Renaissance – the universal man, the archetype of the future of a free humanity, did not belong to any country, any class, and any age. Embodying the culture of the past, they created a new culture which heralded a future still to come.”175

M.N. Roy is a strong advocate for the individual. During his time, the trend in political philosophy is more to place the group and not the
individual at the top. Therefore, his individualistic approaches make a radical change in this trend. He tries to distinguish between the individual’s welfare from social welfare. As individual enjoys the well-being, so individual should not sacrifice it for society as, Marxist held. But in the modern complex society Roy’s too much of individualistic approach is not practically possible. However, Roy’s interpretation of rational faculty and educability to bring about social change is acceptable because this will awaken man as an individual and his place in the society. With Russell it can be said, “You must admit that heredity has a part in producing a good adult, and that education is not the only factor to be considered.” Regarding the relation between individual and society, Roy’s main concern is Indian society, in which majority of people are illiterate, so they are not conscious politically and also about their position in society. May be that is why Roy gives much importance on education, for reconstruction of society.
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