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M.N. ROY’S ASSESSMENT OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Roy gave much importance on reason and freethinking. Therefore, his approach to his contemporary personalities was critical. He was a nationalist, Marxist and above all a humanistic philosopher. He worked with so many great personalities of the world during his lifetime. He was influenced by some of them, and also influenced them through his personality. As a Communist, he worked with Lenin, Stalin, Borodin etc., as a nationalist with Gandhi, Nehru and other nationalist leader of that time. Above all as a Marxist, he was greatly, influenced by Karl Marx. However, as a humanist he assessed his contemporaries like Marx, Gandhi, and Tagore etc. It is not possible to focus all the personalities that Roy had met. In this particular chapter, I have just focused on Roy’s assessment primarily on Marx and Gandhi and secondarily on few others.

(I) MARX:

M.N. Roy held that revolution is concerned with the ultimate things, and that the first necessity of revolutionary is a philosophy and his first choice of philosophy was Marxism up to the early 1940s. He
reformulated the Marxian philosophy in such a way that it appears as a philosophy of freedom\textsuperscript{1}. Roy's philosophy of Radical Humanism founded upon Marxism, but it diverse from it, in so many important points.

Marxism exists in two main forms, with intermediate mixtures. On one extreme, it is almost pure theory and on the other it is a practical politics. Marxism tended with Lenin was carried to its logical conclusion of subordinating the theoretical side of Marxism wholly to political opportunism. Roy was against Stalin, and never showed much interest in the Lenin's technique of bringing off \textit{Coups d' etat}. He always showed a feeling for the broad social effects of political and technical changes, within the general Marxian framework\textsuperscript{2}.

Roy was inspired by Marx's original humanism and by his social goal. He considered Marx as essentially a humanist and lover of human freedom. Like Marx, Roy regarded the physical being of man in constant relationship with nature, wherein man plays an active role. He was also inspired by Marx's basic doctrine "existence determines consciousness". He agreed with Marx that biological urge for self-preservation was the moving force. Again, Marx's socialism "as the kingdom freedom" where human reason will overcome the irrational forces, which now tyrannies
But to Roy, “I have never been an orthodox Marxist. My attitude to Marxism was critical from the very beginning” Roy differed from Marxism in several points. Although Roy was inspired by Marx’s basic doctrine “existence determines consciousness”, he would not go all the way with Marx and identify this with the economic interpretation of history. To Roy, Marx made a false distinction between primitive man’s intelligent effort to earn a livelihood and biological struggle for existence. Marx had wrongly held that the origin of society and subsequent human development were economically motivated. Physical urge and economic motive both were different to Roy. According to Roy, Marx had started from a society engaged in economic activity, not concerning the means of production, asked who produced the means of production. But for Roy means of production is produced from the ideal of means of production. This idea itself is the production of brain. He maintained that an idea in the brain of the ancestor of man, made the means of production possible. He explained it, with the help of biological struggle for existence. Man’s urge to be free, produced the idea of means of production. “The brain is the most powerful means of production; when you talk about means of
production, do not forget that". So man is greater than any means of production. That is the defeat of Marxism according to Roy, and he tried to free Marxism from its basic fallacy in his own philosophy of Radical Humanism. Roy criticized that Marx entirely ignored the entire process of becoming the man, before he entered into social relations. So he knew nothing of the human nature which underlies the ensemble of social relations, which induces man to enter into these relations.

Roy pointed out that the very principle of Marx’s dialectical materialism was absurd. To Roy, the methodology of dialectics could be applicable to the realm of ideology, not materialism. Therefore, the dialectical materialism of Marx was only in name, it was essentially an idealistic system. Roy claimed that the processes of nature can be explained without making use of dialectic. The analysis of matter by modern physics made him to reject dialectics in the domain of ontology. Again, the movement of thought from democracy to socialism is not dialectical but continuous. Roy criticised Marx’s materialism as dogmatic and un-scientific, because Marx did not carry the analysis of mental phenomena far enough, beyond the dawn of social history. Marx ignored the entire process of the becoming of man before he entered the social relation. Roy held that the substratum of the human nature is stable.
The becoming of man involves the parallel process of mental and physical activities. The relation between the two is not causality, but priority. From primitive consciousness, mind evolves in the context of a biological organism. Mental activities are determined in the entire stages by physical existence and thereafter by social conditions, but for Marx man's relation to matter is the relation of one material entity to other material entity.

Moreover, Roy held that the negation of a constant element in human nature lead to the negation of morality. Without the recognition of some permanent values, no ethics is possible. If morality is not found in human nature, it must have a transcendental nature. However, to Roy man is essentially rational and therefore mortal.

Again, if the principles of dialectical materialism and allied with that the economic interpretation of history are unsound, naturally the theory of class war is misleading, which is the key tenet of Marxism. Marx's doctrine of class war "makes social progress sterile and stagnant. If class struggle be the mark and measure of the class progress of society, then naturally there will be no progress when there is no class war." The cohesive force in society is the cause of progress in the society to
Roy. "No class is ever destroyed owing to its antagonism to any other class". "But there is another side of the picture- the cohesive force in society. Without that force, human society would have broken down long ago, and there would have been no evolution of civilization. There is some social interest which binds classes together."

Roy maintained that Marxism certainly was wrong regarding the role of the middle class in the capitalist society. Roy gave much importance on the middle class. Middle class attained great height in intellectual and political considerations. The importance of the middle class as a part of society was on the increase and it played an aggressive role in the history of many countries. The decay of capitalism economically ruined the middle classes and thus quickened in their minds a desire for a new social order. "Between capital and labour the middle class numerically grows, politically as an enemy of the status quo". Even to him the ideology of socialism was conceived by middle class.

Marx regarded "surplus value" as the source of increasing exploitation by the Capitalist class. Roy remarked it as the fundamental fallacy not only Marxist economics, but of the entire philosophy of revolution. The surplus value, of Marxist economics was called by Roy
the lever of all progress. This 'social surplus' was the marginal product which was not consumed by the labour of community. Roy held that economically, a demand for the abolition of surplus value was impractical. "Social surplus will disappear if production of surplus value is ever stopped; then, with the disappearance the lever of progress society will stagnate and eventually breakdown. Ancient civilizations disappeared, owing to inadequacy or shrinkage of social surplus". Roy asserted that for the development of society, it was necessary that everyone must produce something more than what was just enough for himself.

Again, Roy held that the appropriation of social surplus by one particular class was certainly an undesirable system. But, the sanction for the demand was not economic, but moral, social justice demanded it, which would not result from Marxist scheme of revolution. Marxist implicitly admitted that even under the socialist economic system, social surplus was produced in the form of 'exploiter should be exploited by the proletariat'. That evidently meant that under the new order, the social surplus was appropriated, by the new ruling class - the proletariat pending the advent of the utopia of a classless and stateless society. Roy held that
the ideal of a stateless society would never be realized, because state is the creation of man through which man realizes his freedom.\textsuperscript{21}

Regarding the role of individual, Roy made a significant departure from Marx. Roy thought that Marx was blinded by his sense of the overwhelming importance of social factors in human character, which eventually made him consider the individual as an abstraction and consequently attribute all reality and potency not to individuals but to classes. According to Roy, Marx ignored the self-evident truth that society is an association of individuals.\textsuperscript{22} "Man must be man, individually conscious of his dignity and creativeness, before he can make history not the masses."\textsuperscript{23} Roy maintained that the community is the creation of individuals to server the interests of individuals. The basic biological urge of self-preservation made individuals realize the necessity of combining in the struggle for existence. It never meant that subordination of the individual to society. So, unlike Marx Roy held that society was the means and the individual the end.\textsuperscript{24}

Roy explained that Marx was an advocate of freedom; and as a Humanist, he stood for the freedom of the individual. He talked of socialism as 'the kingdom of freedom,' where man will be the master of
his environments. However, he also criticizes Marx as, “one who preached such a humanist doctrine could not be a worshiper at the shrine of an exacting collective ego, even of the proletariat”. “The positive value of Marxism can be appraised only in the context of liberal tradition”25. To Roy, the social relationship should be to secure for individuals, as individuals, the maximum measure of freedom. The sum total of the quanta of freedom actually enjoyed by its members individually was the measure of the liberating or progressive significance of any social order. A political system and an economic experiment, which subordinated the man of flesh and blood to an abstract collective ego, could not possibly be the suitable means for the attainment of the goal of the freedom. It was absurd to agree that negation of freedom was the road of freedom. Therefore, “the purpose of all rational human endeavour, collective as well as individual, should be the attainment of freedom in ever larger measure, and freedom if real only as individual freedom”26. Explaining Marxist so-called stateless or classless society as a utopia, Roy maintained that in that utopia ‘man can never be free’ and that negation of freedom was logically inherent in the communist theoretical system. Therefore, Roy gave much importance on individual and his freedom27.
Regarding morality, Roy held that “Marx’s ethical questions were also of the tradition of bourgeois Utilitarianism”. Hegelian influence induced Marx to reject the individualistic approach to moral problems. The projection in the future of the Hegelian moral positivism made Marxian relativism dogmatic while the ethical relativism of utilitarian was rational. Hegelian doctrine held that ‘that present might is right’. Marx projecting the Hegelian doctrine into future declared that ‘coming might to be also right’. That influence of Hegel according to Roy, Marx broke away from his original moral Radicalism, which was the strongest appeal of the philosophy of revolution. So he criticized Marx as, “Karl Marx may have put Hegel on his feet but has certainly placed himself on the head”.

Roy rejected Marxism on the ground that what Marx had written a hundred years ago, was not applicable today. However, Roy called himself a spiritual descendant of Marx. Because he agreed, that Marx was a passionate Humanist and with a burning faith in revolution, he was a romanticist. As a romanticist, “he proclaimed his faith in the creativeness of man, which according to the process of social evolution, brought about revolutions. Marx, being a Humanist, the force of his theory of revolution was its powerful moral appeal”. So, Roy accepted
Marxism as a Humanistic Philosophy. But, the dogmatic rigidity of Marx was missing in Roy. Roy thought that his philosophy is the result of his critical approaches towards Marxism, which is free from orthodoxy. In spite of his regards to communism and materialism, Roy was inclined to believe in certain spiritual values in a limited sense. Here he comes closer to Buddha than to Marx. Roy said, “A philosophy, to be guide for all forms of human action, must have some ethics, some morals, which must recognize certain things as permanent and abiding in humanity. And only a group of human beings—be it a political party or any other kind of organization—primarily moved by these abiding (and I should say even permanent, as permanent as humanity itself) values, can claim to be the maker of the future”. He said that there are certain values, certain principles, which transcend time and space otherwise we shall have to lose faith in the progress of humanity. His acceptance of this abiding permanent principle and values is perhaps due to the impact of tradition and culture of Indian Philosophy on him. Roy said, “None can run away from his shadow. Over present is the result of our past.” In this point Roy comes closure to Buddha’s doctrine of dependent origination i.e. every origination depends on some cause. As a believer of freethinking irrespective of himself, his Radical Humanism is the outcome of his critical attitude towards Marxism.
(II) GANDHI:

Mahatma Gandhi, who was the father of modern India, regarded as another name for nationalism. According to M.N. Roy, “The two are considered to be identical”. That is why, “anybody who wishes to be recognized as an ardent nationalist must call himself a Gandhist. Nobody’s loyalty and devotion to the cause of national freedom is fully accepted, unless he professes to believe in certain doctrines and dogmas, which being associated with the name of Mahatma Gandhi, have come to be known as Gandhism”33. The lecture delivered at Barisal on April 21, 1940, he discussed this point. To him, perhaps Gandhi may be a nobler soul than the nationalist may and he may perhaps entertain ideas higher than the ideals of nationalism. But, in case of struggle for national freedom, “it is necessary for us to stop and think whether by accepting the principles of Gandhism we qualify ourselves for participating in the struggle for freedom of our country.”34

Both Gandhi and Roy was Nationalist. To Roy himself there are some similarities and also some vital differences in between his ideology of Radicalism and Gandhi’s ideology35. Roy had commented on Gandhi
in most of his writings. The first detailed critical analysis on Gandhi made by M.N. Roy, in his book India in Transition, which was written in Moscow in 1921. In his article regarding morality in political practice, he commented on Gandhism that it is a practical philosophy as it lays down codes of conduct and therefore, it must be pragmatically judged. Roy maintained that Gandhism is not utopian; it does not pursue a distant ideal, it is evangelist, like a revealed religion. The prophet delivers his message not through precepts, but by example of his life. That was the reason according to Roy, Gandhi may be remembered in history as one, whose life was his message and on that token, he failed. Because there may be none among the thousands of professed Gandhists who preached the gospel as well as live it. Gandhi had failed to introduce morality in political practice and because of that failure; Gandhism offers no solution of the crisis of modern culture.

To Roy, the core of Gandhism, its fundamental urge, is its hostility to industrialism and modern world. He not only rejected industrialism but also rejected nearly everything associated with it. One of such examples given by Roy that, the late Mahadev Desai, the Mahatma’s secretary, once formed the project of learning French, as he was a good linguist and a man of literary ability, but Mahatma forbade it, because to him learning
French was a sinful vanity and waste of time. Even Mahatma did not want us to know English; to him we must use Hindi, which is our own language. “At bottom he regards all learning and art as sinful, because they are enjoyable, and because learning is modern.” Gandhi was against western civilization. In the preface to the third edition of his book ‘Indian Home Rule’ he confessed- “I am not aiming at destroying railways or hospitals, though I would certainly welcome their natural destruction. Neither railways nor hospitals are a test of a high and pure civilization... It requires a higher simplicity and renunciation than people are today prepared for”. To Gandhi, India’s progress, political freedom etc. all is possible if India would discard modern civilization. His quarrel was not with the British government but with the ‘Western Civilization’. M.N. Roy disagreed with M.K. Gandhi. He claimed that the ideals of Gandhi’s philosophy are practically untenable in the present situation. Gandhi’s criticism of modern civilization, that is, capitalist society, is correct, but the remedy he prescribes is not only wrong but also impossible. Because, the remedy prescribed by Gandhi is ‘If India adopted the doctrine of love as an active part of her religion and introduced it in her politics, swaraj would descend upon India from heaven.’ To Roy one need not be a sentimental humanitarian, nor a
religions fanatic in order to denounce the present order of society in the countries where capitalism rules\textsuperscript{38}.

Roy differed from Gandhi, as for Roy, freedom, equality and democracy are impossible if we reject modern technology. These are also impossible without a high level of education. Education is an expensive matter, which a non-industrial society cannot afford\textsuperscript{39}. Criticizing orthodox nationalism, in his book, 'Fragments of a Prisoner's Diary' Roy mentioned, "give freedom to the women as in Europe and America, but don't let them abandon the ideal of Indian womanhood, don't let them to contaminated by the 'abuse' of that freedom, as is the case with the west, abolish the caste system, but guard against the promiscuity of western society; encourage capitalism, but avoid the greediness of western materialism; get rid of religions superstitions and have a rationalist view of life, but don't accept experimental science as only source of human knowledge."\textsuperscript{40} The western civilization is not altogether rejected; it is only asked to place itself under the purifying influence of India. Roy claimed that they have no courage to break with the old and embrace the new.

Gandhi wanted to uproot traditional Indian society rather than transform it. He tried to revitalize village as the basic social unit. For this
reason, he criticized the socialists for their advocacy of industrialization, which Gandhi equated with the introduction of large-scale machinery and its attendant disruption of India’s traditional village based economy\textsuperscript{41}. But like the Russian Marxist, Roy felt, “any attempt at social reconstruction based on traditional social units- with their underlying system of customs, values, behavioral patterns and forms of organization was doomed ultimately to failure and in the short run could only succeed in restraining social progress.”\textsuperscript{42} Thus, he disagreed with Gandhi and not appreciated Gandhi’s appeal ‘return to village’ to the Indian people and his revolutionary potentiality.

M.N. Roy persistently criticized M.K. Gandhi almost from the time he first appeared on the Indian scene. “Gandhi was a nationalist, not only in the sense that he wanted to secure India’s political independence but also in his attainment to Indian culture and he appealed to Hindu religious values to gain support for nationalist movement.” But to Roy Gandhi’s style of political leadership is an antithesis to the growth of democratic attitudes and also the values of subservience, submission and self-abnegation already enriched in Hinduism. Roy characterized Gandhi’s fasts as a form of moral coercion, which impedes the development of habits of rational persuasion and his arrogation of complete discretionary
power as authoritarian rather than democratic outlook. Again to Roy Hinduism is a slave ideology and Gandhi is like an ideological jailer who for centuries fetters the Indian mind in the name of spirituality. Roy argued that Gandhi would consign man to the suffocating restrictions imposed by caste system, religious superstition and village life.\textsuperscript{43}

Gandhi’s theory of ‘trusteeship’ for the welfare of the society was different from Roy’s view. Gandhi held that his object is to reach the heart of landlord and convert them so that they might hold all their private property ‘in trust’ for their tenants and ‘use it primarily for their welfare’. Gandhi’s ultimate aim was ‘the co-operation and co-ordination of capital and labour and of the landlord and tenant’. The wealthy persons accept it because it makes them appear virtuous and also at the same time protected their ill-gotten gains. This occasional donation to public cause, “strengthen their position .......... giving it moral sanction”. Jai Prakash Narayan also characterized it as a mixture of time economic analysis good intentions and ineffective moralizing.\textsuperscript{44} To M.N. Roy, this is the association of capitalist class with puritanical morality. The capitalist is cut off from society and this makes him feel guilty. He has often to do things which morality condemns, so he tends to atone for it by mortifying the flesh. “He wears coarse or severe clothes, lies on a hard bed, restricts
his diet, and so forth, and feels that the moral balance is thereby maintained. He does bad things and makes a lot of money, but after all he does not enjoy himself”. This Puritanism has the further advantage that it inspires both the capitalist and his employees to work hard and spend little. Thus this makes possible the accumulation of capital and survival in competitive economy. To Roy this was the reason, because of which Mahatma’s teaching had acquired great prestige among the capitalists of India. According to M.N. Roy Gandhiji’s politics was moral politics not rational politics. He did not agree with Gandhiji’s policy of social reform. He thought that Gandhian ideas on society and reforms would make the Indian people a backward nation in the world.

Radicalism of M.N. Roy did not accept this type of puritanical morality. To Roy this concept is a utopia that ‘spiritualizes’ capitalism. It is as Roy called ‘ethical capitalism’. Roy maintained that it is not a part of the ‘spiritual genius’ of India to abolish capitalism, it is only to ‘moralise’ or humanize it. Roy’s Radicalism did not strive to deny the world the benefit of technology or knowledge. Again, Radicalism had not tie to Capitalist or pre-capitalist social form as Gandhism in its alternative version appeared to be. To Roy “Gandhism is restrictive all round it wants to shut mankind in, to enclose it within national frontiers, to
deprive it of all that makes life worth living, of knowledge, of art, of frontier”. These were the main reasons, according to Roy Radicalism opposed to nationalism. Because their ideology is “to open the windows, to let all the winds of the world blow over the land, the art, the literature, the science, the technology of the world, to let people know them and enjoy them and profit from them”. Roy held that Gandhism is diseased at the core. It is the product of a pathological mentality, of guilt fear, obsession and self-hatred, but Radicalist ideas are healthy and national. Thus, Roy was highly critical of Gandhism. The very first issue on Gandhi entitled “Science and Superstition” which prompted Gandhi to remark, “Roy was his enemy number one”. To Phillip Spratt a Radicalist, “Roy’s approach to Gandhism seems that of an outsider, an unsympathetic foreigner”. For Spratt also Gandhism is a fascist ideology.

However, after Gandhi’s death, a new respect for him emerged in Roy’s thinking. “Although he continued to reject Gandhi’s religiosity and nationalism, in evolving his philosophy of Radical Humanism Roy come closer to Gandhi in his emphasis on human solidarity, the relation of means to end, the necessity of some form of economic and political decentralization and rejection of party politics”. Philip Spratt wrote that
what changed Roy’s attitude towards Gandhi was Gandhi’s campaign against the communal massacres, which came at the time of his own final disillusionment with communist political method. Spratt observed the similarity in Roy and Gandhi’s mutual opposition to Partition, and common spirit of their response to the communal riots. He remarked that on hearing the news of Gandhi’s assassination ‘Roy was deeply moved ........ hence forth a new respect for Gandhi showed in his writings’. In two articles of February and April 1948, entitled ‘The Message of the Martyr’ and ‘Homage to the Martyr’ Roy sets faith for the first time the extent of his ideological agreement with Gandhi. Roy realized that Gandhi’s revivalist nationalism was neither the essential nor the greatest element in Gandhi’s teachings, essentially, Gandhi’s message in a moral, humanist, cosmopolitan appeal. Roy was against the nationalism of Gandhi not his ‘moral and humanist essence of message’.

Thus, the common pre-occupation of Gandhi and Roy emerges from a similar set of ideological assumptions about the moral nature of men, and the possibility of creating a perfect social order of spiritually free men even as the ideal political leader, they are like a “Karmayogin” type, above the lust for power and occupying a position of pure moral authority. However, there is much in Roy’s thought that is not
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encompassed by Gandhi. Roy's aesthetic humanism, rationalism, and materialism distinguished him not from Gandhi but from any other tradition of thought in modern Indian\textsuperscript{52}.

Marx, Gandhi and Roy, the three different personalities preach three different ideologies- Marxism, Gandhism and Radical Humanism that are the humanistic philosophies. Although, all they are humanistic philosophers yet their methods of working and their interpretation of human development are different from one another.

Gandhi as a simple person believes on simple style of living. He was against industrial development, which uses science and technology for heavy production. “Gandhi’s path of utopia was straight and narrow and life in his ‘Ramarajya’ was to be simple, homogeneous and rather austere. Like Rousseau and Talstoy, he saw in science and technology forces, which not only made life complicated and alien to itself but also led to concern tradition of power and exploitation.” However, Roy deeply appreciates science and technology as a tool of development for the benefit of the people\textsuperscript{53}. Marx also supports science and technology for human development.
As a humanist philosopher, man is the centre of all their philosophy. For Marx ‘man is the root of mankind’, Roy believes Protagoras dictum ‘man is the measure of everything’ and Gandhi believes in ‘soul force’ of man. However, their approaches are different. Different from communism both Roy and Gandhi give much importance on individual freedom, which is not possible in the Marxian way. Marx approaches man as a part of society. So man should sacrifice his freedom for the sake of society. Roy and Gandhi give much importance on morality for social development but Marx on economic equality. For Gandhi a perfect society can be existed only the perfection of its members. Similarly, Roy maintains that a moral man can constitute a moral society. Gandhi’s ideal of moral freedom which he called swaraj, is based on love or soul force. Man for Gandhi is both an individual reality and a communal reality and it is love not pressure or co-ercion as Marxist hold that binds men into a community. He thus replaces the politics of the sword by morality of the soul power, compulsion by freedom, dictation by inspiration co-ercion by self-correction and governance from without any governance from within. Thus “The Gandhian and Marxist position that state is a co-ercion is similar only in form, but in substance, their of bring about stateless society are totally contradictory. Gandhi believes in the efficiency of non-violence for the socio economic and spiritual
salvation of the individual, while the Marxist stress upon violent revolution which could eventually bring about the withering away of the state. Roy at the beginning of his revolutionary life believes in violent revolution, but towards the end of his life when he establishes Radical Humanist Movement, he approaches, more on the individual human morality, that based on the revolutionary of man. To Roy all men are rational and therefore moral. Thus, man is potentially moral. Therefore Roy also gives more importance on the potentiality of man which Gandhi called the potential divinity of man. To Gandhi, this inner goodness of human being can be cultivated. Roy also maintains that the inner rationality of man can be cultivated through education and training.

Thus, Gandhi and Roy give much importance on individual aspect, and Marx on social aspect of man. Roy deviating Marx and Gandhi concentrate on middle class. For Marx class struggle is the key to social change. It is the struggle or war between capitalist and labour. As the capitalists exploits the labour class, so labour class should fight for their right through violent way also. For the equation, Marx prefers the classless society in which all people have equal right and wealth. Marx is concerned not with individual but with collective efforts. Gandhiji opposes the violent way and prefers non-violent way of non co-operation
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or 'satyagraha'. He gives much on the 'masses' not the 'classes', but he does not minimize the importance of the individual action. He holds that reform should proceed at both ends. Gandhi believes in the co-ordination and co-operation between capitalist and labour. So to him 'by changing the heart of the capitalist we can convert them, so that they donate their private property 'in trust' for the welfare of society. However, Roy believes that the middle class attains a great height in intellectual and political considerations. As a part of society, middle class plays an aggressive role. Even to him the decay of capitalism economically ruins the middle classes, so they try to bring a new social order. Thus for Roy also class is essential for the progress of the society. However, he gives primary importance to individuals. He is against both Gandhian and Marxian way of revolution, and attaches more importance on philosophical revolution than any other revolution for social progress.

(III) TAGORE:

Rabindranath Tagore, the renowned poet of India, basically was a humanist. At the beginning when Roy joined Nationalist movement, when his name was Narendranath Bhattacharya, he had been impressed by Tagore's patriotic songs, which were very popular at that time. Even he
remembered some of them to the end of his life. However, later on he became critical on Tagore’s view regarding nationalism. He did not appreciate Tagore’s view even after he had become a Marxist. In an article written by Roy in ‘The Masses of India’, he had expressed his reaction on Tagore’s view regarding property. In the article, he interpreted Tagore’s social views to be plea for the continuation of the present system of exploitation, or even worse, for return to the precapitalist patriarchal-feudal order. He criticized Tagore’s view, which Tagore expressed in his article on “City and Village” in Viswabharati that Property is the pillar that supports civilization, which is against communistic concept. Criticizing Tagore, Roy writes “The working classes in the advanced industrialized countries are not ‘gluttonous’, as a poet, born with a silver spoon in his mouth declares”. Roy thought that the world would be a much better place to live in when a comfortable human existence had secured for all. To him Tagore was against modern industrialism because it disrupted the class of landed aristocracy to which he belonged. He was against ‘gluttonous’ demand for a general rise in the standard of living, because an improvement in the material conditions of life correspondingly quicken the intellectual aspect of human existence, making the ancient benevolent patriarchy of Tagore’s ideas, a thing of the dead past. Roy thought that Tagore’s solution of the social problems
already left behind the evolution of modern civilization. But later on, when Roy moved from Marxism to radical humanism, he had read again Tagore’s ‘Nationalism’, ‘Gore’ and ‘the Kalantar’ essays, Roy felt that he had not been altogether fair to Tagore. Because he thought that there were some important points, of affinity between Tagore’s universalistic and decentralist ideas and the principle of radical humanism. Nonetheless, he did not even then feel much enthusiasm for Tagore.

As humanist and philosopher, both Roy and Tagore had much in common in their criticisms of modern societies and trends and in their proposed alternatives. As a Humanist both had placed man at the centre, and opposed those forces which affected man’s freedom. Modern civilization had tended to reduce men and women into one-dimensional individuals, who alienated from themselves and who had become manipulable almost like machinery. They strongly opposed, that aspect of modern civilization, which makes a man machine, minimizing human freedom. Both thought that for a morally desirable society self-training of the individual is very necessary. Both suggested some guidelines of self-training which involved development of man’s conscience and understanding and their concern for others and spirit of service and cooperation. Tagore saw such people as teachers, co-operators, Artists, and
Roy as friends, philosophers and guides. The common to them was to educate people so that they become universal individuals. From such individuals and their association would grow a movement in the direction of a morally desirable society. Both thought that only men and women of developing moral perception and dynamism could set in motion, a process that would bring society nearer to a moral and harmonious order. Again, both agreed that man is a product of biological evolution has the capacity to struggle against environment. Tagore says, "As an animal he is still dependent on nature, as a man he is a sovereign who builds his world and rules it." Tagore thought that man is not a tool in the hand of physical forces. Even man somehow has the capacity to play a part in evolution; he has the power to change the pattern of his behavior and responses. His responses are not automatic, they also cannot be pre-determined. However, he did not say that Nature or physical forces do not have any determining influences on man, because man is a product of biological evolution. Roy also thought that man is not the tool of physical forces and man has the capacity to struggle against those forces of nature. Roy also held that man as a biological species influence by general laws of organic evolution. He says, "Human nature, therefore, is determined by those laws. Subject, to an evolutionary process, it cannot be an immutable category."
Roy's reason or rational faculty was the 'surplus' according to Tagore. However, Tagore's surplus was an infinite aspect of man, which he called peculiarity, with which man appeared on earth. Tagore thought that this surplus enables man to transcend his limitations from which other animals can never free themselves. It is the capacity of going beyond himself. Roy also held that the rationality of man is innate. He says, "Human nature is essentially rational .................... human nature can evolve can be changed". Roy thought that this continuous change of human nature is the manifestation of the unfoldment of human personality. However, Roy rejected any infinity in man. Reason was the biological product of man.

Tagore and Roy both appreciated the multifarious ness of human needs and possibilities and recognized that science and technology were essential for the satisfaction of these needs and for the realization of these possibilities. Tagore was a religious man, but his religious faith did not prevent him from acknowledging the crucial importance of science in human development. In his view scientific inquiry and the application of scientific knowledge, instead of being distrusted and discarded, had to be guided by regard for human freedom, integrity and harmony. Sivnarayan
Ray, one of the Colleagues of Roy says, "I do not think that Roy would have at all disagreed with him on this score"\textsuperscript{64}.

Roy rejected the prophetic aspect of Tagore, because Tagore became the ‘gurudev’ to his admirers. However, he accepted Tagore as a poet because he thought that as a humanist poet, we could learn from Tagore. Roy says “Let the past bury its dead, however illustrious they, may have been and learn a motto of life from the poet Tagore – a poem he wrote before he became a prophet and began to preach mysticism as all prophet’s always do. However, the poet survives the prophet. Let us laugh at the prophet, but learn from the poet. Here is what you can learn’:

Let us go forward, forward brothers!

To lag behind, is to live for nothing,

What is the use of living a life, which is death?\textsuperscript{65}

Thus, Roy agreed with Tagore as a Humanist, faith on science and technology, uses of modern technology for the progress of the society. He admired Tagore as a humanist poet but in other aspects, he differed from Tagore. Roy was a materialist and had no faith on spiritualism, mysticism etc. which Tagore appreciated.
Roy was in contact with Nehru after his return to India. His relations with Nehru were more amicable, at first. Nehru had a high regard for Roy's intellectual capabilities and retained a soft corner for him in his heart until the end. Even commenting on Roy's condition when Roy was in jail, and imprisonment destroyed Roy's health, Nehru wrote that the life of one of the bravest and ablest of India's sons was 'sliding downhill to the brink'. Roy, on his part also had hoped to secure Nehru's help in radicalizing congress. At the congress session held in Dec. 1936 at Faizpur, Jawaharlal Nehru as a president of congress welcomed Roy 'as a well tried soldier in India's fight for freedom', who 'comes with fresh mind and heart', eager to take part in that struggle. Roy's attitude to Nehru was ambivalent, he felt attracted to him as 'a person and had a very high regard for him. He described Nehru, many years later as a man of modern education and culture, endowed with a high degree of moral integrity, refinement and personal charm. Roy thought that as far as Nehru’s personality embraces all these virtues and many other attributes of a modern civilized man, he stands far above the top leaders of his party and his colleagues in the government and even he

(87)
has no peer in nationalist India. However, Roy added that Nehru could become the hero of India nationalism, only as a spiritual son of Gandhiji⁶⁸.

However, later on Roy criticized Nehru because of his tendency to always compromise with the rightwing leadership and yield to Gandhiji’s influence, abandoning his own socialist position. For Roy the Congress Socialist Party had organized by the ‘group of people, who had not quite freed themselves from the influence of Gandhism and reformist varieties Socialism, and were excessively dependent on Jawaharlal Nehru, who in turn, could or would not break away from his dependence on Gandhi’⁶⁹. Roy thought that Nehru has the potentiality to become a great leader without others supports. Far from sharing the prevailing opinion, which looked upon Nehru as a Socialist’s natural leader, Roy regarded Nehru as well as Gandhi as an unwitting tool of the old guard⁷⁰. Roy was against Nehru because of his activities as a national leader. Roy considered nationalism as being the genesis of fascism, and he held both Gandhi and Nehru, responsible for fascist trends in the national life. However, later on Roy wrote about Nehru in a more sympathetic term. His harsh accusation of fascist leanings of either Gandhi or Nehru is, said to be one-sided⁷¹.
After independence when Nehru became the Prime Minister of India, Roy expressed his view about the policy of National Government at Calcutta Public meeting, in 1949. He argued that the best policy for the national government, just then over a year old, was to pursue a policy of neutrality. After a few years, India declared its foreign policy of “non-alignment”. That was Nehru’s contribution, who along Tito and Nasser, was the originator of global (or Third World) non-alignment. Thus, Roy’s “neutrality” changed to “non-alignment” in Nehru’s policy. Again, in an editorial in The Radical Humanist, on November 22, 1953, Roy strongly criticized reported negotiations between Pakistan and dubbed it as an “Ominous Perspective” Nehru until then been wooing the USA for India’s economic development and support on the Kashmir question, had disturbed by Roy’s pointer. He met Roy, on 13th. Of December and discussed what eventually became the central focus of India’s non-alignment policy. Nehru told ailing Roy “we have a lot of things to do together.” Roy did not survive long enough but Nehru had known of Roy’s appreciation of Tito’s “neutralism”. Nehru had influenced by Roy’s line of thinking to some extent.72
Roy's comments on Nehru, being critical as a Nationalist, but as a person he has a great regard for him and he would be a friend and well wisher of Roy till his death. Even Nehru contributed medical expenses for Roy when he was the Prime minister of India\textsuperscript{73}. Roy expressed his thoughts about Nehru and other great personalities in his book "Men I Met".

(V) OTHERS:

Roy was also in contact with many personalities in India, like Aurobindo Ghose, Vivekananda, Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai, Jaiprakash Narayan, and other nationalist and socialist leaders. Roy thought that the leaders of religions nationalism of the orthodox as well as the reformed school were Bipen Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghose who was the mentor of Roy at the time of split. However, Roy held, "its fundamental ideology was conceived by a young intellectual of petit bourgeois origin. He was Narendranath Dutta, subsequently known by the religious nomenclature of Swami Vivekananda."\textsuperscript{74} Roy thought that Vivekananda in early 1890 has felt the rebellious spirit affecting the lower middle class intellectuals. He had moved by the sufferings of the common people. Roy had impressed by Vivekananda's attitude towards new order and his
synthesisation of the old with new. "Declassed society, possessing a keen intellect, he made a spectacular plunge into the philosophical depths of Hindu scriptures and discovered in his cult of Vedantism a sort of Socialistic humanitarian religion. He was the picturesque and tremendously vigorous embodiment of the old trying to adjust itself to the new." Though Roy bracketed Bal Gangadhar Tilak with Vivekananda as "a prophet of Hindu nationalism", he ascribed to the latter a global role. "Spiritually must conquer the west. Now is the time to work for India's spiritual ideals penetrating deep into the west". Roy did not proceed to say that Gandhi was a sort of fulfillment of Vivekananda's aim because Gandhi seemed to him to be more in Tilak's line. 

About the movement of the Extremists, Roy said that the leader of this movement was Bal Gangadhar Tilak. He put forward his programme of "integral nationalism", which claimed that nationhood of the Indian people was a historically accomplished fact. Hence, the right to self-government was not conditional upon any preliminary evolution, social or economic. This challenge to the older leaders rallied the discontented and rebellious lower middle class youth around Tilak. Roy held that Tilak invoked the teachings of the Hindu scriptures and philosophy to serve the purpose of a modern political movement. He delved into history to find
inspiration for the present and sought to produce a magnetic charm in the
personality of the Mahratta hero Sivaji.” Roy had met Lala Lajpot Rai at
New York and is befriended by him. Later in his private memorandum
Lajpot Rai noted, “the only one of the Bengali revolutionaries for whom I
have had genuine respect is M.N.Roy.” Jayaprakash Narayan a socialist
leader had also influenced by Roy’s personality. He visited Roy once, to
discuss with him his ideas of non-party politics and decetralisation.
Jayaprakash stated many times later that his ideas on both issues were to
some extent influenced by Roy’s thinking. He was in touch with Roy’s
writings when he was in United States for studies in nineteenth centuries.
He was particularly, impressed by Roy’s two books ‘India in Transition’
and ‘Aftermath of Non-co-operation’. He was also a regular reader during
that period of Roy’s journal New Masses. However, they came together
after both had changed considerably. Commenting on Ranade, the social
reformer Roy held that he raised the sanctimonious voice of a petty
bourgeois moralist, because of Ranade’s view on 1900. i.e. “you can not
have a good social system when you find yourself low in the scale of
political right, nor can you be fit to exercise political rights and privileges
unless your social system is based upon reason and justice” Roy was
highly impressed by the intellectuals of his times. In Roy’s opinion, “the
intellectuals trained in modern political thought laid down the theoretical
foundation for the nationalism which was still to come, but the dynamic cause behind the movement was the economic revival of the native middle class after more than a hundred years of repression.” For all his criticism of the moderates and liberals, there was an underlying appreciation of them, a definite preference for them if the choice was restricted between them and religious nationalists.\textsuperscript{81}

Roy concluded his assessment of the liberals in the following words:

“\text{The national liberation of India, which would put her people on the road to moral and material progress, is not to be realized by political movements with orthodox reactionary ideology. This is the mission of the progressive bourgeoisie, the liberal intellectuals assembled at the first session of the Indian National Congress, heralded the birth of a new idea. Historically they were revolutionaries. They rebelled against two mighty forces, viz. those of social conservatism and religious superstition still dominating Indian Society, and the absolute political monopoly exercised by foreign bourgeoisie.”} \textsuperscript{82}

Towards the beginning of twentieth century when Marx’s ideology was in a critical period, because some thinkers tried to revise or
undermine it, some attacked it in the light of contemporary developments in science and philosophy, Lenin appeared in the screen to rescue Marxism from attack and misinterpretation\(^8^3\). Roy was connected with Lenin when he became a full-fledged communist in 1920. Roy had several meetings with Lenin and shared their thoughts. When Lenin first met Roy, he playfully remarked, ‘You are so young; I expected a grey-bearded wise man from East’. Roy had impressed by Lenin’s modesty\(^8^4\). Lenin had prepared a document called “Thesis on National and colonial Question” which was shown to Roy. But, Roy differed with Lenin, on the role of bourgeoisie in the movement for national liberation in various colonial countries. Roy played a “highly significant role in formulation and conduct of Comintern policy on the national and colonial question.”\(^8^5\) Roy was of the view that the bourgeoisie of a colonial country was not a revolutionary class, that it would enter into compromises with imperialism, and that the movement for national liberation in colonial countries should develop under the hegemony of workers and peasants led by communists. However, Lenin favoured the view that communist should support colonial nationalist movement led by the local bourgeoisie. Both agreed that the Comintern should support the national liberation movements against imperial power. But, Roy maintained that a distinction was to be made between a “revolutionary” and “reformist”
bourgeois democratic movement When the nationalist leaders belonged to the latter variety, communists should not collaborate with them. This view had incorporated in Lenin's thesis. Therefore, Lenin asked Roy to prepare an alternative thesis, as his knowledge about colonial countries like India and China was very limited. Roy prepared the supplementary thesis. Lenin suggested that after making some alterations, both the theses, his own and those of Roy should place for acceptance before the conference. This had done and the second conference of the Communist International adopted both the theses.86 "Comrade, I shall confine myself to a brief introduction, after which Comrade Maring, who has been secretary to our commission, will give you a detailed account of the changes we have made in the thesis. He will follow by Comrade Roy, who has formulated the supplementary thesis. Our commission has unanimously adopted both the preliminary thesis.87 Roy had impressed by Lenin's greatness. Commenting on Lenin, regarding the thesis and their meetings Roy wrote, "Lenin's attitude was very kind and tolerant. In the beginning, he appeared to be amused by the naivety of a no vice. But before long he was impressed by my arguments........, it was perhaps the most valuable experience of my life until then. I had rare privilege of being treated as an equal by a great man who proved his greatness by doing so. He could refuse to discuss with a young man of no importance.
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Roy had a great regard for Lenin as a Communist leader and for his contribution to Communist International. Appreciating Lenin’s contribution Roy says, “Under Lenin’s leadership the International has become a true International. ...... It was left to Lenin to save Marxism from the hands of the revisionists; ........... It was Lenin who told the avant-garde of the proletariat that in the Marxist sense the proletariat not only comprised the working classes of the develop imperialist and capitalist countries of Europe and of the Americas, but also hundreds of millions of working masses of colonial and semi-colonial peoples. This is Lenin’s greatest deed (Tat) to which I wish to direct attention on this opening day of the congress of the Communist International.”

However, in the later years Roy disagreed with Lenin in several points. Roy mentioned that when the parties of the Second International called upon the workers in their respective countries to participate in the last war, as a war of national defense, Lenin denounced the war as an imperialist war. He gave the slogan that the war should transform in to a civil war. The Russian Revolution triumphed with that slogan and the Communist International inherited the tradition. Ultimately, it approached the
situation created but the present anti-Fascist war with the old slogan of Lenin. It failed to see how the slogan was entirely in applicable to this war. Roy commented that Lenin's old slogan was not applicable to it because the war is a civil war and therefore there is nothing to be transformed.

Roy held that theoretically Lenin was the most intolerant defender of orthodox Marxism. He would not recognize the revolutionary significance of the middle class theoretically. He accepted it only in the field of organization. While discussing the organizational problem of the revolutionary party, Lenin admitted that the proletariat by themselves could not develop a socio-democratic consciousness, which must be brought to them from outside – by middle class intellectuals. Emphasizing this significant view, Lenin further said that, spontaneously, the working class did not become socialist, but trade unionist. That revealed the contradiction between Marxist economism and the theory that the Proletariat was the builder of the new order. Thus, he saw the mistake of ignoring middle class, and tried to rectify it, but only in the field of organization. In theory, the proletariat still remained the chosen people of Marxist world. But Roy gave much importance on middle class. He says, "The credit belongs to the middle class, which is very woefully
maligned and totally ignored in the orthodox Marxist scheme of revolution.” The ideal of socialism and theory of the proletarian revolution were not born out of the experience of the working class. Roy held that the result of Lenin’s realistic evolution of the working class was to super impose the party on the class, which it claimed to represent. But in no way, the party was the part of the class. Commenting on it, Roy writes, “But the dogmatic, uncompromising Marxist, Lenin was the theoretician of the principle which came to be the cardinal article of faith of the communist movement.” However, Roy agreed that Lenin and other Russians made valuable contributions to Marxism while they were preparing for the Revolution.

Stalin follows Lenin in re affirming his materialistic interpretation of Marxism. At the beginning, Roy’s relation with Stalin was very intimate i.e. from 1921. He met Stalin when he was very well. He met him several times and there began a close collaboration, which continued about six years. Roy had impressed by Stalin’s method of winning the confidence of his close associates; the method was to take over the sounder part of the views of others. At that time, Stalin was at the beginning of his relentless rise to power. Soon Roy was initiated in Stalin’s inner circle and could observe the ‘mastermind’ make far-
reaching decisions and eventually he came to be counted among Stalin’s young men."  

Roy’s differences with Stalin started during the time of Chinese Revolution, when Roy differed with Borodin regarding the method of revolution. Roy informed the matter to Stalin. Because Stalin had repeatedly said between 1925 and 1927 that for China and India, it was Roy’s alternative thesis that was applicable. After the settlement of the revolution when Roy returned to Moscow in 1927, he found himself in a strange situation. Although he pursued in China a policy approved by Stalin, the latter did not even see him to hear his version of what happened in China. In the sixth Congress of Comintern held in May-June 1928, and in the Tenth Plenum of Executive Committee of the Comintern held in July 1929, Stalin brought about some radical changes in the politics of the international communist movement. It had decided that in colonial countries, communists should have no truck with bourgeois nationalist parties. This meant the communists in India should sever their connections with the Indian National Congress. Again, it had also decided that socialist parties in Europe should be condemned as counter-revolutionary and opposed by the communists. This implied that the united front between communists and socialists to oppose the rising
forces of Fascism should be disrupted. Roy was against both these policies. He thought that in India, communist should work inside the nationalist movement in order to radicalize it, on the basis of economic demand of the peasants and workers. He was also in favour of the continuation of the united front in Europe between communists and socialists in order to oppose the rising Fascism. Roy published his view in the press of the Opposition Communist Party of Germany led by Heinrich Brondler and August Thalheimer, who had already incurred Stalin’s displeasure. This was the time when Stalin was engaged in liquidating all those communist leaders who had any independent opinions of their own. So in September 1929, an announcement had made in the Inprecor, on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Comintern that “Roy, by contributing to the Brandler press and supporting the Brandler organizations, has placed himself outside the ranks of the Communist International, and is to be considered as expelled from Communist International”. But later on in India Roy proved that his view was right. Though Roy worked outside India, he never forgot his country and its need. Roy claimed that the real reason for his expulsion was his critical mind and independent spirit, which had not prepared to bind by rigid party discipline.
Commenting on Stalin’s New Economic policy in Russia, Roy writes “The mistake or misfortune was to deviate from Leninist path; and Stalin was compelled to take that fateful step in order to retain the leadership of the party in the face of the powerful opposition of the ‘unprincipled alliance’ of the old Bolsheviks with Trotsky sus..... If Soviet economy under Stalin developed towards National Socialism, that is, because, as State Capitalism, Socialism can not be anything else.” Thus, Roy thought that Stalin failed to build the rapid economic successes.

Stalin died on March 6, 1953, paying his tribute to Stalin Roy wrote in a long article: “During these years of cold war between the communist and anti-communist worlds, Stalin personified the fearful specter of Communism invoked by Karl Marx a century ago. He was the most hated, feared and maligned man of our time. As the leader of an admittedly dictorial system, he was ruthless and at home committed and connivel with many unnecessarily cruel acts, which shocked the civilized world. But at the same time, he led a numerous people inhabiting one-sixth of the globe out of medieval darkness and economic backwardness. Centuries before him, Peter the Great endeavored to do the same thing. For that patriotic endeavour, he has gone down in history as a great man.

(101)
No great man has ever been an angel. Greatness is always purchased at the cost of goodness. Stalin did not do anything worse. He certainly deserves a place among the great men of history.” He again wrote, “Stalin was a man of peace, although he disdained to have peace at any price. He would go far to avoid war because he believed that under the present condition of the world, peace would promote the cause of communism. The future of the world will not be so very gloomy as it appears today if this true will be recognized by the anti-communist world. If that happens, Stalin’s death will mark the beginning of a new chapter in contemporary history—a chapter of mutual understanding and toleration. Stalin was undoubtedly the tallest personality of our time, and as such is bound to leave his mark on history.”

Again, in another article titled “Stalinism Survives Stalin” he had made some view about Stalin regarding his attitude towards peace. He wrote “certain sensational steps taken by the new Soviet Government, Reach offensive abroad and slackening of terror at home”. He regarded Stalin as a ‘revisionist, indeed heretical’ interpreter of Marx, but he attributed Russia’s survival and progress to the realistic policy adopted by Stalin in contrast to the orthodox Marxist policy advocated by Trotsky. Roy thought that Stalin followed the policy of peace not because he was a
“pacifist” but because “he knew that peace would be more advantageous for the consolidation of the Soviet Union than war”. He asserted that for the same reason Stalin’s successors were following the same policy98.

As a communist, Roy accepted Marxist philosophy and so he agreed with both Lenin and Stalin and with other communist leaders of that time, like Borodin Bukharia etc. But, he differed from such leaders on their policies and methods. Roy was a practical man and his attitude towards any problems was very practical. He was a believer of freethinking, so he expressed his view openly. Due to his boldness of thought, he never hesitated to criticize anybody. His relation with Borodin was so friendly. Even he believed the Marxist philosophy and became a communist due to his association with Borodin. However, later on during Chinese revolution he differed from Borodin. When their mission had failed in China, Roy blamed Borodin, who was ready to do everything for the bourgeoisie. When Stalin turned his back on the united front policy of alliances with nationalist movements or social democratic parties and changed the policy, Roy who generally agreed with Bukharia, also lost99.
Though Roy had met so many great personalities during his lifetime, the first person among them, who shaped Roy’s life into a new turn was Jatin Mukharjee. Roy loved Jatin, whom he regarded as a hero—the embodiment of all revolutionary virtues. He unquestionably followed his leader. Jatin, on his part, considered the young follower as his right-hand man. Roy’s attachment to Jatin Mukherji reveals a side of his character, which was to show itself several times in later life. Roy had emotionally attached with Jatin Mukherji. Not only Jatin Mukherji, Roy was capable of forming close emotional relationships with people under whose influence he came— for example with Lenin, Borodin, Carranza etc. Even though, Jatin Mukherji’s influence made a great impact on him. As for Jatin, the hero of his youth, he had this to say in his mature years, “I have the privileged of meeting many outstanding personalities of our time. These were great man; Jatinda was a good man, and I have still to find a better”100.

It is very difficult to compare Roy with the prominent people of his period, because the circumstances in which he worked and the fields that he covered are so unique that no comparison or construct is likely to be meaningful. Thus as a lifelong revolutionary and a thinker of great originality, Roy makes a position of his own in the international field.
According to the American political scientist Robert C. North, “Roy ranks with Lenin and Mao Tse-Tung in the development of fundamental communist policy for the underdeveloped, as contrasted with industrialized, areas of the globe”. This is why nearly forty years after his death Soviet academicians still continue to be troubled by Roy’s heterodox views during the 1920s on nationalism, colonialism and revolution. Roy’s attitude towards all was very critical. He accepted nothing without scrutinizing it. Perhaps, that is why, he critically analyze all the personalities he met. He writes about 21 such personalities including Trotsky, Mao-Tse-Tung of China, Tito of Yugoslavia, Ho Chi Minh of Vietnam, and also Gandhi, Nehru and others in his book ‘Men I Met’. At the third phase of his life, i.e. as a Radical Humanist, he had a liberal attitude to all. The personalities that he had boldly criticized earlier, he analyzed them liberally later.
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