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CONCLUSION

The concepts of 'freedom' and 'determinism' occupy an important place in contemporary Indian philosophy. Contemporary Indian philosophers consider 'freedom' as the inborn quality of man. According to these thinkers there are no contradictions involved in holding that man is potentially free but there are some obstacles which limit his freedom. They hold that there are many objective and subjective factors which determines man's freedom. Man can make an effort to overcome these obstacles. Thus man is both free and determined. 'Freedom and determinism' are related concepts. Freedom is freedom from determinism. In contemporary Indian philosophy 'determinism' is discussed in relation to freedom.

The four distinguished philosophers of contemporary Indian philosophy approach these dual concepts 'freedom' and 'determinism' from their own perspectives and give their own interpretations. So there interpretations present differences. They approach it from both subjective and objective standpoints. But each of these interpretations has a significance of its own. Each is unique in its own way. They reveal a new aspect of freedom. So, all these concepts deserve careful observation. It is also observed that the periods and the contexts in which they live have influences in their respective approaches.
Since the 19th century, there is a confluence of traditional Indian and contemporary western thoughts. Its impact is seen in the thoughts of many contemporary philosophers.

All these philosophers try to make man aware of the fact that although he is potentially free, his freedom is determined by various factors. They also try to make man aware of these various determinant factors which will help man to realize the truth. Although some philosophers talk about absolute freedom, their concept of absolute freedom is something abstract.

By observing the interpretations given by four distinguished philosophers on the concepts 'freedom' and 'determinism', we can find out their significance. In K.C. Bhattacharyya, it is observed that unlike traditional Indian philosophy, his 'concept of freedom' is not ethical. His concept of freedom is ontological as he considers 'freedom' as reality. But the process he recognizes is epistemological and psychological.

K.C. Bhattacharyya considers 'subject as freedom' and introduces a method of dissociation for the realization of freedom. For him, to realize the subject as freedom, the subject has to be disengaged from both the objective and the subjective worlds. Thus he indirectly establishes that the subject's inherent freedom is determined by the objective and subjective states. Although he recognizes this as a negative method for realizing freedom, he does
not consider his concept of freedom as negative and indefinite, but rather positive and definite. Because, he holds that in the state of ‘subject as freedom’, the subject is known as self-evidencing reality. Here the subject is self-revealing to itself.

K.C. Bhattacharyya’s explanation of the subject as distinct from the object is also appreciable. He makes a very clear explanation of the subject as distinct from the object. He holds that subject has being of its own from the ultimate standpoint. The subject is known in itself. But the object has no meaning without the subject. Subject in its perceptual body possesses a sense of uniqueness which is felt in one’s own subjectivity and not found in the apprehension of other’s subjectivity.

He makes the distinction between the subject and the object in another way. The subject is the source of all meaning. He gives a very clear explanation of meaning. Meaning may be understood in two different ways- which refers to some object or which is self-centred, and which does not refer to any object. It indicates that the subject can disengage itself from the world of object. In other words subject is known in itself. The subject is known in direct understanding of its meaning. The subject is known in the direct understanding of the word ‘I’ used by the speaker. We can take the name of Husserl, the phenomenologist, in
this line of thinking. Husserl maintains that ‘I’ the transcendental self, is the source of all meaningful activities, theoretical as well as practical.

Again, in this process of dissociation he makes very minute analysis of the different subjective states like – perceived body, felt body, images, thought, feeling, and stage of introspection and beyond introspection. He also explains clearly the contents of all these subjective states and makes it clear how the subject disengages himself from these different states. He explains each of the subjective states from an epistemological point of view. For this he recognizes different grades of non-perceptual knowledge and different modes of representation. He says, our bodily ‘I’ may be known from within and that knowledge need not be perceptual. Secondly, the self as itself may be immediately grasped from its absence. Thirdly, memory also enables us to apprehend in a way what the self or ‘I’ is. Fourthly, he says, productive imagination also helps us to realize ‘I’, the subject proper. But in productive imagination subject is not concrete, only available in the form of a glimpse. Finally he accepts inferential knowledge of the subject. So for Bhattacharyya freedom can be realized by following perceptual modes and also by transcending perceptual modes of cognitive consciousness. This type of disengagemental method of realizing freedom is not found in any other thinker’s philosophy. His style of description expresses his creative philosophy.
Like Advaita Vedanta, K.C. Bhattacharyya also seeks to overcome the perceptual dualism between empirical and transcendental. But their approaches are different. For Vedanta, distinction between empirical and transcendental is only apparent and it can be overcome by the knowledge of the transcendental self. Then one can have the highest form of self-realization and is free. But K.C. Bhattacharyya introduces a disengagemental method to overcome dualism between the empirical and transcendental. He gives a very clear explanation of the disengagement procedure. This shows his creative thinking.

K.C.Bhattacharyya has taken this distinction between empirical and transcendental in its own way. He makes distinction between what he calls objective fact, psychic fact and spiritual fact. For him, the highest spiritual fact manifests itself on different alternative but 'absolute' modes as truth, as rasa (aesthetic feel), as (objectless) spiritual subjectivity or freedom. Thus, the object is not real. Object is an appearance to the subject. So like Kant he does not accept dualism between subject and object. For him duality between subject and object is not real. It is only symbolic of their felt dissociation.

For K.C.Bhattacharyya, freedom cannot be attained in a spontaneous manner but through gradual stages. In each stage of disengagement a certain degree of freedom is realized. This can be understood when he says that felt body provides the first taste of freedom. It indicates that as long as self is
engaged with body he is in bondage. The body is the product of matter, thus the material world is considered as bondage to the self. It appears that like the traditional Indian philosopher, K.C. Bhattacharyya takes freedom in the sense of ‘freedom from’. In this state of freedom self is free from all objective and subjective states. In this state only self’s self-identity is intuited. This intuited self-identity is self-evident. This is the realization of absolute self and freedom. Thus, K.C. Bhattacharyya advocates absolute freedom. It implies that his conception of freedom is completely idealistic. His concept of freedom can be realized and felt but its explanation is a bit tricky and complicated.

To realize the subject as freedom K.C. Bhattacharyya makes minute analysis of different objective and subjective states. From this it appears that he creates an imaginary situation of the realization of the subject as itself. But this imaginary situation does not ignore the scientific world. Because his way to freedom passes through the physical nature, body, mind and introspective self-awareness, although it does so in a negative way.

K.C. Bhattacharyya’s interpretation of subject or self is taken by some as solipsism. But it does not appear as such. For Bhattacharyya, the subject as purely subjective can only be ascertained by knowing it from within. He does not deny the objective world but tries to disengage subject from this. This disengagement of the subject from the objective world is possible for all
individual subjects who try to realize freedom. Last of all it can be said that all his explanation is the result of his acute analytic intellect combined with imagination and insights of very high order.

M.N.Roy's concept of freedom appears to be totally different from K.C.Bhattacharyya. Roy is a Radical humanist. The main motto of his humanist philosophy is individual freedom. Roy tries to construct a new social order based on individual freedom. He judges the progress of society on the basis of the freedom it confers to the individual. His approach to freedom is free from dogmatic supposition and conforms to scientific thought.

Roy may be considered as one of the greatest social reformers of his age. His ideas of new social order are based on scientific analysis and rational reflection. He is against all kinds of submissions—physical, spiritual and mental. He stresses on intellectual freedom. Intellectual freedom will lead man to knowing his rights and liberties. He maintains that through intellectual freedom there can be rational understanding and harmony in the life of individuals and social organizations.

Roy develops his Radical humanism in a situation when due to lack of education people completely surrendered themselves in the hands of a supernatural agency like God. Roy and his group try to explain human experiences and problems without any reference to super-natural powers. Roy realizes the
problem faced by human beings under theology and the prejudices of supernaturalism. The main objective of his Radical humanism is to set man free. He wants to show that individuals need freedom and it is important. Thus his concept of freedom is not merely theoretical it is also based on practical experience.

Roy shows that in man the urge for freedom develops from the urge for existence. From this he tries to establish that the essence of freedom is not divine, it is biologically inherent in man. He shows that urge for freedom is the urge of the individual to unfold his potentialities. This urge for freedom is the source of human progress. It is observed that Roy tries to explain the concept of freedom from the root.

For Roy man is potentially free. But man is not aware of it. He tries to make man aware that freedom is a power inherent in him; it is the power of self-determination. He seeks to adjust the method of action to the possibilities of man. By this he tries to give the individual man a special recognition. Thus for Roy, freedom is not something to be acquired, as men are born free. Roy explains his concept of freedom on the basis of deep observation of it.

Although Roy holds that freedom is an inborn quality of man, he does not believe that freedom is enjoyed by all in an equal manner. He holds that freedom is conditional. Freedom depends on the self-realization of the
individual. By this Roy tries to make man realize his inherent potentialities and also make him his own master to shape his destiny. It shows that Roy is not only concerned with physical freedom but also intellectual freedom. He considers intellectual freedom as the most desirable for human happiness and cultural progress. His outlook can be considered as a synthesis of activism and rationalism. It can also be established that like Bhagavadgītā, Roy does not accept Naiskarmya.

Unlike traditional philosophers, Roy does not conceive freedom as an ideal to be attained. For him freedom is not an ultimate end. Freedom is the beginning of life. It is an experience to be had in every moment of a man's life. So for Roy freedom is not a complete idea, it is a process and it is eternal.

Roy's concept of freedom is very comprehensive. He considers freedom from all aspects- social, political, economic and moral aspects. He holds that man has to enjoy freedom in all fields. He recognizes the role of education, politics and economic security, in realizing freedom. Moreover, he is very analytical and creative in his explanation of freedom. He examines every facet of the concept of freedom and also the problems faced by an individual man in absence of it. Such a comprehensive concept of freedom is not found in any other thinkers. He possesses a true spirit of fighting for the individual freedom.
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Roy is progressive in his thinking and possesses an open mind. He is ready to accept things in the light of new experiences. He does not want to make New humanism a closed system. Roy developed Radical humanism with the expectation that it will grow and evolve along with growth and development of human knowledge. So he does not offer any final truth. His thoughts can be accommodated with growing experiences. His philosophy is essentially a philosophy of freedom and free thinking.

Although in the contemporary world many thinkers advocate freedom, in reality their ideal is confined in speech and slogans, not effective in practice. In practice, individual freedom is subordinated to the need of organization. But Roy fought against this with sincere devotion. His real intention is to develop a form of government where individual freedom is not subordinated to any collective ego. He sacrificed his political career for this purpose.

It is to be noted that although the main objective of Roy's Radical humanism is individual freedom he does not advocate absolute freedom of man. He holds that absolute freedom in the sense of doing whatever one likes to do, will not fulfil the basic purpose of freedom. It indicates that he recognizes the social responsibilities of man. So he advocates limited freedom of man. Roy's humanism is a synthesis of individual good and common good.
Roy accepts physical determinism. He holds that as an object of nature man is subject to physical laws. But man possesses will, so he can choose. He takes human will as the expression of reason in nature. Roy reconciles determinism with free-will. For him man is both free and determined.

It is observed that Roy has great faith on human reason. He deduces morality from man's innate rationality. But in reality human reason is not as perfect as he thinks it is. Man is seen sometimes being controlled by instinct and not reason. But Roy believes that as a rational being man can behave rationally. Human dignity, personality, sovereignty and creativity are all within Roy's humanism. He tries to establish that human existence is itself self-sufficient. With the aim of secular and rational morality Roy and his group try to open a new perspective before the world. Roy advocates scientific thinking and scientific politics free from any presupposition and dogma.

Roy is very pragmatic in his thinking and recognizes economic security as a necessary condition for freedom. He realizes that intellectual and moral freedom will be impossible without economic freedom. Economic liberation of the masses is an essential condition for advancing towards the goal of freedom.

Roy has the courage to express his view which he learns from experience. It is because he has no personal interest behind his revolution for individual freedom. He realizes the need for new orientation of human thinking in the
midst of present political, social and economic crisis. So he may be regarded as a saint in the new sense of the term. Actually Roy possesses an optimistic outlook regarding the future of man. For this he feels the need for a change in the outlook of man. He realizes that this is possible only through a revolution covering all aspects of society—education, politics, economics, along with Cultural Revolution.

Roy’s keen foresight is observed in his anticipation of the effects of parliamentary democracy. In parliamentary democracy power is captured by a political party. As a result, individual citizens become powerless for all practical purposes and most of the time they have no means to exercise their sovereignty. So he is in favour of the principles of co-operation, democracy and decentralization. He favours these principles not only in politics but also in social and economic fields. Roy is very analytical in his thinking. He also observes that mere decentralization will not work unless people are aware of their rights and liberties and unless they work with true democratic spirit. So Roy stresses on to make people aware of their rights and liberties. But along with it he also recognizes accountability to one’s own conscience. Without it no change in any institution or organization will be successful.
Roy recognizes the role of ethics in all fields—political, economic, and social. He holds that without keeping moral values human freedom will be in vain. So he does not consider man as a biological animal but a moral one.

It is observed that Roy did not get proper recognition in his life time, but even then no one can deny his contribution as a political philosopher. It is anticipated that he will get due respect from the subsequent generations. But for this, his philosophical ideology should be disseminated among the common masses.

Radhakrishnan is the true bridge between tradition and modernity. He stood for both ancient and contemporary thinking at the same time. He expresses his views on all major problems of life in the great transitional period of history and impressed people from all walks of life in his age.

Radhakrishnan interprets the thoughts of the ancient and modern Indian thinkers giving it a social and humanist orientation. In his philosophy secularism, equality, justice and unity of mankind—these ideas are integrated with the ideas of freedom and national progress.

Radhakrishnan advocates freedom of man. But he formulates limited freedom of man. Radhakrishnan expresses his concept of freedom by considering Indian tradition and culture. He holds that man has freedom as he can make choices. Man exists because he has freedom. He holds that nature
presents before man infinite possibilities. But nature does not allow man to develop all the possibilities. It indicates that nature determines man's freedom. Thus he admits the present constraints and previous necessities in man's life. Man as a self conscious being can change the given conditions and shape them to his own purpose. Man possesses freedom, so he can remake his life. The law of karma affirms the responsibilities of each individual for his life. Actually, Radhakrishnan's concept of freedom keeps a balance between previous necessities and present constraints. Constraints can be overcome. Though the past is determined, future is conditioned. So man is only conditioned not determined. He denies absolute freedom.

With the theory of karma Radhakrishnan tries to keep balance between freedom and determinism. He tries to assert the law of karma as being consistent with human freedom. He believes that though the past is determined man can make his future as he wants to have it. As a religious thinker he believes that the divine element in man will direct man to choose what is best for him as a spiritual being. He holds that when we are self-willed we surrender to the restraint exercised by the mechanical forces. We are then victim of the law of karma. By the use of free-will we can make an effort to free our mind of selfish desires and let the mind be filled with thoughts of the eternal. Then we can subjugate the karma and the necessities of life. The community with the
eternal endows us creative quality. So it seems that Radhakrishnan tries to explain freedom in the lights of spiritual thinking.

Radhakrishnan’s concept of freedom is basically ethical. He states that human life is the result of the law of *karma*. The law of *karma* intensifies tremendous significance on our decisions which we make for the right or wrong. Actually, Radhakrishnan advocates limited rational freedom of man. Radhakrishnan believes in the law of *karma* to preserve moral values in man. For Radhakrishnan, the law of *karma* provides hope for the desperate and the sufferers as they may believe that he may have a good life in future. Thus the law of *karma* may inspire man to make his future.

Again, Radhakrishnan talks about degrees of freedom. He states that man’s freedom is conditioned by degrees as his freedom depends on the amount of effort he applies to create his future life. It indicates that like Bhagavadgītā, Radhakrishnan disfavours *Naïskarma*.

Radhakrishnan denies the doctrine of pre-destination, as it is inconsistent with freedom. He accepts birth and death as predestined. But in this regard it may be considered although cannot be established that human life is to a certain extent predetermined. It does not deny human freedom. One has to do their duty to lead their life forward.
With his concept of *sarvamukti* Radhakrishnan tries to dispel individualism from man. He holds that redeemed souls have to work for the liberation of unredeemed soul then there will be perfection for the humanity.

Radhakrishnan denounced the notion of *mukti* which has to be attained by renouncing *samsāra*- one’s world of persons and communications with others. For him it is through this world that one achieves freedom which is creative. It indicates that Radhakrishnan accepts *jivanmukti* that liberation can be attained in this life.

In his political philosophy Radhakrishnan recognizes the value and significance of the individual. He holds that man can develop the possibilities within him in an atmosphere of freedom. He is not in favour of a political arrangement in which individuality is suppressed. He considers liberty as a condition for man’s moral growth. Radhakrishnan stresses on freedom of speech. He holds that if men are not free to express their views and feelings there is no way of knowing whether they are free or suppressed. Freedom of speech is necessary condition for democracy.

It is observed that Radhakrishnan accepts freedom of man. But he holds that as a self-conscious individual man can enjoy freedom without causing any disturbance to others. This indicates that Radhakrishnan recognizes the social
responsibility of man. There is an emphasis on both individual and common good in Radhakrishnan's philosophy.

As a progressive thinker of modern world he tries to establish a balance between determinism and freedom. He is a critique of deterministic thinking. But he holds that as men are subject to moral obligation they can enjoy limited freedom. Radhakrishnan claims that self-discovery, self-knowledge and self-fulfilment are men's destiny. There is an influence of scientific outlook in his philosophy.

Krishnamurti, the great thinker of the contemporary world, opened a new aspect of freedom which is not fully recognized by other thinkers. Although he belongs to the philosophical tradition of India yet he is unique in many ways.

Krishnamurti is unique, because he boldly refuses to follow any traditional Indian philosophical school. He is unique, because he not only refuses to follow religious cults but also does not set up any cult of his own. He does not expound any philosophical theory or religion. He realizes that a specific line of thinking prevents full freedom to perceive, feel and react. His talks are not based on any authority or academic knowledge, but on his own insights into the mind. So he talks and expresses freely about his reaction to the problems of human life. It implies that Krishnamurti's thinking starts with freedom.
Generally, it is believed that human freedom is conditioned by external factors. Krishnamurti tries to establish that although men are conditioned by both external and internal factors internal conditions are more powerful than external one. So Krishnamurti tries to make man aware of internal conditions of freedom. He tries to establish that without inward freedom, outward freedom is meaningless. This is evident from the present world scenario. Today these two things proceed in opposite directions. External freedom increases but internal freedom decreases. For Krishnamurti freedom is freedom of mind. By a free mind, Krishnamurti means a mind which is free from knowledge, past experience and other mental states. If observed deeply our day to day activities then it is found that a mind with knowledge and experience hinders our freedom of observation. For him what we call freedom is only freedom in pseudo. What Krishnamurti says cannot be denied. Krishnamurti tries to make man sensitive of every situation. Thus, it can be said that his concept of freedom is an expression of his love for humanity. His analysis paves the way for our understanding of the psychological conditioning. So from the perspective that Krishnamurti takes, it seems quite apparent that real freedom is actually the internal one.

Krishnamurti does not accept physical determinism in the case of human beings. He tries to establish that men are determined not by the external causal law but by causal network of thought processes. It is observed in our day to day
life that thought processes lull men into a false sense of reality, of being free, thus conditioning our mind.

Another important thing Krishnamurti reveals is some misconceptions of freedom. It is a common belief that those who can revolt are free. But for Krishnamurti revolting is not freedom. It is only a reaction. People revolt against a pattern and set on their own a new pattern. This is not freedom. Thus his analysis of the problem of freedom is realistic. His emphasis on saying 'No' is significant. It is not negative. It makes man aware of the situation. Actually, Krishnamurti tries to make man aware and sensitive in everyday situations.

Krishnamurti's discussion is based on intellectual insights. As a result, he reveals some minute things related to human life, which are very important. Sometimes his revelations appear to be contradictory. Krishnamurti says that man is conditioned by family, society, nationality, tradition, language and other similar factors. Again he says 'to be is to be related'. But if observed minutely it is not really a contradiction. He admits that society conditions our freedom. But for this he does not deny relationships. Because, for Krishnamurti it is in relationships one can know oneself and also others. Without relationships life has no meaning. No one can deny that social rules and norms sometimes condition our freedom. Relationships do not imply dependence. It shows that Krishnamurti is very analytic of the problems related with human life.
Krishnamurti's philosophy is not considered as a positive one. But it is not correct. For Krishnamurti, positive is not something to be gained. Freedom from the known indicates his positive character. A person full of old thoughts and experience cannot be positive. He always stresses on to look at things with a fresh and unbiased outlook.

Unlike traditional Indian philosophers, Krishnamurti does not take freedom in the sense of 'freedom from'. In traditional Indian philosophy, freedom is considered as 'freedom from suffering'. But Krishnamurti tries to establish that 'freedom' is not away from something. Freedom can be attained through suffering. To be free from something, first one has to understand it. This is another great revelation of Krishnamurti. By this, Krishnamurti tries to change the outlook of man towards the problem. Without depending on method, theory or system, Krishnamurti sets up a new way of observation which reveals the true nature of things. By this, he tries to stress on independent thinking, which is not influenced by any theory or systems. This will be able to bring about social, political and psychological revolutions.

Like the traditional thinkers, he also admits that attachment hinders freedom. He says that mental states like motive, anxiety, fear and appetite conditions our freedom. All these are due to the attachment to the world. Attachment conditions our freedom. If one is attached to anything he cannot be
Krishnamurti is progressive in his thinking. He recognizes how fear affects us psychologically; fear causes insecurity and conditions our freedom. Today people live in constant fear. They fear to protest, they fear to express. This obstructs creativity and hinders mental development.

Krishnamurti tries to develop the highest form of thinking in man to see what is false. Without it one cannot say 'No'. Krishnamurti does not try to make man mechanical by conforming to others. He tries to change the outlook and attitude of man towards the problems of life. His only intention is to make man bold so that he can face the situation. Then only one can be called free.

Krishnamurti has high confidence in man and believes that each individual has no limit on development if he can break free from inner bondage. He denies all forms of dependence.

Krishnamurti's purpose was not to convince others on his ideology or philosophy. He only pointed out a certain truth which is quite relevant for the people of the present world. He feels that in the present context, there is a need of radical change, a revolution among human beings. But such a revolution need not be based on ideology or conceptual utopias. For this, there is a need for people who are passionate about the world and a necessity for change. Men who are free from political and religious authority as well as tradition will be able to bring about social, political and psychological revolution.
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Krishnamurti’s concept of freedom is very relevant for people of the modern generation. As his philosophy is completely based on his insights, therefore what he says will attract and influence people of this age. They can understand the true meaning of freedom which will help them look at the problem in a new way. He reveals clearly that the freedom that people enjoy is not freedom in the true sense of the term. It is only a pseudo-freedom which everybody ought to realize. Among the contemporary thinkers, Krishnamurti is the only person who gives a detailed explanation of internal conditions of freedom. Although he is not known to the common man, once his concept of ‘the internal conditions of freedom’ is published, it is bound to create a sensation among the younger generations.

From the above discussion, it can be said concluded that men enjoy limited freedom. No one is absolutely free. Freedom of man is conditioned by both external and internal factors. Human beings are determined by the material world, social relations, and mental states and also by other factors. So men are both free and determined. It is clear that all these philosophers admit determinism. So for them, freedom is freedom from determinism. But they talk about determinism along with freedom. They do not take ‘freedom’ and ‘determinism’ as separate concepts. So, separate discussions of these two concepts are not found in these contemporary Indian thinkers. Another thing observed is that although Indian philosophers, in general talk about bondage to
the world their main focus is on freedom. Thus people are not aware of conditioning or determinism as a separate concept. It is also seen that many contemporary philosophers do not use the 'determinism' in their philosophy. They use words such as 'bondage', 'law of karma', 'conditioned' to mean 'determinism'. It appears that contemporary philosophers who are influenced by western thought use the term 'determinism' in their philosophy.

Again, it can be held that people are conditioned and not determined. Determinism is basically applicable to physical things and not to human beings. When it is said that something is determined, it implies that it is permanently determined by something. A particular event may be produced by a particular cause. This is not possible in case of human beings. Human actions are not determined only by external factors, but also by internal factors. Thus, human actions are not predictable like physical things. Men may overcome a particular situation if he is aware of it. So, human action is not determined but conditioned.

It is observed that although both K.C. Bhattacharyya and Krishnamurti admits ‘determinism’, but talk about absolute freedom. They take freedom in the absolute sense. K.C.Bhattacharyya's ‘subject as freedom’ and Krishnamurti's ‘freedom from the known’ is freedom in the absolute sense. Thus, it may be said that they deny hard determinism.
Both M.N. Roy and Radhakrishnan advocate limited freedom of man. Although individual freedom is the main objective of Roy's philosophy, he never talks about absolute freedom or unlimited freedom. Radhakrishnan formulated rational freedom for man. Man is both free and determined. It indicates that both Roy and Radhakrishnan accept soft determinism. They reconcile freedom with determinism.