

CHAPTER V

New Humanism and M.N.Roy

Generally it is said that there are three phases in the life of M.N.Roy. First, he was a revolutionary, Secondly, he was a Marxist and Thirdly, he was humanist. However, if studied more analytically, it will be found that there are more phases that we find in Roy's life. These additional phases can be shown in the undermentioned ways :

The first phase of Roy's life is in between 1907 to 1914. During this period he was a revolutionary.

The second phase is in between 1914 to 1930. At this phase Mr. Roy was a Marxist and Communist.

The third phase is in between 1930 to 1936. During this tenure he was in India and was imprisoned.

The fourth phase lies in between 1940 to 1948. During this period he founded the Radical Democratic Party in India. M.N. Roy was of opinion that India's freedom was a part of world freedom.

The fifth phase of Roy's life lies in between 1948 to 1954. During this period he founded Radical Humanist Movement in India.

Here, I like to quote Debi Chatterjee : To quote him :
 "Following the Second World War, his break with Marxism was complete, and he devoted himself to the development of the philosophy of New Humanism, a pursuit which he continued till his death in 1954"¹. Radical Humanism is based on the postulate that "man is the measure of all things" which was enunciated by Protagoras. Mr. Roy said : "man is the maker of his destiny". While he was formulating Radical Humanism, Roy went beyond Communism. Roy said : "New Humanism proclaims the sovereignty of man on the authority of modern science, which has dispelled all mystery about the essence of man. It maintains that a rational and moral society is possible because man, by nature, is rational and, therefore, can be moral, not under any compulsion, but voluntarily; that the sanction of morality is embedded in human nature"².

However, we may say that Roy is the most renowned thinker of 20th Century Indian Renaissance. Each individual of the

world will honour Mr. Roy for his humanistic outlook. He was engaged to the liberating inspiration of humanism. He was an exponent of morals in politics. He denounced unprincipled scramble for power. His main task was to moralise and humanise politics. In May 1947 Manifesto of New Humanism was adopted to create a new world of freedom. Mr. Roy was a revolutionary and an intellectual giant. In 1940 he started to Radicalism from Marxism. He clearly stated that the ethical foundation of Marxism is weak. During 1940 to 1947 Roy is regarded as a Radical. Later on he ushered in integral Scientific humanism or New Humanism. We have already said that the Manifesto of Humanism was declared by Roy in 1947. Roy pointed out that in the past man either submitted to the Natural forces or to the Supernatural agency. Through the light of the days men revolted against the blind belief in supernaturalism. Modern civilization came before them. Roy said :

"The eclipse of the humanist tradition is the curse of this degeneration and decay. Modern civilization stood at the head of the declining place of decay the moment it broke away from tradition of humanism-subordinated man to the institutions"³.

The civilized world requires a novel hope, faith, ideal and a philosophy. Man must free him from supernatural

authority. Moreover, he must think that he is not a slave. He must prepare an atmosphere for full development of the human personality. Roy put much emphasis on reason and as such he went against fatalistic theories. However, to be acquainted with the humanistic outlook of Mr. Roy we are to note his view against Marxism. He intended to take Communism as a philosophy of emancipation. But he found though there is establishment of Communism in Russia yet there is presence of exploitation and slavery. He became grived when he found that Stalin denied moral values of progressive force and was desirous to spread military power for establishing supremacy. Thus it is palpable that Communism is showing supremacy on power rather than humanism. So Roy took him away from the ideals of Communism. He marked disregard and insulation in Communism towards individuals. Here, liberty and sovereignty have been denied. Capitalism, according to Roy, also denies human freedom. Denial of human freedom is the main crisis of the present world. Neither Communism nor Capitalism could indicate the real path to come out from this crisis and as such both the "Isms" are far from truth. Be it noted that Capitalism says of the production of goods. But these goods are not supplied for the benefits of the people. They are produced for selling at a profit. Roy also says : "Nazism and Fascism are condemned as totalitarian, because they deny the sovereignty of the individual; they do not give the individual any place in society except as a

cog in a vast machinery and endow this vast machinery with a collective ego"⁴.

Totalitarianism, according to Roy, is a negation of the concept of freedom. Communism is a totalitarian cult. It says of collective ego. It subordinates individual. But man is the creator of the social world and as such he is the primary and cannot be subordinate. One cannot be a libertarian denying the sovereignty of the individual. Roy says, "We find that society is the creation of individuals. The individual comes first, he is prior to society; society is the means for attaining an end, which is freedom and progress of the individual. But the end has been forgotten. A false conception of the place of man in society is the cause of the wrong juxtaposition of end and means; the divorce of ethics from political practice and social engineering. That, in its turn, is the cause of the present crisis. Unless we go to the root of this crisis, we cannot overcome it"⁵.

Roy's view of man and his emancipation reminds us the existential thought. Existentialism puts emphasis on the importance of man as an individual, and his freedom and responsibility. The individual has a free choice. Sartre, an existentialist thinker, gives importance on freedom. He says that man is the creator of values. Thus we find a similarity between Existential thought and Roy's thought of human individual.

Roy's humanism is Cosmopolitan humanism. His humanism is "New Humanism". The business of new humanists is to make all individuals conscious of his innate rationality. Its function is to find individual's unity with others in cosmopolitan Commonwealth of free men and women. Roy says, "Man did not appear on the earth out of nowhere. He rose out of the background of the physical universe, through the long process of biological evolution. The umbilical cord was never broken. Man with his mind, intelligence, will remain an integral part of the physical Universe. The latter is a cosmos-a-law-governed system. Therefore, man's being, his emotions, will, ideas are also determined; man is essentially rational. The reason in man is an echo of the harmony of the universe. Morality must be referred back to man's innate rationality The innate rationality of man is the only guarantee of a harmonious order, which will also be a moral order ..." ⁶.

At a particular phase of his life M.N.Roy was impressed by the philosophy of Karl Marx. Marx was a humanist. As he was a humanist, he stood for the freedom of man. Though he was inspired by Marxism nevertheless Roy did not hesitate to go beyond Marxism when he found that Marxist philosophy is outdated in some respects. Roy was a rationalist and as such he did not accept even Marxism dogmatically - He denounced the dictatorship of the proletariat as enunciated by Marxism

Roy was of opinion that Marx had given highest seat to the class-consciousness than individual-consciousness. Moreover, he says that Marx's prediction that in future the society will be bifurcated into two classes, namely, 'Have', and 'Have-not' classes has not been proved to be true. There is existence of the third group which is called middle class. Marxism given importance on the working class whereas Roy has gives importance on the middle class in the most underdeveloped or unprogressive part of the society. He denied the dictatorship of the proletariat. Truly speaking, Roy gave primacy to the individual than the class, whether it be proletariat or middle class. Roy speaks in terms of individuals rather than classes or nations. M.N.Roy said, "Radicalism thinks in terms neither of nation nor of class, its concern is man it conceives freedom of the individual"⁷.

Roy repeatedly says of the sovereignty of the individuals. Almost all writings of Roy reflect his thought regarding the primacy of the individual, and his rationality and morality. Moreover, Roy has pointed out that man is not merely a biological entity. He was a great humanist. He could not accept communism and other political theories prevalent at that time. According to Roy, freedom is necessary for everything at every stage in man's mental evolution. He considers the urge for freedom as a continuation of the biological struggle for survival, we have already

/was

pointed out that Roy/disillusioned by Communism. He marked that Marx was a humanist. But Marx has stressed importance on economic factor for development of the individuals. Marx dehumanised humanity. Roy opined that Marxism ignored that man is the maker of his destiny. This is because of the influence of the mechanistic view of life which Marx advocated. However, Marx's view was not acceptable to Roy as he thought that no theory could be true always and everywhere. Through the change of time theories also change. Marx ignored many factors of human life but put highest value on the forces of production. Man becomes secondary, production becomes primary. So, it dehumanizes humanism and as such Roy criticized Marxism vehemently and this took him away from Communism and he advocated the 'New Humanism'. Roy says : "New Humanism proclaims that sovereignty of man on the authority of modern science, which has dispelled all mystery about the essence of man"⁸.

Roy has said that humanism is concerned with human behaviour. To him, humanist put emphasis on primacy and sovereignty to the individual. Roy says that New Humanism starts in everything from man and his needs.

Moreover, Roy says, "New Humanism tries to go into the genesis of man and to examine the background out of which man emerges in nature ... whatever we call human nature, man's attributes and potentialities, can be strictly deduced

from the background of the evolving physical Universe"⁹.

New Humanism of Roy is the product of his long acquired experience. He was a believer of free thinking. For this reason he gave up communistic thought. However, the word Humanism is not new one. It is found in ancient Greek philosophy and in Vaisnava philosophy of India. But only Roy gave a scientific explanation of the term 'Humanism' during the modern times. Through the progress of science the barriers lying before the individuals have been reduced. Today man can free him from every kind of prejudice and blind faith. Roy is an exponent of realism and scientific method. To him it is fictional to think of supernaturalism. He wanted to setup sound ethical theories by taking the help of science. Man's rationality does not originate from God, it has come by the process of biological evolutionary process. Reason is innate and inborn. Roy has admitted the evolutionary process. To him man is the part and parcel of this world. In 'New Humanism' we find that man is the measure of all things. The word 'New' has been significantly used by Roy. Man has been treated from a new or novel point of view. Scientific outlook works behind the concept of man. The sum and substance of 'New Humanism' of Roy lies in the concept of reason, ethics and emancipation. Man is basically a rational being, but he also possesses animality and sometimes this animality predominates over

rationality. So there is need of moral teaching and for this reason Roy has put much emphasis on moral education of the individual. Thus it is found that 'new Humanism' is based on reason, morality and emancipation or freedom. Roy's rational morality is the part of his materialistic view of reality. The main content of 'New Humanism' is emancipation of the individuals from the prisons of spiritualism, economic determinism, social and political determinism. Humanism, individualism, rational morality are the three pillars of emancipation. In the language of M.N.Roy, "New Humanism holds that for creating a new world of liberty and social justice, revolution must go beyond an economic reorganisation of society. The urge for freedom being the basic incentive of life, the purpose of all rational human endeavour must be to strive for the removal of social conditions which restrict the unfolding of the potentialities of man. The success of this striving is the measure of freedom attained. The position of the individual is the indicator of the progressive and liberating significance of any collective effort or social system"¹⁰.

The motto of 'New Humanism' is to bring brotherhood among men. The slogan of fraternity and brotherhood is found in Gandhi, Aurobinda and Rabindranath Tagore. It is also found in the voice of M.N.Roy. He says, "New Humanism is cosmopolitan. A cosmopolitan commonwealth of spiritually free

men will not be limited by the boundaries of national states, - Capitalist, Fascist, Socialist, Communist, or of any other kind, - which will gradually disappear under the impact of the twentieth Century Renaissance of Man"¹¹. - Thus from the above discussion we observe that Roy was against any kind of national state, be it Communism or Capitalism etc. and he after criticising all these views, has established his own thought which is known as 'New Humanism' for emancipation of all individuals of the universe. This shows his broadness of mind.

From our long discussion we have observed that Roy criticised Marxism in some respects. Before entering into more depth of 'New Humanism' enunciated by Roy it will be better if we mention some Marxist ideas which have been denied by Roy in the course of his discussion. We have already pointed out that Marxism does not give importance to middle class of people. This has been denounced by Roy. Now we like to say that Marxist view of 'Surplus Value' and 'state should wither away' have been criticized by Roy. At this stage we shall confine our discussion in criticizing these views. But before putting criticisms against them we like to give the main content of these views as explained by the Marxists. First, we will take up the view of 'Surplus Value' and then the Concept of the state-less society' will be dealt with.

Marx's theory of 'Surplus Value' is based on English Classical economics. The economic aspects of Marxism hinge on the doctrine of Surplus Value and the theory of surplus value depends on the theory of value of English classical economics. According to Marx, labour is only the source of value. We know that there are four elements of production, namely, land, labour, capital and organization. But among the four factors, labour is the most significant and essential, others are not so. Though the labourer is the creator of all values nevertheless he is not paid the profit of the labour by the capitalists. The value created by the labourers is higher than the value paid to them. Value produced + Value spent = Surplus value. From the surplus value the Capitalists get profit, the landlord gets rent, and the money lenders get interest.

Labour creates two types of values, viz. (i) necessary values, and (ii) surplus values. The wage paid to the labourer is the necessary value. The remaining major part of the workers' due is lying with the capitalists. However, the difference between the value of a commodity and actual payment made to the labourer represent surplus value. It is to be kept in mind that the greater is the exploitation of the worker, the higher is the surplus value. This surplus value, according to Marx, is called 'Congealed' labour'. The capitalists system is based on this exploited labour and it is noteworthy that the state is safeguarding their cause.

It is today a device of the capitalists class.

Against this surplus value theory many objections can be raised. But for the required purpose it will not be wise to enter into the heart. However, it can be said that this surplus value theory gives too much importance to labour while it ignores other factors of production. Here, I like to put before the reader the criticism against the theory by Late M.N.Roy who is a humanist heart and soul. He has clearly stated that there could not be progress of a society unless there was a surplus of production over consumption. Again, there could not be progress of a society unless this surplus was employed as capital for increasing production further. Without surplus value, capital cannot be accumulated and without accumulation of capital economic development is not possible. So the accumulation of the capital by the capitalists is not illegitimate. According to Roy, capitalist economy raises the whole society to a higher level. Thus Roy says that creation of surplus value and the accumulation of capital is essential for both capitalist and socialist societies.

Now I like to discuss Marxian view of the state in the following paragraphs. According to Marxism, the dictatorship of the proletariat will bring about social and economic justice and then there will be no thesis, antithesis and class-war, one will not be exploited by the other. Thus the

way will be prepared for the disappearance of the state. In Marxism we find that the state came into existence when private property came into being. When the property originated, the owners of the property wanted a political machinery to safeguard their property and to dominate the proletariat. Here, we find the existence of the state. According to Marx, the state is an organic growth in the process of social evolution. The state is not static, it is changeable. It changes through the change of the superstructure of the society.

There are two classes, namely, capitalist class and labour class. The Labourers or proletariats want emancipations. The capitalists want to get maximum profit. So there comes a conflict between the two classes. Again, when the 'Haves' and 'Have-nots' will become severe then the economic crisis will go to the top, and, then the revolution will occur. The capitalists will be dethroned by the proletariats. During this period the state will remain. According to Marx, the revolutionary party should capture the state and use it against the capitalists. But to Lenin the state should be utilized for meeting the counter-revolution. For preserving the interest the capitalists will fight till last. When the counter-revolution is foiled, the state will exist as long as the workers require it. The more socialization of production will make the state more

useless. Quoting Lenin we can say, "The state will wither away".

Now the question is : can the political philosophers admit it ? Obviously not. It is the state which only can preserve the interest of the individuals. Thus the doctrine that "the state will wither away" is not acceptable even to us. In this connection, I like to place before the reader the view of Late M.N.Roy. In the view of Marx, the state is merely a device for exploitation. There will be no necessity of the state when the exploiters will establish the dictatorship. How the state will be abolished and what will be its future course - these questions have not been discussed by Marx in detail. Marxian view of state, according to Roy, is imaginal and fictional. He says that there will be necessity of dictatorship to pressurise the force of power of the opponents. He is of opinion that state is an essential part of human beings who are social. The abolition of the state is an impossibility and an attempt to do it is to welcome suicidal success. Roy writes : "We must take it for granted that Karl Marx honestly believed that under socialism class distinctions would disappear, and therefore the state as a class organisation wither away. But one cannot help feeling that was a naive belief; it was wishful thinking. How could a keen intellect be reconciled to such a belief ? The zeal to prove that Communism was not a utopia which lured Marx away towards

the uncertain ground of speculation, and he made a dogma out of speculative thought. So long as a stateless society remained inconceivable, communism could not be anything but a utopia. Therefore, for the sake of his "Scientific" Socialism, Marx had to postulate the withering away of the state. Either, at the point, Marx came very near to anarchism—also a utopia—or he did not think hard enough. The State is the political organisation of society. How could a Complicated, centralised, industrial society be ever without a state? This question should have occurred to Marx while he was casting the horoscope of humanity"¹².

Moreover, in thesis no.9 Roy writes : "The state being the political organization of society, its withering away under Communism is a utopia which has been exploded by experience"¹³.

Thus it is found from the discussion that Roy does not admit the Marxist concept that the "state will wither away". Now we like to take up the problem, 'politics without parties' after M.N.Roy. For discussion of this problem it will be cogent for us if we note the role and function of the political parties. Political party is the life blood of democracy. The existence of democracy cannot be imagined without political party. Without it dictatorship and autocracy will come into being. In the study of democracy political parties today have got tremendous importance.

It is to be noted that the science of political parties is regarded as 'Stasiology'. The term 'Stasiology' is derived from the Greek word 'stasis' meaning 'faction'. Political party is an organized group of citizens which holds the some views on public questions, working as a political unit and trying to secure control over government for pushing forward its own principles and policies. In this connection, for better understanding, I like to put the definition of political party given by S. Neumann. To quote him :

"We may define political party generally as the articulate organization of society's active political agents, those who are concerned with the control of Governmental power and who compete for popular support with another group or groups holding divergent views. As such, it is the great intermediary which links social forces and ideologies to official governmental institutions and relates them to political action within the larger political community"¹⁴. It is an undeniable fact that modern democracy cannot function without the political parties. Political party is a voluntary social group. It possesses an ideology. Different political parties differ from themselves in respect of their own ideologies. Political parties represent economic policy and regulation. One of the main functions of the political party is to control and direct the struggle for political power. A political party wins the support of

the people through election. It preserves the national integration and takes necessary steps for welfare of the citizens. Ultimate aim of the political party is to capture power following the provisions of the constitution.

There are different ways of classifying political parties. In a way we may divide parties in the following manner : (1) Conservative, (2) Liberal, (3) Reactionary and Radical. Further, we may divide parties as (a) Leftists and (b) Rightists. In the constitution of India there is no mention of the political party. We find multi-party system in India. Moreover, it is observed that some political parties in India are leftists and some are rightist.

However, we like to quote Jawharlal Nehru to know the character or nature of political party in India. To quote him : "The parties as they exist in India today, apart from the Congress, may be divided into four groups. There are certain political parties with an economic ideology. There is the Communist party with the allied organizations. There are the various communal parties under different names but essentially following a narrow communal ideals, and there are a number of local parties and groups having only a provincial or even narrower appeal"¹⁵.

Thus there are many political parties in India having separate political ideals and they are serving the people of

India. It has become a problem to us whether there should have existence of many political parties as we find today in India. We are not saying of single political party. But it seems that as many political parties as found in India is not desirable. Number should be reduced otherwise people will be perplexed and the clash among the parties will become the main issue which will remove them from their ideals.

Political party is necessary in democracy for the betterment of the people. Late M.N. Roy, a great humanist, has denounced political party. Here, our task is to deal with the view of Roy regarding the activities of political party. The role of political party, according to Roy, is secondary and unnecessary. His idea of partyless politics has systematized his ideals of democracy. He opines that the democratic ideals must be self-contradictory, if the existence of political party is admitted. By party we mean a fragment of people but democracy means rule of people by people. Part can not be whole. Party and democracy are not equivalent. If party-Govt, is called democracy, then benevolent despotism becomes democracy. Roy says : "parties fight elections for the purpose of coming to power. Struggle for power results from the existence of parties"¹⁶.

Humanism, according to Roy, advocates of mundane salvation not salvation in heaven. Political parties only

hanker after power and they restrict the number of citizens participating in political activity. Roy has explicitly stated that the political parties of India such as Congress, Sangh, Sabha or Dal are busy to capture political power. Moreover, Roy says that political practice allows an insignificant number of people to rule the bulk of the community. Hence, Roy is in favour of politics without party. Under the existing party system it is found that the people only vote to elect their representatives. Roy says : "Political practice cannot be truly democratised unless the people can nominate as well as vote for a candidate. It is easy to see that parties will have no place in the latter form of political practice, which provides for sustained actual participation of the entire community"¹⁷.

Politics is the scramble for power. There is no place of morality in it. The main capital of the politicians is the backwardness and lack of education of the people. The party does not give priority and prominence to the people of intellectual merit but it gives importance to the people who can help the party to capture power. In this regard Roy has given a real picture. Roy says that democracy degenerates into demagoguery. The political party gives quantitative not qualitative importance to man. Idea of sovereignty, according to Roy, has become a constitution of fiction for the party system. So Roy declares of politics without parties.

Whether his view is acceptable or not will be taken into account in the concluding chapter. So for the required purpose we like to give an idea of the genesis of democracy starting from Plato. After this we will mention Roy's opinion regarding parliamentary democracy.

Roy's novel thought acquaints us with the new ideals and ideas. He denies the importance of political party. He also does not admit parliamentary democracy. Plato has mentioned of three classes of people, viz. (i) economic class, (ii) military class, and (iii) rulers class. If these classes act or perform appointed duties, selfishness will disappear and unity will come to fore automatically.

Every man has some wants. No man is sufficient unto himself. There is need of mutual co-operation for the satisfaction of common wants, so men drive to organize a society. According to Plato, the bond which first combines individuals in a state is the bond of mutual economic dependence. Plato confines himself to three primary economic wants, namely, food, clothing and shelter. And it is to be noted that Plato introduced the principle of division of labour. Further, it is to be kept in mind that Platonic state consists of three distinct classes. They are :

(1) the producing class, (2) the warrior class, and (3) the ruling class. Plato has explicitly stated that all men do not possess equal capacity for virtue, hence, all are not

entitled to participate in the function of the Govt. Reason, or wisdom has got an important role in Plato's Philosophy. All men do not possess high wisdom, a few persons who belong to high reason, can rule the country. So Plato's Govt. of ideal state must be aristocratic in character. The Govt. in the ideal state should be entrusted to the persons possessing supreme wisdom. Plato advocates of Govt. by the elite. According to Plato, if the Govt. is subject to law, monarchy is best, democracy is worst, and aristocracy holds an intermediate place. However, the Greeks used the term 'polis' in place of city-state. This ancient city-states left a rich legacy to mankind. Ancient Greeks were acquainted with the direct democracy. G. Sartori says, "The term 'democracy' was coined twenty five hundred years ago. It first appeared in Herodotus' History in connection with the notion of isonomia, equality before the law. From then on even though it was eclipsed for a very long interval, it has remained part of the political vocabulary"¹⁸. In ancient Greece, women and slave were not treated as citizens and they could not share in democracy. Again, in the Roman empire the will of the emperor in the field of actual governance was counted. The emperors were elected by the people but they had no say. With the fall of Rome democracy had no scope. We find prevalent of feudalism in the middle age. In modern time we find Parliamentary democracy. In France during the Revolution

(1789-94) people established a republic abolishing monarchy. 20th century is the golden age for democracy.

Democracy has two forms : Direct and Indirect. Direct democracy was a success in the city-states of Greek. Today it is not fruitful because of large span of area of the state. In different states we find indirect democracy or representative democracy. Representative democracy is of two forms, namely, Presidential and Parliamentary. India like Britain has adopted the parliamentary system of democracy. But in U.K. and India, there is a slight difference between the two systems of democracy.

On 15th August, 1947 India won independence after a long struggle against the British. And on 26th January 1950 the Indian Constitution came into force. It is also to be noted that India has adopted the parliamentary system of democracy. According to Roy, representative Govt. means the rule of the party. And he says that parliamentary democracy is benevolent despotism. In democracy heads are only counted to get majority's opinion. But it gives no freedom of the heads i.e., individuals. In this system no importance is given on intelligence, integrity, wisdom, moral excellence and the like. But these factors are necessary for blooming the individuality of the individuals. Roy has put much emphasis on moral sanction while this has been denounced by

Parliamentary democracy. Moreover, under the Parliamentary democracy we find party dictatorships. Parliamentarism, according to Roy, does not give the fullest scope to democracy. Roy writes : "Democratic practice which is no more than mere counting of heads is, in the last analysis, also a homage to the collective ego. It allows scope neither for the individual, nor for intelligence"¹⁹. Again, Roy says : "Mechanical counting of heads will cease to be the criterion of democracy"²⁰.

According to Roy, the condition of western democracy is also miserable. Men have no reliance on the success of traditional democracy. So there is immense need of reformation of democracy. Democracy must have to base on humanity. It should not depend on the counting of hands of people. Real democracy is to be established in stead of Parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary democracy becomes the centre to the people who are devoid of morals. There is no place of prudence, honesty, wisdom, morals etc. in it. But such type of human values can not be denied. There is no other superior support to moral support. Certainty of parliamentary democracy does not depend on law, on the contrary, it depends on the conscience of the power-holders who have got majority's support. In theses nos. 12,13 we find Roy's view on parliamentary democracy. Thesis 12 says, "The defects of formal parliamentary democracy have also been exposed in experience

... . Atomised individual citizens are powerless for all practical purposes, and most of the time. They have no means to exercise their sovereignty and to wield a standing control of the state machinery"²¹. Again, thesis no.13 says "Liberalism is falsified or parodied under formal parliamentary democracy"²². Thus Roy has denounced parliamentary democracy. So he stood for decentralized and partyless democracy. M.N.Roy writes : "The endeavour to lay down the humanist foundation of a democratic order must be coordinated with the cooperative reconstruction of the economic life. The result will be direct and economic problems solved on the basis of local resources with the intelligent initiative and cooperative effort of the citizens"²³. Thus we are to be acquainted with local resources after Roy in the following paragraphs.

Roy has pointed out the crisis of modern civilization and it is due to attempt to capture power. Human values have been denied. But to Roy man should be given due honour and he should not be used as a means. He has clearly stated the fact that humanism does not require political power. Humanism attempts for salvation of man and this salvation does not mean salvation in heaven. However, in 'New Humanism', M.N.Roy has given supremacy of organised democracy and decentralization of administration. Moreover, he has said of partyless society. Roy has pointed out that no social

system can be treated as absolute or final. We always find progress of man and society. We can not impose absolute goodness on anything, at best we can say that under this present circumstances, this is the best.

We have already said that there are two forms of democracy, viz. direct democracy and indirect democracy. Moreover, possibly under the influence of the philosophy Plato, Roy admitted the direct form of democracy. Today in many countries we find the indirect form of democracy. But its fatal consequences have been noted by Roy. He says that indirect democracy neglects both man and his desire. Even in general election individual man cannot take his own decision depending on reason. He can not cast his vote according to his own decision because he has to abide by the instructions or commands of the party. Individual being casts his vote in favour of a person who may not even be known to him. So the question of selection of the candidates does not arise at all as per the prevailing system of the politics.

In parliamentary democracy we find scramble for power. The contesting candidates bring out the manifesto published before the commencement of election. But reality speaks, if not all times, and by all, that after being elected the political persons enjoy the benefits of the Govt. And Govt. becomes 'for the people' not by the people i.e. the business

of the Govt. then becomes only to rule the people. It forgets that Govt. has been elected by the people. This, according to M.N.Roy, is not a real democratic Govt. It is said by Roy that in parliamentary democracy and liberal politics individual man's existence is like an atom i.e. trifling. Man is helpless having no freedom and as such he has no sovereignty at all. So he searches for his security. Roy has also pointed out that sometimes in a parliamentary democratic Govt. a party may not get majority and in that case coalition of different parties becomes inevitable. Today this feature has become very common in the history of Indian politics. Roy says that this Govt. can not be beneficial to the interest of the people due to difference of opinion. The consequence of a coalition Govt. in India has given us practical result. Roy's thought and prediction have become true. In such cases dictatorship seems to be justified and democracy in such case is the hindrance of civilization. However, Roy mentions two conditions for establishment of democracy. These are :

(a) decentralization of power and (b) self-dependence of man.

Man is the creator of all social, political and economical laws. In course of time man becomes subordinate to these laws. At that times man's democratic existence is demolished. "Radical humanism envisages a government based on moral sense of the people and therefore every man's moral sense must be highly developed. Along with it, a sense of justice

fairplay and social responsibility must develop in their fullness"²⁴. New Humanism restores supreme confidence in man. It strives for reconstruction of society. "The Radical Humanist Association has also given prominent place to the formation of people's committees in their programme doing "ground work by way of the education of the people in the values and conventions of democracy"²⁵".

According to Roy, people's committee should be the basic unit of an organised democracy. But why? In reply to this question it may be said that the people of the locality are well acquainted with the basic problems as well as the needs of the locality. Roy says that village Panchayats can be set up as units of organised democracy. In this connection, we find a similarity between Roy and Gandhi. Gandhi also gives importance on the Panchayati system. In 1991 in the Election Manifesto of political party, it is found that the importance has been given to Panchayati Raj. This is for to give power directly to the people of the villages. And today different political parties of India are thinking of the development of the people of the grass-root. They are also thinking of social and economic justice. Moreover, political parties of India are thinking of Human Rights to be established by legislation. The thought of Roy shows his farsightedness. Today we are following Roy without mentioning his names. This is really a tragedy that many persons of India do not know the name of

Late M.N.Roy and his contribution. His humanistic thought has made Roy immortal in the world history. Be it not that even when he was a Marxist his humanistic thought was prevailing though not explicitly. Now our task is to make a comparative study between M.N.Roy's and Gandhi's thought. Mahatma Gandhi desired to purify politics. He tried to rise politics which scrambles for power. He will remain immortal in the heart of people of India for his humanist idea. However, at this stage we like to mention the idea of state of Mahatma Gandhi.

Dr. Eddy Asirvatham writes : "Mahatma Gandhi was not primarily a political thinker, not even a political agitator. He was essentially a religious-minded man, a humanist, and a man of action and intuition. He was a curious amalgam of a mystic and a pragmatist. In his own words, he was not a politician masquerading as a religious man, but a religious man entered politics because of his great concern for his fellow human beings"²⁶.

However, his role in Indian Politics is remarkable. He was an advocate of non-violence and he was against the state. he says that the state employs force. State, according to him, cannot stand as a champion of the poor. It is found that Mahatma Gandhiji's ideal was of stateless society. In this regard he was much influenced by Tolstoy who praised of the stateless society. Only stateless society can be beneficial

to the individuals. By adopting force by the state slavery cannot be done away with. This was also admitted by Gandhi. Human beings possess soul whereas the state does not, and as such state is a soulless machine. He did not admit the power of the state. His political thought is based on religion. He said that every utterance and action of his own was based on religious consciousness. Moreover, his politics is based on ethics and in this regard his thought differs from that of Machiavelli who denied ethical aspects in politics. Gandhiji said that the state was never an end in itself. It was only a means to an end. Thus he said that the ideal society is a democracy without the state.

In India of My Dreams Mahatma says that every village will be republic or Panchayat and it must have full power. He says of the rural civilization and this rural civilization is free from exploitation. His dream was to develop self-contained villages based mainly on agriculture and cottage industry. Gandhi says, "I suggest that, if India is to evolve along non-violent lines, it will have to decentralize many things. Centralization cannot be sustained and defended without adequate force. Simple homes from which there is nothing to take away require no policing ..."²⁷.

It is also to be noted that Gandhiji was in favour of a federation of decentralized units of ideal village republics.

"The Government of the village will be conducted by the Panchayat of five persons, annually elected by adult villagers, male and female This Panchayat will be legislature, judiciary, and executive combined"²⁸.

Thus it is said that the individual is the architect of his own Govt. Gandhiji's thought reveals his love for man. However, we find that Roy also gave emphasis on Panchayati system and here we find relation between Roy and Gandhiji.

It should be kept in mind that Panchayati Raj system in India has been accepted since 1953 as per recommendation of Balwanti Mehta Committee report. This system was existing prior independence of India. During the Mughal Empire, the importance of this system became less important. After independence this system has got importance. Art.40 of I Indian Constitution shows its importance. It is also found that Pandit Jawharlal Nehru also admitted the importance of Panchayat system. Thus it is an undeniable fact that there is necessity of local-self Govt. for the fulfilment of the interest of the people. In this connection, we find difference of outlook between Mahatma and Roy. Roy vehemently protested against Mahatma in many respects nevertheless he gave regard to him very much. According to Roy, if Indian democracy is to become a real democracy, it must work starting from the lowest level of society. He told of

formation of "people's committees" in the villages. Moreover, it is found that Roy said of the partyless politics. He also made a model of constitution for free India. He pointed out that the sovereign power is to be vested in the people who are to exercise power through people's committees to be established in the villages, towns and cities. Provincial and federal Govt. are to be elected by the local committees. Provisions for referendum and recall are also admitted by Roy. In election, selection of the candidates would be made by the local committees. It should not be imposed by other as we find today in India. In such type of democracy there will be direct contact of the individuals. The function of the local committee will be to rise rationality and morality among the individuals.

M.N. Roy was the first active politician in India who developed the concept of 'Total Revolution'. Moreover, he advocated the formation of people's committee. According to Roy, there is necessity of forming people's committee at village level. He says that organised democracy gets concrete form in people's committee. Thesis 16 says :

"The method and programme of social revolution must be based on a reassertion of the basic principle of social progress. A social renaissance can come only through determined and widespread endeavour to educate the people as regards the

principles of freedom and rational co-operative living. The people will be organised into effective democratic bodies to build up the socio-political foundation of the post-revolutionary order. Social revolution requires in rapidly increasing number men of the new renaissance, and a rapidly expanding system of people's committees, and an organic co-ordination of both. The programme of revolution will similarly be based on the principles of freedom, reason and social harmony. It will mean elimination of every form of monopoly and vested interest in the regulation of social life"²⁹. Thus it is found that Roy ushers in a revolution which requires the principle of freedom, reason and social harmony. Further, he advocates a social reconstruction of the world. He also points out that there is need of education for reorganisation of the society. The task of education is to manifest the personality of the individual. consciousness of the people is necessary in democracy and this can be evolved only by education and as such there is immense need of education. It is palpable that each and every person is reasonable and he has ability of thinking. Roy has said that in humanism of the past there was supremacy of poetic and spiritualistic thought. But 'New Humanism' has put much emphasis on the exercise of science.

Now I like to mention the main content of 'New Humanism' advocated by M.N.Roy. And it will perhaps not be out of

place to mention the gist of the '22 Theses' proclaimed by Roy for taking up the 'New Humanism'. However, it is to be noted that the main content of 'New Humanism' is that it has gone against the traditional spiritual and supernatural view. It has abandoned the previous view that man is fully dependent on God or super-natural power. It has given supreme importance on man and his reason and this reason develops morality, and morality makes a man free. It declares of freedom of individual man discarding the parliamentary form of Govt. and bringing the importance of people's committee. 'New Humanism' says that neither capitalism nor parliamentary democracy system can solve our problems. It points out that both socialism and communism gainsay the notion of freedom. 'New Humanism' alone can reconcile between social organisation and individual freedom.

The sum and substance of 'New Humanism' is this that it gives primacy of man and his freedom. It never admits any authority over man. It also aims at secular, rational morality to open a new perspective before the world. Humanists believe that there are some human values and these values transcend all other considerations. It develops human personality which is the ultimate aim of life.

There cannot be freedom of the individual if there is no social change. And social change can be brought by revolution. 'New Humanism' is related to the life of man and

as such it is not an abstract philosophy. It intends to usher in a new world and for creation of new world of liberty and social justice, we must go beyond an economic reorganisation of society. Thus Roy says of 'Total Revolution'. It is also explicitly pointed out by Roy in his 'New Humanism' that education of the individuals is a necessary condition for social reorganisation and its progress. Education will remove the barrier of being free of the individuals. Lastly, it is said that 'New Humanism' advocates of fraternity among men.

At the end of this chapter we like to give a note on the 22 Theses of 'New Humanism' in short below. It is found that Roy's first draft of Radical Humanism consists of 18 theses only. But later on after discussion with Philip Spratt, V.M. Talkunde and the like he added other four theses to earlier theses. Thus in 'Radical Humanism' we find altogether 22 theses. The Principles of 'Radical Humanism' give the full and vivid picture of 'New Humanism'. The first thesis reveals that "Man is the archetype of society". It says that manifestation of the individual is the cause of progress of the society i.e., social progress depends on individual. Social progress and freedom mean summation of individual freedom and beneficence. Through the good of the individual, comes collective good. In this regard we find that Roy was much influenced by Bentham and J.S.Mill who advocated "greatest happiness of a greatest number". Further, the thesis

number 3 also advocates that individual good is the only standard of collective good. Here too, we find primacy of the individual. Thus an egoistic tendency is found in Roy though he was not an egoist as he has told "of the world as a commonwealth and fraternity of free men". This we find, in the thesis number 22 of Roy. Again, thesis number 2 says : "... Truth is the content of knowledge". Here, we find that Roy was influenced by Socrates who says that "Virtue is Knowledge" and vice versa. Thesis 4 states of the freedom of will of the individuals. It says of the morality and rationality. Thesis number 5 gives supremacy of human will. It cannot be conjoined with 'economic incentive'. On the other hand, thesis number 7 says that for creation of the new world, the revolution must go beyond economic reorganisation, of the society. Thesis 8 also says that "... it is not freedom to sacrifice the individual at the altar of imaginary collective ego". Some theses express the political thought of Roy. Theses Nos. 9-16 involve the political thought of M N Roy. Thesis 9 clearly goes against communistic thought that 'state will witheraway'. This, according to Roy, is Utopia only. Thesis no.11 denounces dictatorship because it disregards individual freedom. Thesis no.12 goes against Parliamentary democracy. Here, it seems that Roy was somewhat biased by the view of city state of the ancient Greek. The thesis no.14 speaks of People's Committees. In this regard we find Gandhi's influence. And today political

philosophers and thinkers are announcing of the local-self Govt. on which Roy gave importance much earlier. Again, the thesis 16 says that people must be unified through the Panchayats. These Panchayats will be the basis of society and state.

Theses Nos. 17 and 18 stress on economic aspect. Here, it is pointed out that economic liberation of the people is a necessary condition for freedom of the individuals. Thesis 18 indicates regarding the problem of production and distribution. Still further, it may be noted that thesis 20 says of the importance of education. The thesis 19 states that political behaviour of the individuals must be rational and as such it will be ethical. Furthermore, the thesis 21 points out the importance of reconciliation between individual and collective individuals. However, a panorama of different thoughts are found in Roy's mind. Some theses enunciated by Roy express the anti communistic view which took him beyond communism. On the other hand, in him we find economic and political thoughts which were very important and as such even today those thoughts are still helping the political thinkers for the betterment of the citizens. Not only these thoughts are present in Roy but also cultural and moral aspects have been given maximum weightage. He was also not unaware of the necessity of the scientific thought which are necessary in overall development of the country and its citizens. Much

importance has been given to morals of the people for the better organisation of the state and of the development of the citizens. Thus Roy's every kind of thought will remain in the heart of the people of this day. And it will also be helpful to the coming generation.

From our previous discussion it is found that after dissociating from communism Roy advocates of 'Radical Humanism'. He pointed out that neither capitalism nor socialism could do away with the crisis of human emancipation. Communistic Philosophy is defective. In stead of making a man free, it makes man slave by the leaders of the state. So there is need of transcendence from communism and a new type of political party and economic system should be formed which will treat man as a man and which will think for liberty of man. In 1947 in the manifesto of 'New Humanism', M.N.Roy while discussing with the political ideas said that his view of 'New Humanism' was not established basing on any dogma, but there was reason and morality in its establishment. Development of science during renaissance in the European countries gave birth of a new idea of humanism. 'New Humanism' of Roy has given importance on morality. In this respect we find a similarity between Gandhi and Roy. Roy's 'Radicalism' does not speak of class and community. It speaks of man. It speaks of freedom of man. But in Marxism class consciousness rather individual consciousness has been

depicted. According to Roy, human behaviour is rational and morality comes from man's intelligent response.

Roy says that social morality is a burning problem. He writes : "The realization of the possibility of a secular rational morality opens up a new perspective before the modern world. The time-honoured concepts of man's dignity, personality, sovereignty, creativeness, become full of meaning. The feeling that by himself man can never be good fills him with a sense of helpness; and hopelessness follows. Spiritual liberation is the condition for social and political liberation. It must be realized that human existence is self-contained and self-sufficient; and that, therefore, man can find in himself the power to work out his destiny, to make a better world to live in"³⁰. However in the concluding part of this chapter we like to note that at every phase of Roy's life we find his love for human beings. During the first phase when he was a reactionary, his love for the Indians is found as he took attempt for removal of bondage of the Indians from the hands of the British. Further, when he was associated with communism, his love to the exploited persons was found. Still further, during the 'New Humanism' his thought of love of all men has been blcomed in full.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Marxist Thought in India, Debi Chatterjee, p.32.
2. Quoted from 'New Humanism' of M.N.Roy mentioned by him in Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, p.498.
3. Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, M.N.Roy, p.269, Cal Renaissance Publishers, 1952.
4. Beyond Communism, Phillip Sprate & M.N.Roy, p.83.
5. Beyond Communism, Phillip Spratta & M.N.Roy, p.87.
6. New Humanism : A Manifesto, M.N.Roy, pp.34,47.
7. New Humanism, M.N.Roy, p.43.
8. Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, M.N.Roy, p.498.
9. Politics, Power and Parties, M.N.Roy, p.134.
10. Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, M.N.Roy, p.499.
11. Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, M.N.Roy, p.499.
12. New Orientation, M.N.Roy, p.147.
13. Thesis No.9 of New Humanism of Roy and Quoted from Beyond Communism, p.108.

14. Modern Political Parties - 1956, S. Neumann, p.352.
15. Hindusthan Times, March 19, 1953.
16. Politics, Power and Parties, M.N. Roy, p.81.
17. Ibid., p.95.
18. Democratic theory (1962), G. Sartori, p.250.
19. New Orientation, M.N. Roy, p.165.
20. New Orientation, M.N. Roy, p.167.
21. Quoted from Beyond Communism, Phillip Spratt & M.N. Roy, p.109.
22. Quoted from Beyond Communism, Phillip Spratt & M.N. Roy, p.109.
23. M.N. Roy's speech at the First All India Convention of Radical Humanism, Feb 4, 1951.
24. Quest for Freedom, B.N. Dasgupta, p.31.
25. M.N. Roy, The Man, J.B.H. Wadia, p.98.
26. Political Theory, Dr. Eddy Asirvatham, p.682.
27. Harijan, 30th December, 1939.
28. Selection from Gandhi by N.K. Bose, Navajiban, 1957, p.74.
29. Beyond Communism, Phillip Spratt & M.N. Roy, p.110.
30. Reason, Romanticism and Revolution, M.N. Roy, p.467.