GANDHI AND ROY: THE INTERACTION OF IDEOLOGIES IN INDIA

Dr. Dlaton has taught at the school of Oriental and African Studies, London, and in the United States, and written on Ideology in Modern India. The interpretation of Roy's intellectual development vis-à-vis Gandhi offered here may seem controversial, especially to those associates and students of Roy who find the differences between Gandhi and Roy even in the last phase much more fundamental than the similarities, but there is no doubt that the posit`ion very ably presented here deserves serious consideration. The essay was originally published in a symposium 'Gandhi, India and the World' (Melbourne, Philadelphia, Bombay 1970) edited by me, and has been slightly shortened.

Sibbi Narain Ray (SNR)

Manabendra Nath Roy (1887-1954) was born into a Bengali Brahman family in a village outside of Calcutta. Twenty eight years later, as a terrorist revolutionary, he left India for an adventurous career in the Communist international movement. These initial twenty-eight years in Bengal were decisive for the shaping of his personality and thought. Three components of this early experience deserve mention. First, there was the influence of Roy's Brahminical family background and outlook. This inspired and reinforced his penchant for theory, his elitism, and his strong moral temper. Second, the re was Roy's early, intense belief in Hinduism. His religious frame of mind, like the Brahminical spirit, never left him, but prodded him on in his quest for 'those abiding, permanent values of humanity.' Third, in this first generation of his life, the ideology of Indian nationalism exerted an immense influence on Roy as it did on many of his contemporary Bengali intellectuals and students.

'An ideology', writes Edward Shils, 'is the product of man's need for imposing intellectual order on the world. The need for ideology is an intensification of the need for a cognitive and moral map of the universe…' Roy's quest for an adequate ideology began during his youth in Bengal. It continued throughout his next phase as an orthodox communist and later as a Marxist revisionist. Then, still later, having abandoned Marxism for what he called 'Radical Humanism', his search intensified for 'a cognitive and moral map of the universe'. It ended not in satisfaction, but only with his death in 1954. Yet, in this last phase of his thought, Roy had come closer to the fulfilment of his needs, to realization of his identity though the construction of an ideology, than he had ever approached in his earlier phases. The outlines of Roy's cognitive and moral map had been determined in his youth by the combined influences of a Brahminical outlook, a Hindu creed, and the nationalist experience in Bengal. Yet, unlike Gandhi, Roy never came to terms with the demands of his early formative period; unlike Gandhi, he remained alienated until the end from large segments of his own tradition. It is for this reason that the evolution of Roy's thought, which represents a continuing response to the demands of the Indian nationalist tradition, forms an important part of the analysis.

The year 1915 is a key one in the Gandhi-Roy story. In that year, Roy, a terrorist schooled under Jatin Mukherjee and Aurobindo Ghose, left Calcutta on a revolutionary mission to obtain German arms for the struggle against the Raj. In that same year, Mohandas Gandhi returned to India after twenty-one years in South Africa. He soon began his extraordinary rise to power in the Congress. By 1920 he had come to dominate the Indian nationalist movement with a sure sense of leadership that reached a dramatic peak with the Dandi Salt March of 1930. During these fifteen years of Gandhi's eminence, Roy

acquired his reputation of being 'undoubtedly the most colourful of all non-Russian Communists in the era of Lenin and Stalin'. From 1915 until December 1930, Roy moved about on various revolutionary missions, Mexico to Moscow to Berlin, and then Paris, Zurich and Tashkent. In Mexico, Roy was converted to Communism and reputedly helped form the first Communist Party there. In Moscow, he contributed to revolutionary strategy for communist activity in the colonial areas. In Europe, he rose to a position of authority in the Comintern, published a series of books and pamphlets on Marxist theory, and edited a communist newspaper. Therefore, the achievements of both Gandhi and Roy during this period were spectacular. Yet, for all their respective achievements, there was never anything like a balance of power between these two figures. It was Gandhi and never Roy who dominated the Indian nationalist movement with his unparalleled genius for mass leadership. Whereas Roy would struggle long and hard to gain power in India, Gandhi acquired authority with ease and kept it. While Roy necessarily remained, throughout this fifteen year period, preoccupied with Gandhi's power, the latter never mentions Roy in his writes or speeches. Even after Roy's return to the political scene in the late thirties, Gandhi took scant notice of him. Roy, then remained both a cultural and political outsider and suffered as a result. Gandhi, after his return to India in 1915, became rooted in the nationalist tradition and developed a style of political behaviour which gained for him personal confidence as well as political power. Thus, while Roy, out of touch with his tradition, never ceased in his effort to come to secure in his surroundings, could remain aloof. In this sense, a consideration of Roy's view of Gandhi becomes part of a larger problem, that of the relationship of the Indian intellectual to his tradition.

The first detailed Marxist critique of Gandhi appeared in Roy's first major book, India in Transition, which was written in Moscow in 1921. The book grew out of discussions which Roy had with Lenin and other communist figures at the Second Congress of the Communist International. At this Congress, Roy had argued against Lenin that communist policy in the colonial areas must be to support proletarian rather than bourgeois movements. Lenin contended that bourgeois nationalist organizations like the Indian Congress could be considered revolutionary, and since no viable Communist parties existed, these organizations deserved the support of the International. Roy replied that the Congress and similar agencies could only betray the revolution: an Indian proletariat existed, and must be mobilized behind a communist leadership. The Roy-Lenin controversy was clearly over fundamental issues, and had innumerable implications for communist strategy in the future.

Roy later reflected back upon his differences with Lenin and concluded that 'the role of Gandhi was the crucial point of difference. Lenin believed that, as the inspirer and leader of a mass movement, he was a revolutionary. I maintained that, a religious and cultural revivalist, he was bound to be a reactionary socially, however revolutionary he might appear politically. In Roy's view, 'the religious ideology preached buy him [Gandhi] also appealed to the medieval mentality of the masses. But the same ideology discouraged any revolutionary mass action. The quintessence of the situation, as I analysed and understood it, was a potentially revolutionary movement restrained by a reactionary ideology.' 'I reminded Lenin of the dictum that I had learnt from him: that without a revolutionary ideology, there could be no revolution.' These arguments formed the basis of the position on Gandhi that was developed by Roy in *India in Transition*.

Roy begins his critique of Gandhi in this book with the confident assertion that Gandhism has now 'reached a crisis' and its 'impending wane…signifies the collapse of the reactionary forces and their total alienation from the political movement'. Roy's confidence was rooted in the classic Marxist belief in the inexorable march forward of western civilization. Gandhism was seen as a temporary obstacle in the path of history, which would soon be swept aside: not by the Raj, but by the masses themselves, once they became conscious of the progressive movement of history. Whatever Gandhi may tell the masses, 'post-British India cannot and will not become pre-British India.' Therefore, 'here lies the contradiction in the orthodox nationalism as expressed of late in the cult of Gandhism. It endeavours to utilize the mass energy for the perpetuation or revival of that heritage of national culture which has been made untenable by the awakening of mass energy…Therefore, Gandhism is bound to be defeated. The signs of the impending defeat are already perceptible, Gandhism will fall victim to its own contradictions.'

Roy admits that under Gandhi's leadership, through the effective use of hartal and non-co-operation, 'for the first time in its history, the Indian national movement entered into the period of active struggle." Yet, here as elsewhere Roy remains confined within his Marxist categories. Gandhi's success in 1920, he says, simply revealed that 'the time for mass-action was ripe. Economic forces, together with other objective causes had created an atmosphere' which propelled Gandhi into power. Roy seeks to drive home his argument against Lenin by stressing the potential role of the Indian proletariat, portraying it as an awakened and thriving revolutionary force.

Roy's mistake cannot be explained wholly in terms of his Marxism. Rather, his Marxism may be explained as part of a desperate search for a new identity. The identity that Roy sought in the critical period of his youth, was that of an urbane, cosmopolitan type, entirely at home with western civilization which were responsible for the subjugation of his own people. The ideology must, in short, serve to liberate him from the sense of inferiority instilled by imperialism, and at the same arm him in his struggle for the liberation of India. Marxism suited this purpose exactly. His total affirmation of Marxism, therefore, followed immediately after his total rejection of nationalism, and from this there emerged his total and unreasoning denial of Gandhi as a lasting political force in India. In this sense, India in Transition offers a clear example of an intellectual determined to reject his tradition. Not only Gandhi, but also extremist leaders like Tilak and Aurobindo, who only five years earlier had commanded Roy's allegiance, are now dismissed with contempt as examples of 'pretty-bourgeosis humanitarianism.' For the next the years, until his imprisonment in 1931, Roy struggled to affirm himself in his new identity as an international Marxist revolutionary.

Throughout the twenties, as Roy rises to the peak of his authority in the Comintern, his view on Gandhi set forth in 1921 is refined and elaborated. A series of excellent articles and pamphlets by Roy and his first wife Evelyn are devoted to Gandhism. In One year of Non-Co-operation, for example the Roys distinguished five 'grave errors' or 'great defects' of Gandhism. The 'most glaring defect' is the absence of an intelligent programme of economic reform. Next, there is Gandhi's 'obstinate and futile' emphasis on social harmony instead of a frank recognition of the real necessity of class conflict. Then, they find a senseless 'intrusion of metaphysics into the realm of politics'. The revolt against the Raj, they emphasize, 'is a question of economics, not metaphysics.' Further, hey deplore Gandhi's reactionary view of history, his desire 'to run from the Machine-age back to the Stone Age'. Finally, they criticize the total lack of any

revolutionary quality in Gandhi's approach to social change; they see only a 'weak and watery reformism, which shrinks at every turn from the realities of the struggle for freedom.' The entire critique is made with exceptional clarity and forcefulness, and it, together with other writings by the Roys on Gandhi, represent the most incisive communist criticism of him during this period.

For a variety of reasons Roy soon fell out of favour with Moscow, and in December 1929 he was officially expelled from the Communist International. He reacted by persuading himself that he could seize control of the revolutionary movement in India, and a year later he returned home. He was soon arrested, and he remained a political prisoner until November 1936. These five hard years in jail witnessed a substantial change in Roy's ideology, and this eventually had its effect upon his view of Gandhi.

While in prison, Roy, like Gandhi and Nehru, read and wrote voluminously. His three volumes of 'prison diaries' refer often to Gandhi. Indeed, it might be argued that there is no better index to the extent to which Gandhi's presence dominated the Indian scene than the jail reflections of his harshest critic. Roy had inherited from his early nationalist experience and religious outlook a moralist's predilection for seeing the world in categorical terms of right and wrong and he had acquired from his Brahminical spirit a corresponding intellectual tendency to construct the required moral categories. Although Gandhi was never a theorist of this type, he nevertheless shared with Roy a Strong taste for moralizing and a passionate concern for the ethical well-being of society. Eventually, in his radical Humanist phase, the morality in Roy will prevail, just as it had always prevailed in Gandhi, and Roy will abandon Marxism because he finds it devoid of ethics. However, even as early as the thirties, a first glimpse of the way in which Roy's moral outlook will erode his Marxism can be seen in his prison diaries. This appears in his reflections on the two concepts of freedom and revolution. Both of these ideas were to become key themes of Radical Humanism, and the basis of their later development is found here, in the diaries.

When Roy wrote about freedom and revolution as an orthodox Marxist in the twenties, he conceived them as economic categories. Freedom would come with the necessary changes in the economic mode of production, and revolution would be achieved through a violent seizure of power by the Party and the masses. Now, in the thirties, Roy begins to perceive other dimensions in these two ideas. In regard to freedom, he says that his aim is to 'indicate the way to real spiritual freedom offered by the materialist philosophy. For the first time in Roy's writings, the supreme goal of 'spiritual freedom' is distinguished from the lesser aims of 'political freedom, economic prosperity and social happiness.' It should be obvious that Roy, a Marxist, is not using the term 'spiritual freedom' here consciously in a metaphysical sense. Yet the term does not derive from Marxism; and it cannot be a mere coincidence that it was used often by both Vivekananda and Aurobindo, who Roy had at one time read closely. The significant change in Roy's concept of revolution is evident in his increasing preference for the term 'Indian Renaissance', in the second volume of the jail diaries emphasizes the need for a new philosophical outlook in India.

The above analysis of Roy's prison diaries is not meant to suggest that a reader of these volumes in the thirties, with no possible knowledge of the way Roy's thought would develop, could have perceived the affinities between Gandhi and Roy which eventually appeared. The fact, however, that these ideas can be found in the diaries in embryonic form indicates that Roy's movement towards a Gandhian way of

thinking did not occurs overnight. But while it is necessary to appreciate this degree of continuity in Roy's thought, it is equally important to recognize the sharp contrasts, especially in his view of Gandhi, between the 'thirties and the late 'forties. The ruthlessness of Roy's attack on Gandhi in the diaries reaches a climax in an essay entitled 'India's Message'. The critique begins with a contemptuous dismissal of Gandhism as a political philosophy. Far from posting a philosophical system, Roy finds in Gandhism only 'a mass of platitudes and hopeless self-contradictions' emerging from 'a conception of morality based upon dogmatic faith.' As such, it is religion, not philosophy, a religion which has become politicized and thus serves as 'the ideological reflex' of India's 'cultural backwardness' and superstition'.

Roy's attack on Gandhi in 1922 was largely content to write Gandhism off as a medieval ideology at the mercy of inexorable economic forces. Now, however, Roy concentrates on the moral virtues which Gandhi idealized and refutes them at length. Roy argues that 'admirable virtues' like 'love, goodness, sacrifice, simplicity, and absolute non-violence' when preached to the masses by Gandhi only serve to emasculate them. Overthrow of the ruling classes becomes impossible, and the result can only be 'voluntary submission of the masses to the established system of oppression and exploitation.' The worst of Gandhi's tenets is his 'cult of non-violence', the 'central pivot' of his thought, 'holding its quaint dogmas and naïve doctrines together into a comprehensive system of highly reactionary thought.' Far from serving any noble purpose, ahimsa in politics only tends to support the forces of violence and exploitation. 'Therefore, those who preach non-violence, [to and for]… the exploited and oppressed masses, are defenders of violence in practice. If Gandhi's non-violence were practised, capitalism would remain entrenched and the Juggernauth of vulgar materialism' would emerge triumphant. 'Love, the sentimental counterpart of the cult of non-violence, thus is exposed as mere cant.' Finally, Roy asserts that Gandhi's values are based on 'blind faith' and offer only 'the message of medievalism' which idealizes 'the savage living on the tree.' In this way, Gandhi inhibits real progress, which Roy sees in terms of the 'dynamic process' of 'modern civilization' that 'must go forward.' For Roy, then, the light is in the West: in the forces of rationalism, technology, modern science, and 'an economy of abundance.' This latter position was maintained by Roy until the end, and it will always distinguish him sharply from Gandhi.

Soon after his discharge from prison, Roy decided that the sole route to political success in India lay in co-operation with the Congress. This meant a much more conciliatory attitude towards Gandhi. Subhas Bose, had opposed Gandhi in the Congress with some initial success, but Roy, unlike Bose, had neither mass appeal nor a strong regional base of power in Bengal. Therefore, Roy made a brief but futile attempt to rise in the Congress though co-operation with the Gandhians. His article of this period entitled 'Gandhiji, A Critical Appreciation' reflects this spirit of conciliation. He begins with the claim that 'I appreciate Gandhiji's greatness better than any of his ardent admirers. Gandhi, he says, is a great 'political awakener' of the masses and the highest tribute that one can pay him 'would be a regard and respect Gandhiji as the embodiment of the primitive, blind, spontaneous spirit of revolt of the Indian masses.' While Roy does mention, incidentally, that Gandhism may in the future come to stifle the revolution rather than promote it, he concludes that at present 'let us admire, respect and properly appreciate him for the great services that he rendered to the struggle for freedom.' This article does not present a sincere statement of Roy's view of Gandhi at this time. As his personal correspondence shows, Roy regarded Gandhi in this period as his arch-enemy, who should be destroyed as quickly as possible.

In 1946, Philip Spratt, a close associate and strong admirer of Roy, wrote an appreciative foreword for Roy's latest series of speeches, which were published under the significant title of *New orientation.* Spratt reviewed Roy's position on Gandhi and then concluded:

> Roy was highly critical of Gandhism from the very start, in 1920, and has never altered his opinion…Yet it is true, I think, that he has failed to make his criticisms intelligible to the Indian reader. His approach to Gandhism seems that of an outsider, an unsympathetic foreigner. He has never tried to get under the skin of the Mahatma or his admirers and see where that extraordinary power comes from.

This remark constitutes a good indication of the nature of Roy's difficulties with Gandhi during a generation of observation and criticism. Yet, precisely at the moment of Spratt's writing, we can see now in retrospect that significant changes were occurring in Roy's thinking about several key theoretical issues : fundamental questions concerning the nature of power and authority, revolution and history, politics and leadership. And with this fundamental reassessment of basic issues, which Roy called his 'New Orientation', there eventually followed a drastic change of view on Gandhi.

Several factors influenced Roy's sweeping intellectual reappraisal in 1946. First, Roy's Radical Democratic Party, established in opposition to the Congress, was resoundingly defeated in the Indian general elections held throughout the country in the spring of 1946. If the historical importance for India of these general elections was to demonstrate that the League controlled the Muslims and the congress the Hindus, then their importance for Roy was to show that his party, given the nation's polarization, was nowhere in sight. It meant the end of his political career. A second factor which affected his thinking concerned the direction and behaviour of the world communist movement under Stalin. Abroad, the brutal aspects of his leadership were becoming crudely clear; at home, Roy had long been under attack from the Communist Party of India and it became evident that neither practical nor theoretical reconciliation with Communism was possible. Roy expressed the nature of his dilemma in stark terms when he told his followers that they must beware of 'two psychoses' prevalent in India, those of communism and of nationalism. 'Radicalism,' he declared, 'is not camouflaged Communism. We shall have to get over the major nationalist psychosis as well as the minor Communist psychosis, if we believe that we have something new to contribute to the political thought and practice, not only for our country, but of the world as a whole.'

An ideologist abhors nothing more than a moral vacuum, or what Roy liked to deplore as the 'moral and cultural crisis' of our time. For such a vacuum or 'crisis' suggests basic uncertainty over the rightness and wrongness of fundamental moral values, and it is the element of moral certainty which the ideologist seeks above all else. In this respect, Gandhi was no less an ideologist than Roy; but whereas Gandhi had achieved certainty on such matters during his experience in South Africa, Roy underwent a series of such crises, the last and most serious in 1945-46. The final phase of his life, from 1946-53, represents a period of gradual resolution in which Roy delved deeply into his personal resources, trying to form a coherent pattern of thought to meet the demands before him. A close examination of Roy's prolific writings during this period could tell us much about problems relating to the intellectual between tradition and modernity or the relation of ideology to the quest for personal identity. The main purpose

of the concluding section of this essay will merely be to suggest how Roy, while trying to purge himself of the 'nationalish psychosis', nevertheless moved far away from Marxism into a way of thinking which is significantly akin to Gandhi.

On August 1946, while Roy, residing in Dehra Dun, was appraising and reappraising his New Orientation, and Gandhi was busily commenting on Nature Cure from Sewagram, there occurred in Calcutta the worst catastrophe that British India had known. The Muslim League's 'Direct Action Day' in Calcutta was accompanied by unprecedented communal riots : the great Calcutta killing lasted until 20 August, and in these four tragic days, 4000 Hindus and Muslims were slaughtered. The even marks a horrific watershed in the study of the Partition: and its consequences were to have a profound effect upon Roy's view of Gandhi.

Gandhi's reaction to the Calcutta killing, unlike that of Nehru or Jinnah, was to perceive immediately the disastrous social implications and then to act courageously, in an attempt to quell the violence. Just as the Jallianwala Bagh massacre twenty-seven years earlier had shocked Gandhi into realizing the injustice of the Raj, so the Calcutta killing forced him to see the abyss of violence within his own society. When he learned of the appalling scope of the Calcutta tragedy, he exclaimed: 'Would that the violence of Calcutta were sterilized and did not become a signal for its spread all over!' However, when the virus spread into Noakhali and Bihar, he move fast and effectively. The ensuing fifteen months, culminating in his assassination, contain the finest hours of his entire career. During this period, he scored two brilliant triumphs for his method of Satyagraha in his Calcutta and Delhi fasts against communal violence. Less dramatic than these, but equally impressive, were his 'walking tours' in Noakhali and his ingenious us of the prayer meeting to restore trust in a series of strife-torn villages. These final acts moved nearly everyone in India-British, Hindu, and Muslim, alike to a higher appreciation of Gandhi's greatness. Roy in this case was no exception.

'What changed Roy's attitude [towards Gandhi]', writes Phillip Spratt, 'was Gandhi's campaign against the communal massacres, which came at the time of his own final disillusionment with communist political methods.' Spratt observes the similarity in Roy's and Gandhi's mutual opposition to Partition and the common spirit of their response to the communal riots. He remarks that on hearing the news of Gandhi's assassination, 'Roy was deeply moved… henceforth a new respect for Gandhi showed in his writing.' There was indeed a striking change in Roy's attitude towards Gandhi following the assassination. In two articles of February and April 1948, entitled 'The Message of the Martyr' and 'Homage to the Martyr', Roy sets forth for the first time the extent of his ideological agreement with Gandhi. He now discovers that Gandhi's revivalist nationalism was neither the essential nor the greatest element in Gandhi's teaching. 'Essentially, [Gandhi's message] is a moral, humanist, cosmopolitan appeal…The lesson of the martyrdom of the Mahatma is that the nobler core of his message could not be reconciled with the intolerant cult of nationalism, which he also preached. Unfortunately, this contradiction in his ideas and ideals was not realized by the Mahatma until the last days of his life.' In Gandhi's final phase, what Roy repeatedly calls the 'moral and humanist essence of his message' appeared, and it is precisely this which is 'needed by India never so very urgently as today'. Thus, Indians can do justice to their Mahatma when they learn 'to place the moral and humanist core of his teachings above the carnal cult of nationalism and power-politics.

There are those who argue that Roy's tributes to Gandhi after the assassination were merely sentimental outbursts, entirely inconsistent with the main line of his thought. This argument is mistaken for several reasons. First, when Roy was attacked by some of his readers for calling Gandhi a humanist and cosmopolitan, he admitted that he had written the article while 'deeply moved' by the crime, 'in an emotional state'. But then he went on to defend his position with vehemence, deploring the 'insensitivity of the logical purists' who attacked him, and refusing categorically to retract a word that he had written. Gandhi, he insisted in this later article, 'sincerely wanted politics to be guided by moral considerations', and his 'endeavour to introduce morality into political practice was the positive core of Gandhism.' This made Gandhi, like Roy, a humanist. A second reason why this argument is mistaken has already been seen : glimpses of Roy's movement away from Marx and towards Gandhi can be found as early as in the prison diaries, the ideological changes of his 'new orientation'.

Finally, far changed attitude takes a permanent form in his later writings: as Philip Spratt remarked, a 'new respect' for Gandhi now infuses his thoughts. This can be seen clearly in an article which Roy wrote on Gandhi a full year after the assassination. In this piece, Roy pays respect to 'the immortality of this [Gandhi's] message' and then sums up the significance of Gandhi's thought in these remarkable words: 'Practice of the precept of purifying politics with truth and non-violence alone will immortalise the memory of the Mahatma. Monuments of mortar and marble will perish, but the light of the sublime message of truth and non-violence will shine forever." The passage signifies a total departure from Roy's earlier denunciation of Gandhi. Equally important, though, is the relationship which Roy suggests here between the values of truth and non-violence on the one hand, and the goal of purifying politics on the other. For the formation of this conceptual relationship indicates a nexus of ideas in Roy's mind familiar to Gandhi's way of thinking, especially on the themes of politics and power, and the relation of the means to the ends of action.

'The implication of the doctrine of non-violence,' Roy now believes, 'is the moral dictum that the end does not justify the means. That is the core of the Mahatma's message — which is not compatible with power-politics. The mahatma wanted to purify politics; that can be done only by raising political practice above the vulgar level of a scramble for power'. This passage represents those ideas which Roy began to develop at a feverish pace in the last five years of his life. In a characteristically Gandhian manner, Roy wants now to purify politics by purging it of both the 'struggle for power' and the party system itself. 'Humanist politics,' he says, must be a moral force; 'it must get out of the struggle for power of the political parties.' Only in these circumstances can political power be transformed into moral authority. Leadership must come not from corrupt party bosses, but rather from 'detached individuals, that is, spiritually free men [who] cannot be corrupted by power.....it is possible for the individual man to attain spiritual freedom, to be detached and thus to be above corruption. Such men would not hanker after power'. Thus preoccupation with the corruptibility of political power and the need for establishing a moral basis for leadership was, as Roy acknowledged, at the heart of Gandhi's thought. Moreover, their common preoccupation 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.

The implications of this way of thinking for politics are far-reaching: they range from a vision of the ideal political leader as a *karmayogin* type, above the lust for power, occupying a position of pure moral authority, to a theory of social organisation which urges party-less politics, and a highly decentralised system of government. This is a way of thinking which is fraught with paradoxes. There is a strong element of elitism or moral authoritarianism mixed with a marked strain of not only populism but a peculiar variety of Indian anarchism. Yet it is this paradoxical quality which makes the ideology of modern India so fascinating: as appealing, in its way, as the equally paradoxical thought of Calvin, or Rousseau, or Marx.

It should be stressed in conclusion that the perception of a great tradition of ideas in modern India need not detract from the variety of little traditions of thought which co-exist beside it. Nor are the latter necessarily subsumed within the former. There is much in Roy's thought, for example, that is not encompassed by Gandhi. Radical Humanism as set forth by Roy and developed by his associates cannot be fairly presented as merely a variation on Gandhism. For Roy's persistent emphasis on atheistic humanism, rationalism, and materialism must distinguish him from Gandhi, indeed, from any other tradition of thought in modern India. The focus of this essay has been on an ideological movement of congruence and not divergence. It is this movement of thought, shared to a notable degree by such apparently divergent figures as Gandhi and Roy that can be seen as the dominant ideology of modern India.