

THE RADICAL HUMANIST



ESTABLISHED : APRIL 1937

*(Formerly in the name of 'INDEPENDENT INDIA'
from April 1937 to March 1949)*

Founder

M.N. ROY

Vol. 89 Number 10

JANUARY 2026

Rs. 15 / MONTH



(21 March 1887 – 25 January 1954)

On the 71st Death Anniversary of M.N. Roy, the great revolutionary freedom-fighter, philosopher, intellectual, prolific writer and exponent of individual freedoms and Radical Humanism, we pay our respectful tributes and vow to take his legacy forward

670

THE RADICAL HUMANIST

Vol. 89 Number 10, January 2026

Monthly journal of the Indian Renaissance Institute

Devoted to the development of the Renaissance Movement and to the promotion of human rights, scientific temper, rational thinking and a humanist view of life.

Founder Editor:

M.N. Roy

Advisor:

Dr. Narisetti Innaiah

Editor:

Mahi Pal Singh-Editor

Editorial Board:

Vinod Jain, Bhaskar Sur,
Dr. Dipavali Sen, Pratap Saharan,
Mahi Pal Singh-Editor (Ex-Officio)

Printer and Publisher:

Sheoraj Singh,

Send articles and reports to:

Mahi Pal Singh at Raghav Vihar, Phase- 3,
Prem Nagar, Dehradun- 248007. (Uttarakhand)
(M) 9312206414, 8433255386, (Landline):
013-53549624

or E-mail them to:

theradicalhumanist@gmail.com or
mahipalsinghrh@gmail.com

YouTube:

INDIAN RENAISSANCE INSTITUTE; I.R.I.
Website: www.indianrenaissanceinstitute.com

Please send Subscription/Donation

Cheques in favour of :

The Radical Humanist to:

Sheoraj Singh,

3821/7, Kanhaiya Nagar,

Tri Nagar, Delhi- 110035. (M) 9891928222.

Email ID: srsingh3821@gmail.com

**Donations and Subscriptions can
also be transferred directly to :**

The Radical Humanist, Current Account Number
0349201821034, IFSC Code CNRB0002024, Canara
Bank, Totaram Bazar, Tri Nagar, New Delhi- 110035.

Please Note: Authors will bear sole accountability
for corroborating the facts that they give in their
write-ups. The Editor is responsible for selection
of the matter that is published in the magazine.

CONTENTS:

Page No.

Articles and Features :

Articles and Features.:

**“Reminiscing Manabendra Nath
Roy”: 3 Radical Humanism:
Sovereignty, Rationality, and
Freedom** 3
Sohini Datta

**A Wishlist for the Chief Justice
of India** 8
Madan B. Lokur

**Two Fundamental Criteria: Man
and Reason** 11
He Wan

**Marxism Applied to India from
Abroad** 17
G.P. Bhattacharjee

**Possibility of Synthesizing the
Thoughts of Gandhi-Roy-
Ambedkar
and Upadhyay** 23
Dr. Vidyut Joshi

**Origin of Religion and its
Development** 28
Bipin Shroff

Ill effect of caste and blind faith 33
Sudhesh Korde

**The Humanist Frame: The Frame
of Humanist Communication** 35
Patrick Meredith

**Minutes of the Board of Trustees
Meeting,** 38
2nd November 2025 at NOIDA

Books written by M.N. Roy 42
available at our website:

Articles and Features :

“Reminiscing Manabendra Nath Roy”

Radical Humanism: Sovereignty, Rationality, and Freedom

(21 March 1887 – 25 January 1954)

Sohini Datta,

Guest-Faculty, Department of Economics
and Politics, Visva Bharati, Santiniketan,
West Bengal - 731235, India

Abstract

M.N. Roy's concept of Radical Humanism stressed three important principles- Sovereignty, Rationality, and Freedom. The paper elaborates the theoretically rich and engaging intellectual history of M.N. Roy's philosophical position on freedom and morality, which is according to Roy, nothing mystic, nothing divine but comes naturally to human beings. The paper gives the insight to understand the relations between Human Nature, Freedom and Morality which is purely based on the scientific theory of physics and biology. The paper also shows a range of his intellectual experiences that ultimately shaped his unique idea of Radical Humanism comprising of full human freedom. In the recent era of communal politics in India, it has become extremely important to cultivate mass consciousness to build social solidarity among human beings. Thus understanding the basic tenets of Radical Humanism is essential which can further empower the individuals to experience a rational living in its truest sense. Among many interesting selections in his volume Roy's principle of radical democracy: twenty-two thesis is especially a representative of his thinking on Radical Humanism. He emphasized ethics and eschewed Supernatural interpretations as antithetical to his scientifically oriented conception of "New Humanism."

Keywords: Radical Humanism, Sovereignty, Rationality, Freedom, Scientific Humanism, New Humanism, Materialism

M.N. Roy was one of the most interesting, however, exceptionally debatable modern Indian scholars of politics and philosophy. In the development of his thoughts, Roy shifted his position from a Revolutionary to an impassioned Marxist and from a Marxist to an extreme Humanist. Indian contemporary ways of thinking can broadly be classified as spiritualism and materialism. Materialism can further be separated into the Marxist edge of materialism and the non-Marxist Abstract M N Roy's concept of Radical Humanism stressed three important principles-casing of materialism. M N Roy represented the non-Marxist frame of materialism in modern India and that was his distinction in the contemporary period.

The original name of Manabendra Nath Roy was Narendra Nath Bhattacharya. He started his Political journey as a National Revolutionary at the early age of fourteen. He had been dynamic in the activist association like Anushilan Samiti and Yugantar bunch in Bengal. He left India in 1915 to gather arms for an uprising against Britishers however failed in his strategic tailing he got away into the USA and took cover at Stanford University. M N Roy's coordinated effort with his communist companions at Stanford University and pursuing rich Marxist literature in the New York library that pulled him in the Marxist way of thinking.

On behalf of Lenin, Borodin welcomed Roy to Soviet Russia where he turned into an active individual in the Communist International since 1920 and proceeded in the USSR until he left the nation in 1930. In Communist International, he had been exceptionally dynamic managing colonial issues that the connection between the Communist International and the development of Communist freedom movements in nations like colonial India. He was able to establish the first Communist Party in India and what we find

in Indian Communism today is actually a continuation of his efforts. He had a conflict with Lenin and known as "Debate over Colonial Question". He was removed from socialist International in 1929 returned India in 1930. His long haul involvement with the communist development everywhere throughout the world, at last, resulted in the culmination of another way of thinking which today knew as New Humanism, Radical Humanism or Scientific Humanism.

Radical Humanism is an undeniable a fascinating way of thinking where two things are to be noted about Roy's philosophical position in his last stage: First - he had shown subtle decline on his confidence on Marxism and finally bid goodbye to the official tenets of Marxism. Second - he had based his Humanism on present-day science that is on Physics and Biology. Radical humanism had completely disagreed with the spiritual tradition of Indian philosophy. Most prominent thinkers of spiritualism in India were Mahatma Gandhi, Aurobindo Ghosh, Swami Vivekananda, Rabindranath Tagore and many more. Humanism is indeed an exception to this common feature of Indian thinking of spiritualism. At the same time, he did not agree with several things in Marxism as well, especially the question of class leadership that is a proletariat dictatorship.

So we can say that are two things very important for Roy's new philosophy:

(1.) His disagreement with spiritual tradition and continuation of it in contemporary India.

(2.) He disagreed with Marxism. He dared to question the basic tenets of Marxism including class domination, proletariat dictatorship and even philosophy of dialectical materialism was not acceptable to Roy because he integrated materialism in his way by naming it Physical

Realism to avoid the misrepresentation of materialism. He had developed the concept of materialism based on modern science especially Physics and Biology. So he was able to develop Scientific Humanism which is indeed against all forms of Fascism on one hand and oppose religion on the other hand. It is interesting to say that his opposition to religion goes parallel with his opposition to Marxism. M N Roy's political stands in the days preceding Independence was quite strange. On one side Roy opposed Gandhian path as he never agreed to Ahimsa Path of Gandhism and on the other side he could not agree with Marxist and the Congress Socialist Unity. So, in pre independent India, Roy's position was complicated, he had to fight on both sides with Gandhi and Marxist.

Basic tenets of Radical Humanism: Sovereignty, Rationality, and Freedom

In what sense Roy's humanism becomes relevant? To see both the critical and constructive phases of Roy's philosophy. He is a very strong critic of both religion and Marxism. His critic focused on anything that makes an individual human being submissive. For example Supernaturalism of religion, a class dictatorship of Marxism, Superhuman power that makes individual submissive to the collective ego. "Sacrificing the individual on the altar of the collective ego."

(a) Sovereignty

The sovereignty of the individual human being is sometimes the most fundamental tenets of Radical Humanism. Individual before any social or any other collective system. An individual is the target of all reforms in society. We can easily understand the position and comparison with Marxism which is socialism and the idea which puts society before an individual.

In this case, we can see Roy's position is closer to Gandhism than that of Marxism. It is because Gandhism also argued that only a just society can create a just individual but Roy's

position is not spiritualistic, it is materialistic. Roy was confident that Radical Humanism can explain the existence of the individual with reference to the scientific theory especially the theory in Physics and Biology. So, Roy had made a very beautiful synthesis between the postulates of physics that is the world is a law-governed system and the biological theory of evolution that is ascending process of becoming. All these processes are rooted in the real world that is Cosmos or the law governed world. From this background of the law-governed universe, individuals are acquiring potential knowledge. So, we come to the second most important tenet of Radical Humanism- Rationality.

(b) Rationality

According to Roy "Man is essentially a rational being. His basic urge is not to believe but to question to know." Roy traced back the origin of human rationality to the cosmos or the law government universe that is why Roy clearly defined human rationality as the 'microcosmic echo of the macrocosm' which means macrocosm is the universe, the law governing system and the individual is a microcosmic echo. So, human rationality or the ability to understand the relations in nature is nothing divine, it is the worldly development due to the process of biological evolution that is human being becomes Rational as a product of nature but there is nothing mystic about rationality of individual human being. It is only the biological heritage or an echo of the harmony of the universe and we can also explain the third postulate of Radical Humanism namely the human urge for freedom.

(c) Freedom

Of course, freedom is connected with the human faculty of morality. Human freedom is rooted in the biological natural life of the species. The architect of freedom is nothing but the struggle for existence. Thus this struggle for existence is a characteristic of life in nature becomes qualitatively transformed in the human being. There is a natural evolution of human

beings on a biological level from his childhood to the last breath of his life is a continuous struggle for existence which is mechanical and this biological struggle for existence becomes the urge for freedom. Human brain which is an integral part of biological struggle develops gradually which brings conscience and rationality to an individual. That is the quest for freedom which is indeed a continuation of the biological struggle for existence. Another important thing about Roy's principle of freedom is he could successfully link freedom with knowledge. That is a human being in the pursuit of freedom also attains new ideas. This accumulation of knowledge is indeed linked with the human urge for freedom. That is stage by stage human being detached from nature. They want to liberate themselves from the constraints of nature and for continuing this liberation, human beings continuously acquire knowledge that is the supporting mechanism of human life on Earth.

Roy's concept of morality is unique because it has been told that he did not like the term materialism mainly for the reason that materialism sometimes implies a negation of morality. Materialists are not clear about moral questions. Roy wanted to avoid this and also he wanted to add the development in physics to the concept of Humanism that is why he used the term Physical Realism instead of materialism. He was specific about the question of morality. Roy argued that morality is not a divine faculty. God has nothing to do with human morality and even society does not guarantee morality. Rationality is a natural development and rationality creates society but when we go to Marxism, society is moulding everything. Social life is moulding our psychological life, our morality, and our rationality.

But Roy is of the view that rationality is determining our social life. Roy said that on the basis of nationality, human beings create a society, create a moral institution and moral ideas. So, Rationality is the essential factor of a

human being to achieve a moral life. The original contribution made by M N Roy to political science is based on tenets of Sovereignty, Rationality, and Freedom. Roy's philosophy is essentially anti-authoritarian, it is more and more recognizing the sovereignty of an individual. Based on his philosophical idea, Roy had formed a political party named Radical Democratic Party and without any delay dissolve the party because Roy and his disciples believed that a political party is indeed an authoritarian structure, the institution that will demand the submission of individual. Thus he dissolved the party and convert it into Radical Human Movement. A visionary movement that shall contain enlightened individuals who can act as guides, friends, philosophers of people instead of being their leaders or Masters. A crucial element in Roy's Radical Humanist Politics is the idea of Party-less Democracy. It may sound a little bit strange how democracy is possible without a party but the concept of party-less democracy guided by an enlightened individual is the core of Roy's idea and he put forth not just the idea but he had proposed definite scheme to realize party-less democracy. It should be based on the Cooperative economy. It should be based on organized liberal democracy. There are different levels of organization and Roy had the vision of direct democracy from the bottom level.

According to Roy, a democratic system is measured successfully according to the amount of freedom it guarantees to the individual of that society. So, the most basic thing is the freedom of the individual and a party or class or even a parliamentary system was opposed by Roy. He believed that in parliamentary democracy in due course of time, the system will become corrupt and the system will become dominating, totalitarian over the ordinary people. So, he opposed not only the class dictatorship of Marxism, not an only theocratic government but also parliamentary democracy what we call traditional conventional parliamentary

democracy. He was afraid of all the systems becoming totalitarian and oppressive on the life of people. Finally, he had the dream of establishing the Renaissance Movement in India. At his last stage of thinking, he also understood the importance of Universal Education to teach human beings to think critically and make them scientifically literate. For Humanist philosophers, political scientists and others, Manabendra Nath Roy's unique and still very relevant view of Humanism will have great appeal and broad application beyond its original Indian context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Roy, M. N., and Spratt, Phillip. Beyond Communism (Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1981). https://archive.org/stream/in.ernet.dli.2015.124407/2015.124407.Beyond-Communism-Ed 1st_djvu.txt
2. Roy, M. N. Materialism (Calcutta: The Indian Renaissance Association Ltd., 1940).
3. Roy, M.N. M.N. Roy's Memoirs (New Delhi: Allied Publishers Private Limited, 1964). https://archive.org/stream/in.ernet.dli.2015.149696/2015.149696.Mnroys Memoirs_djvu.txt
4. Roy, M. N. New Humanism – A Manifesto (Calcutta: Renaissance publications, 1953) <https://archive.org/>

stream/in.ernet.dli.2015.460336/2015.460336.New Humanism_djvu.txt

5. Roy, M. N. Reason, Romanticism, and Revolution (Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1989). ISBN 81-202-0167-1
6. Chakraborty, B. and Pandey, R.P. Modern Indian Political Thought: Text and Context (Delhi: SAGE Publications India Private Ltd

JOURNAL ARTICLES

1. Kataria, K. (2005). M.N. ROY'S CONCEPTION OF NEW HUMANISM. The Indian Journal of Political Science, 66(3), 619-632. Retrieved March 31, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/41856153
2. Nath, Ramendra. "Manabendra Nath Roy (1887—1954)", Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, https://www.iep.utm.edu/roy_mn/
3. Kataria, Kanta. (2005). M.N. ROY'S CONCEPTION OF NEW HUMANISM. The Indian Journal of Political Science. 66. 619-632. 10.2307/41856153.

Courtesy **International Research Journal of Management Sociology & Humanity (IRJMSH)** Vol 11 Issue 12 [Year 2020] ISSN 2277 – 9809 (Online) 2348–9359 (Print) www.irjmsh.com 

Articles/Reports for The Radical Humanist

Dear Friends,

Please mail your articles/reports for publication in the RH to:- theradicalhumanist@gmail.com or mahipalsinghrh@gmail.com or post them to:- Mahi Pal Singh, Raghav Vihar Phase-3, Prem Nagar, Dehradun, 248007 (Uttarakhand)

Please send your digital passport size photograph and your brief resume if it is being sent for the first time to the RH.

A note whether it has also been published elsewhere or is being sent exclusively for the RH should also be attached with it.

- Mahi Pal Singh,

Editor, The Radical Humanist

A Wishlist for the Chief Justice of India

Madan B. Lokur

Whatever view one takes, there is not a shadow of doubt that the CJI has a massive problem on his hands.



Representative image. President Droupadi Murmu administers the oath of office to Justice Surya Kant as the 53rd Chief Justice of India during a swearing-in ceremony, at Rashtrapati Bhavan in New Delhi, Monday, Nov. 24, 2025. Photo: PTI.

The year is coming to a close and the Chief Justice of India (CJI) has been in the saddle for about a month. What is the new year going to be like for him? I wish a crystal ball was available somewhere to tell us what is in store for him. Some say the justice delivery system in India is facing serious challenges with mounting case pendencies and vacancies in judicial appointments. Some say these are not challenges but symptoms of a grave crisis with justice delivery on a ventilator. Some are optimistic. They believe every institution has its ups and downs and the system will eventually take care of itself. Remember the Emergency, they say. The Supreme Court plumbed the depths but bounced back within a decade or two. It was then hailed a People's

Court. Don't worry, be happy.

Whatever view one takes, there is not a shadow of doubt that the CJI has a massive problem on his hands. If he doesn't or cannot resolve the issues plaguing justice delivery during his 15-month tenure, we might as well bid a silent goodbye to *nyaya* or *insaaf* or justice (pre Macaulay) and the rule of law (post Macaulay). So, here is my wishlist for the CJI.

Strengthen every high court

Our Constitution provides that every high court has its own Chief Justice. The administration and management of the high court (and the courts subordinate to it) are in the domain of its Chief Justice, not in the jurisdiction or the domain of the Supreme Court

of India. Recently, a senior advocate of the Supreme Court had to remind a bench (as reported online) presided over by the predecessor CJI: “Why should the High Courts be divested of their authority and duty under the Constitution? It is time to strengthen the High Courts, not weaken them. Things have gone too far.” Things have gone too far – wow!

So, regardless of whether things have gone too far or not, on top of my wishlist is the strengthening of every high court. Remember, during the Emergency, nine out of 11 high courts stood their ground – only the Supreme Court capitulated. So it is possible to re-strengthen the high courts, but how?

It is time to recognise that the high court of a state is the supreme court of that state. The interpretation of every state law should end in finality in the high court. Why should a ‘landlord versus tenant’ dispute in a state come to be decided by the Supreme Court of India. Surely, the high court can resolve it. Should the high court commit an error, including a perverse error, it can correct itself by constituting a larger Bench, as the Supreme Court does. There is really no occasion for any decision interpreting a state law to reach the Supreme Court, unless it has a federal impact. The Supreme Court is essentially a federal court while the high court is a state-specific court. The Supreme Court should retain its federal character by only deciding cases involving the Constitution or parliamentary laws or cases impacting not only the state, but the country. Leave the high courts to interpret state legislation as the supreme court of the state. This will reinvigorate the high courts and collaterally reduce the number of cases travelling to the Supreme Court.

Appointment of Chief Justices and transfer of judges

Second, the CJI and the collegium should forget about appointing a Chief Justice of the high court from outside the state or transferring judges from one high court to another. Please

stop it. What purpose does a transfer serve? If a judge is good enough to be the Chief Justice of a high court about which he or she knows nothing, surely, that judge is better equipped to be the Chief Justice of his or her own high court, called the parent court.

The idea of an outside Chief Justice was mooted when the collegium system of recommending judges for appointment did not exist. There were, perhaps, allegations of nepotism and favouritism in recommending the appointment of judges since the decision was only of the Chief Justice. Now that the collegium system exists, the chances of bias in recommendations are greatly minimised, though not eliminated. But then, the collegium in the Supreme Court can take care of any allegation of bias.

Transfer of judges makes even lesser sense, perhaps no sense at all. Better administration of justice? Is there any evidence that a judge became more judicious after being transferred or evidence that the transferor or transferee high court became more efficient? Let’s get real – there is no such evidence, nor will there ever be such evidence. We do not have any system of evaluating the performance of a judge. All transfers are based on a subjective assessment and, in the recent past, it is believed, some transfers are at the behest of the Union government. If true, it’s the beginning of the end of the judiciary’s independence.

Incidentally, one of the objections to the 27th amendment to the Pakistan Constitution is that a judge can be transferred without his consent. Transfer without consent is something quite routine in India. Recall the terrible transfers such as those of Justice Rajiv Shakhder, Justice Akil Kureshi, Justice Muralidhar and many more. Also recall the stubborn refusal by the Union government to transfer a judge despite the plaintive cry of the then CJI. Now, if newspaper reports are to be believed, there is already a mutiny on the

deck with a judge of the Madras high court not accepting a transfer to Kerala high court. Such mutinies may increase over time.

Transparency in the collegium system

Third, the problem with the collegium system is the opacity in its functioning.

The high court collegium is also opaque, but every lawyer in the high court knows what has happened in the collegium meetings. Again, let's get real and not behave like an ostrich. And what's wrong if the collegium, whether in the high court or in the Supreme Court is transparent? Hasn't the Supreme Court borrowed (and sometimes adopted) the principle that sunlight is the best disinfectant? Let's give transparency a chance.

Consider the advantages of transparency. If a dummy is recommended for appointment as a High Court judge, it will only shame the high court collegium. If the recommendation is accepted by the Supreme Court collegium, it will shame those learned judges. Therefore, to preserve their self respect and dignity, the collegium in the high court and the Supreme Court will have no option but to act fairly keeping merit and diversity in mind. They will eschew nepotism and favouritism, but more importantly, transparency will prevent the Union government from dominating the appointment process.

Some say that India is the only country where judges appoint judges. Not true – the Supreme Court collegium only makes a recommendation to the Union government. Ultimately, it is the Union government which decides whom to appoint. So many recommendations have been rejected by the Union government or kept pending indefinitely. This has resulted in some lawyers withdrawing their consent to be appointed, most famously Aditya Sondhi from Bengaluru. A high court Chief Justice, recommended for appointment to the Supreme Court, had to wait for almost eight months before the government cleared

his appointment. So to say that judges appoint judges is false and misleading.

In this context, the collegium system of recommendations should not be killed. Rather, it should be improved through sunlight and strengthened. Today, the Central Government appears to be in control of the appointment of judges. So, if a recommendation of the Supreme Court collegium is thrown in the waste paper basket, there is nothing the Supreme Court can do about it. The non-appointment of Saurabh Kirpal to the Delhi high court is an example. With the Union government having seemingly captured the process of appointment of judges, the collegium system is gradually becoming a lame duck. Strengthen it please, otherwise the independence of the judiciary is lost and the last bastion will crumble like a house of cards.

The usual suspects

Reducing the number of pending cases and appointing judges to the high courts have been talked about, but not acted upon for decades. It is my belief that unless action is taken, starting today, and on a mission mode, these twin problems cannot be sorted out.

Consider this: the number of cases pending in the high courts and district courts across the country is increasing by a couple of lakhs every month. This can be verified from the National Judicial Data Grid. There is no way this backlog can be tackled through conventional methods. The judicial posts lying vacant across the country is in the region of 20%. These posts cannot be filled up because adequate courtrooms and infrastructure are lacking, there is a massive shortage of trained staff, the prestige of holding a judicial post is waning with rapid-fire transfers, some competent lawyers are not willing to be appointed judges. The resource crunch will not go away. Increasing the judge strength is possible on paper, not in fact.

(To be Contd....on Page -16)

Two Fundamental Criteria: Man and Reason

He Wan

.....Continued from the last issue

Thus, it also inevitably formed my reasonableism and all-fairism, and extended my political proposition and social conception from them, thereby greatly improving my philosophical applied theory. Now I will give a brief introduction to these two topics, and these two are actually the implementation and development of the above two criteria, or they are also their extensions.

Here, I have to mention the natural law promoted by Locke, in which he advocated natural rights, equality for all, and the supremacy of justice. In fact, Locke's natural law in my view is the humane righteous principle created by man through conscious action that are in line with the interests of all and in line with the ultimate development, that is, reasonable law. On the other hand, Locke deeply saw where on earth the fundamental problems of everything and everything lay — namely the issue of interests, and pointed out sharply, "People form this society only to seek, preserve and enhance the interests of citizens themselves." On this basis, I regard how people fairly obtain interests as the fundamental way to solve all problems, and propose that when there is no the phenomenon of taking advantage in this world, the world is just a perfect society. All in all, Locke's natural law can be said to be the cornerstone of the whole philosophical application theory and social development theory!

Actually, the prescription that I make to this world is simply to unify thinking, unify actions and unify development under the guidance of reasonably righteous principle, so as to realize the fully unified all-fairism's society of all of mankind. This road is undoubtedly the third road that is different from capitalist society and socialist society, will completely circumvent the fundamental problems of the two and allow them

to safely withdraw from the stage of history. Of course, this is a step-by-step "gentle" reform process, from economy to politics, from part to all, in an orderly manner. The regional process sequence can be roughly divided into four echelons: the first echelon is EU countries; the second echelon is Japan, South Korea, India and other countries; the third echelon is the United States, Russia and other countries; the fourth echelon is China, Vietnam and other countries. In fact, the current functioning of the EU system has already fired the first shot for the formation of this future society and it seems that great minds think alike! However, it also have to be seen that the current EU is still far from the true unification, or it is just barely made together, and internal disputes are still emerging endlessly. Today (in 2020), I see Merkelgathering EU member states again to discuss how to compromise their respective interests, so as to reach some consensus on surface. This also actually makes one have to say that the current EU can be described as besetting with difficulties, trudging and even faltering. If for all its causes, there is still a lack of a correct, unified and powerful theory, and there is no the corresponding organization of substantial guide, so as to lead to it. That is to say, their theory is still a mere formality and the European Commission is probably just an empty shelf, so the EU has not taken the problems into the real place and the deep place, however my theory and organization can be said to be exactly to make up for these major deficiencies!

And in this new social form, the corresponding political system and the two political systems of autocracy and democracy are definitely very different. Today, here I might as well put forward "righteouscracy", a political form that is completely different from

democracy and autocracy. In fact, both democracy and autocracy are extremism that violate justice, but simply one is internal and the other is external. Despotism will inevitably suppress the people of its own country, and democracy will often suppress other countries, that is, one grabs extreme interests for the ruling group and the other grabs extreme interests for the ethnic group. The results of democratic elections can only represent majority, but not correctness. For the vast majority of people, their votes will only consider whether they are beneficial to themselves, but not whether they are beneficial to others. Thus, which group has more people, which group will be reflected glory. As for whether it is fair and correct, no one can care about it and restrain it. In domestic affairs, this majority may basically be a more fair reflection, but in external affairs, there is no bottom line. The interest relationship here is highly consistent, so even if the foreign acts are not simon-pure they can be smoothly passed. Where there are injustices, there are struggles. Therefore, under the autocratic and democratic system, the world has never been steady, that kills, strives and wars are always flooding the world. But how can we completely cure these stubborn diseases? Only to adopt a new political system way — righteouscracy. Righteouscracy refers to the political election held by those who hold the ideology of reasonable righteousness in a dominant situation, so as to ensure the correctness of the election, thereby to safeguard the common interests of all people and enable the whole mankind to obtain the eternal and healthy development. Of course, the realization of righteouscratic politics definitely requires a process. At first, only a small proportion of righteous men (people with the ideology of reasonable righteousness) will participate in democratic elections with other ordinary people. But as the righteous men gradually increased that the number of people is more than half, it can be called the righteouscracy election.

In addition to the short-sightedness of many people, the outbreak of the epidemic also exposed a serious problem — weak governments (except for socialist countries, of course), which caused serious consequences that should not be. This has to sound the alarm for us, the drawbacks of democracy are becoming more and more exposed — the perceptual ignorance abducts the true knowledge of reason, and therefore the introduction of righteouscracy politics is not only to contain dictatorship, but also to prevent populist frenetic movements. In fact, as the old saying goes, where there is no forethought, there is always immediate worry. The mess in the United States now undoubtedly confirms the saying — the practice of caring about its head but not its bottom that seeks quick success and instant benefits, has already laid the foreshadowing for today's tragedy. From among it, the most fundamental problem is also reflected — the level of human ideology, that is, whether the far-sighted world thinking or elite thinking, or the short-sighted national thinking or populist thinking.

The biggest difference between democratic politics and righteouscratic politics is that one takes the interests of individuals or some people as the starting point, and the other takes the interests of the whole as the starting point. Of course, democracy is definitely better than autocracy, but righteouscracy is definitely better than democracy. Democracy simply turns the solely big of a family or one person into the solely big of a certain class (this class cannot represent the interests of the ordinary class), and righteouscracy makes everyone big. The present chaos in the world still has a lot to do with the inthoroughness of democratic politics. Although it is more advanced than autocracy, it does not act on the height of the interests of all. Democracy and autocracy can actually be said that one is on a mat and the other is a reed, in other words, one is a tiger's den and the other is a wolf's nest. Both have their own dark side, and neither are very clean and simon-pure, so

they can grab each other's braids and attack each other. Therefore, there is no right or wrong in them, only the difference of size in strength. Also so, no matter which side wins, the interests of honest and hardworking people cannot be safeguarded. In short, the drawbacks of autocracy and democracy can be summarized as follows: one is easy to lead to running amuck, the other is easy to lead to being masters at random.

Obviously, it is not enough to have a sonorous and powerful theoretical instructor and there must also be a solid and effective theoretical executor, that is, a carrier, and it is not only a propaganda organization of thinking level, but also an implementation organization at the action level, so in creating the righteous religion at the same time, also have to build a righteous party to handle specific affairs in society. Without a powerful carrier, no matter how perfect a theory is, it can only be said to be empty talk. Therefore, Righteous Religion is to accomplish this mission, that is, the specific organizational form to realize the all-fairism's society. So far, I dare to say that the "world government" that Einstein yearned for has a whereabouts at long last, otherwise everything is in vain and fantasy under the circumstance that the implementary organization did not innovate, and the current United Nations may always be just a nominal empty shelf. Finally, let me might as well talk about the Righteous Religion, and it is also a synthesis or summary of the above theory!

The content construction of the whole Righteous Religion can be described as follows: taking righteousness as the doctrine, that is, aiming at realizing the eternal existence and happy development of all human beings; taking real knowledge as belief; taking "promoting real knowledge, safeguarding reasonable justice and benefiting mankind" as the propagandist slogan; taking to uphold reasonable righteousness as the principle; taking man-oriented and reason-standard as the criterion; taking to build the all-

fairism's society as the goal; taking real saint and real gentleman as gods' titles, and worshipping Locke and Qian Sima as real saints and worshipping Protagoras, Feuerbach, Mo-tse and Zhi Li as real gentlemen; taking empiricism and positivism as epistemology and methodology; and taking the theory of humanism as the theoretical support and backing, thus constituting the main content of the whole principle of righteousness of Righteous Religion.

And the organizational system planning of Righteous Religion can be summarized as: Righteous Religion, Righteous Party and Righteous Community. Righteous Religion is the organization that directly practices the principle of righteousness while focusing on the matters of spiritual level. The greatest sorrow of mankind is that so far there has been no a correct organization to guide, so can the world not be chaotic! However, the Righteous Religion exactly wants to break this complexion, so as to end the internal fighting as soon as possible and to develop the universe. The journey of mankind is a heavy responsibility and a long way to go, how can we spend time on cannibalism! In addition to spreading new theories, new ideas and new lines to the whole world, Righteous Religion is to build its own entity as soon as possible — Righteous Community. Here is the first to fully practice my theory, and then gradually promote it after obtaining successful experience, so as to change the world in a steady and steady way through the way of empirical evidence.

In the history of philosophy, there was no shortage of people who were keen to create religion, such as Comte and Feuerbach. However, although they all admire humane thinking and regard man as the object of their beliefs, they all place their hopes on man's spiritual emotions — love, and fantasize to inspire people and achieve the purpose of governing the world. On the other hand, I put all hopes on

the empirical facts — reason, through the interpretation of reason, so that people understand where on earth the problems are and how to solve them, so as to strive to be real, specific and targeted for everything. In short, everything of everything must be based on practical experience, not on spiritual assumptions, still less on logical weaving!

Many injustices in the world are to in large part be caused by the disparity in the level of knowledge between people, that is, leaving room for many people to take advantage. It is precisely to make up for this gap that Righteous Religion promotes real knowledge, otherwise the world will never be fair, so education is the first main idea of development of Righteous Religion. Here again, I would like to reiterate that the focus of Righteous Religion's development cannot be doing business, let alone seizing power, but amain to develop education and scientific research. In fact, it is still the same sentence, thought is the heart, and regime is the surface. In the case of no change in thought, the changes of regime again and again are any meaningless. Therefore, I want to create a new religion, not just a political party, so as to completely change the world!

Righteous Party is an organization that indirectly practices the principle of righteousness in order to connect with the secular world. Its main function is to deal with the material affairs in the society outside the religion, which will involve the specific affairs in the fields of politics, economy and law, or it is just a secular political party. While establishing Righteous Religion, the purpose of creating this Righteous Party is also to promote the implementation of the whole righteous principle in a good, fast and stable manner, thus forming a double insurance that complements each other. In the current society of dragons and fish jumbled together, how Righteous Party can deal with the secular rules becomes its basic skill. Obviously, the transformation and promotion of secular thoughts

require a long process, especially for those stubborn forces, which matters cannot be solved by reasoning alone, so there must be a game here, and there is no doubt in this game process that needs hard power, skills and even means. Therefore, the members of Righteous Party must be application-oriented talents, and their ideological height does not necessarily have to reach the level of Righteousmen. Also therefore, the members of Righteous Party are not necessarily all Righteousmen, but Righteousmen are all the members of Righteous Party. However, in Righteous Party, the positions of Righteousmen are not necessarily higher than that of the Righteous Party members, and everyone's status and rights are equal.

Another point is that all political parties in the world who are willing to accept the righteous principle of Righteous Religion can immediately be reorganized into Righteous Party, so as to end the current chaotic situation of scattered sand as soon as possible in the unified program, united front and unified action, so that all the human beings will make hearts to think toward one place and make strengths to go toward one place, and realize the most sensible and complete development pattern. In fact, I have been tirelessly saying that people must look far ahead and aim high, never be as short-sighted as mice, just do not want some people to ruin the overall situation because of taking a little advantage before their eyes. Especially when faced with disasters, epidemics and distress, human beings more need to unite as one, fight in coordination and overcome difficulties together. Such as, this COVID-19 virus is actually a very small epidemic, but due to man's narrow vision, fluke psychology and separate governance, the virus explode, causing huge people's deaths, mental trauma and economic losses that should not have occurred. The human being is a whole. To put it bluntly, everyone are grasshoppers on a rope and no one can be alone. Only when everyone is well,

can you live a really good, better life. If mankind wants to realize the ultimate goal of eternal existence and satisfactory development, it must be unified, exert the greatest wisdom and gather the greatest energy, and overcome all the difficulties and restrictions that are impossible to overcome!

Of course, Righteous Party is only a transitional organization and its main task is to assist Righteous Religion to transform seculars into Righteousmen, especially to deal with those diehards, and to promote the realization of the righteouscratic political system. Politics at this time will be an individual system, that is, participating in politics and heading the administration as an individual, not a partisan system. In this system, everyone has the opportunity to maximize their political talents, and it can form the most effective right restriction. In short, reforming the political system is an inevitable basic link in the realization of the ultimate ideal of mankind by Righteous Religion, otherwise everything is empty talk. After this reform is successful, Righteous Party can dissolve by itself!

Righteous Community is the independent experimental area established by Righteous Religion to practice its own theory, that is, this place is Righteous Community. Here, we will directly build the all-fairism's society according to the conception of the righteous principle. There are two identities in Righteous Community: Righteousman and Righteouscivilian. The Righteousmen are obviously advanced people with the very high righteous principle's thought. They are the core force in building the new society and have the right to vote. Of course, there are also high standards for the selection of the Righteousmen. Righteouscivilians are the undertakers of the basic work in Righteous Community, and they do not have the right to vote. One of the biggest differences between the new society and the present one is that it wants correctness instead

of majority. For those who are short-sighted, they will only consider their own interests and not the overall interests (the interests of everyone), in other words, they have no sense of the overall situation, so we must first discard this short-sighted error. In fact, the gist of the whole human development is to allow as many people as possible to have the correct ideology, otherwise everything is in vain talk and this is also the premise of righteouscratic politics. For those who are not up to the standard of thoughts, not only they will not accomplish things, but also spoil things, especially they are no discernment and very easy to be fooled and used by others, so ordinary people are not suitable for having rights, which is the biggest drawback of today's democracy. However, through learning, comprehension and promotion, the Righteouscivilians can become the Righteousman. It can be said that when people reach the standards of Righteousmen is exactly when the whole world realizes the all-fairism's society!

In fact, Righteous Community is equivalent to the revolutionary base area of Righteous Religion, and it bears the heavy responsibility of how to break the current situation. That is to say, it will divide the cosmopolitans and the nationalists and populists in society, in other words, they will play their own "games". Throughout the whole history of mankind, those advanced thought theories, such as Mo-tse's Each Other's Love and Mutual Benefit and Sun Yat-sen's "the world belongs to all", could not be effectively implemented because they were held back by too many parochialists, and these forces are still quite powerful. Similarly, you cannot shake the current major vested interest groups, so in the dreggy situation, it is impossible for you to cleanse yourself, benefit all the people in the world and realize your ambitions, let alone turn the tide. It can also be seen that the politics of democratic countries are almost always compromised in stooping to the realistic

helplessness, so that the development has long stagnated, there has been no substantive improvement and the whole world is in a state of stalemate. How to do? The only way out is to draw a clear limit between the two and they must not be mixed and developed together. Instead, let Righteous Community operate independently

from the secular society, so as to compete in two different social forms and finally move towards unity. I am also convinced that with the differentiation's development of great foresight and short-sightedness. Which is right and which is wrong will soon come out in the wash! 🌈

To be continued...

A Wishlist for the Chief Justice of India

Contd. from page - (10)

In addition to the district courts, an average citizen comes in contact with tribunals, consumer forums and other quasi-judicial bodies. The pendency of cases in these adjudicatory authorities (including under the Right to Information Act) is increasing on a daily basis. More than 5 lakhs cases are pending before a handful of tribunals. The plight of children before Juvenile Justice Boards is more than pathetic as recently revealed by the India Justice Report.

As it appears, the challenges from pendencies and vacancies are insurmountable and the justice system seems to be crashing. Perhaps, it would be easier to clean the Augean stables. Even so, there are several available solutions. However, they cannot be credibly implemented without the government machinery and the judiciary working in tandem on a mission mode. I doubt if this will ever happen.

Madan B. Lokur is a former judge of the Supreme Court of India.

This article went live on December seventeenth, two thousand twenty five, at twenty-three minutes past five in the evening.

Courtesy **The Wire**, 17 Dec 2025. 🌈

THE RADICAL HUMANIST SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Revised w.e.f. 1 August 2024

In SAARC Countries:

For one year - Rs. 300.00

For two years - Rs. 550.00

For three years - Rs. 800.00

Life subscription - Rs. 4000.00

(Life subscription is only for individual subscribers and for institutions Rs. 5000/- for 20 years)

In other Countries: Annual subscription (Air Mail) \$ 150.00; GBP 100.00

Donations and Subscriptions can also be transferred directly to The Radical Humanist, Current Account Number 0349201821034, IFSC Code CNRB0002024, Canara Bank, Totaram Bazar, Tri Nagar, Delhi- 110035.

Please send Subscription/Donation Cheques, along with your name and address, in favour of The Radical Humanist to:

SHEO RAJ SINGH, 3821/7, KANHAIYA NAGAR, TRINAGAR, DELHI – 110035.

(M) 9891928222, E-mail: srsingh3821@gmail.com

Marxism Applied to India from Abroad

G.P. Bhattacharjee

.....Continued from the last issue

In a new economic tendency of British Imperialism in the post-First-World War period Roy discovered a factor strong enough to unite the Indian bourgeoisie with foreign imperialism. This economic tendency is the foundation of what came to be known as the decolonization theory. A clear elucidation of this theory is found in several books, such as, *The Future of Indian Politics*, *Our Task in India*, *Our Differences* and in a number of articles.

After the First World War, Roy maintained, British Imperialism was faced with a severe crisis and a new economic tendency resulted from its attempt to overcome the crisis. Explaining its origin Roy wrote: "Owing to the contradiction of the world market on the whole and the reduction of her share in it, Britain found herself in deep industrial crisis²⁵. There was a 'contraction of the world market' because the war had ruined a number of countries economically reducing their purchasing power almost to a vanishing point. And there was a 'reduction of Britain's share in world market because when Britain was busy with war efforts, several countries such as the U.S.A. and Japan established themselves in the world market as exporters of manufactured goods. As a result, a large part of the world market was lost to British industries and the actual production of Britain fell much lower than her productive capacity²⁶. Owing to this decline in production the accumulation of British capital also diminished and the needs of the home industry (refitting the old etc.) absorbed so much of it that there was little left for the purpose of export"²⁷. In order to survive as an imperialist power under such circumstances Britain was forced to adopt new methods of imperialist

exploitation. She was in need mainly of two favourable conditions—a large market to sell the produce of her industries, and secondly, a reduction in the cost of production in order to face the new competition successfully. In order to secure these two conditions the imperialist policy in India was given a new orientation. In its own interest British Imperialism, Roy maintained, now favoured a policy of Indian industrialisation reversing the older policy of keeping India industrially backward. A policy of industrialisation in India would, Roy pointed out, enable Britain to secure the foregoing conditions, necessary for her survival as an imperialist power. To overcome the crisis, the British industries must sell more and more commodities to India and therefore the purchasing power of the Indian people must be increased. "This can be done", Roy explained, "only by raising the standard of living of the Indian people. The standard of living of the Indian people again cannot be raised unless the choking grip of her economic life is considerably loosened"²⁸. That is, the obstacle in the way of her industrialisation must be removed. Indian industrialisation would help British economy also by creating a market for her metal and engineering industries. Owing to the rise of new industrial countries with greater competing power, Britain, as already mentioned, found herself in a difficult position. But this difficulty also could be obviated, Roy argued, by following a policy of Indian industrialisation. Industries in India would be more profitable for the British capitalists than industries in their own country. Cheap labour, cheap raw materials and considerable saving on the cost of transportation taken together would enable the British capitalists to produce commodities at

a very low cost in India and thus face world competition successfully. All these considerations led the British Government, Roy held, to encourage industrialisation in India. Summarising the whole process Roy wrote: “It is no longer profitable for Britain to hold India as a purely agricultural reserve. It will be more profitable to industrialise her. Industrialised India will offer lucrative investment for British capital, cheap labour and easily accessible raw materials will produce enormous profit; and the buying capacity of India will increase, thus helping British trade”²⁹

British Imperialism, therefore, decided in its own interest to follow a policy of industrialisation in India. But there arose, as Roy pointed out, another difficulty. It was the inability of Britain to supply the capital necessary to promote the rapid industrialisation of India. The post-First-World-War economic crisis, as previously indicated, seriously affected the accumulation of capital in Britain and she was not in a position to export the necessary amount of capital to India. In order to solve this problem the British capitalists agreed to form an alliance with the Indian bourgeoisie in whose hands a considerable amount of wealth had already been accumulated³⁰. Therefore, the foreign imperialists and the Indian bourgeoisie came to an economic alliance on the basis of the mobilisation of India’s capital resources under the hegemony of imperialist finance. This view of Roy came to be known as the theory of decolonisation. The theory implies a direct economic cooperation between the British imperialists and the Indian bourgeoisie. And this economic cooperation would, Roy firmly believed, prepare the way for political cooperation. After this economic alliance, the Indian bourgeoisie, Roy held, would not take part in any anti-imperialist struggle “except of the harmless parliamentary brand”³¹. The

appointment of the Industrial Commission (1916), the Fiscal Commission (1922), the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms (1919) all these were explained by Roy in terms of this theory.

Thus, in Roy’s analysis, the landed aristocracy and the big bourgeoisie entered into an alliance with foreign imperialism and ceased to be revolutionary forces. The remaining three classes— the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the workers— were the oppressed classes and the Indian Revolution, Roy maintained, would be the joint-product of these three classes.³²

Of these three classes the petty bourgeoisie were considered by Roy as incapable of independent political action.³³ The usual Marxist derision (mockery) of the petty bourgeoisie was fully shared by him. The petty bourgeoisie who were economically bankrupt were recognised by Roy as “an important factor in the national revolution”³⁴, but their vision, he held, was clouded by the reactionary social philosophy of Gandhism. Moreover, the petty bourgeoisie, depending upon the upper classes and government employments, cannot advocate a violent overthrow of the foreign rule, and therefore Roy concluded that “the lower middle class extremism cannot and will not go very far beyond —the limits set by the Moderates”³⁵. Roy, however, still had faith in the revolutionary potentialities of the petty bourgeois class and maintained that under favourable conditions they might lean towards the toiling masses. He wrote: “The petty bourgeois are still linked in thought with feudalism and landlordism and are separated from the masses, but if we organise the peasantry and the workers they will force the pace of the petty bourgeoisie who are now ready to compromise with imperialism for the sake of peace and money. If they find that by fighting for more they gain support from the masses in their fight they

will grow bolder and less inclined to compromise.³⁶

The remaining two of the oppressed classes, namely the peasantry and the workers, were considered by Roy as the most revolutionary section of the Indian population. They “will go boldly into the struggle, because they have nothing to risk, but everything to gain” from the violent overthrow of Imperialist regime.³⁷ Sometimes, therefore, Roy characterised the workers and the peasants as the only elements essentially revolutionary. Of these two classes again the peasantry was considered by him as too backward to be an independent political factor. They, he said, either follow the bourgeoisie, when they carry on a revolutionary struggle against feudalism, or become allies of the proletariat. Therefore by this process of elimination the proletariat class emerges as the only class capable of leading the national revolution.³⁸

By an analysis of the position and role of different classes in Indian society Roy came to the conclusion that, a section of the Indian population in their own economic interest would side with foreign imperialism. The anti-imperialist war, therefore, would take the form of a class war rather than a national war for independence. “The movement for national freedom” he wrote, “has developed into a gigantic class struggle. In this situation the task is to confront the counter revolutionary alliance of foreign imperialism and native reaction (the nationalist bourgeoisie is a thoroughly reactionary force) with the united army of all the oppressed and exploited classes”³⁹.

In this analysis of the role and position of different classes in the Indian society Roy completely ignored the force of nationalism. Marxism had convinced him that man is exclusively an economic being and that politics is simply the means to realise the economic interest of a class. By acknowledging the

revolutionary role of the Indian bourgeoisie, Lenin was at least more realistic because his theory was compatible with a national struggle for independence. Roy’s thesis went directly counter to nationalism and could make no headway in the period of a national struggle for independence. On the basis of the preceding analysis about the role and position of different classes Roy developed certain ideas on the nature and perspective of the Indian Revolution. The distorted growth of the Indian economy would, Roy maintained, make the pattern of the evolution of the Indian society different from that of Europe. In India capitalism has developed but feudalism has not been abolished. The Bourgeoisie in India, Roy analysed, seek to maintain the feudal-cum-capitalist social order and cannot play the role its Western counter part played in society. In order to abolish feudalism, India requires what is usually called a bourgeois democratic revolution, though the bourgeois class itself, as we have already explained, cannot bring it about. The development of capitalism, again, brings India on the threshold of the era of the proletarian revolution. The Indian Revolution, therefore would be of an unusual type. Describing the peculiar social setting of Indian conditions Roy wrote: “Two revolutions overlap in contemporary India. The bourgeois revolution has not yet been completed while the proletarian revolution appears on the order of the day. The latter does not depend upon the completion of the former. On the contrary the historic task of carrying through the bourgeois revolution devolves upon the proletariat and taking place under the leadership of the proletariat to become the prelude not historically (as the bourgeois revolution under any condition is) but immediately to the socialist revolution.”⁴⁰

The ultimate objective of the Indian Revolution, according to Roy, is obviously socialism but socialism cannot be achieved

immediately because of the absence of its preconditions—the development of the working class on a large scale. The majority of the Indian people belong to the peasantry and their demand is not socialism but the ownership of the land which they cultivate. Therefore, at the first stage the peasant ownership of the land would have to be recognised and to that extent the Indian Revolution would take the character of a bourgeois democratic revolution, but it would not be led by the bourgeoisie, and, therefore, they would not be allowed to reap any benefit out of it. The industries would not be left under the control of the private capitalists but would be placed under the direction of the state and the supervision of the Worker's Council, and, thus, the abuses and miseries of capitalist industrialism would be avoided. The Indian Revolution led by the proletariat would establish a system which would enter into the socialist phase directly without placing the bourgeoisie in power at any stage. This is what Roy meant when he said that the Indian Revolution would be the immediate prelude to the socialist revolution. This idea was further elaborated by him at a later stage.

The character of the state to be established by the Revolution would be determined by the nature of the revolution itself. Roy held that the Indian Revolution not being led by the bourgeoisie would not establish Parliamentary Democracy. He also deprecated the idea of a proletarian dictatorship for India under the existing conditions, though he did not categorically rule it out from the future evolution of the Indian society.⁴¹ In his writings of this period Roy referred to 'the revolutionary democratic State⁴² for India, though its features were not fully explained. As early as 1922 and in many of his programmes formulated during this period Roy stood for universal adult franchise, but in *Our Task in India* he wrote aggressively on

Democratic Dictatorship repudiating the principle of universal suffrage. The revolutionary democratic state based upon the franchise of the overwhelming majority of the people (not adult franchise) would, Roy wrote, also be a dictatorship because it would mercilessly suppress its vanquished enemy disregarding the hypocritical parliamentary principle of the right of the minority. In this book we find a faint glimpse of the new democratic state which Roy in course of time developed as Radical Democracy. Criticising parliamentary democracy Roy pointed out that under it political rights do not carry real and effective political power. The average citizen is given the right simply of casting votes once in a while but the effective power is monopolised by the capitalist ruling class. Under the revolutionary democratic state, visualised vaguely by Roy, the people would be given real and effective political power. The basic unit of the state would not be individual citizens but people organised by productive vocations. Delegates from these organisations would meet in conferences at district, divisional, provincial and all-India levels and both legislative and executive power would be vested in these conferences. They would elect Standing Committees to carry on the administration in the period intervening between two conferences. Under this system the legislature and executive functions of the state would not remain in separate bodies but vested in these conferences and Standing Committees elected by them.⁴³ The principal objective of Roy was, as he explained it in clear and unambiguous terms, to bring the state machinery under direct control of the people instead of keeping it as an instrument of coercion standing over their head. The concept of effective democracy, stated then in broad outline, was later to be dissociated from the idea of dictatorship and evolved with certain major changes into Radical Democracy.

Roy's theories about the nature and perspective of the Indian Revolution were determined by the ideas which he formed about those of the Russian Revolution. Socially and economically he considered India to be on par with the pre-revolutionary Russia and he therefore tried to apply the pattern of the Russian Revolution, as he understood it, to India too. Foreign domination of the country as such did not appear to have caused any change in the character of the revolution in India.

The Indian struggle for national independence, in Roy's opinion, was, as we have already explained, a form of class war and this analysis determined the strategy and tactics he tried to follow in the struggle. In the Indian society there were, in his opinion, three revolutionary classes the workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie- and of these three classes the workers constituted the most advanced section. To launch an uncompromising anti-imperialist struggle for complete national independence, Roy stood for two parties—one of the proletariat only and the other consisting of the three revolutionary classes. In order to discharge its historic mission the proletariat, Roy wrote, must have its own class organisation—the Communist Party wedded to Marxism.⁴⁴ Besides, there was the necessity of another party binding together all the three oppressed classes of the Indian society— a democratic party of the people wedded to the programme of revolutionary nationalism.⁴⁵ The latter, which must include the former, should, Roy said, have a “non-offensive” name so that the diverse revolutionary elements of the country are not frightened away by the name itself. Roy suggested the name of Peoples' Party or Workers' and Peasants' Party for it. The Revolutionary Peoples' Party was to be organised as a part of the Congress though it should remain under the control of the

Communist Party which must remain secret and illegal.

The Indian National Congress arose, according to Roy, as the political organisation of the Indian bourgeoisie, and it remained under the influence, of this class until the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1920-22 ⁴⁶. After the First World War when the British Government started a policy of co-operation towards the Indian capitalists, for reasons already explained, the big bourgeoisie left the Congress and during the time of the Non-Cooperation Movement, the Congress, Roy wrote in the same article, was turned into “a gigantic mass organisation focussing the revolutionary will of the entire people to become free from imperialist domination”. In spite of its multiclass character, the movement, Roy observed, remained, on the whole, a petty bourgeois movement, with a reformist political outlook and a decidedly reactionary social ideology, and the leadership was for all practical purposes under the influence of the bourgeoisie. The withdrawal of the Non-Cooperation Movement by Mahatma Gandhi after the manifestation of violence at Chauri Chaura was considered by Roy as an instance of “rank betrayal of the revolutionary forces” ⁴⁷ by the Congress leadership. But he confidently believed that the objectively revolutionary movement of the Indian masses would inevitably outgrow the reactionary leadership. “The economic forces”, he wrote, “that are awaking them out of their age-long stagnation and apathy will assert themselves and the leadership of the political movement must conform to their imperious dictates”.⁴⁸ After the suspension of the Non-Cooperation Movement, the Congress, he believed, was brought to a state of disintegration, and the masses, he felt, were leaving the Congress. The rise of the peasant movement and the trade union organisation among the workers led Roy to this conclusion.⁴⁹ He was confident

that Gandhian politics had no future in India and observed: “Non-Cooperation of the doctrinarian pacifists, of the Tolstoyan passive-resisters, has proved futile, as was to be expected”.⁵⁰ The leadership of the future”, Roy wrote, “is left for those ardent and courageous revolutionaries who will undertake the task of organizing the Mass Party—the political party of the Workers and Peasants,

the only social elements objectively revolutionary and whose interests can never be protected by half-way measures of reform and compromise.⁵¹ Roy took upon himself the task of supplying that leadership. He tried to organise the secret communist party and at the same time sought to influence a section of the Congress which might form the larger mass party.⁵²

To be continued....

References:

25. M. N. Roy, *Our Task in India*, p. 63.
26. M. N. Roy, *Our Differences*, p. 52.
27. M. N. Roy, *Our Task in India*, pp. 53-54.
28. M. N. Roy, *The Future of Indian Politics*, p. 43.
29. M. N. Roy, *The Aftermath of Non-Co-operation*, p. 12.
30. M. N. Roy, *Our Task in India*, pp. 53-54.
31. M. N. Roy, *Our Differences*, p.103
32. *Inprecor* IV (25 July. 1924) p.519
33. M. N. Roy, *India's Problems and Its Solution* ,p. 17
34. M. N. Ray. *Our Task in India*, p.79
35. M. N. Roy, *India's Problems and Its Solution*, p. 17
36. *Inprecor* IV (25 July, 1924). p. 519.
37. M. N. Roy, *India's Problem and Its Solution*. p. 17.
38. M. N. Roy. *Our Task in India*, pp. 78-79,
39. *hid*, p. 66
40. *id.*, p. 17.
41. *Cawnpore Case Evidence*, Exhibit No. 13, p. 27.
42. M. N. Roy. *Our Task in India*, p. 96.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 96-98.
44. M. N. Roy, *Our Task in India*, p. 80.
45. M. N. Roy, *The Future of Indian Politics*, p. 117.
46. M. N. Roy, “The Indian National Congress”, *Inprecor*, VIII, (13 January 1927), p. 99.
47. M. N. Roy, *India's Problem and Its Solution*, p. 7.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
49. M. N. Roy, “The Peasant Movement in India”, *Inprecor* II (20 June 1922), p. 379. and “The Indian Trade Union Congress”, *Inprecor* II (3 January 1922), p. 4.
50. M. N. Roy, *India's Problem and Its Solution*, p. 20.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
52. See Overstreet and Windmiller, *Communism in India*; David Druhe, *Soviet Russia and Indian Communism*; M. R. Masani, *The Communist Party of India*; Sir Cecil Kaye, *Communism in India 1924-27* (Government of India Press)

Possibility of Synthesizing the Thoughts of Gandhi-Roy-Ambedkar and Upadhyay

Dr. Vidyut Joshi

.....*Continued from the last issue*

Upadhyay (1916-1968):

Deendayal Upadhyay, the leader of the Bharatiy Janata Sangh, an active member of the RSS, and a disciple of the RSS founder Hedgewar, was intelligent in studies but could not complete his M.A. due to financial constraints. He became a journalist and started a periodical named *Rashtradharm*. Later, he also founded *Panchjanya*. In 1951, when Shyama Prasad Mukherjee started the Bharatiy Janata Sangh, Upadhyay supported its resolutions and became an active member. He was an intellectual leader of the Sangh and Bharatiy Janata Sangh, serving as General Secretary for 15 years and President in his later years. Upadhyay's intellectual contribution to the Sangh and Jana Sangh was unparalleled. He was also a skilled organizer and had a simple personality.

1. He believed that at the root of this world lies Advait (non-duality). The individual is a part of the family. The family is a part of community and community is a part of the entire humanity. This humanity is a part of nature, and nature is a part of God. In this way, the whole humanity should be one. Humans connect with the whole and become one. This is recognized as the principle of unity in humanism. In this view, the relationships between humans and the whole universe is that of harmony.
2. The connection formed through this harmony is spirituality. There is no contradiction between spirituality and materialism. Both are sides of the same unity. This material world and the spiritual connection are both religion.

Religion is not confined to a single ritual or a particular form of worship. When we connect this material world with spiritual relationships, only then true religion will emerge, and we will find solutions to the problems of the world. Therefore, religion is duty. State religion is the duty of the state. Religion can fulfil its duty without leaning towards any particular sect.

3. His theory of the nation includes a geographical area and the people living in it. However, the feeling of being a nation is just as important, as Upadhyay explains. Thus, the essence of nationalism lies in its historical context, traditions, and culture. The laws and institutions we create to govern the state represent the ideational part of the nation. The aims of the nation (what kind of nation we want to build) are the ideas or resolutions of the nation's self-consciousness. In other words, they are the nation's mind or soul.
4. In economics, he speaks of both wealth and work. He also does not separate economics and politics. The economic activity is good when it benefits everyone, and this can be the national economy. If the interests of some people are satisfied while others are left behind, it cannot be considered a national economy, because all people are an inseparable part of one nation. He also believed that the economy of any nation should be indigenous, meaning it should be rooted in its own context. This idea gave rise to the Swadeshi movement

in the Sangh. Here he is aligned with Gandhi. He was opposed to both Marxist and capitalist systems. When the state becomes absolute authority economically and politically, religion deteriorates. At that time, vested interests emerge. He rejects consumerism under capitalism. He also believed that full employment is essential.

Similarly, he also speaks about work along with wealth. Human needs or necessities should be fulfilled. A hungry human cannot be a bearer of religion. Therefore, the state must make efforts to fulfil the needs of every individual.

5. When discussing the relationship between individual and society, or the social structure, he says that in the West, socialism has given more importance to society (or class), and in doing so, the place of the individual has been undervalued. In contrast, in capitalism, more importance is given to the individual and their freedom, but this causes the breakdown of society's coherence. It is true that society is made up of individuals, but it is not merely a direct and simple sum of individuals. In his view, society is also a unity. It is an organic unity. This society has its own self. The universality and coherence of this society must be preserved. Just as the interests of society cannot be served by sacrificing individual interests, similarly, individualism cannot be realized at the cost of society. Here, he highlights the incompleteness of both socialism and capitalism. He accepts varna and jati (castes) in society but emphasizes the need for dialogue between them, not conflict.
6. Regarding the state, he believes that all

of India should be one state, not a federation of states. Despite the country having different regions, having a single state will help strengthen the feeling of nationhood. Of course, even though it should be a single state, there should be no centralization of power. Here, every village panchayat should have its own authority, and no one should be able to dissolve it. There should be a proper distribution of powers between the lowest-level panchayat system and the national system. Here, he seems to support Panchayati Raj in a somewhat different way.

7. The foundation of the current trend of majoritarianism (in form of Hinduism) is credited to Upadhyay. He believes that the concept of a secular state is wrong. However, he also says that the majority is not always right.
8. According to Upadhyay, education is the responsibility of society. It was like this before as well. He believed that the Gurukul system was the best method for education. There was no fee in Gurukuls, but students voluntarily offered Guru Dakshina (a form of respect and gift).

Synthesizing Commonalities:

All these thinkers/philosophers seem to differ in their approaches, especially in the studies carried out by different scholars so far. Particularly in the case of the comparative studies of Ambedkar and Gandhi, the differences between them have been taken into account. A special focus is made on how they differed in their approach to the issues of the Dalits. Similarly, Roy's followers have formed a distinct group, and as far as Upadhyay is concerned, the BJP has adopted his concept of majoritarianism, but they have left behind his unity-based humanism and many other ideas. Similarly, Congress has only accepted

Gandhi's ideas to the extent of running the Khadi and Village Industries Commission and established Panchayati raj. But the Congress has not embraced his other thoughts.

Now, the current state of the world is such that Marxism, which provided a thesis on class analysis and class struggle, has almost become obsolete. Today, the world is governed by a new form of capitalism built on individualism and competitive market relations, called neo-liberalism. Neo-liberalism, popularly known as L (liberalism), P (privatization) and G (globalization) clearly adopts market-based policies. After the arrival of this LPG, terrorism, fierce competition, family disorganization, ills caused by market-based artificial lifestyle, mental suffering like depression, inequality, multi-dimensional poverty, wars, centralization of power and decision making, and most importantly, environmental crisis such as pollution, global warming, and carbon emissions and depletion in Ozone layer are increasing. Now, to break free from these existential problems, thinkers of the world are contemplating new systems. In such a time, if the thoughts of these four humanist thinkers could be synthesized and given to the world, India could truly offer the world a new and contemporary way of thinking. Therefore, the first thing to consider are the common issues in the thoughts of these four thinkers.

1. First and foremost, these four thinkers view the world not through the competition-based individualism (capitalism) or the class struggle based socialism (classism), but by placing harmony based entire humanity, at the foundation. Instead of seeing humans as competing or conflicting with each other, they put harmony in all human relations. This is the fundamental innovation. This being so, the competition or conflict present in system are incidental and can be avoided.
2. All four thinkers are at least partially spiritual. They seek to build a value-based way of life. They are not materialists like the thinkers in other parts of the world but are also spiritual. Therefore, they all give importance to ethics and morality. Roy, in fact, had resigned from his position as an office bearer of the second comintern, arguing that there is no morality in revolution. Gandhi, Ambedkar and Upadhyay show faith in religion. But they were far away from idol worship. Though Gandhi used to organise all religion prayer to organise people, but he never visited a temple for idol worship.
3. All four are democratic. None of these thinkers believe in absolute rule. All of them were for representative democracy. All the four wanted people's participation. None of them believed in centralization of power. They all believe in republics. All four are ardent nationalists and patriots. They all dedicated their lives to the service of their country.
4. All the four thinkers have criticised both the ideologies of communism and capitalism. Though Ambedkar somewhat supported liberal capitalism, his emphasis remains on social justice and ethics. Naturally, participative, just and egalitarian society cannot be a free capitalist. Gandhi was for 'Sarvodaya' (emancipation of all) with a decentralized economy and trust based industry. Ambedkar was for 'democratic state socialism, where social justice, equity and upliftment of marginalized people was a priority. Roy was for cooperative economy, where people are the owner of the capital and decision makers. Upadhyay

was for 'swadeshi' model of economy based on principles of de-centralization and self-reliance. Upadhyay clearly rejects Western capitalism and Marxism.

5. All these four were not against private capital. All of them wanted decentralized markets. They desired a new economic system in which private capital is supported as part of the individual's self-rule, but they oppose the inequality that arises due to private capital. They were not in favour of state role that facilitates only market and not other systems. They were for an active role of state. They support a cooperative, decentralized, egalitarian, participative and indigenous economy.
6. All the four have emphasised harmony in human relationships, and not only that, but they also emphasised harmony in man's relationship with nature. Thus, their model is based on, harmony and not on competition and conflict. This helps a lot in solving environmental crisis. Harmony model accepts sustainable development.
7. Because they do not believe in competition and conflict, all four are, broadly speaking, advocates of non-violence. Of course, for national defence and other such necessary purposes they advocate harmony. But largely they want a non-violent social order.
8. The British education model was for developing knowledge (head) All four were for an integrated knowledge where learning includes skill (hand), character (heart), and harmony with others (harmony). Thus, more or less all four were for four 'H' pillars on which edifice of integrated education should be built.

9. All four thinkers believe in a system of law and justice that is not based on individual winners and losers. Gandhi wanted 'Ram Rajya' where social justice would prevail. Ambedkar was all for state to provide social justice. Roy was critic of colonial law and wanted justice system based on reason and morality. Upadhyay wanted a 'Dharm rajya'. And a collective (communitarian) system, not only some individual delivering justice.
10. All the four wanted a system of direct public participation. If people have a direct say in the decisions affecting them, inequality will be reduced.

After highlighting these common points, it is necessary to clarify certain matters. For example, Gandhi did not oppose machines. He opposed the private ownership of machines that led to the exploitation of others through ownership of machines. Similarly, some people still see a trace of communism in Roy's views. These are people who have not read Roy. In the same way, some people believe that Upadhyay was against Muslims and other non-Hindu religions. However, he considered Hinduism as a way of life and defined religion as duty. What is generally called religion, he refers to as worship style. He had no objection to the existence of various worship styles. Similarly, Ambedkar is often portrayed as pro-Dalit and anti-Brahmin. However, Ambedkar clarified that his opposition was to Brahmanism, meaning the ideas that create division, not to Brahmins themselves. These matters are sometimes not clearly explained or are misunderstood. The small differences among these four thinkers are contextual and not absolute. Therefore, the importance of these differences remains limited to the respective situations they address. Some of the differences are problem solving programmes.

(To be Contd....on Page - 41)

Writer's Comments:

Dear Mahi Pal Singh,

This is indeed an unexpected surprise. Thank you so much for your efficiency! And this is a great moment! I can finally say with relief that I have found my people! During these nearly 20 years of my academic journey, from the mainland to Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, and then to Europe and America, I couldn't find a place where I could display my talents! Maybe they all prefer to stay in their comfort zones, but I don't want to waste time, waste my life, especially the promising future of humanity!

A few days ago, I recorded the following passage: "Today, I watched a short video about Joseph Fourier and saved it. As soon as I saw him, I couldn't help but notice that he looked more and more like me -- self-taught (true geniuses don't need teachers), simplifying the complex, and challenging authority. His understanding of mathematics is just like my understanding of philosophy -- seemingly complicated things are actually all based on the same principle. For thousands of years, philosophy has been made extremely complex, but the core and most practical truth can be summed up in one sentence: When there is no such thing as taking advantage of others in the world, it will be a perfect society! Based on this, I have further extended two specific truths, namely the broad principle: Desire is the goal, consciousness is the means, the world is the tool, and real knowledge is the path; the narrow principle: In the reciprocity criterion of man-oriented mutual trust and mutual concession, achieve the maximization of everyone's interests (including the greatest happiness and the greatest meaning). These understandings are undoubtedly the most fundamental guidance. With this foundation, humanity can finally usher in a truly comprehensive, thorough, and maximum development!" From this, I also have to say that philosophy itself is a very simple discipline, somewhat like a brain teaser. As long as you turn that corner, everything will immediately become clear and all problems will be solved. Therefore, everything can only be said to be a case of being blinded by a single leaf! When you truly grasp the truth, you will find that philosophy is actually more precise, practical, and ingenious than mathematics. And the direction of truth is to eliminate the weaknesses in human nature through the power of real knowledge, such as narrow-mindedness, greed, and jealousy, and thereby establish a new profit-making model and form the ultimate world governed by human principles, that is, to change the course: to transform the natural instinctual law into the human real knowledge law!

Frankly speaking, all the conflicts, crises and wars that humanity has experienced so far are caused by the lack of correct philosophical guidance. In the absence of such spiritual guidance, with the rapid advancement of science and technology, humanity is actually in a more dangerous situation than ever before. Once these high technologies fall into the hands of totalitarianists and extremists, humanity will be doomed. However, there have been excellent achievements in the history of philosophy - the theories of Protagoras, Locke and Feuerbach, though they are not perfect. Therefore, what needs to be done now is to upgrade and transform on the basis of their theories. After the bourgeoisie came to power, they quickly made peace with and cooperated with religious theology mainly because there was no alternative in the spiritual realm. For instance, Feuerbach's theory of religious anthropology still had significant problems. Under such circumstances, the bourgeoisie essentially restored the "game rules" to the state of the law of the jungle, which was at least better than the state of individual freedom being restricted by autocracy. In fact, what needs to be done now is to determine the ontology, find the truth, unify thoughts, reach a consensus, build trust, and thereby achieve the artificial law form of the principle-governed society. However, the basic principles of capitalist society systems proposed by Locke, such as property not being publicly owned and power not being privately owned, cannot be changed. In short, what needs to be changed is the "fortress" of the spiritual realm that the bourgeoisie relies on. The ultimate goal is to create a fair profit environment, so as to maximize efficiency through mutual assistance and cooperation, and achieve all goals through collective strength!

Best wishes,

Mr. He Wan

Origin of Religion and its Development

Bipin Shroff



Today there are only 10,000 (ten thousand) religions and 4,000 (four thousand) gods in the world.

We will see in this article that our religious texts, such as the four Vedas, Ramayana, Mahabharata, Gita, Bible, Quran, Adi Granth, etc., are not as old as we think because there were no languages before 3,500 years ago. If language had not developed, how old can the creation of religious texts be? We will also see how the concept of God first emerged among humans? How did religion start? Then how was fear and greed cleverly used to spread religion? How did the 10,000 religions and 4,000 gods that exist today come into existence?

To understand this depth, we first have to understand human evolution. Along with this, the study of religion and philosophy cannot be ignored!

The era of Mahakal poetry – If we count from the current year 2025 in Indian Sanskrit, then only 2300 to 2600 years ago, the Mahabharata and Ramayana, which shaped the cultural psyche of Hinduism, were composed. It is historically estimated that Maharishi Valmiki, who composed the Valmiki Ramayana, was born 2500 years ago. It is estimated that Veda Vyas, the author of the Mahabharata, was born about 2400 years ago in present-day Nepal. It is

mentioned that Veda Muni composed the “Shri Bhagavad Gita” in the sixth festival of the Mahabharata, Bhishma Parva. In Hinduism, the official name of the author of the four Vedas, one hundred and eight Upanishads, eighteen Puranas, Mahabharata and “Gita” is Maharishi Veda Vyas. It may be a myth that a single man could create so many books in his life span of approximately 75-100 years, historical truth is subject to evidence.

During this period, Mahavira composed the book of Jainism and Gautama Buddha composed the book of Buddhism, Dhammapada, in Pali language. The founder of Judaism, Musa, published his religious book ‘Torah’ 800 years after his birth by his followers. One of the five books became the “Old Testament” of Christianity. The “Bible” was composed about 70 to 200 years after the death of Jesus Christ. The “New Testament” was composed in the first or second century CE. The Quran is believed to have been composed 40 years after the death of the Prophet Muhammad. To compose the Quran, the “Hafiz” people who had memorized the verses of the Quran were called and the decision made

based on the oral final dialogues & discussion was considered the final document of the Quran. The book “Guru Granth Sahib” was published as Gurgranth Vani about 65 years after the death of its founder Guru Nanak (in 1604). Goswami Tulsidasji (born 1523 - died 1611) composed the three books Ramcharit Manas, Hanuman Chalisa and Ramlila in his Awadhi language, which are 400 years old. Tulsidas’ followers prepared Ramlila in the form of a play and kept it alive in the minds of the people.

For general understanding, we can conclude that all the religious books of the world are about 2600 years old. What are the reasons that all these religious books could be created only in the last 2600 years? And could not be done before that! To find that truth, we have to study biological and human evolution in depth!

70,000 years ago, our first descendants ‘Homo sapiens’ in the wild state (Way of life) were fruits, tree-leaf gatherers and hunters. Now we have to find out when ‘bread-clothes and houses(ROTI-KAPDA-Makan) were built’ in the life of ‘Homo sapiens’? About ten to twelve thousand years ago, humans started understanding how to use land for agriculture activities? The development of agricultural civilization gradually taught humans to live a safe life with the help of natural factors. From a wandering hunter - gatherer life, he learned how to live a group-social life safely in one place. Family, clans, order, security, etc. social units were formed as per the need. According to the concept of Hinduism, the existence of Satya, Dwapar, Treta or Kali Yuga were after agricultural civilization, that is, after ten or twelve thousand years, and not before. Because in the hunter-gatherer or forest dweller life, society or collective life system did not exist.

Around 8000 years ago, humans learned to use cotton and wool, after 6000 years, they learned to make and wear clothes. For building and construction, etc., with the development of agriculture, they learned to build houses of sun-

dried mud bricks. Then after 3000 years, the practice of building brick houses with brick kilns came into vogue. Around 5000 years ago, samples of baked bricks were found in the Indus (river) civilization. This means that the creation of royal palaces and grand temples in the country or on the world stage was not possible before five thousand years ago.

12000 years ago, there was no agricultural production. 6000 years ago, humans lived in a sedentary state. 5000 years ago, the construction of huge palaces and temples was not possible. Then how old is the existence of any religion?

Mythology- There is a fundamental difference between mythology and history. Mythology has no scientific evidence. It is fiction. Whereas the truths of history are subjected to scientific evidence. If the invention of agriculture, clothing etc. is only ten thousand or five thousand years old, then how can any religion, God, Prophet, Avatar or Vedas be created before that? Therefore, it is considered fiction.

Part-2.

When humans got bread, clothes and houses, when did language come? When humans got agriculture, bricks and clothes, when did language come? Or when did language arise? Only 3500 years ago or only 1500 years before Christ! The question naturally arises in all of our minds that if mankind did not have language, how would it have communicated? The simple answer is like animals and birds. Before language, humans used gestures, sounds and signs like animals and birds (Sign Language) e.g. drinking water or feeling hungry, or screaming and crying to show physical pain, etc. Different nouns were used for this. Natural and instinctive feelings like sleep, food, pleasure and fear were shown through nouns. But thinking, imagining, expressing etc. So it became possible only after the development of language.

The Sanskrit language developed around 1500 BC. Panini’s grammar was developed one

thousand years after the development of Sanskrit language, around 500 BC. Language developed the thinking power of humans and the power of imagination very quickly. How to store and share the accumulated knowledge became possible. The creation of all religious texts became possible only after 3500 years of language development! At the same time, language gave wings to fly in the sky to explore philosophy and contemplation in the world.

Immediately, humans started thinking about unsolved problems related to creation. Who created this creation? How could the sun, moon, stars all be created? Sometimes there is excessive rain, sometimes there is a storm! Why does all this happen in nature? All these were not just questions that arose in the human mind, but all those natural factors made the human being afraid. The human being also found the dark scary. (Even today the fear of the dark has not diminished.) He was also afraid of fire. Due to all these fears, gradually the human being started worshipping all those celestial powers. He started considering all these powers as gods but naturally superior to man's power. For example, the Sun God, the Fire God, the Wind God, the Moon God, the Indra God, the Varuna God, etc. During this period, the theory of polytheism was born. In India, its people created thirty-three crore gods. At that time, the population of gods was more than the total population of India. Along with the invention of rituals like mantras, tantras and magic spells to worship all those gods, the parasitic Brahmanical thinking of those who practiced them was also born. Shruti and Smriti became a part of life.

Over time, these Shruti and Smriti became the basis of the Vedas! Maharishi Veda Vyasa divided them all according to subjects and composed four Vedas, Yajurveda (rituals of sacrifice and rituals), Rugveda, Samaveda (music and Yajna mantras) and Arthaveda (disease prevention and Tantra mantras). The

composition of the Vedas is only 2600 years old.

Talking about the birth time of Shri Ram and the Ramayana, there are many fanciful assumptions prevalent in the public mind. Based on the constellations of the birth time of Shri Ram in the planetarium software, Shri Ram was born only 7000 years ago (5114 years BC). Other legends are associated with the historical character Ravana along with Ram. Ravana's reign is shown to be from 2054 to 2017 BC. According to all the assumptions about the birth of Shri Ram, it is considered to be approximately 4500 to 7000 years old. The Vedic Mahakal in which the Ramayana was composed by the sage Valmiki has shown the time as 2500 years ago. There is a gap of thousands of years between the birth of Rama and the composition of Valmiki Ramayana.

Fact of the composition of the Mahabharata - It is believed that Shri Krishna was born 5000 years ago. Mahabharata The Departmental Archaeological Survey of the country has not found any historical, scientific or physical evidence of such a devastating war. The conclusion of the Department of Archaeology is that the Mahabharata war must have taken place around 1500 BC. If the Sanskrit language was not born 3500 years ago, then how could these two epics have been written in Sanskrit thousands of years before that! In 2001, the Indian Historical Conference was held at the Alipore campus of Calcutta University. In its last session, Nobel laureate, economist and Vice Chancellor of Nalanda University. Prof. Amrit Sen concluded that (1) there is no scientific historical evidence or proof of the existence of Ramayana and Mahabharata. (2) both the epics are just mythological legends (Mythology) (3) The characters of Shri Ram and Shri Krishna are also characters of fictional legends.

Part-3.

Religions were created in society to serve the interests of the parasite people by using both fear and greed?

Religions were created in society to create a system of life based on order and morality by using both fear and greed. In that era, imaginary enlightenment was presented through mythological stories. We find examples of this in the “Panchatantra” and “Aesop’s” fables. For example, “Ganji’s dog, pigeon-ant, vicious fox, some demon drank the ocean, some king drank fire, some kings had 60,000 sons, some kings ruled for 10,000 years, etc. All these stories are fictional, but their teachings were reasonable. In this context, Ramayana and Mahabharata also proved to be very great texts that give lessons on the moral-honorable-family-relations of society. Those texts have proven to be the basic building of the Hindu way of life. The characters put in them by the creator of both texts are absolutely alive, even though they are timeless, they still bind the fibers of individual and collective life. Similar mythological characters are also available in every religious text like Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Jainism. To consider those texts as true or factual, it is of the same coin. There is another side. We have to accept the fact that no religion was created 13,000 years ago because before that man lived in the hunting era. The body for the creation of family and society was not formed. Along with this, it is also necessary to accept that the language for the creation of religious texts was not developed. Language was not developed 3,500 years ago.

So how did the idea of God, God or Allah first arise in the mind of a black-headed man? How was the creation created? Who created it? Who is managing the sun, moon, celestial bodies and natural factors such as rain, sea, river, mountain etc.? To find the answer, man will not be able to go back millions of years. An intellectual discovered from his fertile soil that God, who lives in the seventh heaven, created the earth in six days and rested on the seventh day. These are all mythological stories of the creation of the universe. Someone said that the

living organisms were created from water. Another said that first there was a flood on the earth and then there was the creation.

Humans have made as many assumptions as possible for the creation of God, and that work is still ongoing for humans. But thousands of religions and their countless scriptures have been created in its support. The God of each religion is independent, supported by its separate scripture and the birthplace of its God - pilgrimage - pilgrimage place. Jerusalem for Christianity, Mecca-Medina for Islam and as many religious places as there are branches of Hinduism such as Mathura, Ayodhya, Amarnath, Shatrunjay, Palitana, Amritsar etc.

On a global scale, three types of concepts of religion and God are in circulation. Monism such as Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Polytheism, Hinduism and Shintoism of Japan and Atheism (Agnosticism) includes Buddhism, Jainism and Taoism. There are 1000 religions and 4000 gods on our earth.

Two important factors, especially “fear” and the other “greed”, have played a special role in the spread of religion. The fear of hell and rebirth and the greed of heaven, paradise and salvation. Eventually, religions became a business of superstition and all kinds of exploitation among the people. Gradually, all these religions started doing organized business activities. Today, the scope of business run by religions has become three trillion American dollars.

For political authorities, the use of religious sentiments to gain and maintain their power and through it, they have gained an unfettered right to control all kinds of citizens. Religion has become a scapegoat for state power. Religions are like political tools for spreading hatred, violence and wars in society. It has become a toy of the authorities. People started killing each other in the name of religion! It has now been proven that religion is nothing more than a man-made concept, a concept. It has become an organized established interest.

Part-4.

Last articles on Origin of Religion.

The general conclusion of the three previous articles on religion is that concept of religion is man-made. Moreover, God or Allah is nothing more than a human being's imagination. Then are nature and the Supreme Soul one or different? Then what is truth from the point of view of philosophy?

From the point of view of philosophy, two directions have been considered to solve this problem.

One is Dualism and the other is Monism.

Dualism – In this school of thought, the concepts of materialism and spiritualism, nature and its controller Supreme Soul, body and soul have been developed. In the early years, there was a puzzle for man in the form of human curiosity. Who would be managing the different factors of nature such as the sun, moon, rain, fire, wind etc.! The effects of these factors were felt as heat, cold, fire, etc., but at that stage, it was not within the power of the human mind to understand who created and how it was managed. Thus, one was nature and the other was its manager, giver of birth, God or doer, whatever name one wants to give. Dualistic thinking and its close relationship with each other prepared fertile ground for the formation of different religions. Sow the seeds of superstition, fear and then greed in this fertile ground and reap its fruits and crops for centuries.

But philosophy challenged dualism that if the creator or author of nature is God, then who is the creator of God? Because the foundation of the dualistic building is made up of two elements like nature and God. If God is self-sufficient, why is nature not self-sufficient! With this argument, the concept of nature itself becomes self-sufficient, and the concept of the omnipotence of God becomes impossible or non-existent. Since then, gradually, by understanding the laws of nature, man has made the struggle for survival easier with the cooperation of others.

Advaitavada –

Both nature and God are not different. There is only one, which is known as Monism.. There is absolutely no need for an external power like God for its creation and management. Understand the laws of nature and become prosperous! However, even today there are groups of people all over the world who worship nature as the divine. In which they worship the sun, moon, fire, rain, sea, land, etc. They worship the factors of nature. Another name for Monism is Materialism. Which denies the existence of the body and a soul separate from it. Man himself is a part of nature. Therefore, like all the factors of nature, functions of the human body & its management are also subject to the laws of nature. Like other laws of nature, the laws of body management can be understood and its problems can also be solved!

There are causes for human problems. Those problems are not created by God. Therefore, they can be solved without the help of God alone! Just as nature is physical and non-dual, similarly the human body is also physical and non-dual.

Concept of soul – The human brain (human brain power) has a role in the management of the body. The human brain cannot be called a soul! It has the importance of communication through the five senses that helps in decisions like consciousness, decision-making power and enlightenment. When the human brain dies, the body also becomes dead. The human brain is also a part of the physical body like different organs such as the heart, lungs, kidneys. In it, there is no place for an immaterial element like the soul in the human brain.

Human Religion – The violent damage that all the so-called divine religions have done to humanity and are still doing in the 21st century is immeasurable. To strengthen their established interests, the organizations of divine religions divide human groups into different groups, instigating hatred, discrimination, etc.

(To be Contd.....on Page - 41)

Ill effect of caste and blindfaith

When I meet someone who is not known to me but known to the people whom I know, the person immediately asks which caste I belong to? I am a human being first. I should not be asked this question. Yes, I point blank ask him, "Why you are asking this question? Is it not sufficient for you to be a normal human being?" I tell him that the people like him are dividing the people among themselves on the basis of castes. As such there is no base supporting this argument of different castes. Even in Vedas it is not written anywhere about this (I am not an expert on Vedas).

Through the centuries India has been divided by these groups, which is based totally on castes. Our so called Rishis also advocate on these lines, which is really very dangerous for the people. There are so many Godmen in India, who are all the time surrounded by yesmen, preach to remain cool, not to get angry, not to go after the wealth, etc., restricting the people in one form or the other. But in true sense they never follow what they preach. Instead they gather wealth, get angry if questioned, restricting the entry in their ashram, etc. Even they are supported by politicians and political parties. This so called Godman takes the disadvantage of the weak minded people by hammering them with wrong things and messages, even threatening them. People do not analyze and think why they should respect this Godman. Most of the people of India have got the mindset of slave, which has been existing since centuries and continued. They are responsible for creating havoc in the minds of people. Their comments are also inflammatory and dividing the people with double standards. Take the recent case of a girl in New Delhi, who was attacked and raped by six people in the bus. The so called unscrupulous Godman Asharam, advocated

that she should have recited the name of God, who would have come to her rescue and would have saved her. How God was going to help when she was attacked and raped? If that is the case why the God sent these people for



Sudhesh Korde

attack and to rape her in the first place? If one has to believe God to come to the rescue then why he is not restricting these bad people? Asharam is well supported by all the political parties and the politicians. A person like Asharam takes the disadvantage of the weak minded people by hammering them with wrong things and messages, even threatening them. So called unscrupulous Godman like Asharam are responsible for creating havoc in the minds of people. Their comments are of inflammatory nature. Recently a minor girl has filed FIR against him, accusing him of sexual molestation. The police came with summons but instead of him receiving it, it was received by a person from his ashram. He is asked to remain present before the police before 30th August 2013. Instead of that he still wants more time and cannot appear on this date. Even the political parties are trying to cover up the case. Our political parties have gone arrogant and are insensitive towards such incidents. All political parties want immunity from everything for such people so that no one can dare to file cases against them.

Indian people do not allow themselves to work freely in all fields of intellectual or economic activity where there is more scope of improvement and progress. Castism among

the people of India restricts them from moving away from customary beliefs, which hampers them from friendship, fraternity, mutual respect, etc. in the minds of people. Old tradition still exists. This customary belief plays negative role in inculcation of positive values like liberty, equality, fraternity, etc.

The people of India are pessimistic by nature, which restrains them from thinking for better outlook towards life. They think of having better opportunity in the other world which is not true. They think that this world is *mithya*, or unreal, and continue to move away from the worldly truth. This hampers their progress. Because of this one can say 'An average Indian is a dishonest person'.

We need to imbibe the character of brave, virtuous and individual will to realize his or her true potential and shunt the old pessimistic outlook and move with positive outlook.

The Indian culture's, philosophy of Indian people, attainment of heaven is the sole objective. The said objective takes the people away from the reality, the truth. It is bound by the institution of religion. They think that the God, which takes form in the mind only, will help them, which is the falsity of the real world.

The people in power dominate religious institutions and use the same ideology to enslave the masses keeping them ignorant about the truth to preserve their own social status, authority and material gains. Laws of inequality which have been inherent for thousands of years, have developed castism, which give rise to untouchability because of the same religious values. This religious mysticism has been awarded with selfishness. An individual, who is religious minded, strives for his own sanctity and transcendental life. This selfish motive is based on illusionary concepts. Social attitude, nationalism, self aggrandizement, etc. secularism and broadmindedness and individual freedom have

no importance to this religious minded people. We can very well relate to some of the western countries, where they kept religion out of the politics. They consider democracy, fundamental rights of man, fraternity, People's Republic etc as more important. Indian people are blindfolded and they follow the religious people blindly, which is fantasy only and illusory. Most of the Indian political parties, which have ruled and those who are in the opposition, take the path of religion, moving away from the actual experience. An illiterate man, scared, confused and bewildered thinks of God as the source of all these events occurring in this universe. This is absolutely because of ignorance or lack of education. Science has proved the cause of rainfall, blowing of wind, sunrise or moonrise, sunset, moonset, solar & lunar eclipse, and how various diseases originate, etc.


The society in which the pace of creation of knowledge is slow or where society has regressed in the field of knowledge, the social mind is removed from the reality.

Beauty of the universe is intrinsic. Knowledge is beautiful. Let us unearth this vast knowledge and create space and freedom for the same on the basis of facts and not myth. We have yet to unearth one hundred percent knowledge available on this universe. It is continuous process, which will last centuries and never end.

I should not be recognized on the basis of caste.

***Sudhesh Korde** is Physically Challenged with B.Com, D.B.M., M.B.A. (Finance), interested in humanist activities. Mobile No.: 09879545389

Email: sudhesh1959@gmail.com, sudhesh1959@yahoo.co.in

Note: The article was earlier published in the November 2013 issue of The Radical Humanist. As it is relevant even today, it is being reproduced here. – Ed. 

The Humanist Frame

The Frame of Humanist Communication

Patrick Meredith

(Summarized by : **Vinod Jain**)

other from within the brain itself. The inner stream is determined by previous learning and experience. Hence communication and education must go hand in hand.

One of the principal tenets of Humanism is that man is not only taking a hand in evolution, but that his situation makes this obligatory.

Communication, by whatever the means or the medium, involves three essential ingredients: a sender, a message and a receiver. There has been a tendency to concentrate on the middle term and to take the two end terms for granted—in fact literally to prefer means to ends. And unless technology is humanized this tendency will grow.

Two out of the many international conferences that discussed the matter were the Royal Society Conference on Scientific Information in 1948 and the Washington International Conference on Scientific Information in 1958.

Some 85 years ago H.G.Wells said: “ Few people as yet, outside the world of expert librarians and museum curators and so forth, know how manageable well-ordered facts can be made, however multitudinous, and how swiftly and completely even the rarest visions and the most recondite matters can be recalled, once they have been put in place in a well-ordered scheme of reference and reproduction.”

The dream was premature. In 1956, according to J.W.Perry, the dream could be realized:

“Just as the invention of writing and of pictorial representation made it possible to

store knowledge outside of human memory, so these dreamers now argue, a further advance has become a necessity. Libraries must be converted from warehouses of knowledge to effective extensions of human memory.... The technological basis for realizing our dream is at hand.”

PROBLEMS

The obstacle to the dream’s realization lies in the stubborn three-body relation of language, knowledge and culture. Some four hundred artificial languages have been invented without really facing this problem. The anthropologists and linguists throw important light on the relation of language to culture. Through the forms of language a culture imposes a world-view, a metaphysic, on the individual. A culture is a totality of experiences, concepts, beliefs and their consequences. It provides the determining context in which language finds its meaning. But cultures are no longer static. Man’s increasing control of his own evolution is seen in the reshaping of his cultures. In this process the conceptual innovations of science are persistently eroding and transforming the (existing) metaphysical groundwork of ideologies. But of course it is not a one-way or a uniform process from primitive concepts of magic to sophisticated concepts of science. Inter-cultural communication in a language apparently accepted by both parties can be nullified by unformulated ideological discrepancies, as in many United Nations Debates.

The organization of science today is so dominated by the needs of research, with its emphasis on novelty, that the tremendous span

and volume of existing scientific knowledge tends to be taken for granted. The fact that this or that theory is modified or discarded tends to be generalized into a dismissal of all that was known up till about five years ago as out of date. The great conceptual network of principles still valid, stretching back to Newton, the historical insight and experience regarding instruments, all contribute to the indispensable and continuing inheritance of modern science. The failure to communicate the latest news in science may be less serious than the failure to assimilate this common heritage.

In the past the great encyclopaedists such as Diderot satisfied this need. Today the traditional multivolume encyclopaedia can no longer meet the needs: it can serve for reference but not for education.

PRINCIPLES

An intuition of the inescapable relation between knowledge and language led the founders of the Royal Society, some centuries ago, to commission Bishop Wilkins to design a philosophic language for the communications of science. He displayed an essential insight into the relations between taxonomy (classification) and language. It is by creating classifications that science systematically and economically stores its findings.

But here we strike a major failure of communication. It is the gap between those who move with ease and richness in the qualitative and meaningful regions of empirical knowledge and those who move with power and penetration in the mathematical and meaningless regions of symbolic abstraction from experience. It is no accident that the two major triumphs of the nineteenth century — Darwin's theory of evolution by Natural Selection and Mendeleef's establishment of the Periodic Table of Chemical Elements — were both outcomes of the taxonomic approach. The classification of stars in our own (20th) century is a further triumph of insight.

Science has thrown up a host of special symbolisms in chemistry, meteorology, electronics and the like, admirably adapted to their special fields of facts but unrelated to one another or to any master code. Of course the 'master code' is in a sense a dream, to be realized neither by information theory, nor by logic, nor by epistemology, nor by semantics. But science should keep this dream as one aim of its evolution. In my view, an indispensable contribution will come from information theory, which is itself 'a scientific body of knowledge'.

We seem to be so free to say whatever we want that we overlook the inherently causal nature of communication. Language does real work; but the amount of physical energy involved is so extremely small that it hardly seems worth taking thought to economize our language. However, when we think about the time spent in the act of communication, rather than the energy consumed, the scale of magnitude at once becomes significant. For the act of communication is completed only in the act of understanding. And economy of time in communication is the opposite of richness of understanding.

But the language of scientific communication must remind us not only of logic and evidence but of the world-picture which provides the context of its evidence.

PROPOSALS

Logic and evidence are essential ingredients in any positivist representation of knowledge. All good scientists would go farther and add 'imaginative constructions', 'models' or some equivalent term. Whatever we call them, they play a decisive role in the coherence of science, and it is by virtue of coherence and imagination that we can speak of a 'world picture'. Without such a picture it is difficult to see how we can speak of a 'frame of Humanist Communication'.

Humanism must meet the challenge thrown out by Dennis Gabor:

‘It is a sad thought indeed that our civilization has not produced a New Vision, which could guide us on into the new Golden Age which has now become physically possible, but only physically.’

There are three distinct criteria by which communication can be judged— adequacy, accuracy and economy. These are represented by the three questions —- Have I said enough? Is it correct? Have I said it in optimum time?

At this point a fuller treatment of the problems of communication would extend beyond the confines of science as ordinarily understood. For man does not live by bread alone. The ecological environment must include messages from musicians, painters, sculptors, poets and dramatists.

Taxonomy is the methodology of classification, and classification demands the establishment of systematic categories.

When the Copernican revolution led to the reclassification of the earth as a Planet, the whole cosmic picture was changed. Categories are organizers of thought, though intellect often resists the reorganization. As classification becomes more adequate our world -picture becomes richer. As insight into its structure spreads, the mind depends less and less on the multiplicity of fact: the pressure on the means of communication is reduced.

All knowledge involves general principles as well as specific facts, but the principles must be explicitly generalized for transfer to take place. Gestalt theory with its concept of

‘pragnanz’ confirms the principle.

Let us suppose there are two concepts, which though differing in expression and qualitative reference, are structurally identical. Then a single effort of understanding can replace two distinct efforts, provided that a common language is used. This transfer-principle, systematically exploited, could revolutionize the psychological economy of scientific education. It is bound up with the development of a scientific Interlingua grounded in the objective structure of science itself. This Interlingua, however, will not be like any spoken language: it will be more like an atlas. Languages have to be learnt: an atlas is consulted.

It is not Utopianism which drives Humanists to explore the future. Nor, is it any longer the fear of extinction. It is love of their children and a dread of their degradation. ...A direction can be defined only in reference to a frame. This frame decides the context, and hence the meaning, of Humanist Communication. In this space I have only hinted at the nature of this frame, this atlas of knowledge. When we have it open before us our language will suffer a sea-change.

Language is so much a part of us that we passionately resist external efforts to change it. Yet each generation assimilates changes, rather delighting in the shocks to their father’s. The young of today, take naturally to a global language. The Humanist world-picture will enable the new generation to sail on the high seas of human knowledge with confidence and courage. 🌈

(To be continued.....)

The Radical Humanist on Website

‘The Radical Humanist’ is now available at <http://www.lohiatoday.com/> on Periodicals page, thanks to Manohar Ravela who administers the site on Ram Manohar Lohia, the great socialist leader of India.

– Mahi Pal Singh

Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting, 2nd November 2025 at NOIDA

INDIAN RENAISSANCE INSTITUTE

The meeting of the Board of Trustees was attended by the following members and was presided over by Shri Vinod Kumar Jain.

Board of Trustees Members:

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Vinod Kumar Jain | 5. Surajdeo Prasad |
| 2. Mahi Pal Singh | 6. Sandeep Chaudhary |
| 3. Sheo Raj Singh | 7. Hawa Singh Hooda |
| 4. Rajender Kumar Sharma | |

Invitee Members:

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Surya Kant Saini | 8. Priyanka Chaudhary |
| 2. Sanjeev Kumar | 9. Sita Ram Pal |
| 3. Jitender Kumar | 10. Deepali Jain |
| 4. Brij Bhan Singh | 11. Vijay Khanna |
| 5. Sachin Kumar | 12. Saurabh Chaudhary |
| 6. Sanjeev Chaudhary | 13. Mamata Basant |
| 7. Manoj Bhati | |

The Secretary presented the minutes of the last Board of Trustees meeting held on 11th May 2025 for confirmation which were confirmed unanimously.

Meeting of the Board of Trustees for Co-Opting Co-Opted members

Then the meeting of the Board of Trustees consisting of Life Trustees and the Elected Trustees took place. It was presided over by Sh. Vinod Kumar Jain, Chairman, IRI.

The Board of Trustees unanimously co-opted the following members as Co-Opted Trustees:

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Surya Kant Saini | 2. Adv. Sanjeev Kumar. |
|-------------------------|------------------------|

Election of the Office Bearers of the IRI

After co-opting two members for the next two years, the Board of Trustees elected the following Office Bearers of the IRI:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Chairman: Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain | 2. Secretary: Mr. Mahi Pal Singh |
| 3. Treasurer: Mr. Sheo Raj Singh | |

Complete Board of Trustees:

Life Trustees:

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain | 5. Mr. Rajender Kumar Sharma |
| 2. Mr. Ramesh Awasthi | 6. Mr. Ved Prakash Arya |
| 3. Mr. Mahi Pal Singh | 7. Mr. Suraj Deo Prasad |
| 4. Mr. Sheo Raj Singh | 8. Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sharma |

Elected Trustees: (Elected for two years):

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Bhaskar Sur | 5. Mr. Pratap Saharan |
| 2. Mrs. Indira Verma | 6. Mr. Saurabh Chaudhary |

3. Mr. Hawa Singh Hooda
4. Mr. Sandeep Chaudhary

7. Mr. Sanjeev Kumar

Co-Opted Trustees:

1. Mr. Surya Kant Saini

2. Adv. Sanjeev Kumar

The following Resolutions were passed unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 5/2025

“RESOLVED by this meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Indian Renaissance Institute held on today, the 2nd November, 2025 at NOIDA that the Saving Account No. 20009375096 in Bank of Maharashtra, B-29, Connaught Place, New Delhi- 110001 in the name of the ‘Indian Renaissance Institute’, shall continue to be operated by any two of the following office bearers of the Indian Renaissance Institute as before:

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| (1) Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain | Chairman |
| (2) Mr. Mahi Pal Singh | Secretary |
| (3) Mr. Sheo Raj Singh | Treasurer” |

RESOLUTION NO. 6/2025

“It is hereby resolved in this meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Indian Renaissance Institute held on today, the 02.11.2025 at NOIDA that any two of the following office-bearers will continue to operate Account No. 02070100005296, UCO Bank, Supreme Court Branch, New Delhi in the name of Indian Renaissance Institute (IRI) as before.

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| (1) Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain | Chairman |
| (2) Mr. Mahi Pal Singh | Secretary |
| (3) Mr. Sheo Raj Singh | Treasurer” |

RESOLUTION NO. 7/2025

“RESOLVED by this meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Indian Renaissance Institute held on today, the 2nd November, 2025 at NOIDA that the Current Account No. 0349201821034 in Canara Bank, Tota Ram Bazar, Kanhaiya Nagar Branch, Delhi- 110035 in the name of ‘The Radical Humanist’, shall continue to be operated by any two of the following office bearers of the Indian Renaissance Institute as before:

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| (1) Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain | Chairman |
| (2) Mr. Mahi Pal Singh | Secretary |
| (3) Mr. Sheo Rraj Singh | Treasurer” |

RESOLUTION NO. 8/2025

As you know the office of ‘The Radical Humanist’ and Indian Renaissance Institute were running from the house of Mr. N.D. Pancholi Ex-Member and Ex-Secretary of IRI till April 2022.

- (I) The Board of Trustees in its meeting dated 20.04.2022 resolved to shift the RH office to house of Mr. Sheo Raj Singh publisher of ‘The Radical Humanist’. The resolution was signed by Mr. N.D. Pancholi also in the capacity of Vice-President of IRI.
- (II) The Board of Trustees in its another meeting held on 15.10.2022 decided to shift

the office of IRI also from Mr. N.D. Pancholi's house to the house of Mr. Sheo Raj Singh as Mr. Pancholi refused to accommodate the office in his house.

Despite repeated requests and resolutions by the BOT, Mr. Pancholi is not allowing the shifting of office of the RH and IRI from his house and keeping the record and office equipments, such as Almirahs, tables, chairs, computer, typewriter and stationery etc in his possession.

Under these circumstances, the present team of office bearers was running the office from the house of Mr. Sheo Raj Singh with the help of old computer (Laptop) and other office equipments arranged from our own resources.

Now, these equipments have become obsolete, and were running on higher cost of repair. So, it was decided to purchase the following office equipments in order to run the affairs of the RH and IRI efficiently.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| (i) One Laptop | (iii) One Pen-drive and |
| (ii) One Printer, Scanner and Photocopier | (iv) One tablet for Secretary. |

The total cost of the equipment works out Rs.47415 + Rs.17900 = Rs.65415/- (Rupees Sixty Five Thousand Four Hundred Fifteen Only)

The purchase invoices are attached herewith.

The Resolution was submitted for the approval of the Board of Trustees and was duly passed.

Resolution on Re-constitution of the Editorial Board of The Radical Humanist

RESOLUTION NO. 9/2025

"It is hereby resolved in the meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Indian Renaissance Institute held on today, the 02.11.2025 at NOIDA: The following members are appointed members of Editorial Board of the Radical Humanist, the monthly journal of Indian Renaissance Institute:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain | 4. Mr. Pratap Saharan |
| 2. Mr. Bhaskar Sur | 5. Mr. Mahi Pal Singh (Ex-Officio)" |
| 3. Dr. Dipavali Sen | |

RESOLUTION NO. 10/2025

"It was resolved to form the Office-Bearers' Committee with the following office-bearers to take necessary decisions during the pendency of the following Board of Trustees' meeting:

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain | Chairman |
| 2. Mr. Rajender Kumar Sharma | Vice-Chairman |
| 3. Mr. Ved Prakash Arya | Vice-Chairman |
| 4. Mr. Mahi Pal Singh | Secretary |
| 5. Mr. Sheo Raj Singh | Treasurer |

All the decisions of the Office-Bearers' Committee would be placed before the Board of Trustees in its next meeting for its approval."

Sanction for New Membership

The Board gave its sanction for the new membership of the following persons:

1. Adv. Vijay Kumar Jain (Delhi), Life Membership
2. Mr. Sudhesh Ramesh Korde (Gujarat), Life Membership
3. Mr. Sujay Kumar C. Basu (Gujarat), Life Membership
4. Mr. Brij Bhan Singh (Delhi), Life Membership

The Treasurer, Mr. Sheo Raj Singh reported that the IRI had incurred Rs. 8750/- on Tea and Lunch for the meeting. The following members volunteered to contribute the following amount to defray the expenses:

- | | | |
|----|------------------------|------------|
| 1. | Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain – | Rs. 3000/- |
| 2. | Mr. Surya Kant Saini – | Rs. 1000/- |
| 3. | Mr. Sita Ram Pal - | Rs. 1000/- |
| 4. | Mr. Sanjeev Kumar - | Rs. 1000/- |
| 5. | Mr. Hawa Singh Hooda - | Rs. 1000/- |

The Secretary expressed the hope that the new Board of Trustees will work wholeheartedly for achieving the goals of the Society as enshrined in the Constitution of the IRI and spread the message of radical humanism among the maximum numbers of new people.

At the end the Secretary thanked Mr. Vinod Kumar Jain for presiding over the meeting and all the other members for attending and making the meeting a grand success. He also thanked the donors who met a major portion of the expenses incurred for the meeting.

Mahi Pal Singh

Secretary, IRI, (2.11.2025)

Possibility of Synthesizing...

Contd. from page - (26)

In our country, it has become an accepted practice to argue against a single idea and to differ, and perhaps this is why we have not been able to establish a definite national political character. For instance, the British are seen as reserved, the French as carefree, Americans as individual achievers, and Arabs as people who live with prosperity and medieval thoughts. There is even a history. But instead of creating a mode of thought and behaviour pattern here, care has been taken to ensure we differ. If we are to stand as one nation, we must find commonality in our knowledge pool and at least establish an Indian way of conduct. Instead of fostering division, this mentality has allowed so many castes and traditions to thrive here. Now, there is a need for a universally accepted and inclusive idea at the national level - an idea that represents the new India and creates national integration in a new form. Not only that, it should offer the entire world a new intellectual perspective. Since such attempts have not been made so far, we must seek to find common ground in the thoughts of thinkers like Gandhi, Roy, Ambedkar, and Upadhyay. 🌈

Origin of Religion and its...

Contd. from page - (32)

They keep humans anywhere in the world in an atmosphere of unrest, violence and war by inciting hatred, discrimination, etc. Human civilization as such by political power is kept in an atmosphere of unrest, violence and war. Human wealth is created, & its valuable savings-income-welfare research is used to spread destruction instead of human happiness.

Human religion (Known as Humanism) says that all the humans of the world are one. Therefore, their problems and interests are also the same. There is no difference between any human being on the basis of religion, region, nation, language, color, gender, etc. It is necessary to get out of all this narrow-mindedness and strive for human-centered empowerment. The use of all the world's resources is to create a prosperous, peaceful world, not one created by God, but one created by man, with the help of human values such as freedom, rationality, and secular morality. 🌈

Books written by M.N. Roy available at our website:

www.indianrenaissanceinstitute.com

1. If I Were Stalin
2. Beyond Communism
3. Cultural Requisites of Freedom
4. From Savagery to Civilisation
5. Historical Role of Islam
6. Fragmentsa of a Prisoner's Diary
7. Materialism
8. M.N. Roy's Memoirs
9. Revolution and Counter Revolution in China
10. Men I Met
11. National Government or People's Government
12. New Humanism – A Manifesto
13. New Orientation
14. Politics, Power and Parties
15. Reason, Romanticism and Revolution – Volume 1
16. Reason, Romanticism and Revolution – Volume 2
17. Draft Constitution of Free India
18. M.N. Roy's Letters to the Congress Socialist Party
(Written in 1934-36)
19. The Philosophy and Practice of Radical Humanism
20. Problem of Freedom
21. Humanist Politics
22. Science, Philosophy & Politics
23. Vigyan Ki Kasauti Par Darshan, Sanskriti Aur Dharam (*Hindi*)
24. Navmanavad (*Hindi*)
25. Islam Ki Etihask Bhoomika (*Hindi*)
26. Hamara Sanskritik Darp (*Hindi*)

Some members of the IRI who attended the meeting at NOIDA on 2nd November 2025



**Not one celebrity, Not one Journalist,
Not one person, Not one channel spoke
even a single word on Rupee falling to
90 against the dollar.**



**Same people used to rip apart UPA and
Manmohan Singh even when Rupee reached 58.**

**Fall of the conscience of a nation and
its ability to question.**