
ETHICS BEYOND GOD: RADICAL HUMANISM OF M. N. ROY IN CONVERSATION WITH KANTIAN MORALITY

***Sujit Kumar Sarkar**

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Raiganj University, Raiganj, Uttar
Dinajpur.

Article Received: 02 March 2026

Article Revised: 20 March 2026

Published on: 10 April 2026

*Corresponding Author: Sujit Kumar Sarkar

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Philosophy, Raiganj University, Raiganj,
Uttar Dinajpur.

DOI: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.9501>

ABSTRACT:

This study explores a comparative analysis of Immanuel Kant's moral philosophy and M.N. Roy's Radical Humanism. It critically examines the possibility of establishing morality independently of theological or metaphysical foundations. Traditionally, moral systems are often seen as closely intertwined with religious doctrines, with moral authority deriving from divine commands. Kant grounds morality in rational autonomy and categorical imperatives; consequently, he partially disengages ethics from religion. However, Kant's postulates regarding God and immortality—posited as necessary for the attainment of the Highest Good—reveal an underlying reliance on transcendental concepts.

In contrast, M.N. Roy presents a completely secular and anthropocentric ethical framework. Radical Humanism rejects all forms of supernatural authority, asserting that morality stems from human reason, freedom, and social experience. This study argues that Roy's philosophy represents a significant advancement over Kant's project by fully realising the secularization of ethics.

In conclusion, this paper demonstrates that it is indeed possible to sustain morality without recourse to God. Thus, in a pluralistic and modern world, reason, autonomy, and human responsibility constitute a sufficient foundation for an ethical life.

KEYWORDS: *Categorical Imperative, Ethics Without God, Kantian Ethics, Moral Autonomy, Radical Humanism, Secular Ethics.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

The inquiry into whether morality necessitates a transcendent or divine foundation has persisted as one of the most enduring and contentious issues in the annals of philosophy. For centuries, ethical frameworks were predominantly integrated within religious paradigms. In the ethical frameworks, moral duties were perceived as manifestations of divine intent and moral principles as representations of an objective, metaphysical order. In these frameworks, moral authority originated from God. The validity of ethical norms was contingent upon their theological foundation. As a result, many people were sceptical of, if not outright rejected, the idea that morality could exist without religion.

But the rise of modern philosophy changed this traditional way of thinking. The Enlightenment stressed reason, independence, and critical inquiry. It called into question the idea that morality had to be based on religion. In this intellectual milieu, Immanuel Kant emerges as a central figure. Kant endeavoured to reconstruct ethics upon a rational foundation. Kant contended that moral law is founded on the autonomy of the rational will. He asserts that ethical obligation originates not from external authority but from the intrinsic framework of reason itself. Kant's concept of the categorical imperative sought to establish a universal and objective morality. It is independent of empirical circumstances and theological doctrines.

Kant's project, though revolutionary, is still philosophically complicated and, in some ways, not finished. He effectively dissociates morality from direct reliance on divine command. For Kant, morality is autonomous. Furthermore, according to him, the realization of the highest good (*summum bonum*) necessitates the postulation of the immortality of the soul and God. This creates a subtle but important conflict in his system. Morality is both independent and indirectly linked to a higher framework. Thus, Kant's morality occupies a middle ground between traditional theological morality and fully secular ethical theories.

It is precisely this specific tension or dialectic that served as the foundation for the philosophy of Manabendra Nath Roy. In the middle of the twentieth century, M. N. Roy came up with his theory of 'Radical Humanism'. It is a more radical and uncompromising view of how to live a moral life. Roy rejects not only religious authority but also all forms of metaphysical transcendence. His objective was to establish morality solely on human reason, freedom, and social experience. He believes that ethical values are not given by God or by metaphysics. Instead, they come from human rational activity. These values are always

changing as history and culture change. In this regard, Radical Humanism signifies a pivotal advancement towards the total secularization of ethics.

2. Objective of the Study:

This study is situated within a broader philosophical context. Its primary objective is to investigate the feasibility of a “God-independent morality” through a critical engagement between Kantian moral philosophy and Radical Humanism of M. N. Roy. The central research question is whether it is possible to establish a robust foundation for morality based solely on human rational autonomy, without recourse to any supernatural or theological underpinnings.

This investigation is not solely of historical interest but possesses considerable contemporary significance. The modern world is becoming increasingly more diverse. In such a context, relying solely on religious authority as the basis for morality is becoming more and more difficult. Ethical frameworks must be able to handle different points of view, while still being clear and persuasive for everyone. In this context, the inquiry regarding the autonomy of morality from God becomes increasingly pressing.

The main idea of this study is that we do not need something other than ourselves to know what is right and wrong. We can figure it out by using our minds and making our own decisions. Kant started to think about ethics in a way, but he still believed in some things that are not based on human experience. ‘Radical Humanism’ is different because it is based on human ideas and experiences. This study looks at ideas and argues that the philosophy of M. N. Roy is a big step forward in thinking about ethics. It gives us a way to understand what is right and wrong when we do not believe in something more than ourselves. This paper thinks that Roy’s philosophy is important for understanding ethics in today’s world.

3. The Foundation of Kantian Ethics:

The moral philosophy of Immanuel Kant made a major milestone in the history of ethics. Kant rejected two ideas: both theological voluntarism and empirical moral theories. Instead, Kant wanted to base morality on reason, that is, pure practical reason. It is a pure rational foundation of morality to Kant. He believed that moral principles do not come from divine commands or subjective inclination. Moral principles come from reason.

The core of Kant’s ethics is the idea of autonomy. Autonomy means that people can make their own moral laws. In this sense, morality comes from within, not from outside. Kant says that people are morally obligated because it is rational, not because someone else says so.

Kant's moral philosophy focuses on reason and autonomy. He thinks that people should make their moral decisions. This approach to morality is based on rationality. This idea shows that Kant had an idea that morals are basically made by ourselves and are based on reason. Kant says that, "the moral law is given as a fact of pure reason of which we are a priori conscious..." (Abbott, 1909, p. 136) Human beings can have ethics that do not need to come from religion. Kant's idea is really important because it says that morality is something that we create for ourselves. It is based on what we think is right, not on what someone else tells us. According to Kant, morality is self-legislated, which is a concept, and it is also rationally grounded. So, it is based on reason and thinking.

3.1. The Concept of Good Will:

The concept of good will is really important to Kant's thoughts on morality. He believes that the good will is the thing that is always good. It does not matter what happens as a result of the will or what skills someone has. To Kant, the good will is only good because it is good without qualification. It is intrinsically good.

In Kant's morality, the moral value of an action is determined not by its result but by the motive behind it—specifically, whether it is performed from duty. Actions motivated by inclination or self-interest lack genuine moral worth, even if they produce desirable results. That's why Kant says, "it is impossible to conceive anything at all in the world, or even out of it, which can be taken as good without qualification, except a good will." (Kant, 1964, p. 61) Thus, Kant decisively shifts the focus of ethics from consequential evaluation to intentional justification.

Kant thinks that what makes an action good or bad is not what happens because of it. Instead, it is why someone does the action. If someone does something because they feel like it or because it benefits them, then it is not really an action. This is true even if good things happen as a result. So, Kant's idea of morality is about doing things because it's the right thing to do, not because of what might happen.

Kant's idea of the good will changes the way we think about morality. It is no longer about trying to get what we want. Instead, it is about following the rules that everyone should follow. This way of thinking is based on reason. What is right, not just what we want. The good will is still the idea here.

3.2. The Categorical Imperative:

The most important idea of Kantian ethics is the Categorical Imperative. This is the standard that we use to decide what is right and wrong. The Categorical Imperative is different from rules that tell us what to do. These other rules depend on what a human being wants to happen. The Categorical Imperative is a rule that always applies no matter what.

One of the well-known ways to explain the Categorical Imperative is to say that we should only do things that we think everyone else should do too. This means that when a rational agent makes a decision, he has to think about whether the Categorical Imperative would be a rule for everyone to follow. A rational agent has to ask himself if he would want everyone to act the way he is acting. This concept helps us make sure that we are doing the thing, not just what we want to do. The Categorical Imperative helps us be consistent and fair in our decisions. Kant has succeeded in formulating the fundamental principles on which the moral life is based.

The idea of the imperative is that it shows us what is right and wrong. This is based on a law that makes sense to everyone. The categorical imperative is a rule that applies to all human beings who can think and reason, no matter what their situation is. The categorical imperative is like a guide that tells us how to behave. It is a law that is the same for everyone. It is based on reason, not on what we want or feel. The categorical imperative is important because it helps us figure out what is right and wrong. It applies to all rational beings, including us.

3.3. Autonomy and Freedom:

Kant thinks about morality, and he thinks about freedom at the same time. For Kant, freedom is not about being able to do what you want because nobody is stopping you. It is about being able to make choices based on rules that you make for yourself and that make sense. Kant defines 'will' as "The power of a rational being to act in accordance with its conception of laws, i.e. in accordance with principles." (Paton, 1965, p. 208) The idea that autonomy and freedom are connected is really important in ethics. When we talk about autonomy and freedom, we are talking about a particular thing. A rational agent is free when he makes choices based on what he thinks is right, not just because he feels like it. According to Kant, a moral agent is free because they can make choices based on their thoughts. To Kant, autonomy and freedom are very important.

Thus, autonomy is not a part of being a moral person. It is actually what makes us responsible for our actions. Autonomy is the basis of why a rational agent has to follow rules. It makes us answerable for what we do. So, autonomy and ethics are closely linked. Autonomy is what

makes ethics work. Without autonomy, we would not have obligations. Autonomy is key to understanding why we have to be moral.

3.4. The Role of God in Kantian Morality:

Kant tried hard to base morality on reason. He does not completely remove the idea of God from his thoughts on ethics. Kant talks about some ideas that we have to assume are true in order to be moral. These ideas include freedom, immortality and belief in God. We do not know these things for sure. We have to assume they are true in order for morality to make sense. Kant believes that, for human beings to be completely moral and for things to happen for good, all human beings have to believe that God is behind it all.

This creates a problem in Kant's philosophy. On the one hand, Kant holds that morality is something that we can figure out on our own. On the other hand, he believes that morality becomes truly effective in a subjective sense only when a rational agent has faith in the existence of God as a higher power. The Role of God in Kantian ethics is very important. It shows that Kant's ideas about morality are not just based on reason but on the idea of God.

4. Emergence of Radical Humanism:

The philosophy of M. N. Roy is a change from traditional Marxism to a way of thinking that really cares about people. M. N. Roy started out as a believer in Marxism and wanted to make big changes. But over time, he got disappointed with the idea that everything is controlled by money and material things. This change was not about politics; it was about the way M. N. Roy thought about the world. M. N. Roy came to think that Marxism made them people like they were products of the economy. Marxism took away people's freedom to make choices and be responsible for what they do. In "*New Humanism: A Manifesto*", M. N. Roy clearly says that, "it was experiencing a crisis of culture which called for a new attitude to life as a 'whole—A New social ideology, a new philosophy.'" (Roy, 1961, p. vi)

So, Radical Humanism comes up as a way to deal with the problems of Marxism. It is also associated with the weaknesses of style, religious and spiritual systems. Radical Humanism is a response to these issues. It tries to fix the things that Marxism and traditional religious systems got wrong. Radical Humanism is about finding a way to think about things.

4.1. The Centrality of Reason:

Radical Humanism is about reason being the most important thing in human life. Reason is what Roy thinks we should always rely on. He does not like ideas or superstitions. Roy believes that human reason is all we need to make choices and live a good life.

Roy is different from Kant. Kant thinks reason is important for being a person, but he also thinks there are things beyond what we can see and touch that are important. Roy does not think that. For Roy, reason is something that people can use. It gets better as we learn and grow. It is based on what we see and experience in the world. It is connected to how our bodies and societies work. Radical Humanism and reason are closely tied together. Roy's ideas are centred around the idea that Radical Humanism and reason can help us make sense of the world. Roy thinks that people should use their brains to figure things out. This means that:

- Moral values are things that people made up
- We come up with rules for being good by thinking about what's right
- We do not need someone or something outside of us, like a god, to tell us what to do

So Radical Humanism is a move towards making ethics completely about people and not about religion. Radical Humanism is about people making their own decisions and not relying on something else. This is what Roy thinks Radical Humanism is about: making ethics just, about people and what we think is right.

4.2. Freedom as the Basis of Morality:

Freedom is really important in the philosophy of M. N. Roy. To him, the idea of freedom is different from Kant's. According to Roy idea of freedom is based on what's really happening in the world. To Roy-

- Freedom is not some big idea that we cannot touch.
- It is something that's real, and it is a part of being human.
- It happens when we think about things and when society gets better.

So, Freedom is the starting point and the goal of being a person. When we try to be good, we use our freedom. We think about what we are doing.

This is very different from what religion says about being good. It is also different from people who think that everything is already decided. In Radical Humanism, a person is not

controlled by God or by what has to happen. A person can make their choices and decide what they want to do with their life. In this regard, Roy says that, “the free individual discharges his social functions, not under any compulsion, nor again as a homage to the exacting god of a collective ego, but out of a moral conviction which grows from the consciousness of freedom.” (Roy, 1961, p. 7) Morality stems from freedom—this is the core of Radical Humanism. Freedom, in this case, is what makes it possible for people to be in charge of their lives and to make their own decisions. Freedom is what allows people to create their destiny and to live the life they want.

4.3. Humanism as an Ethical Project:

Radical Humanism is not a theory but a complete plan for ethics and society. It aims to rebuild society based on reason, freedom and respect for beings. Roy imagines a world where-

- People use thinking to guide them.
- Social institutions help promote freedom and fairness.
- We keep re-examining our values in light of what we learn from experience.

This changing and forward-thinking idea of ethics sets Radical Humanism apart from traditional moral systems, which are based on old customs or divine revelation. It's worth noting that Roy's humanism is about ethics, not about human beings. It does not blindly praise humans. Instead emphasizes their duty to build a fair and rational world.

5. Ethics Without God:

One key thing about Radical Humanism is that it totally rejects the idea of something beyond life. Roy says we do not need to believe in God or that we live forever or in any reality to have ethics. This directly answers a question of this paper – can we have morality without God? Roy is very clear. Yes, we can. He says,

- Believing in God can actually make people less responsible for their actions.
- When we blame forces, we are less likely to take responsibility.
- For ethics to really work, people must feel they can make their own decisions.

So, morality is not something we find but something we create through human reason and actions. Unlike Kant, who still thinks we need to believe in God to make decisions, Roy gets rid of that idea. This gives us a morality that is based on human life and does not involve spiritual things.

As the classical assumption, morality requires God. For a time, people have thought that morality and religion are connected. People believed that what is right and wrong comes from God. They thought that we should do what is right because God says so. This old way of thinking says some things about God and morality. It says that-

- God is where we get our rules from.
- What is right and wrong is not just what people think, but what God says.
- If we do not have God, then we cannot say what is really right or wrong; everything is what people think

These ideas are still important in the study of theology and ethics. They are still talked about today when we think about what's right and wrong.

Immanuel Kant started to ask if we really need God to know what is right and wrong. The idea of morality requiring God is still something that human beings think about today. The concept of morality requiring God is a part of this discussion. Morality requiring God is an issue that has been debated for a long time. One change in modern moral philosophy is the idea that ethics stands on its own. It does not depend on religion. Immanuel Kant plays a role in this change. He says that moral laws come from reason, not from God. As we talked about before, Kant still believes in something bigger than us.

This question brings up ideas about ethics that are not related to religion, like Radical Humanism. It is really about Radical Humanism and what Radical Humanism has to say about these things. Radical Humanism of M. N. Roy represents a significant intellectual shift from both religious morality and orthodox Marxism. It seeks to reconstruct ethics on the basis of human reason, scientific knowledge, and individual freedom. According to M.N. Roy, human beings are inherently moral and rational—there is no need for God or external authority. He clearly stated that, “it is in the nature of man to be rational and moral, and therefore capable of building a free, harmonious and just social order.” (Roy, 1961, p. viii) In doing so, Roy attempts to demonstrate that morality is possible without God. In fact, it is more authentic and meaningful when freed from theological constraints.

So, the argument about morality, religion and philosophy shows that being a person does not need God to exist. When we deeply reflect upon the perspectives of those who do not believe in God, it becomes evident that we can distinguish between right and wrong by exercising our own intellect, drawing upon our lived experiences, and engaging in dialogue with one another. This idea is the basis for Radical Humanism. It is all about saying that we can be

good people and know what is right without needing something bigger than us, like God, to tell us what to do. Radical Humanism really likes the idea that we can be good without needing God.

6. The Need for a Comparative Framework:

The main idea of this study is to have Immanuel Kant and M. N. Roy talk to each other in a way. Even though they represent distinct historical epochs, cultures, and schools of thought. They share a highly significant commonality. Both sought to ground the criteria for 'right' and 'wrong' in reason rather than in religious precepts. They do not agree on how much to separate what is right and wrong from things that are beyond what we can see and touch.

This part will show that Radical Humanism is not another way of thinking about what is right and wrong that is different from what Immanuel Kant said. It is actually a continuation of Immanuel Kant's ideas. It also changes them in important ways to create something new. Radical Humanism takes the ideas of Immanuel Kant. Builds on them.

7. Divergence of The Question of Transcendence:

Kant and Roy have different ideas about transcendence, even though they both believe in using reason.

➤ Kant says we need to believe in things to make our morals work. He lists these things: God, Immortality, and the Highest Good. These are not things we can prove, but we need to believe in them to make our morals strong. Kant thinks that without these things, we cannot be sure that good people will be happy and that bad people will not be happy.

M. N. Roy does not agree with Kant. He says no to these things: no God, no guarantees from the universe, and no reason to think that morals are justified by something bigger than us. 'Radical Humanism rejects supernatural authority by affirming that man is inherently rational and moral, and that knowledge must be based on scientific understanding rather than faith.' (Roy, 1961) For Roy, our morals should be based on what people think is right and how we live together.

Kant thinks that morality is partly based on things we cannot see or touch. Roy thinks that morality is completely based on what people think and how we live together.

➤ According to Kant, autonomy is a rational thing. It is not based on real-life situations. The moral law applies to all people who can think logically. Kant's autonomy is always formal autonomy.

According to M.N. Roy, autonomy comes from real-life experiences and social situations. It gets better as people learn and grow. Being a person is connected to everyday life. So, Kant's autonomy is about being free in an abstract way. Roy's autonomy is about being free, in a changing way. The autonomy of M. N. Roy is concrete autonomy.

➤ Both of these philosophers talk about freedom. They think about it in different ways. Kant thinks that freedom is something we need to have in order to make choices. He believes that freedom is something that exists outside of the world we can see and experience. Kant thinks that freedom is necessary for us to be able to make choices, and freedom is something that, it is not a part of the physical world.

On the other hand, Roy thinks that freedom is something that we actually live with. According to Roy, freedom is something that we really experience. It grows as we think and learn, and as we interact with other people.

So, the idea of the freedom of M. N. Roy's works is more compatible. With the idea that the world is a natural realm. This world is governed solely by its own rules. Kant's idea of freedom, on the other hand, is still connected to the idea that there are two separate worlds, one that we can see and one that we cannot.

➤ The comparison of these two philosophers leads to an important idea. Roy is the one who completes what the philosopher Kant started. This is because Radical Humanism is like a step in Kant's plan for ethics. Kant begins this movement towards ethics based on reason by doing things. He says that people are in charge of their morality. He also questions the authority of the church. He does not completely get rid of the idea of something beyond this world. Roy takes this idea further by getting rid of all the philosophical ideas that we cannot prove. He says that human reason is enough to understand the world. He creates a system of morality that is based on this world and does not include any religious ideas. So, we can see that Kant makes morality more rational, and Roy makes it completely secular, which means it is not based on any beliefs.

This is a difference between the two philosophers. It clearly shows how Roy completes what Kant started with his ideas on morality and ethics, specifically with Radical Humanism and the completion of Kant's ethical project.

8. Critical Evaluation: Rethinking Ethics Without God:

The analysis before this shows that morality does not need God to exist. When we compare what Immanuel Kant and M. N. Roy said, it is clear that ethics can be based on reason. We

need to look at this idea more closely. The question is not just whether morality can exist without God. It is also whether that kind of morality can have:

- Objectivity
- Normativity
- Universal validity

Kant tries to make sure these things exist through the way reason works. On the one hand, Roy thinks they come from how human rationality and social experience change over time. Morality and ethics are key here. We see morality and ethics in action. Kant and Roy discuss morality and ethics. Kantian Ethics has some good points that people still think about today when they talk about ethics.

➤ **Universality and Objectivity:** Kantian Ethics gives us a way to figure out what is right and wrong that works for everyone. He says that we should only do things that we would want everyone else to do too. This way, we do not just do what we think is right; we do what is really right.

➤ **Moral Duty and Integrity:** Kantian Ethics says that we should do things because it is our duty, not just because we feel like it. This means that we do the thing even when we do not want to.

➤ **Rational Foundation:** Kantian Ethics is based on reason, not on what some people think God wants. This means that anyone can understand it and use it to make choices.

These things make Kantian Ethics a strong and good way to think about what's right and wrong. Kantian Ethics is still important today because of these strengths.

8.1. Limitations of Kantian Ethics:

Kantian Ethics is not perfect; it has some weaknesses.

➤ **Residual Transcendence:** Kantian Ethics relies on things like God. Living forever. This causes some tension in Kantian Ethics. According to Kant, we can make our moral decisions, but it seems like we need to believe in God and live forever for morality to really work.

➤ **Formalism:** Kantian Ethics is too focused on rules and not enough on life. The categorical imperative is a rule that is supposed to help us make decisions, but it does not always give us enough guidance in complicated situations.

➤ **Detachment from Social Reality:** Kantian Ethics focuses a lot on being rational and making our decisions. It does not think about how society, history and our emotions affect our lives. It tends to ignore the historical and emotional parts of being human.

8.2. Strengths of Radical Humanism:

The Radical Humanism that M. N. Roy developed is a good alternative to other ideas. It deals with a lot of the problems that other ideas have.

- **Complete Secularization of Ethics:** M. N. Roy gets rid of the need for anything beyond what we can see and touch. He creates a way of thinking about what is right and wrong that is based only on what is in this world. This is what a lot of scientists and people who believe in reasoning think is a way to look at things.
- **Emphasis on Human Freedom:** M. N. Roy thinks that freedom is the important thing when it comes to making choices about what is right and wrong. He believes that people are able to make their own decisions and create their own moral and social rules.
- **Integration with Social Reality:** M. N. Roy is different from Kant, because he thinks that what is right and wrong is connected to the world and the time we are living in. This makes his ideas more relevant to what is actually happening.
- **Dynamic and Evolving Ethics:** Radical Humanism says that what is right and wrong is not always the same. It changes as people live their lives and think critically about what is happening. Radical Humanism recognizes that people's ideas about what is right and wrong will change over time as they learn and grow.

9. Contemporary Relevance:

The question of “ethics without God” is really important. It affects our lives today. It has an impact on the way we live and the decisions we make in our society.

- **Pluralism and Secularism:** We have different people with many different beliefs in our societies. So, it is a problem to use one set of religious beliefs to decide what is right and wrong. We need a way to make decisions that does not depend on religion. This way, everyone can be treated fairly, no matter what they believe. We can call this an ethical framework.
- **Technological Advancements:** New things like artificial intelligence and biotechnology are changing our world. We also have problems like the environment that need to be solved. These things make us ask questions about what is right and wrong. We cannot just use religious ideas to answer these questions. We need ways of thinking about ethics.
- **Human Rights and Democracy:** Our governments are based on the idea that all people are important and should be free. These ideas are also important in ethics, in the ideas of Kant and the Radical Humanism of M. N. Roy. In this context, Roy’s idea of a secular and rational ethics is very important. Roy’s vision of ethics is relevant to our lives today. Ethics in a

secular age is what we need to think about. We need to think about how ethics can work in a society without God. This is what Roy's vision of a secular and rational ethics is all about.

10. Can We Bring Things Together?

We have to think about something: should we pick between Kant and Roy, or can we find a way to combine the two? Maybe we can find a way to bring them together. Keeping the things that are good about Kant's ideas, like how they apply to everyone and are very thorough. Also, using the things that are good about Roy's ideas, like how he thinks about the world we live in and how we should be fair to everyone. If we can do this, we might be able to make a better way of thinking about ethics that balances what is fair for everyone and is able to adapt to different situations. Using our brains to think things through and understand how people really live. Having rules to follow and being able to use them in real life to make ethics, and ethics work better.

Radical Humanism highlights the shortcomings of constructing a system of morality independent of God. Kant proposes a logical framework, yet it relies on certain concepts that remain incompletely elucidated; this serves to constrain the autonomy of morality. Radical Humanism is different. It offers a morality that is based on human needs and does not involve God. It makes us wonder if this morality can be the same for everyone and if it will last. Both of these ideas help us understand how moral philosophy is changing now that we do not rely on God. They also show that morality can come from reason and our ability to make choices. Morality is based on what humans think and decide. It is not based on God or a higher power.

11. Concluding Remarks:

The main goal of this study was to find out if morality needs to come from something other than us or if it can be based on what people think is right and wrong. I looked at what Kant and M. N. Roy said. I found out that most people today think that morality can be based on what people think is right and wrong. Kant's ideas about morality were a change in the way people thought about ethics. He said that morality comes from reason and what people want, not from what God or the church says. This means that people can figure out what is right and wrong on their own without needing to be told by someone. Kant's idea of the imperative gives us a way to know what is right and wrong. That applies to everyone everywhere. However, Kant still believed in God. Thought that morality was connected to a higher power. This means that his ideas about morality were not entirely based on what people think.

This is where M. N. Roy's ideas become important. Roy took Kant's ideas. Removed anything that had to do with God or a higher power. He said that people are capable of figuring out what is right and wrong on their own without needing anything. This means that morality is something that people create based on what they think and how they live together. Roy's ideas, known as Radical Humanism, say that morality is about people being free and treating each other with respect. It is based on what people think and how they live together. It is directed towards making the world a better place for everyone. M. N. Roy and Immanuel Kant both thought about morality, and their ideas are important for understanding what morality means to people.

Kant and Roy both believe in using reason and being independent. They do not think people should follow religion without questioning it. However, they have different ideas about things that are beyond what we can see and experience. Kant thinks that religion should be based on principles and that reason is more important. On the other hand, Roy does not think religion is necessary at all. This difference shows how people's ideas about ethics are changing from being based on religion to being fully separate from religion.

There is a discussion in the philosophy of religion that supports this change. Some people criticise the idea that God's commands are what make things right or wrong. They also talk about the problems with the idea that God decides what is good. Additionally, people have developed theories that do not depend on the existence of God. We can figure out what is right and wrong by using reason, thinking about our experiences and interacting with each other. In this context, the idea of having ethics without God is not a change but rather a natural part of the history of thinking about morality.

Kant's ideas about ethics are very thorough. Radical Humanism is an alternative that does not involve God. But it raises questions about whether its ideas can apply to everyone. Are they stable? And how to deal with aspects of human life that cannot be explained by reason? These challenges suggest that the best way to think about ethics, in the future, might be to consider both Kant's and Roy's ideas and to think critically about how they can be used.

Radical Humanism is a change from religious morality and materialism. It says reason and freedom are the bases for ethics. Roy's ideas are different from Kant's. Kant still uses a kind of framework. Roy makes a philosophy that is only about people and not about God. This way, he answers the question of whether we need God for morality. He says that people can make values just by being rational and free. People can decide what is right and wrong by themselves. Morality comes from what people think and choose.

The main point of this study is that we do not need God to know what is right and wrong. We can figure it out by using our minds. Over time, people have moved away from getting their guidance from religion to using reason and now to a way of thinking called Radical Humanism. This shows that people are starting to understand themselves in a way. We no longer think that morality comes from a power but from our own ability to think and reason. So, having ethics without God does not mean we do not have a basis for morality. It means we are creating a basis that is more about people being in charge of their own lives, using reason and being responsible for the world they live in. Radical Humanism is not a way of thinking; it is a way of looking at how people can be free. It is about people taking control of their lives and making their own decisions about what is right and wrong.

REFERENCES:

1. Abbott, T. K. (1909). *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on The Theory of Ethics*. (T. K. Abbott, Trans.) London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co.
2. Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.
3. Kant, I. (1938). *Religion Within the Boundary of Pure Reason*. (A. J. W. Semple, Trans.) Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 38 George Street.
4. Kant, I. (1964). *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*. (H. J. Paton, Trans.) New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, London: Harper & Row, Publishers.
5. Paton, H. J. (1965). *The Categorical Imperative: A Study in Kant's Moral Philosophy*. 47 Princes Gate, London: Hutchinson's University Library.
6. Roy, M. N. (1952). *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution* (Vol. I). 15, Bankim Chatterjee Street, Calcutta-12: Renaissance Publishers LTD.
7. Roy, M. N. (1961). *New Humanism: A Manifesto*. Bankim Chatterjee Street, Calcutta-12: Renaissance Publishers Private LTD.
8. Wood, A. W. (2008). *Kantian Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.