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The making of a free, democratic and liberal man is the driving impulse of western culture. It is a continuing intellectual and moral movement, now universal in its scope. Originating from the West though and initially identified with archetypal western man, the emergence of the free democratic man has now become the concern of the rest of mankind also. It is a concern on which veers the destiny of mankind, the flowering of the best in human nature and even the survival of mankind. The fateful turning point that philosophy took at the hands of Socrates from speculation on Nature to a deep gaze within the soul of man is the beginning of Philosophy’s conscious participation in the making of man. His disciple, Plato’s construction of a model State to find human nature projected in it in a magnified form is a landmark in the formulation of a problem that will be intriguing philosophers for all time to come, namely, the relation between the individual and the society. Further, Socrates taking hemlock in defense of freedom of discourse is the eternal symbol of a living tradition in quest of the free man. And Russell for one is a philosopher most true to this tradition.

Whatever there are in the Universe tends towards the realisation of the possibilities their nature is capable of. What we have in History, therefore, is unfoldment of the possibilities in human nature and Nature. Freedom is the unfoldment of the best in every individual human being in Nature and society. Thus, any discourse on freedom is meaningful within
the framework set by the potentials inherent in human nature and Nature. Thinkers throughout the ages who dwelt on the problem of individual freedom and social constraints, therefore, probed deep into human nature and Nature.

Let us begin with some considerations on human nature first.

Man by nature is capable of biological reproduction. Individually, man is a finite and mortal being. But as a species-being man can continue his existence through biological reproduction. Biological reproduction presupposes a togetherness of men and women, and hence a collective existence. This coming together or collective existence gives rise to family. Human nature gives rise to social institutions which in turn reflect human nature. Philosophers and social scientists who study human nature, therefore, seriously study family as an institution. Morgan’s path breaking studies in the evolution of family from savagery through barbarism to civilisation is one classic example.¹ So is Malinowski’s studies on the subject approvingly referred to by Russell in his works.² Russell on his part studies family in relation to love and sex in his book, Marriage And Morals.

Man can not only biologically reproduce himself, but he can also produce material objects for his needs using raw materials supplied by Nature. To use natural objects as his raw materials, man must be able to know their properties. He can know their properties because he is a conscious being who can inquire into the nature of things. Thus man engaged in a material production also develops the knowing attitude. Besides, knowing is not for production only. Knowing newer and newer things is
also a delightful experience in itself. Nature arouses curiosity, and satisfaction of curiosity is enjoyable in itself apart from useful consequences. But curiosity apart, knowledge enabling man to use natural objects as raw materials in material production, also develops a manipulative attitude in man. Theoretical contemplation of Nature as well as production of useful objects from natural objects are forms of man’s appropriation of Nature.

From the very beginning tools are used in material production, As the process became more and more elaborate, tools became more and more complex. Ultimately, tools gave way to technology, which represents an organised complex of man and machine. The use of technology in material production ultimately gave rise to giant economic organisations having dynamics of their own. Here again we find that the productive activity rooted in human nature gives rise to social organisations.

Material production is a creative activity that satisfies human needs. But it is also a manipulative activity that gives rise to the dominating or power attitude toward the world. Perhaps, there is an universal tendency in man to indulge in the game of playing the God. This may also be called the manipulative or power attitude. Possibly, man’s consciousness of power began with the use and control over his own limbs, the emancipation of ‘the Hand’ for work heralding the beginning of industrial culture. Tools added to his organ (tools are his extended organ) increases his manipulative power over Nature. When tools are transformed into technology, skill and knowledge into laws of modus operandi, man dreams of extending his power into the Universe, not even recognising the sky as the limit. The phenomenon of manipulative control is all the more intriguing when it is realised that
man seeks to control, not only matter, but conscious beings as well. He not
only takes delight in the exercise of power over his follow beings, but
regards this as the crowning achievement of his existence. Exercise of power
over man needs institutional machinery, a functional system where the
component parts are manned by machines and man functioning as machines.
Man, the seemingly helpless creature in the vast cosmos, appropriates the
power of ‘techne’ (technology of social institutions included) and ‘logos’
to become all powerful, spins a cobweb of power structure which has every
tendency to become normative in its own right. Man starts thinking that he
can fathom the vastness of the Universe by using his projected Ego as the
measuring rod. To understand this power seeking dimension of man is
crucial to the understanding of the conflict between social institutions as
means of power and individual human freedom. As the work progresses, it
will be seen that in developing his social theory Russell gives utmost
importance to the analysis of this power dimension of human existence.

Man is also a need based being. He has essential needs. As an objective
and embodied being, man has both material and spiritual needs. For
example, he needs food, not only for survival, but also for the humane
satisfaction of his hunger, which is an active mode of gratification of his
senses. He has eyes and therefore he needs beautiful objects to see. He is
aroused by the mystery of the Universe. He therefore needs leisure to
contemplate on the Universe and also to cultivate the faculty of thought to
be able to contemplate. He needs to love and to be loved. He thus needs to
be related to his fellow beings. He can create material objects, objects of
beauty, objects of art, religion, thought systems, scientific theories etc.
This creative urge in him needs to be satisfied. Man is endowed with certain
capacities and dispositions and has a corresponding need to realise them.
Human beings striving to fulfil their needs in their togetherness give rise to social institutions.

Man is also a communicative being who can share a common universe of discourse with his fellow beings through the use of language. When a man describes a world for his fellow being he shares a common universe of discourse with them and a common experience. This is because our world and experiences are sharable. The Universe lends itself to contemplation and description. But the descriptive function is not the only function of language. Language is also manipulative as when we use imperatives to change our environments or introduce technical terms to build up science and technology with which we control the world. Language is also used to exercise influence over our fellow beings as when we persuade others to share our point of view. Language can also be a tool of inquiry as when we use dialogue to find out the truth or arrive at a consensus. Dialogue opens up possibilities and as such it reflects men's freedom to find out or choose one among the many possibilities.

Human beings by their very nature develop certain tendencies and attitudes. Thus man develop the knowing, the acting, the manipulative or the dominating, the appropriating, the loving and the choosing attitude to the world. It is in the unfoldment of human nature in these tendencies and attitudes that men can realise his freedom. In knowing, loving and acting on the world; and in their relation with one another, men realise their freedom.

As human nature is directly communal, men's theoretical and practical commitment in the world is also a collective enterprise. True, every
individual human being is unique in his own right. But even then they realise their uniqueness in their relationship with one another, in their togetherness. This human relationship or togetherness is very complex and elaborate. Therefore, it gives rise to a number of social organisations and structures. Thus material production gives rise to economic organisations, biological reproduction to family, need to protect the individual against violence to the State, need to cultivate the faculty of thought to educational organisations, the need of collective religious life to the Church. These in turn, have given rise to yet many other structures.

Once created, social organisations tend to have a life and a dynamics of their own. Although men use social organisations, social organisations also use men. Originally designed to help the individuals, organisations carried away by the momentum of their own dynamics, tend to develop extraneous ends. It is thus that conflicts also arise between individual human freedom and social organisations. Social philosophers throughout the ages have been intrigued by this conflict. They have formulated the nature of the conflict in their own way and have offered many solutions.

The nature of the conflict between freedom and organisation; and the problem of reconciling personal freedom with stable and efficient social organisations, is undoubtedly one that greatly troubled Russell. In fact, to resolve the conflict is the major thrust of Russell's social philosophy.

While describing his intellectual development, Russell said in his Autobiography that two separate objectives which ultimately united into one whole; dominated his work. One is the quest for certainly, to find out whether anything could be known.
The quest for certainty which Russell wanted in the kind of way in which people want religious faith led him to the Platonic world of mathematics. Russell gave his own account of how certainty eluded him in the end:

I thought that certainty is more likely to be found in mathematics than elsewhere. But I discovered that many mathematical demonstrations, which my teachers expected me to accept, were full of fallacies, and that, if certainty were indeed discoverable in mathematics, it would be in a new kind of mathematics, with more solid foundations than those that had hitherto been thought secure. But as the work proceeded, I was continually reminded of the fable about the elephant and the tortoise. Having constructed an elephant upon which the mathematical world could rest, I found the elephant tottering, and proceeded to construct a tortoise to keep the elephant from falling. But the tortoise was no more secure than the elephant, and after some twenty years of very arduous toil, I came to the conclusion that there was nothing more that I could do in the way of making mathematical knowledge indubitable. *

The second objective, to do whatever might be possible towards creating a happier world led Russell to search for a social theory. As a happy society is one in which individual freedom is realised within stable efficient social organisations, Russell’s social theory concentrated on the resolution of the conflict between individual freedom and social organisations. He formulated the problem clearly and worked out a number of solutions. He came to believe that a great measure of success has been achieved towards the resolution. He came to be persuaded about the truth of the following propositions:

Neither misery nor folly need be any part of the inevitable lot of man.

Intelligence, patience and eloquence can, sooner or later, lead the human race out of its self imposed tortures provided it does not exterminate itself meanwhile.

Wars, oppressions, tortures, and morbid miseries which have been due to men’s hostility to men fostered by gloomy creeds are unnecessary. Given the will, the sympathy and intellectual energy, they can be overcome.

There are people who grow angry when hopes are suggested to them, are in love with misery and death. But with intelligence and energy hope can be given to the world inspite of these people.

According to Russell, there are dogmatic and precise creeds such as Christianity, Marxism and Fascism etc. They may have immediate impact. But invariably any such gospel ultimately turned out to be yet another case of the God that failed. Again a partial doctrine which deals only with some
part or aspect of human life is not likely to be the answer to the social maladies of mankind. Some people may argue that institutions alone matter and institutional reform will enable us to realise the free man in a good society. Still others may argue that a change of heart alone can work wonders. The truth, according to Russell, is that institutions mould individuals, but individuals are responsible for transforming institutions so that they may serve as means in moulding individuals in the right way. Now individuals can actively transform institutions provided they retain a measure of initiative and flexibility. And initiative can be retained if individuals are not forced into one rigid mould or all drilled into one army. Hence the need for striking a harmony between individual freedom and social institutions.

Russell opined that although the realisation of this harmony may take longer than what he initially thought it will take, it is possible to have a world where men can be free and happy. He believed that it is worth while to live with a view to bringing it. Russell lived upto his convictions. In his theoretical commitment, he groped for a social theory that will resolve the conflict between freedom and organisation. In his practical commitment, he actively participated in politics, achieved world wide fame as a moral and social propagandist. He worked for World Government and international peace, campaigned for nuclear disarmament, actively intervened for conflict resolution in international crises. Russell’s social theory, his formulation of the conflict of freedom and organisation; and his proposed resolution of the conflict, is going to be the subject matter of study in the present thesis. The dialectical development of the thesis will be as fellows.
An exposition of Russell's concept of freedom will be presented in the second chapter. His analysis of the two senses of freedom, freedom to and freedom from, will be given an elaborate exposition. It will be shown that in Russell's analysis, freedom to do, to have; freedom as the active mode of striving is founded in human nature. His view that freedom is the realisation of the best in the individual through his dispositions, tendencies and faculties, will be explained. It will also be shown that, according to Russell, freedom also means freedom of individuals and groups from various forms of constraints. The relationship between individual freedom and group freedom will also be explained.

An exposition of Russell's views on the structure and dynamics of social organisations will be attempted at in the third chapter. It will be shown how according to Russell, organisations once they are created tend to have a life and dynamics of their own.

The fourth chapter will be devoted to an exposition of Russell's formulation of the conflict between human freedom and social organisations. Russell's analysis of the dynamics of the State, the economic organisations, the Church, the educational organisations and the family will be discussed in detail. His views on how the dynamics of these institutions come into conflict with individual freedom and group freedom will also be presented in detail.

Russell's proposals towards resolution of the conflict between human freedom and institutional dynamics vis-a-vis the State, the economic organisations, the Church, the educational organisations and the family, will be presented in the fifth paper.
The sixth chapter will be devoted to an examination of the principles Russell uses in the resolution of the conflict between human freedom and social organisations. The Russellian principles for conflict resolution will be identified, analysed and assessed. Where they are found to be viable, the present researcher will make an attempt to advance reasons for their viability. Where problems and paradoxes appear in the application of the Russellian principles, they will be pointed out.

In the conclusion, an attempt will be made to suggest solutions towards resolution of the problems and paradoxes that appear in some of the Russellian principles. New vistas Russell’s social philosophy has opened up towards evolving a new model of reconciling individual freedom with institutional dynamics will be mentioned for further exploration by future researchers.