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Man is a social being in the manner of reproduction, production of his means of sustenance, communication with one another and satisfaction as well creation of new needs. A man is born in society and family is perhaps one of earliest forms of social organisation. Similarly men produce material objects of utility not in isolation, but in group. Hegel is the first philosopher who examined labour that unites self with ‘the other’ as a social category. Working together with others is one way in which man encounters his existence in ‘the other’. Labour is a process that unites man to man, the individual discovering his self in the collective. As the process of material production becomes more complex, the vastness and intricacy of social relationship are increased. The evolution and subsequent fashioning of language as a tool to explore and share a common universe of discourse is a phenomenon that reveals the deeper social being of man. Lastly, man satisfies his needs in society, every form of society creating its own needs. Certain dispositional needs like the need to love, sexual partnership etc. can be satisfied only in a relationship to others. Hence, human existence is intrinsically social in character.

Man’s social mode of existence engenders some form of organisation. It is Russell’s views on the dynamics of social organisation that we are going to discuss in this chapter.
3.1 THE STRUCTURE AND DYNAMICS OF ORGANISATION

According to Russell, anything that is of interest is the result of organisation. An organisation may be considered as a kind of organism provided the analogy does not go too far. It has a life of its own, a tendency to growth and decay. A discussion on organisation is relevant because control and management of human affairs is through organisation.

Every social organisation consists of individuals. Organisation means coming together of individuals. The way how individuals come together tells us many things about the nature of an organisation. Where individuals come together of their own accord to pursue certain common purpose, the organisation is voluntary, for example; a club. Where the coming together is natural and biological, it is a family or clan. Where the membership is based on some kind of force and recognition of some authority, the organisation is a State. Some organisations may be of a very complicated nature, involving elements of force, such as, Railway Company.

Individuals come together to do such things which they cannot achieve in isolation. Hence every organisation invariably must have a purpose. Human beings are purposive systems capable of goal directed activity. So, are the organisations they create. The purpose of an organisation may be explicit or unexpressed, conscious or unconscious. It may be military, political, economic or religious, educational or athletic and so on.

An organisation achieves its purpose through its performance. Just as parts of an organism must co-ordinate, so also an organisation which is like an organism in many senses, must perform through the functional
co-ordination of its members. All organisations have a structure that corresponds to the sum total of functions they will be performing towards desired ends. Each functional part of the organisation (which is a total structure) performs specific function and the parts co-ordinate with one another to make the total structure function. Individuals co-ordinate their activities vis-a-vis the organisation in their role as functional parts. This co-ordination must be based on some principle of performance. The principle of performance is embodied in the government which sees to it that the organisation performs to achieve its purpose. Every organisation, therefore, must have a government, which takes decisions in the name of the whole body and has more power than the single members have, at any rate as regards the purposes for which the organisation exists. With the development of science and technology, there is a corresponding improvement in the technique of control of men and Nature. The advantages of organisation in controlling men and Nature to achieve collective purpose become obvious. Hence as men become more civilised, individual life tends to get more organised. But while organisations increase collective or group power, individuals also have to surrender some of their independence. He has to act his role as functional part in the organisation. An organisation of which an individual is a member has a control over him to the extent to which he submits to its rule. Furthermore, an individual may be subject to the power of organisations of which he is not a member. More and more, the important decisions are those of bodies of men, not of single individuals. And the decisions of bodies of men, unless the members are very few, have to be effected through governments. Thus, government necessarily plays a much larger part in the life of a modern civilised community than in that of pre-industrial societies.
As a solitary being man has less manipulative power over others and Nature. As a member of an organisation, he can have enormous control over man and Nature. But in so acquiring organised power, he has to surrender something of his independence. One way of making up the loss is either by direct participation in the government or in the election of the government. Although theoretically every member has a share in the decision making process, the members of the government have more controlling power than others, even if such a government is democratically elected. Even the official appointed by a democratically elected government have more power than ordinary members of an organisation. Thus inherent in every organisation is the members of the government gradually becoming a power by themselves, exercising control over the ordinary members and enjoying privileges which the latter does not have. Russell, therefore, says:

Every increase in the size of organisations increases inequalities of power by simultaneously diminishing the independence of ordinary members and enlarging the scope of the initiative of the government. The average man submits because much more can be achieved cooperatively than singly; the exceptionally power loving man rejoices, since it provides his opportunity ...*

Thus, if we follow Russell, the dynamics of an organisation may be explained as follows:

1. An organisation has more power over man and Nature than individuals do have in isolation. By belonging to an organisation an individual experiences a sense of power in the control of man and Nature and in the shaping of his destiny. But this power is achieved at the cost of his individual independence. The more an organisation acquires control over man and Nature, the more justification it has to control the activities of its members. Thus in the very dynamics of an organisation we find two opposing tendencies, increase in the power of the collective going together with an inverse decrease in the independence of the individual.

2. To set an organisation in motion, to make it perform, to control members and non-members alike, an organisation needs some form of control. That is to say, the organisation must have a government. Now, within the same organisation, those who are in the government have more power and privileges than ordinary members. Although theoretically every member may participate in the government through their representative, the government may become a power external to the members and those who seek to control and dominate may use their participation in the government for their self perpetuation.

This internal dynamics or intrinsic motion is closely interrelated with its external dynamics or relationship with other organisations.

Let us see how.

When there are many organisations having the same purpose and operating in the same field, a competition inevitably results. The more an organisation has control over man and Nature, the greater is the tendency
to seek for more. To extend its power and control, an organisation has to compete effectively with other organisations of the same kind. To increase its competing power, an organisation has to grow in size. The more an organisation grows in size, the greater is the degree of control which it exerts over the members. Increase in size follows the dynamics of inter organisational relations, which is one of competition. Whereas, increase in the degree of control which organisations exert over their members follows the internal dynamics of organisations which must correspond to the external dynamics or inter-organisational relations. Thus competition leads to increase in external size which in turn leads to increase in internal control. These are two closely related dynamics of organisations. Russell calls size the extent of power and internal control the density of power.

According to Russell, every organisation in the absence of any counteracting force, tends to grow both in size and in density of power. Growth in size is stopped either by the pressure of other organisations or by the organisation in question becoming world wide.

Let us take the case of the State, an important organisation man has created. Every State has a tendency to expand through foreign conquest and this tendency is stopped only when it reaches a frontier at which some other State or States can exert a pressure as strong as its own.

According to Russell, the more organisation expands the greater is the concentration of power in some central authority. In ancient empires or State systems the concentration was nominally complete. But, in actual practice, the exercise of power was limited to a great extent by technical constraints. Lack of communication resulting in tardy movement of persons,
goods and transmission of news rendered the central authority ineffective in controlling remote and peripheral areas. Now, revolution in road communication and transmission of messages have made it easier than in former days to exert power at a distance from the centre. Coupled with this is, the revolution in science and technology innovating new forms of control. The effect of this is the tendency for organisations to increase in size through increase in the intensity of competition. Especially for organisations like the State, the tendency is for expansion to become global, as the resulting increase of size need not impair efficiency. Given the technical feasibility of governance to reach any part of the world and also given the absolutist character of the State there is the possibility of World State being established by the most powerful State victorious in a really serious world-war, or more probably, by the most powerful of the neutral State. The World State is what expansion in the size of an organisation leads to.*

Russell also opines that corresponding to the tendency to increase in the size of the State, there is a corresponding tendency to increase in the density of power, that is in the degree of the exercise of control over the members. As love of power is inherent in man and as those who have tasted power thirst for more, the men who control the State may be expected to desire an increase of its internal activities just as much as an increase of its territory. Where there are solid grounds for augmenting the functions of the State and increase in the interference of the State over the life of individuals, citizens are ordinarily disposed to yield to the State. But increase in the density of State power beyond a certain point is bound to be counteracted by a desire of independence. Here two opposite forces are

* cf. Chapter Four.
at work. On the one hand, organisations increasing the intensity of control. On the other hand, individuals asserting their love of freedom. Here is a visible tension, one force trying to prevail over the other. When they are evenly balanced, there is a temporary equilibrium. An increase in one side of the balance tends to stimulate increase in the other side. A decrease in one side would also invite the tendency to increase in the other side. Thus if control of organisation were increased love of independence would become the stronger force and if it were diminished love of power would be the stronger.

Love of independence is expressed in concrete forms of aversion to one or other forms of government control like prohibition, conscription, religious conformity, ideological conformity etc. Modern States use propaganda and education to weaken the desire for personal independence. Schools, newspapers, cinema, radio, drill etc. make for uniformity in modern communities. Thus, according to Russell;

The position of momentary equilibrium between the sentiment of independence and love of power tends, therefore, under modern conditions, to shift further and further in the direction of power, thus facilitating the creation and success of totalitarian States. By education, love of independence can be weakened to an extent to which, at present, no limits are known. How far the internal power of the State may be gradually increased without provoking revolt it is impossible to say; but there seems no reason to doubt, that given time, it can be increased far beyond the point at present reached even in the most autocratic States.*

*Ibid., p 115
This Russellian doctrine of equilibrium and tension between freedom and organisation will be explored at length in the subsequent chapters.* Russell further holds that the law of increase in the extent and intensity of organisations and following that the law of equilibrium and tension holds true for other organisations as well. Churches, political parties and business corporations all follow the same law.

Most Churches aim at being world wide. They also aim at control of some of the most intimate concerns of their members, such as marriage and the education of children. The power impulses of Churches have been limited only by lack of opportunity, and by the fear of revolt in the shape of heresy or schism.

Similarly, political parties seek to control the activities of their members in many ways. Even in the so-called democratic parties the members are pledged to party orthodoxy. Failure to keep this pledge means political extinction and financial loss. Members must be loyal to the party programme. Even if members cannot see eye to eye with the party, they must not express any opinion to the contrary. They also must be loyal to the leaders in their actions. The programmes are decided by a coterie of wire pullers and the decision making process is democratic in name only. The programme implementation depends on the leader only. If the leaders decide not to carry out the programmes then also their followers must dutifully support their breach of faith by their votes. Here Russell remarks;

* cf Chapter Four
It is this system that has given to leaders the power to thwart their-rank-and-file supporters, and to advocate reforms without having to enact them.*

The density of organisation is immeasurably more in political parties originating from secret societies. Such, according to Russell is the case of the parties of Communists, Fascists and Nazis. An organisation functioning in secrecy for a distant goal with the hope of future triumph is more exacting on the individual freedom of the members than political parties whose working are at least transparent and democratic to some extent. The sacrifice of freedom so demanded of the individuals is initially proposed for a transitional period only, the period of struggle for the millennium to come, to be precise. Once the millennium is come, the faithful flocks are told, there will be freedom with honey and milk. But the problem is, the dark tunnel of transitional period never ends and once the revolutionaries capture power they ruled the State in the same spirit in which they had formerly ruled their parties. This demand of submission from the followers is what the Communists, Fascists and Nazis have in common throughout the world.

Similarly there had been growth in the size and density of economic organisations.** Technological revolution has opened up possibilities for exploitation of natural resources and manpower on an unprecedented scale. This has led to large scale production and expansion of market, which

---

** cf Chapter - Four
again create conditions for giant size economic organisations in the form of trusts or corporations. The tendency is to the formation of trusts or corporations that are co-extensive with some great State and its satellites. The need for capture of foreign markets on the one hand and protection of home market on the other hand necessitated gunboat diplomacy and tariff. Hence big business came to be intimately associated with the State. The conquest of foreign market has come to be dependent upon the military strength of the State to which the trust or corporation in question belongs. Where giant economic organisations operate transnational, there develops inevitably an unholy alliance between economic organisations and the State. Amalgamation of companies into giant corporations and industries into one giant industry become the order of the day. The natural tendency to combination is true of economic organisations as well as the State. If advantage in production is the hall mark of amalgamation of economic organisations, then advantages in realising the purposes of the State such as wealth, health, intelligence and happiness of the citizens etc. should lead to the amalgamation of the States into a World-State. But at present, the purposes of States are equated with perpetuation of national power. Therefore, the purposes of different States conflict and cannot be furthered by amalgamation. Consequently, the emergence of a World State may be through the conquest of world by one Nation-State or through the universal adoption of some creed transcending nationalism.

According to Russell, the psychological foundations of organisations are equally important. Although organisations have a purpose and an independent life of their own, they are also founded on human passions or sentiments. Sentiments such as love of home, of family, of country, love of power, love of enjoyment etc. as well as sentiments of aversion such as
fear of pain, laziness, dislike of foreigners, hatred of alien creeds etc. give
rise to a host of organisations. Such organisations as are founded on the
egoistic and exclusive passions or sentiments of the members can never
become world wide. Again organisations embodying sentiments to be
realised by co-operation are significantly different from organisations
whose purposes involve conflict.

As regards the density of organisations, the powers of organisations
other than the State over their members depend upon the right of expulsion
and are more or less severe according to the degree of obloquy and financial
hardship attached to expulsion. But the powers of the State over its citizens
are unlimited unless there are constitutional provisions to safeguard the
citizens from arbitrary exercise of State power. The United States is
founded “on the self-evident truths” that “all men are created equal, and
that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that
among these are Life, Liberty and pursuit of Happiness”.* Therefore, her
constitution of governance lays it down that no man can be deprived of
life, liberty or property except by the due process of law. Until and unless
a man is found guilty by a duly constituted judicial authority, he cannot be
deprived of life, liberty or property. In England, the Parliament is supreme,
holding sway over the life of individuals. In totalitarian States, the power
over individuals is freely exercised by the Executives. What acted as a
catalyst against State power is the doctrine of the Rights of Man.

* Jefferson, Thomas, “The Unanimous Declaration Of The Thirteen
United States Of America” in the Britannica Library Of Great
American Writing Vol.1 ed. Untermeyer, Louis, (USA: Britannica
The power of State over members of another State depends on war, threat of war, diplomatic pressure, economic sanctions etc. Theoretically speaking, a militarily powerful State can decree anything, even extermination to the members of another State. Where private or political organisations become a rival to the State through the acquisition of external power either through boycott or extreme forms of intimidation like terrorism the result is either a revolution or anarchy.

In a democratic system, private economic organisations are able to exercise their terrorism without illegality. Through their power to starve their enemies private economic organisations have even defeated governments. Here Russell remarks.

So long as private organisations can decide whether individuals not belonging to them shall, or shall not, have enough to eat, the power of the State is obviously subject to very serious limitations.*

3.2 FORMS OF CONTROL OF ORGANISATIONS

The degree of control an organisation exercises over the members is also interrelated with forms of control or forms of government through which the organisation manages its affairs and exercises its control.

* Russell, Bertrand, Power: A New Social Analysis, p.124
Absolute monarchy as one man rule is one of the oldest, simplest and most widespread of the constitutions known in historical times. Here one man helped by a small inner band of followers leads a nation either to glory, prosperity, conquest or as is often the case to disaster, defeat or poverty. The general masses follow meekly either through fear or identification with success of the monarch. No political training nor habit of compromise is required of the people, who are simply led. Here the relation between the king and the subject, the leader and the led is one of command and obedience. The coming together of people is not one of free social contract but rather a forcible imposition by the ruler on the people. According to Russell, Rousseau's social contract is a myth. Contract if there be any is not between the king and the subject or among the subject, but rather a voluntary submission or a contract between members of a gang and the king or the strong leader, when it is in their interest to do so. Fear and afterwards custom and tradition compel the majority of the subjects to the arbitrary power of the monarch or individual leader. For this reason, coming together of people under one monarch or enlargement in the areas of sovereign State have been through conquest and fear.

Monarchy, because of its many disadvantages like hereditariship (the ablest ruler need not be hereditary), war of succession, reliance on an inner group, need for external conquest etc. has to give into the other forms of Government or is to be shorn of power either through revolution or some other forms of change.

Oligarchy as a successor to absolute monarchy is a rule by a powerful few over the majority. Oligarchy may be of a hereditary aristocracy, of the rich, of a Church or political party. According to Russell, oligarchy or
hereditary landed aristocracy is apt to be conservative, proud, stupid and rather brutal. The landed aristocracy always yielded to the higher bourgeoisie because of these built in weakness, But an oligarchy of the rich on the whole tends to be more enlightened and astute than other forms of oligarchies known in history. A Government composed of successful merchants clever in money making tends to be clever and not dictatorial in governance.

Theocratic oligarchy or government by a few who represent a dogmatic creed and clings to power through perpetuation of the creed is another form of oligarchy that emerged in the history of mankind. The rule of Church is at one pole and on the other side of the pole is the rule of political parties like that of the communists, Nazis and Fascists. In Lenin’s Russia, for example, oligarchy of the Communist Party euphemistically called ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ is imposed on the people in the name of a democracy that is to be. But democracy turned out to be a faint gleam at the end of an endless dark tunnel, the party tightening its grip on the people. The logic of inner party struggle ultimately led to the control of the party by one man and the rule of the party pave way to the rule of one man. According to Russell, the fundamental problem with theocratic oligarchy is, either creeds make people stupid or when intelligent people gets disillusioned creeds attract only stupid people. Creeds insist on ideological conformity, which kill free exercise of intelligence. This closure of human mind to new stimuli, challenges and adventures of ideas renders the society stereotyped. The death of creative impulse through mummification of the human soul has its counterpart in the mummification of society and vice versa; one reinforces the other. Men who are strongly influenced by a creed tends to regard all thought as potentially heretical and therefore dangerous. The rulers are likely to be fanatics;
... being fanatics, they will be severe; being severe, they
will be opposed; being opposed, they will become more
severe.*

Incapable of self-correction and regeneration, they wait their
turn to be thrown out.

A government is usually called ‘democratic’ if a fairly large
percentage of the population has a share of political power.

In all organisations, especially in States, the problem of government
is two fold. On the one hand, the government desires acquiescence from
the governed. On the other hand, those governed desires the government to
take into account the interest of those over whom it has power. If the
government can make the subjects obey, then the problem is solved. Or if
the government can be made to take into account the interest of the
governed, then also the problem is solved. Where the government fails to
make the subject obey and the subject also fails to make the government
take into account their interest, there is inevitably revolution. To avoid
bloody revolution, and for the protection of the governed, only one method
has been hitherto discovered which is in any degree effective, namely
democracy.

But democracy as a method of government is subject to essential as
well as avoidable limitations. The essential limitation is that matters

* Ibid., p. 129
requiring speedy decision and expert knowledge cannot wait for the normal
democratic decision making process even though they concern the whole
population. The democratic process has to ratify the decisions arrived at
by an executive and expert group only retrospectively. Owing to this
essential limitation in a democracy, the electorate must entrust many of the
most important matters to a representative body or government. So long as
the government respect public opinion all is well with democracy. But the
moment consideration of convenience and self perpetuation gets the upper
hand, all governments have a tendency to say; so much worse for democracy.
Here the threat of revolution seems to be the only deterrent for a democratic
government to resort to undemocratic means. The paradox seems to be that
so long as a democratic government is sure of victory, it sticks to the rule
of the game. But the moment it is not sure of victory, it resorts to
undemocratic methods, throwing the principles of democracy to the winds.
Thus democracy has to keep itself in perpetuity by signing its own death
warrant. Can a democracy face a revolutionary situation or totalitarian
ideologies by sticking to the principles of democracy? Do open societies
have the inherent strength to ensure its openness?

Here Russell’s argument in favour of democracy is that so far we
have not discovered a better form of government than democracy. As
democracy is more corrective than other forms of government it has more
resilience to deal with acute issues without leading to civil war. Given a
liberal spirit including readiness for compromise, respect for law and respect
for other’s opinion, freedom from fear; democracy is more stable than
other governments instituted so far.
Democracy is either direct or representative. Direct democracy in which citizens assemble at an appointed place, vote personally on each issue is possible for a small area like the ancient Greek City State. Here citizens can experience a sense of real power and responsibility as he feels that he is directly participating in a decision making process on issues he can understand from his own experience. But it is not physically possible for direct democracy to extend over a wide area. Only representative democracy with the practice of choosing representative can overcome this geographical difficulty. Now the problem here is, each of the representatives once elected becoming a power unto themselves, with the electorate having no power afterwards to control them. In modern times however the revolution in media and communication has reduced the physical as well as psychological gap between the leader and the people, the centre and periphery to such an extent that the importance of the representative has been diminished. The leader and the propagandist; the demagogues alike, can sway the people. But here again it is the leader or the demagogues who carry the people in most cases inspite of themselves.

The vastness of the social and political forces that decide who shall govern, and complexity of the issues involved, make the individual feel his own part negligible. If his role is reduced to merely voting for a representative belonging to a party whose programme remotely interests him, he is overwhelmed by his political impotence. If he is reduced to following a leader he develops a hero worship psychology paving the way to a one-man government or a caucus government ruling in the name of democracy. Therefore, if democracy is to survive, the difficult question of preservation of democracy when governmental areas are large must be solved.
Coming to the governance of economic organisations, those who have invested capital in industrial undertaking are counterparts of citizens in a State and the employees are like the slave in a city State. While in a capitalist industrial enterprise power may be divided among the investors monarchicaly, oligarchically or democratically, employees have as little claim as were thought to have in antiquity.

According to Russell, Business Corporations exhibit a peculiar form of self-perpetuating oligarchy by the management even to the extent of marginalising the shareholders. To illustrate his point Russell refers to the work *The Modern Corporation And Private Property* by Berle and Means where they have analysed the evolution of oligarchy in the management of corporations. The story is about how small oligarchies with very small participation in ownership, have acquired the government of vast aggregations of capital. The management can form their own proxy committee that in turn will decide their successors. Through their committees the management can virtually dictate their own successors and thus ensure their own self-perpetuation, even though their share in the ownership is negligible. This is true of corporations whose ownership is sufficiently subdivided. Here Russell compares the oligarchies of the corporations with the oligarchy in the Catholic Church, where the Pope selects the Cardinals and the College of Cardinals in turn selects the succeeding Pope. In the complex organisation of a Business Corporation, there are Directors, shareholders, debenture holders, executive staff and ordinary employees. They all have specific functions. The share holders have a right, commensurate with the unit of share they hold, to choose Directors as their representatives. Although theoretically the Directors are there to represent the shareholders, in practice they have more powers
against the shareholders. Employees can have a considerable voice as to the terms of their employment only where trade unionism is well organised. Capitalistic enterprises have this duality of purpose in that they exist to provide goods or services for the public and also aim at providing profits for the share-holders.

As democracy is the best of all the possible alternatives tried so far, Russell's opinion is that democracy may be taken as a paradigm for the evolution of forms of government. Changes in forms of government may be looked at as movements away from or towards democracy. An enquiry into general principles determining the movement towards or away from democracy may as well be part of mankind's roads to freedom. But what is apparent at the very outset is that wealth and war have been the two great influences against democracy. Of this war is the greater danger to democracy. The openness of democracy and its ultimate resilience in winning war gives hopes for survival of democracy.

3.3 ORGANISATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL

On the one hand, governments are necessary for civilised existence and material well being. On the other hand, all government involves inequalities of power and people in power tend to perpetuate themselves by oppressing ordinary citizens. Thus, according to Russell.

... anarchy and despotism are alike disastrous, and some compromise is necessary if human beings are to be happy.*

* Ibid., p.139
There are organisations meant to facilitate the realisation of the individual's wishes or interests. The State in its positive function of providing health, education and opportunities of work for the citizens is one example. There are also organisations whose aims are to prevent individuals from thwarting the legitimate interests of others. Then there are organisations concerned with the moral, intellectual, emotional cultural, spiritual and aesthetic needs of the individual citizens. Civilised communities need organisations with positive functions. Individuals by themselves alone, cannot guarantee their own freedom of fulfilment and release of creativity. Positive organisations multiply human freedom by increasing modalities of choice.

The police and the criminal law are the most important organisations designed to prevent a man from doing injury to others. They belong to the second category of organisations just listed above. They increase human freedom and happiness by checking crime and violence. In the absence of the force and custodian of law and order; terrorists may easily let loose a reign of terror taking away the freedoms of peace loving citizens. The police force in its turn, unless strictly subjected to the rule of law and constantly exposed to humanising democratic traditions, tends to become an institution of tyranny in itself. Or the police force may simply become an instrument in the hands holders of power out to perpetuate status quo. This is the paradox of controllers needing control, force necessary to prevent anarchy transforming itself into institutionalised violence resisting any change in the status quo even at such times when it ought to be changed.

Fear for war and revolution are the two factors that make a State curtail the freedom of its citizens. In times of war and revolution, a State’s
instinct of self-preservation leads to the most drastic forms of control over individual lives. War can be avoided through restructuring of international relations. Revolution is best avoided by a deeply rooted democratic tradition and decision making process, care for the welfare of the citizens. Where the State government monopolises power the State tends to become a force distinct from the body of the citizens. The more the State power is increased, the more indifferent it becomes to the welfare of the citizens, thereby increasing the chances of revolution.

Thus organisations can increase individual happiness and well being, provide education, health, productivity of labour, provision against destitution etc. The need to prevent revolution and defeat in war may compel a State organisation to take up unpleasant measures. But according to Russell, such measures must not be more than temporary, so as not to bring disaster to humanity and intelligence. That is to say, in combating war and revolution, democracy must not sign its death sentence.

According to Russell, an individual may be related to an organisation as a customer, a voluntary member, an involuntary member or an enemy.

Where an individual is related as a customer to an organisation that provides his material and spiritual needs, he derives hope, amusement and the sense of personal initiative. Supply of consumer goods provides an individual a freedom of choice as to how to spend money, which, according to Russell is a source of pleasure. Of course Russell knows very well the 'freedom' of those who do not have any money to spend. He also knows how economic organisations also create false needs and thus create an illusion of freedom of choice, while, in reality the individual is manipulated to become a pliant consumer.
Political parties, Churches, clubs, friendly societies, enterprises in which an individual has invested money are some of the organisations of which a man can be a voluntary member. In each of these categories of organisations, rival organisations may compete for supremacy in their respective fields. The resulting contests may provide a sense of drama as well as an outlet for power impulses for the parties concerned. Kept bloodless and within the bounds of rule of law, with the State strictly enforcing the rules of the game, such contests between organisations provide a useful outlet for the feelings of pugnacity and love of power, which, otherwise might seek more sinister forms of satisfaction. Where the State is weak or lax or partial, political contests may degenerate into riot, murder and civil war. When such dangers are avoided contests between organisations may give wholesome elements in the life of individuals and communities.

A man is an involuntary member of a State, but the principle of nationality which identifies the State with the Nation to which the individual belongs makes his citizenship appear natural to him. Where the principle of nationality make the member citizen of the State a patriot, a citizen's loyalty to the State exceeds his loyalty to any other organisations and such loyalties can take extreme, abject forms. One State arouses in another State fear of aggression. Each State therefore aspires to be the most powerful one. There ensues an all-in contest between States for supremacy. War which includes large scale homicide, destruction of home, children and human civilisation is then resorted to. Citizens are even ready to bear curtailment of freedom and be loyal to death to their Nation States in times of war. So long as the chief activity of the State is preparation for large scale homicide and citizens are loyal to the State out of love of power and
fear of aggression to the extent of enduring loss of individual freedom, there is little hope for human freedom and survival.*

3.4 ORGANISATION AND COMPETITION

We have already pointed out that according to Russell, competition is inherent in the relation of organisations with one another. Here Russell dwells on an interesting paradox of competition. Traditionally, since nineteenth century, competition had been a favourite device for avoiding the dangers of arbitrary power and monopoly. Free competition and laissez faire as the spirit of liberalism had been the message of French Revolution. Free competition seemed to be the natural expression of the energies of an epoch that celebrated knowledge and “techne” as power over Nature and man. But competition so zealously identified with liberalism inevitably leads to the complete victory of one among the competitors. Hence, competition digs its own grave. The paradoxical cycle is, competition as the essence of liberal spirit leading to monopoly which is the end of competition, and hence of the liberal spirit.

Competition by eliminating rivals and concentrating all powers in the hands of the victorious survivor gives rise to large scale organisations. Generally, increase in the size of organisations leads to increase in efficiency. Large size organisations are suitable for certain matters like

* cf. Chapter-Four
road communication, electricity, irrigation, elementary education (which according to Russell ought to be controlled by an international authority),
civil aviation etc. Large States are also better than small ones. For certain purposes like protecting the lives of the citizens, no State can adequately fulfill unless it is world-wide.

Centralization of power and coming together of people is a precondition for building up a large scale civilization and bringing out the best in man. But large organisations overwhelm people, make them feel impotent, rob initiative, are slow moving bound by red tape and unable to take quicker decisions. A solution to this problem must be found if human liberty is to be possible.

Ideologies differ in their attitude to competition among organisations. Liberals advocate free competition in business and propaganda, but not in armed force. For Fascists and Nazis competition in the form of national war is the noblest of human activities. Otherwise all competitions are bad. Marxists decry competition except in the form of the struggle for power between antagonistic classes.

In industry, competition has led to the monopoly of large scale corporates or trusts co-extensive with the State.** Therefore, modern business competition is the same as that of rivalry between States.

---

* cf. Chapter Five
** cf. Chapter Four
Competition for jobs among the individuals within a given economic framework is another form of economic competition. Russell opines that perhaps such competition cannot be altogether abolished, but we may redeem them of inhuman degeneration by observing two conditions. First the unsuccessful should not suffer avoidable hardship. Second, success should, as far as possible, be the reward of some genuine merit, and not of sycophancy or cunning.

The most important form of competition among the organisations is the contest between States, especially among those that are called Great powers. This has become an all out contest for power, for wealth, for control over men’s belief. It has also become, according to Russell, a competition for power over life and death. This is because the power to inflict death upon a human population is considered the principal means to victory. Russell opines that this belligerent contest between the States must end, for it is deadly and will lead to the extinction of mankind. An all out war is the ultimate form of contest between States. With the destructive arsenals at the command of States war means end of mankind and civilisation. The choice is between annihilation through armed competition of States and survival of mankind. A solution this deadly competition must be found if individual human beings are to survive to enjoy their freedom.*

To sum up, human nature is essentially social. The human individual is already stamped with a social category. Marx is basically right when he talks of ‘social individual’ or ‘the mode of individual existence as

* cf. Chapter Four and Chapter Five
essentially social'. Although the Russellian doctrine essentially centres on the individual, we have reasons to think that Russell will hardly differ from Marx in emphasizing the social dimension of individual existence. Man is essentially social in the manner of his biological reproduction and also material production of food, clothing and shelter. His instinctive, emotional, intellectual and spiritual needs are satisfied only in society. The wealth of human nature can be realised in society only. That is to say, the best in human nature and the best in Nature can be realised and appropriated only in social formations. Thus, freedom in the positive sense of active striving, doing and having, unfoldment of impulses and faculties towards the realisation of the total man, is possible only in society. But every society is also an organised formation. Hence social existence always engenders some form of organisation.

Organisation means coming together of individuals to do things which they cannot do in isolation. Man can overcome physical constraints and is able to shape his destiny more effectively when organised than when he is alone. But all organisations have this inherent contradiction that they may be a condition of as well as a limitation to individual human freedom. Thus organisations which are highly structured and designed to achieve purposes have control over members as well as non-members. Individuals in becoming members of organisations are expected to conform to the rules of the organisation and hence compromise part of his individual freedom. Furthermore, organisations such as the State, the corporations, the Church, the Party and terrorist organisations can acquire control not only over the members but non-members as well through exercise of material, moral and ideological force. Therefore, freedom in the positive sense of active striving as well as in the sense of constraints is intimately linked with the life and dynamics of organisations.
Two kinds of dynamics are inherent in every organisation, namely, intra-organisational dynamics and inter-organisational dynamics. The former is the inner working of the organisation including the intensity of the control an organisation exercises over its members, giving rise to a power elite within the organisation. The latter is the dynamics of competition among the organisations having the same purpose vying for areas of control, each organisation tending to expand worldwide either by eliminating or amalgamating other organisations. The internal dynamics and the external dynamics mutually reinforce one another. The more there is internal control the greater is the success in the competition with other organisations. Conversely, the greater is the success in competition, the more is the justification for internal control. Thus inherent in every organisation are two tendencies; the tendency to expand and to become authoritarian. In the most powerful social organisation, namely, the State, both the dynamics are at work - the State tending to become world wide, leading to the feasibility of World Government. On the one hand, the presence of a Central Authority seems to be a necessary condition for drawing out the best in man and enjoying the fruits of civilisation. On the other hand diffusion of Central Authority down to the grassroots level, pluralism, assertion of individual freedom and dignity against Central Authority is also the way of freedom. Organisations being carried away by their own momentum are expressed in the government (of the organisations) and the executives running the government becoming a force external to the members. Members of course seek to counterbalance the curtailment of their individual liberty by participation in the government. But in actual practice, all members cannot participate in the government. Representatives, executives and experts run the government in the name of all the members and they can manoeuvre all the decision making boxes. In almost all
organisations the power elite can so manage as to ensure its self-perpetuation. An organisation's control over individual members is linked with its form of government which may be monarchical, oligarchical or democratic - a government where theoretically at least there is scope for every members to participate, although ultimately the majority decision prevails.

Democracy, more so in its indirect form, has its own limitations. But inspite of its limitations, of all forms governments mentioned above, democracy is one most compatible with individual liberty. Hence, according to Russell, democratic form of government is the paradigm. Growth and working of organisations in relation to individual liberty is to be looked at as a movement to and from the democratic form of government. War and revolution may compel a democratic State to curtail individual liberty. Capitulation to war and revolution will mean natural death for democracy, whereas resorting to undemocratic methods to combat war and revolution will be as good as democracy signing its own death sentence.

There are organisations with the positive function of providing the condition for the creative expression of the individual. Also there are negative organisations like the police and the criminal law whose function is that of preventing individuals and groups from thwarting the legitimate aim of others. While society cannot altogether do away with organisations of these sorts, they should be constantly watched lest watchdog of freedom turn into enemies of freedom.

Lastly, the relation between freedom and organisation will also depend on the nature of relation between the individual and organisation. An
individual may be related to an organisation as a customer. Such is his relation to economic organisations. Economic organisations through supply of material goods may provide freedom of choice to the consumer's indulgence which may be both pleasant and creative. But this freedom is limited by the operation of economic laws and also by creation of false needs which is the hallmark of modern industrial culture. An individual may also be a voluntary member of a Party, a Church, a Club or an intellectual association. Where the association is purely for the sake of society, pleasure of discourse and cultivation of sensibility as is the case with literary, art and intellectual societies - organisations create conditions of human freedom, i.e., enjoyment of human creativity. Organisations having distant goals, e.g., political parties, secret organisations, Church etc. may demand of its members some compromise of individual freedom. Hence even if the membership is voluntary, tension develops and intensifies in the long run between individual freedom and organisation. Where the membership is involuntary for example, the membership of the State, the conflict of individual freedom and organisation is of a very complex nature, involving deep seated problem. Where the relationship is one in which the individual is related to the organisation as to an enemy, e.g., the relation between an individual and an alien State, the problem may assume an even global character. The next chapter will be devoted to the Russellian formulation of the tension of freedom and organisations, vis-a-vis their taxonomy.