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At the end of our journey, we now realise that freedom as Russell envisages it is the unique flowering of individual genius. Freedom is individual commitment in creative actions which are pursued as an end in themselves. Freedom is reaching out towards the best an individual can become, like a plant or a flower seeking sunlight, by integrating all the activities of the individual in accordance with what is to become. Freedom is release of creative impulse and elimination of destructive impulse. It is the cultivation of the faculties of instinct, intellect and spirit in unison, each one integrating the other. It is realisation of the total man by an integral cultivation of the faculties through creative commitment in action in society and Nature. The individual can realise the best in him only when he is free from extraneous constraints. Therefore by freedom Russell also means freedom from external constraints. An individual realises his freedom in unison with his fellow beings. Hence the collective to which an individual belongs must also be free from external constraints if the individual is to be free. When an individual belongs to a nation, he cannot be free until and unless his nation is also free from foreign domination. Where he belongs to a group within a Nation State or a group beyond the Nation State, his freedom is inseparably linked with the freedom of his group, from interference by other groups. Freedom also means the individual’s freedom of creative expression from the trammels of material production in the form of economic compulsions. It also means the individual’s mental freedom from constraints imposed by the State, economic organisations,
the Church, the educational organisations, the family, the political organisations and other social organisations. Mental freedom from constraints is to enable the individual go for adventure of ideas, to explore the Universe and to marvel at the mystery of existence.

Freedom also means personal freedom of exceptional individuals like Christ, Socrates, Buddha and other rare members of mankind from State interference or interference by any powers that be. Each of them is a phenomenon beautiful and valuable in their own right. Not only this; the collective destiny of mankind and the extent of freedom individuals can uniquely realise in their own lives depend to a great extent on the intrinsic merit of these exceptional persons. Freedom is thus highly individual as well as collective, a mode of activity at the same time its realisation, exercise of the faculties which is at the same time their cultivation, creative engagement as well as enjoyment of the fruits of creativity, a process of man making himself through a commitment in society and Nature. Thus freedom positively is a mode of striving, the freedom to be creative; negatively it means absence of constraints by ensuring the social, organisational and institutional space for individuals engaged in creative activity.

Man is a biologically reproductive, materially productive, linguistically communicative and need based being. A man lives, acts and realises his potential as an individual. But he does so together with other individuals like him. Concrete living individuals realise their creativity and the best in their togetherness. The individual existence is unique, but it also has an inseparable social dimension.
Organisations are structures designed by men to facilitate their coming together to realise such ends and freedoms which they cannot achieve isolation. As such organisations are part of the technology men have created, organisations are social structures serving as means to men. But they are peculiar structures manned by individual human beings over whom they have control. It is thus that organisations use men as much as or even more than, men use them. Organisations tend to develop a dynamics of their own, which includes increase in the intensity of internal control over its members (density of power) as well as increase over the extent of control over members as well as non-members, tending to become world wide. In other words, organisations develop a power dimension of their own. The density as well as the size of the organisations overwhelm the individual, threaten his freedom and initiative. Therefore, although social organisations are a necessary condition for the realisation of human freedom, they are not a sufficient condition. Conflicts between organisations and individual freedom arise every now and then. Russell traces these conflicts as they are reflected in the State, economic organisations, the Church, educational organisations and the family.

Thus the State as an institution of force welded to war as an institution, as provider of the conditions of material production, as manipulator of thought through control of educational machinery, as a mega bureaucratic structure overwhelming the individual into insignificance, as oppressor of small nationalities, as the coloniser and sometimes as the terrorist - comes into conflict with individual human freedom.

Large scale economic organisations alienate the worker from his work and the fruits of work. This is because of the conflict between the division
of labour in large scale economic organisations and individual creativity, divorce between management and the worker, self perpetuating oligarchs managing economic organisations, State bureaucracy monopolising power in State run economic organisations, predatory impulse generated by modern giant economic organisations threatening individual freedom, the tyranny of the employer encroaching upon the personal freedom of the employee and economic organisations as a distinct power by themselves threatening individual human freedom.

The Church also comes into conflict with free inquiry, freedom of opinion, intellectual integrity, academic freedom. This is because the Church inculcates dogmas through dogmatic methods. The Church is also opposed to progressive social movement aimed at humanisation of society. The Church sustains its position by instilling fear in the individual, rendering him incapable of identifying his rightful place in the Universe. The Church does violence to human nature, constrains the individual from realising his social self and because of its monolithic character is opposed to the freedom of plurality of views. The Church by its very conception of individual salvation as that of an atomised being stands in the way of final emancipation of men in society and Nature.

Educational organisations whose function it is to inculcate the faculty of free inquiry may be used by the State, economic organisations, the Church and other social organisations for their extraneous ends. Hence educational organisations may also come into conflict with the individual’s freedom of thought.
The family as a social organisation comes into conflict with the freedom of the individuals to love, gender equality, the rights of the child, the demands of eugenics or the improvement of the species.

Russell’s proposed resolutions to the conflicts are:

The dynamics of social organisations, the State most of all, are to be brought under the rule of law. This is to ensure individual freedom and initiative with social order without the use of force, which will ultimately give way to a consciously planned and democratic order.

The principle of democracy is to be followed in the management of social organisations. Those who are affected by the dynamics of any social organisation either directly or indirectly, must participate in its management.

To achieve unipolarity of force and its control by rule of law, to ensure human unity and survival in future which is a necessary condition of any form of individual freedom, a World State is to be instituted. The World State is to limit the sovereignty of States, end the anarchy in inter State relations and actively facilitate the emergence of the free citizens of the world. To these ends, use of force will be reposed in the World State which will intervene in the State, economic organisations, educational organisations and the family for the emergence of the free citizens of the world.

The principle of self-determination is to be followed to ensure national freedom and intra-organisational as well as inter-organisational group freedom.
The principle of centralisation and decentralisation is to be followed to ensure the highest social order in the form of unity of mankind (to be ensured by the World State) and individual initiative at all levels down to the lowest bottom.

Alienation of the worker from his work and the fruits of his work must end. The principle of liberal socialism is to operate to resolve the conflict between economic organisations and individual freedom, to restore a new unity of men, technology and Nature, to combine political democracy with economic freedom for all.

To emancipate the individuals's freedom of thought from the dogmas of the Church, the adventure of thought into the mystery of Universe is to take the place of passive acceptance of dogmas. Cosmic piety is to take the place of Christian piety. Cosmic piety means fidelity to truth, fidelity to inquiry into the nature of things as they are, the endeavour to embrace the whole Universe in theoretical contemplation and also transcend the Universe. Forms of fear such as fear of finitude, fear of death and fear of defeat are to be conquered by a comprehension of human nature and men's rightful place in the Universe. Likewise, fear of sin is to be conquered by an understanding of the psychology of guilt. A good life, which for Russell, is a life inspired by love and guided by knowledge is to take the place of religious life. A good life holds out infinite possibilities as both knowledge and love are infinite.

The principle of liberal education is to be followed if the conflict between educational organisations and the individual's freedom of thought is to be resolved. It means a radical reorientation of education to aim at the
fullest development of human faculties, a reverence of the child for what he can become, disengagement of education from the extraneous ends of the State, the economic organisations, the Church. The World State is also to intervene against the parochial use of education by the Nation States so that education may be instrumental in training the child to become a free citizen of the Universe, to disengage education from economic competition, and finally to let the child experience the joy of mental adventure.

If individual freedom is to be compatible with family as a social institution, sexuality as men women relation must be expression of love based on freedom of choice. This can be made compatible with fidelity of family because of contraception which has rendered impregnation optional. What is needed is only a new sex morality.

After giving exposition of the Russellian resolutions, we have attempted at a critical examination of these resolutions in CHAPTER-SIX. We have also developed arguments to persuade that some of the Russellian resolutions are viable, while others give rise to paradoxes and problems. We will now try to throw up some suggestions towards resolution of these paradoxes and problems.

We will dwell on the paradox of the rule of law.

One possible resolution of the paradox that Russell’s proposal of rule of law gave rise to, is to develop a reasonableness model of social change and order. Rule of law may be interpreted as a reasonable framework for social change, continuity and order. It may be argued that rule of law need not ultimately be founded on force as human beings can defy any form of
force the moment it infringes upon the freedom of indomitable human spirit. Rather it is that the force that rule of law uses to sustain itself against other forms of abominable and anarchic forms of force, cannot be founded on yet another form of force again. The point simply is, it hardly makes sense to say that force itself is founded on force. To overcome this paradox, our paradigmic suggestion is that an unipolar centre of force that puts into quitessance other forms of force can be made to rest on rule of law, whereas rule of law has its foundation not on force, but on a reasonable framework of social change continuity and order. Given the present level of social development it may not be possible to have a rule of law that has the force of moral law and vice versa, although such a synchronisation at a future point of time is not ruled out. But it is possible to render rule of law reasonable such that it strikes the chord of reasonableness already inherent in human nature. Participation of individual citizens in the law making process, the advantages of impartial arbitration, legal enactments facilitating social progress, doing away with lurking class interest in legal enactments by ushering in liberal socialism, dependence on rewards rather than punishment, limit to capital punishment and transparency in the administration of justice etc. are some of the common parameters that can make rule of law reasonable. The practical advantages of following rule of law which Russell also mentions is another factor contributing to its reasonableness. It is of course true that rules are bound to disqualify those who violate the rules which may be a matter of practical disadvantage to them. A condemned criminal or an illegal owner whose properties are expropriated do not have immediate practical advantages following from the operation of law. But in general practical advantages does increase for all who follow the rule. This is true even if advantages are not immediately obvious as in the case of environmental or conservational laws. Pragmatic
considerations however are not a sufficient reason to prove that following rule of law is reasonable. Genuine dialogue is possible under rule of law. A genuine dialogue is an open discourse that takes into account all the possibilities in the affairs of men. From the fact that rule of law makes room for an open discourse that admits of many possibilities, we may conclude that rule of law has as its basic assumption a reasonable model of human nature and society. Such a model is one that admits of alternative rules of game, alternative ways of looking at human nature and human problems and consequently alternative methods of conflict resolution. In the quest of human freedom and survival, conflicts that defy immediate resolution are bound to appear every now and then. It is only reasonable under these circumstances to wait till the parameters relevant to the conflict resolution are identified, rather than insist on cutting the gordian knot. The problem of nuclear holocaust, the problem of evolving a World Authority, the problem of international terrorism etc. are such knotty problems. It is only reasonable, while groping for solutions that we wait patiently for modalities to evolve rather than succumb to our death wish for the extinction of mankind. For example, many people have been advocating with perfect rationality at their command that in a conflict of ideologies large scale nuclear war is preferable to the success of an alien ideology. The subsequent unfoldment of unpredictable parameters in time in the affairs of men proved that they have been rational, but not reasonable. Had the world heeded their advice, mankind would have been extinct by now. It is perfectly possible, moving within the rules of rationality, to argue in defense of nuclear warfare. But it will hardly be reasonable. Similarly, one may not be able to provide an ultimate rational justification of why rule of law must replace force. But one may argue that it is only reasonable, given that openness of a model is the only way how we can make rooms for any
future surprises in the affairs of men. Thus a reasonable model of human nature, social change and order may go a long way towards resolution of the paradox of the rule of law. If the paradox is thus resolved, Russell's proposal of the rule of law as one fundamental principle to resolve the conflict between individual freedom and social organisations, stands.

The resolution of the paradox of rule of law makes it possible for us to suggest that in explaining the parallel and symmetrical evolution of force, Russell is not simply passing on the buck from the State to other institutions. The World State can now be based on rule of law and rule of law on reasonableness. Thus in Russell's design 'survival of mankind' 'preservation of man' in this planet is the most reasonable consideration on which the rule of law to control the World State can be founded. That any conflict resolution must avoid mass grave of mankind is so transparent and reasonable. Thus, we may interpret Russell as asserting that the intervention of the World State in conflict resolution is accepted not because it is the sole repository of force but because it is the most reasonable course left to mankind. We are to obey the rule of law under which or with which the World State operates not because it has the sanction of force, but because it has as its basis a reasonable model of human affairs. Reposing use of force solely in the World State is not the foundation but the mechanism of rule of law in the international relation of States to ensure the survival of mankind.

Within Russell's reasonableness model of conflict resolution in human affairs, we may suggest a reply to the fear that concentration of power may propel the World State to encroach upon other areas of human activity and in the process Russell's paradigm World State may gradually
be transformed into World Slave State. The possible reply from Russell’s model is non-violent civil disobedience. Russell like Gandhi and Christ advocate non-violent civil disobedience as a method of opposition to oppressive power in defense of freedom and human survival. Whenever social power become concentric and oppressive, and institutions malfunction negating human life and freedom, it is always justified to disobey the system. Whereas existing laws and constitutional methods are inadequate to combat oppressive power at any level, be it Nation State or World State, people are entitled to resort to mass civil disobedience as a method of conflict resolution. This is not throwing away rule of law overboard, but rather showing the conflict areas which rule of law has not been able to cover so far. The technique of persuasion, dissemination of information, education, moral propaganda etc., in other words, the technique of reasoning with mankind is not to subvert the rule of law, but rather to extend it and secure its foundation in reasonableness.

It is the employment of non-violent civil disobedience as a method of conflict resolution that can render terrorism irrelevant. There is no doubt that international terrorism can threaten even a World State. Terrorism however is best fought not by cutting the branches but by striking at the roots. Some of the causes espoused by the terrorists are right ones, like demand of the right to self-determination of small nationalities. But a wrong means always contaminates the right cause. It is thus that terrorism degenerates along with the causes it espouses. Training of mankind in the method of non-violent persuasion for conflict resolution and espousal of right causes will strike at the roots of terrorism. Individuals should also be taught to look at the affairs of men from a global perspective. It is reasonable to hope that one day these conditions will be satisfied and if so the World
State can be used as an effective mechanism to combat international terrorism.

Non-violent civil disobedience as a method of persuasion is also inseparably linked with the operation of principle of self-determination. When the demand for self-determination grows from the people and represents the collective will of the people, the movement for self-determination can never be used by terrorists and adventurists to further their ends. Nor can a genuine peoples’ movement for self-determination be used by a terrorist State to wage proxy war against other States. Again, heroic people who fought for freedom from foreign domination will never allow the hard earned fruits of freedom to be appropriated by a few oligarchs or military plutocrats and thus be internally enslaved. Thus the struggle for genuine external self-determination and the struggle for internal self-determination, that is, internal development and democracy, are two sides of the same coin. The difficulties associated with the Russelian principle of self-determination we have pointed out earlier disappears, the moment the demand for self-determination become a democratic movement of the people. The question now is, how do we decide the merits of the case? How do we know that a particular demand for the right to self-determination is a peoples’ democratic demand? It is here that non-violent civil disobedience can provide us the criteria. If a people can convince others the rightness of its demand for self-determination through non-violent means of persuasion, it is a convincing proof that the demand represents a genuine peoples’ democratic movement. As such, it is fairly certain that such an exercise of the right to self-determination will not be perverted or used by external forces to wage proxy war or to simply disintegrate a Nation State. When thus supplemented
by non-violent civil disobedience as a technique of conflict resolution, Russellian principle of self-determination shines in its intrinsic merit.

The concentric and spiralling motion in which power seeks its own level has been pointed out as the fundamental difficulty standing in the way of the Russellian programme of decentralisation of institutional power. A merely formal and structural diffusion of power to local bodies in theory, only to spiral back to the centre in practice, will not serve the cause of individual initiative within social institutions. One of Russell’s solution is that the local bodies should zealously guard their share of power so that such quantum of power does not spiral back to the centre through their negligence and non-performance. But local bodies can do so if and only if the participating individuals are deeply aware of the responsibility to guard their freedom. Thus, in the ultimate analysis, there is no institutional substitute for the urge to be free and this urge burns in the heart of every human being. So far we have been maintaining that institutional dynamics is necessary in the making of the free individual. But this is only one side of the picture, and making here is not to be understood in the mechanistic, plastic sense. Institutions do not make individuals the way an artisan makes a plastic model. It is not true that individuals react only passively to institutional dynamics and external forces. If, at all institutions make men, it is ultimately men who make their institutions and decide on the ways how to use the institutions to mould human beings. Institutions are active only as providing conditions for unfoldment of what is already inherent in the individual. The other equally true side of the picture therefore is; whenever there is institutional crisis, such as concentric and spiralling motion of institutional power becoming oppressive, it is defiance generated by human spirit that rises up to the occasion. Here again peaceful
non-cooperation and non-violent civil disobedience ultimately is most sensible form of defiance of concentration of power. Some people enjoy exercise of power over their fellow beings. Some have the tendency to worship power. But inevitably concentration of power beyond a point is resisted by every human being. Herein lies the best antidote to concentration of institutional power. Human institutions are liable to corruption and degeneration. But men can always rejuvenate them. This is possible because the principle of transcendence inherent in them is beyond any social institution.

It is on this principle of transcendence in the individual that the hope of realising Russell's liberal socialism ultimately depends. Although institutions are essential to the programme of realising socialism, what matters ultimately is the human foundation of socialism. And it is the living individual human beings who constitute the human foundation. It is not perfect machines and institutions which make no mistake that will lead us to socialism. It is, after all, individual human beings who are to create a genuinely free socialist society. Though they stumble often, they rise up again and move on to the road to freedom. Although men live, create and relate with one another through social organisations, it is living individual human beings who are primary and social institutions are secondary. Socialism, Russell's liberal socialism most of all is not merely an economic proposition but also a moral proposition as well. Socialism does not merely mean efficiency, increased material production, better consumer service, high life style etc. Socialism in essence means material and spiritual creation in consonance with the laws of beauty and the best human nature is capable of. Socialism is concerned not merely with what and how much things are produced. It is also concerned with the way things are produced; with
whether the mode of production is human or inhuman. Socialism means reorganisation of work and pay, rendering work a joy like the work of the artist, shortening work time, creating more leisure hours made possible through productivity of labour, gender equality in work, social mobility and freedom in the choice of trade and profession, free education upto a certain specified stage, doing away with false needs and expansion of genuine needs, the possessive impulse gradually giving way to the creative impulse, just distribution of material goods and abundance of spiritual goods. Socialism means enjoyment of the wealth of human nature in society and Nature. A very reasonable argument in favour of socialism is the argument from considerations of beauty as something intrinsically valuable in the affairs of men. This argument questions the basic premise of capitalism that man is essentially self seeking, that material self interest alone is the incentive to material production. The argument rightly points out that a world shaped by self interest is ugly. It further says that the anarchic operation of the law of demand and supply, the law of competition distorts human nature and Nature, technology and society. It is possible to create a world beautiful in itself, more in consonance with the best in human nature and Nature, where the unity of men, Nature and technology will be realised. Thus, the argument from aesthetic consideration is one convincing argument in defense of socialism.

Given this argument, we make the suggestion that the realisation of Russell’s liberal socialism depends to a great extent on sensitising men to beauty. Individual human beings must be made sensitive to the unfoldment of beauty in men, Nature and technology. Even technology, not as a means of exploitation of men and Nature, but as a means of union of men and Nature, can be beautiful, an art in itself. Aesthetic education that opens up
human sensibility to forms of beauty must be an inalienable part of the programme to realise socialism. The relation between art and freedom, the role of performing arts in regenerating the individual and his institutions, are areas for further exploration.

Aesthetic education must therefore be part of liberal education, that will train children to become free citizens of the Universe. The crucial question is, who is going to sponsor liberal education? Whenever the State, the economic organisations and the Church run or finance educational institutions, they tend to use these as means to realise their extraneous ends. Private educational institutions are also bound to be controlled or influenced by their funding agencies. This we saw was the problem faced by Russell's proposal of liberal education to resolve the conflict between educational organisations and individual freedom. The question is, what are the modalities to face this difficulty?

The principle of reciprocity of social institutions provides one possible answer. The inter-dynamics of social institutions is such that a radical reorientation of one institution has a corresponding effect on other institutions and vice-versa. Thus, humanisation liberalisation and limitation of power of a modern State will have a radical effect on educational organisation. Such States are likely to sponsor liberal education on their own or encourage other educational organisations to sponsor liberal education. Liberal education on its part will spiritually and intellectually recharge and recycle a liberal State. Similarly, realisation of liberal socialism will put an end to or reduce to a great extent, cut throat economic competition. This will act as a counterforce to the use of education as a means of success in competition only and thus create congenial conditions
for liberal education. The more the social parameters for a liberal society increases, the more likely it is that education will be valued as a means for the cultivation of the individual. And conversely the more education is valued as a means of cultivation of the individual, the more are the chances for the renewal of a society.

The other possibility is imparting of liberal education through non-formal and non-conventional methods which are less expensive, less doctrinaire and less subject to bureaucratic control. The revolution in science and technology, especially the revolution in information science has made it possible now to organise non formal education, distant education etc. on a global scale. Civilised States can pool their resources to build up the technological infrastructure, while experiment with ideas and adventures of thought can be left to individual initiative and interaction. The idea of a global community of freethinkers is fast becoming a reality. If we add to scientific and technological infrastructure academic societies of freethinkers dedicated to cultivation of free inquiry, the day may not be far off when we have a global network of non-formal centres of education.

In our study of Russell’s social philosophy, we have been closely following Russell’s formulation of the conflict between human freedom and social organisations, and his proposed solutions for conflict resolution. We have seen that Russell aims at an extraordinary synthesis of two great traditions of Western thought, namely, the liberal tradition on the one hand and the tradition of socialist humanism on the other. This dimension of Russell’s social philosophy is of immense significance for the twenty first century. With amazing clarity he formulated the problem: men create institutions to realise their inherent freedom, whereas, the dynamics of
institutions not only serves men, but also overwhelm them. Hence the
conflict. Russell has made a number of proposals for conflict resolution.
We have found that many of his suggestions are viable provided some
other conditions are satisfied. But some of the Russellian resolutions give
rise to paradoxes and problems. On one point however, we feel it that
Russell is certainly right. That is, the conflict resolution ultimately hinges
on the principle of transcendence inherent in every human being. Russell
is right in his conclusion that a conflict resolution in favour of human
freedom is always possible, because although men create and live with his
institutions, he is beyond any social institution in the sense that he can
transcend them. While complementing Russell on his ninety fifth birthday
for embodying this principle in the highest degree, the reknown historian
A.J.Toynbee lucidly explains the principle of transcendence thus:

You have projected yourself, beyond yourself, into the
history of the extraordinary species of which you are so
outstanding a representative. Every living creature is self-
centered by nature; yet every human living creature’s mission
in life is to transfer the centre of his concern from himself to
the ultimate reality, whatever this may be. That is the true
fulfilment of a human being’s destiny. You have achieved
it. This is why I feel constant gratitude to you and affection
for you, and why 18 May, 1967, is a day of happiness and
hope for me, among your many friends.*

* Russell, Bertrand, The Autobiography Of Bertrand Russell,
Vol.III, p.178
In future also men will go on creating institutions. There will be scientific and technological revolutions. New conflict areas between institutions and individual freedom may rise up. Mankind may be compelled to grope for new solutions using new techniques. But none will ever deny that Russell had provided the framework within which one can clearly formulate the problem and grope for solution. Russell devoted his life to "care for what is noble, for what is beautiful, for what is gentle; to allow moment of insight to give wisdom at more mundane times ... to see in imagination the society that is to be created, where individuals grow freely, and where hate and greed and envy die because there is nothing to nourish them."* The horrors of the world has left his hope and optimism unshaken. His life and thought will inspire all those who care for human freedom, happiness and survival for all time to come.

* Abid., p.223
The principle of centralisation and decentralisation is to be followed to ensure the highest social order in the form of unity of mankind (to be ensured by the World State) and individual initiative at all levels down to the lowest bottom.

Alienation of the worker from his work and the fruits of his work must end. The principle of liberal socialism is to operate to resolve the conflict between economic organisations and individual freedom, to restore a new unity of men, technology and Nature, to combine political democracy with economic freedom for all.

To emancipate the individuals's freedom of thought from the dogmas of the Church, the adventure of thought into the mystery of Universe is to take the place of passive acceptance of dogmas. Cosmic piety is to take the place of Christian piety. Cosmic piety means fidelity to truth, fidelity to inquiry into the nature of things as they are, the endeavour to embrace the whole Universe in theoretical contemplation and also transcend the Universe. Forms of fear such as fear of finitude, fear of death and fear of defeat are to be conquered by a comprehension of human nature and men's rightful place in the Universe. Likewise, fear of sin is to be conquered by an understanding of the psychology of guilt. A good life, which for Russell, is a life inspired by love and guided by knowledge is to take the place of religious life. A good life holds out infinite possibilities as both knowledge and love are infinite.

The principle of liberal education is to be followed if the conflict between educational organisations and the individual's freedom of thought is to be resolved. It means a radical reorientation of education to aim at the