Chapter - VII

Attitude to War and Peace

I

Russell's attitude to war and peace has been summed up by the word 'pacifism.' The term 'pacifism' came into general use a few years ago before the World War I "as descriptive of the views of members of free societies and of others engaged in organized efforts to prevent war." The word 'pacifist' is derived from two Latin words, 'pax' meaning 'peace' and 'facere' meaning to make. A pacifist is, therefore, one who fights against war and strives for peace. Pacifism means "the love of peace and repugnance for the use of armed force, especially in the relations between nations." It is a doctrine which urges individuals and nations to renounce force in their dealings with each other. It is an attitude of unwillingness, as The American Peoples Encyclopaedia notes, on the part of an individual or a group to participate in war. It may be noted that pacifism is as old as Christianity, and has its origins, in the West, in the religious teachings of Christ, and, in the East, in the Buddhistic philosophy of ahimsa or non-violence.

Russell's pacifism has its roots in his humanism. It is his love of man and pity for the suffering of mankind that converts him into an internationalist and a pacifist. The desire for love, the pursuit of knowledge and pity for the suffering of mankind were three strongest passions in his life. As Russell himself writes:
"THREE PASSIONS, simple, but overwhelmingly strong, have governed my life; the longing for love, the search for knowledge, and unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind. These passions, like great winds, have blown me hither and thither, in a wayward course, over a deep ocean of anguish, reaching to the very verge of despair." His deep and almost passionate concern for the suffering of man that a war in the modern scientific age entails leads him to seek peace all through his life.

Russell's faith in pacifism was first manifest in his opposition to the Boer War. However, he at first, under the influence of Sidney Webb, supported the War when it broke out in 1899. At that time Russell was a Liberal Imperialist. But early in 1901 he became a pro-Boer. In his Autobiography Russell writes: "In the autumn of 1899 the Boer War broke out. I was at that time a Liberal Imperialist, and at first by no means a pro-Boer. British defeats caused me much anxiety, and I could think of nothing else but the war news. ... When the Boers began to be defeated, my interest grew less, and early in 1901 I became a pro-Boer." This year was a landmark in the very long and chequered life of Russell, because since then he became a pacifist and derided the use of force in international relations. One day in 1901 Russell had a "sort of mystic illumination" which ultimately resulted in his conversion to pacifism. In 1901 Russell and his wife Alys had been staying with Alfred North Whitehead and his wife. At that time Mrs. Whitehead became very seriously ill, and used to suffer severe pain owing to heart trouble. One day Russell and his wife went to Newnham to hear
Gilbert Murray read his translation of The Hippolytus. Upon returning home, they found Mrs. Whitehead undergoing an unusually severe bout of pain. He writes:

"She seemed cut off from everyone and everything by walls of agony, and the sense of the solitude of each human soul suddenly overwhelmed me. ... Suddenly the ground seemed to give way beneath me, and I found myself in quite another region. Within five minutes I went through some such reflections as the following: the loneliness of the human soul is unendurable; nothing can penetrate it except the highest intensity of the sort of love that religious teachers have preached; whatever does not spring from this motive is harmful, or at best useless; it follows that war is wrong, ..., that the use of force is to be deprecated, ...

"At the end of those five minutes, I had become a completely different person. For a time, a sort of mystic illumination possessed me. I felt that I knew the inmost thoughts of everybody that I met in the street, and though this was, no doubt, a delusion, I did in actual fact find myself in far closer touch than previously with all my friends, and many of my acquaintances. Having been an Imperialist, I became during those five minutes a pro-Boer and a Pacifist." But it was from the World War I that his interest in the question on war and peace became all the more absorbing. "Through the spectacle of death," Russell writes, "I acquired a now love for what is living." Since the World War I he became more and more absorbed with the problem of war and the possible ways of preventing it. Here it may be noted that Russell's pacifism is not merely negative. It is very much positive and action-oriented.
From the World War I Russell threw himself wholeheartedly into pacifist propaganda for which he had to suffer a lot, and was even dismissed from his lectureship of the Trinity College at Cambridge in July 1916, and alienated some of his best and intimate friends, namely, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, George Bernard Shaw and A.N. Whitehead. The Independent Labour Party adopted an anti-war stance. And it was mainly through the efforts of the I.L.P. that the Union of Democratic Control (U.D.C.) was formed to condemn Britain's entry into the war. Russell was a member of the U.D.C., and organized a U.D.C. branch in Cambridge. In 1916 he was fined £100 for writing a pacifist leaflet. He was sentenced to six months' imprisonment in 1918 for his article, 'The German Peace Offer', in *The Tribunal*, an official organ of the No-Conscription Fellowship (N.C.F.), in which he criticized the American Army. During the war he was denied passport to America by the War Office to deliver lectures at Harvard, and even his movements in England were seriously restricted. In 1961 he was sentenced to six days' imprisonment because of his participation in a sit-down demonstration against nuclear armaments. But nothing daunted his indomitable spirit, and till the very last day of his life he devoted himself completely and almost passionately to the cause of peace.

Russell was a conscientious objector to the First World War and thought that it was unnecessary. In 1914 a statement was published in the *Manchester Guardian*, urging Britain to remain neutral in any future war. It was signed by a large number of Professors and Fellows of Cambridge University, and issued mainly because of the efforts of Russell. The statement is as follows:
"The undersigned Professors, Fellows, and Masters of Arts in the University of Cambridge desire to express their conviction of the supreme importance of preserving England's neutrality in the existing situation, considering that at present juncture no vital interest of this country is endangered, such as would justify our participation in war."

But almost all the signatories changed their minds as soon as the war started. Russell opposed the war on rationalist and humanitarian grounds rather than because he, like some of his N.C.F. colleagues, wished to stand aside from a war which was of concern only to capitalists.

Russell wanted Britain not to participate in the World War I and to remain neutral. In his article on 'War and Non-Violence', written in 1915, he urged Britain to disband her army and navy, and even considered non-resistance against Germany's attack a better policy. He strongly refuted the thesis propounded by H.G. Wells that it was a war to end war. In his essay, 'War and Peace in my Lifetime' (5 March, 1959), Russell writes: "We are told - for example, by H.G. Wells - that it was a war to end war and a war against militarism. It had, in fact, exactly the opposite effect. It led directly to Communism in Russia and, through the punitive vindictiveness of the Versailles Treaty, to Nazi domination in Germany. The world since 1914 has been one in which civilized ways of life and human feeling have steadily decayed; and there is, as yet, little sign of a contrary tendency."
Russell maintained his pacifist position even during the Munich period. During this period he was of the view that if England were disarmed, Germany would have no cause to hate her and consequently would lose all initiative to attack her. His point of view during this time is well adumbrated in his book, Which Way to Peace? (1936). He wrote in 1936: "Suppose England and France were both to disarm. If the Nazis endeavoured to continue their military parades and their glorification of war they would cease to look heroic and would become ridiculous; their own compatriots would begin to laugh at them, and to reflect that so much strenuousness was no longer called for." To counteract the aggression of Germany, he opposed the alliance of Great Britain with France and the U.S.S.R., and reiterated the policy of non-resistance against Germany's attack. He wrote: "War between Germany and the U.S.S.R. seems almost inevitable unless (what is impossible) they make an alliance for the re-partition of Poland. This war will probably involve France, and is not unlikely to involve Great Britain. The friend of peace in France should work against the Franco-Soviet alliance; the friend of peace in Great Britain should oppose commitment to Russia, and to France also so far as is possible without the breach of peace." He urged Britain to be neutral in the next war. "For neutrality in the next war," he wrote in the thirties, "there are strong arguments, the strongest of which is that the effects of a great war would be worse than subjugation by Hitler."

During the Munich period Russell undermined the danger of
Nazism, and could not realize how menacing Hitler could become. But his mistake, as one of his biographers thinks, "was that of a normal, well-balanced human being incapable of conceiving of a phenomenon like Hilterism as anything but a state of temporary madness soon to be eradicated from a free human society." "With the advent of pacifism," as Rajani Palme Dutt says, "he was so out of touch with the anti-fascist movement of the left in the 'thirties that in 1937 he advocated a friendly reception to an invasion of Britain by Hitler." It is pointed out that it was his obsession with pacifism that was largely, if not wholly, responsible for Russell's pacifist attitude in relation to the Nazis. It may be argued that Russell advocated such a policy with a view to preventing the extension of war. But by advocating such a policy he, however, rendered, as John Lewis observes, "maximum support to the friends of Fascism and the foes of Russia, ..."

While Russell had opposed the World War I, he supported the World War II. During the first two years of the Second World War he, however, stuck to his pacifist convictions, though with much agony of mind. In his letter of December 22, 1939, to Robert Trevelyan, he wrote: "I wonder what you are feeling about the war. I try hard to remain a pacifist, but the thought of Hitler and Stalin triumphant is hard to bear." But in June 1940, Russell wrote to Kingsley Martin, Editor of the New Statesman: "Ever since the war began I have felt that I could no longer go on being a pacifist; but I have hesitated to say so, because of the responsibility involved. If I were young enough to fight myself I
should do so, but it is more difficult to urge others. Now, however, I feel that I ought to announce that I have changed my mind, and I would be glad if you could find an opportunity to mention in the New Statesman that you heard from me to this effect."

In a letter to the Editor of the New York Times in 1941, Russell wrote: "With regard to the present war: I opposed it in advance because, although I thought that in this case there was a principle worth fighting for, the information that I had been able to collect convinced me that this principle could not be preserved by war. Many Englishmen shared this view. It appeared likely that modern war would be so frightful as to be worse than conquest by Hitler. But while the war, though bad enough, has proved less horrible than we expected, conquest by Hitler in many countries proved even worse.

"It was soon after the conquest of Poland that I decided and publicly announced that I wished to support the war in any way that I could. If I were younger I would have volunteered.""

In his view, the method of non-resistance is an effective instrument only when the holders of power are not altogether devoid of a sense of morality and justice, and are not "ruthless beyond a point." But the Nazis, in his opinion, were utterly cruel and stupid and lacked all moral virtues. In his Autobiography Russell writes: "The doctrine which Tolstoy preached with great persuasive force, that the holders of power could be morally regenerated by
non-resistance, was obviously untrue in Germany after 1933. Clearly Tolstoy was right only when the holders of power were not ruthless beyond a point, and clearly the Nazis went beyond this point.\textsuperscript{29}

In his article on 'Mahatma Gandhi' (1952), he writes: "The other limitation to which the method (of non-violence) is subject is one which did not arise either in South Africa or in India, but certainly would have arisen if the method had been employed against Nazis or Russian Communists. If the authorities are sufficiently brutal, they can exterminate non-violent resisters without experiencing that moral repugnance from their acts which in the end paralyzed the British in India. During the Second World War, for example, disciples of Gandhi would lie down on the rails of railways and refuse to move. English drivers would not run over such men, and the result was railway traffic was paralyzed. I cannot think that if the drivers had been Nazis and the men on the rails had been Jews, the result would have been the same." Sir Keith Hancock also echoes the same view, and says that Gandhi's non-violent method could not necessarily have succeeded against Hitler and Stalin. Kingsley Martin doubts whether Gandhi's non-violent resistance would have the same measure of success against the Germans or Japanese as it had against the British.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{31}

One is apt to find inconsistency in Russell's opposition to the World War I and his support of the World War II. But Alan Wood, his most famous biographer, finds nothing incongruous and dichotomous in Russell's attitude and outlook. He thinks that it is empiricism and changing political conditions that account for changes
in his views on political questions. "His attitude," according to one writer, "was consistent throughout, changing only insomuch as his expression developed in accuracy."

Russell himself speaks in the same vein and reminds us time and again that he had never been a complete adherent of the doctrine of non-resistance and accepted pacifism as a creed. In his article entitled 'Two Ideals of Pacifism' (1917), he writes: "Of course, if you hold the position which is taken by the Society of Friends that the use of force is always wrong, you cannot touch the League to Enforce Peace. But I do not myself take that position. I am only opposed to each war separately and in turn, and not to all war. Therefore I cannot object to the League to Enforce Peace on the abstract ground that I think that the use of force is always wrong, for I do not think so. I believe that there have been occasions in the past, and may be again in the future, when the use of force is justifiable." During the Munich period Russell wrote: "I am not a believer in the doctrine of non-resistance; I do not desire the abolition of the police; I do not hold that war is always and everywhere a crime."

In his article entitled 'The Ethics of War', written in 1915, he distinguishes between four kinds of war: (a) War of Colonisation, (b) War of Principle, (c) War of Self-Defence, and (d) War of Prestige. "Of these four kinds I should say that the first and the second," he writes, "are fairly often justified; the third seldom, except as against an adversary of inferior
civilisation; and the fourth, which is the sort to which the present war belongs, never. According to him, a war fought for religion, for national independence, for Communism, for pacifism, or for democracy, may be called a War of Principle. Russell regards the English and American Civil Wars as Wars of Principle and contends that a War of Self-Defence often leads to an oppressive war.

Russell distinguishes between a just and an unjust war. In his opinion, the justness of a war is to be judged not by any legalistic test and from a juridical or quasi-juridicial standpoint, but by the fact whether it promotes human happiness or civilization. According to him, a war is to be judged only by its consequences and is just if it produces greater good than evil to mankind. "It is necessary, in regard to any war, to consider," as Russell writes, "not its paper justification in past agreements, but its real justification in the balance of good which it is to bring to mankind." Russell's pacifism can thus be regarded as conditional and non-absolutist.

Russell's attitude to war and peace bears a close resemblance to that of John Bright and T.H. Green. John Bright once said: "I have never advocated the extreme non-resistance principle in public or in private. I don't know whether I would logically maintain it." According to Green, war can be right when it is "the only means by which the government can prevent more serious wrong..." Like Bright and Green, Russell is not an absolute
pacifist and condemns war only on moral and rational grounds. He opposes not all kinds of war, but only the modern war. "My belief in absolute pacifism," he declares, "is limited to the present time and depends upon the destructiveness of air warfare. In other times and other circumstances I should be prepared to consider gains and losses, and to conclude that war might be worthwhile." Russell, as Kingsley Martin very aptly observes, represents a utilitarian form of British pacifism. Russell's pacifism arises from the realization that a war in the modern scientific age will inevitably lead to the extermination of the human race and is the worst evil that can befall mankind.

Russell, as we have seen, does not condemn war and the use of force under all circumstances. He, therefore, points out in the second volume of his Autobiography that the change in his outlook during the Second World War is "only a quantitative change and a shift of emphasis." But it is difficult for us to subscribe to this view of Russell. In spite of all what he has said in favour of his own relative and qualified pacifist position before and even during the Second World War, we think that before the World War II his position did not differ very much from that of an absolute and uncompromising pacifist. R.A. Scott-James is right when he says that "from 1914 to 1918 he (Russell) was an uncompromising pacifist." This, we think, can be evident from his essay on 'War and Non-Resistance', written during the First World War. Like a true Gandhian, he writes: "It is cowardice that makes it difficult to meet invasion by the method of passive resistance." Russell thus
regards non-violence as a morally superior method of resistance. Though Russell in his article on 'The Ethics of War', written in 1915, admits the justifiability of certain kinds of war, he pleads for the acceptance of the principle of non-resistance as "a matter of practical politics," as it, in his view, contains "an immense measure of wisdom."

Russell's absolutist pacifist position during the World War I can further be seen from his article, 'Resistance and Service' (1917). He writes: "It is important that all resistance to the authorities should be on matters of principle, that it should be open and avowed, and that it should be an outcome of our pacifist principles. It is important, also, that we should remember our main purpose, which is to persuade, not to coerce. Coercion is the method of the militarist, the method which regards one's opponent as not open to reason, and which does not mind humiliating him by an enforced submission. Whether in the economic struggle for justice, or in the pacifist struggle against war, it is to reason and love of mankind that an appeal must be made, not to force and fear. The hostility of the public will never be overcome if you respond with an equal hostility."

We think that it was his English patriotism that led Russell to support the Second World War. We are driven to this conclusion, because he came out in support of the war only when England was threatened with an invasion. As he himself confesses: "I found the Nazis utterly revolting, cruel, bigoted, and stupid. Morally and
intellectually they were alike odious to me. Although I clung to my pacifist convictions, I did so with increasing difficulty. When, in 1940, England was threatened with invasion, I realized that, throughout the First War, I had never seriously envisaged the possibility of utter defeat. I found this possibility unbearable, and at last consciously and definitely decided that I must support what was necessary for victory in the Second War, however difficult victory might be to achieve, and however painful in its consequences. In the light of this confession, it is difficult to accept the view of Alan Wood that it is empiricism that always causes changes in Russell’s approach to political questions. On the contrary, it is more reasonable to conclude that it was the love of his country that accounted for the change in his outlook during the World War II.

Russell defines war as "a conflict between two groups, each of which attempts to kill and maim as many as possible of the other group in order to achieve some object which it desires." The object of war, according to him, is either power or wealth. He regards war as one of the chief political embodiments of man’s possessive impulses. War is a complex phenomenon. Though Russell admits that the causes of war are numerous, he thinks that the root cause of war is to be found in the very nature of man. He is not alone to hold such a view. The view that war is rooted in human nature and behaviour has been dominant in the writings of many ancient and modern behavioural scientists.

Russell writes that the economic cause of war is "to a great extent mythical, and its true causes must be sought for outside the economic sphere." He looks for the ultimate cause of war in man's sub-conscious sphere of instincts, and puts forward what may be called "the instinct theory of war." "The ultimate fact from which war results," he says, "is the fact that a large proportion of mankind have an impulse to conflict rather than harmony, ..." Man, in his opinion, is by nature competitive, pugnacious and power-living; and war results from the competitive and power-living nature of man. "Man is a quarrelsome," writes Russell, "and power-living animal. Life without power and quarrels would seem to him a tame and tedious affair. From the combination of quarrel and love of power most of history proceeds, and, more particularly, wars and empires." It can thus be seen that Russell's conception of human nature largely corresponds to that of Machiavelli and Hobbes. According to Russell, war between nations arises from an instinctive hatred of foreigners, from love of excitement, desire for triumph, honour or power, and from a passionate devotion to the nation.

In stressing the role of subconscious and irrational passions in human behaviour, Russell follows Sigmund Freud, W. McDonald, H.R. Marshall, E.A. Ross and other pioneers of the Psychological School of the 19th century who all have sought to explain the origin of war in terms of instincts. Like Russell, Einstein and Freud have traced the origin of war to the destructive and aggressive instincts that are inherent in human nature. According to Freud, men are not "gentle" and "friendly creatures,
wishing for love," and "a powerful measure of desire for aggression
has to be reckoned as part of their instinctual endowment." He
writes: "The existence of this tendency to aggression which we can
detect in ourselves and rightly presume to be present in others is
the factor that disturbs our relations with our neighbours and makes
it necessary for culture to institute its high demands. Civilized
society is perpetually menaced with disintegration through this
primary hostility of men towards one another." Joad, in his book,
*Why War? (1939)*, also follows Russell in his psychological analysis
of war hysteria. Aldous Huxley too, like Russell, gives us a
psychological explanation of the origin of war. He, of course,
refers to other important causes of war, namely, economic and
political. But he opines that political and economic causes of war
are, in their ultimate analysis, psychological in origin. Lionel
Robbins thinks that the theory that war has its roots in economic
causes does not fit the facts of history. "War would not be
possible," writes John Dewey, "without anger, pugnacity, rivalry,
self-display, and such like native tendencies." Morgenthau says
that war arises from man's selfishness and lust for power.

The Marxists, however, always find economic cause at the
back of war. Even many non-Marxist thinkers explain the origin of
war in terms of economic causes. For example, L.I. Bernard, although
not a Marxist, writes: "To the superficial observer, or to one who
for any reason wishes to avoid 'materialist' theories of the
causation of war, the psychological causes seem to be important ones.
These causes may be called public opinion, patriotism, nationalistic spirit, race or cultural prejudices, religious intolerance, or any other set of opinions, beliefs or ideologies. But at the back of them almost invariably lies those economic causes which have conditioned them. Laski argues that war has always its origin in economic causes.

Though Russell rejects the economic causes of war, he often admits that economic causes play a very important part in the causation of war. In Political Ideals (1917) he writes: "The desire for exclusive markets is one of the most important causes of war." In his well-known book, Freedom and Organization, 1814-1914 (1934), he writes: "It is not by pacifist sentiment, but by world-wide economic organization, that civilized mankind is to be saved from collective suicide." Every intelligent reader of Russell's War Crimes in Vietnam (1967) will be easily convinced that in the closing years of his life he accepts the Marxist theory that it is economic interest or the capitalist organization of society that is the root and ultimate cause of war in the modern world. "It is Americans," he writes, "who have been killing Vietnamese, attacking villages, occupying cities, using gas and chemicals, bombing their schools and hospitals - all this to protect the profits of American capitalism. The men who conscript the soldiers are the same men who sign the military contracts..."

Prof. V.J. McGill very trenchantly criticizes Russell's "instinct theory" of war. According to him, Russell's "instinct
theory of war has become outdated and obsolete. He accuses him for formulating what he calls "an ineradicable impulse to war." But Russell himself refutes the charge. He rejects the theory that war is part of human nature. What he contends is that human nature, neither being good or bad, is rendered so by circumstances. "Men's desires," he writes, "are not an immutable datum. They are affected by circumstances and education and opportunity." Prof. I.L. Horowitz thinks that the available anthropological data do not corroborate Russell's "instinct theory" of war. John Strachey also rejects the theory that it is innate combativeness of men that leads to war. "Reflection will suggest, however, that," he points out, "this is a proposition of so general a character as to contain little or no significance." Pitirim Sorokin denounces all such theories which seek to explain the origin of war in terms of instincts as being inadequate and insufficient. Kenneth N. Waltz also rejects all psychological theories of war.

Russell thinks that the impulse to war cannot be cured unless there are fundamental and far-reaching changes in the economic and political structure of society, in education and moral ideas of men and women. The modern capitalist structure of society, he argues, causes war by promoting the love of material possessions. "Possessiveness - the passion to have and to hold - is the ultimate source," writes Russell, "of war, and the foundation of all the ills from which the political world is suffering." Here Russell explicitly recognizes the predominating importance of the economic causes of war. Secondly, he argues that Capitalism tends to cause
war by concentrating power in the hands of a few individuals. Thirdly, Russell thinks that under the capitalist structure of society men will naturally seek and even welcome war and excitement as a relief from the dull monotony of their day-to-day life. Under Capitalism men are reduced to so many cogs in a machine, and work degenerates into a dull, drab and dreary affair. Russell writes: "The present economic system, by robbing most men of initiative, is one of the causes of the universal weariness which devitalizes urban and industrial populations, making them perpetually seek excitement, and leading them to welcome even the outbreak of war as a relief from the dreary monotony of their daily lives." Karl Marx, Erich Fromm, Lewis Mumford, and Herbert Marcuse—all speak of the devitalizing effects of the capitalist structure of society upon human life.

Russell believes that it is Socialism that can cure the evils of Capitalism and can thereby reduce man's proneness to war. Without international Socialism, war, he holds, cannot be eliminated. To quote him: "Only international Socialism can secure both (peace and freedom), and owing to the stimulation of revolt by capitalist oppression, even peace alone can never be secure until international Socialism is established throughout the world." As we have seen, by Socialism Russell does not mean Marxian Socialism. He advocates Guild Socialism because he thinks that it can secure, through self-government in industry, the dignity, vigour, constructiveness and the joy of life in the modern industrial and scientific age. It is these very things that we need most today, he says, for the
construction of a happy, good and peaceful society. For the elimination of the psychological causes of war, Aldous Huxley pleads for the grant of self-government to industry and other occupational groups. It will, he argues, make work delightful and interesting to ordinary men and women, and will largely deliver them from their sense of boredom, humiliation and helplessness.

Many military experts are of the opinion that a modern nuclear war cannot be as destructive as it is often thought. "With proper tactics, nuclear war," writes Henry A. Kissinger, "need not be as destructive as it appears." Herman Kahn, a distinguished American expert on military affairs, thinks that with a proper system of shelter and other measures a large and appreciable number of civilians' lives can be saved. Russell rejects this view of Herman Kahn as "an optimistic forecast." Russell does not think that human life can be safeguarded against a nuclear war. He repeatedly points out that unless war is abolished, it will abolish mankind and destroy human civilization. J. Robert Oppenheimer, a famous physicist, says: "I do not believe - though of course we cannot today be certain - that we can take measures for the defense of our people, our lives, our institutions, our cities, which will in any real sense be a permanent solution to the problem of the atom bomb." Oskar Morgenstern, a well-known military expert, supports this view. He opines: "Defense against these weapons is practically nonexistent; indeed, it is now impossible. It exists only in the fertile imagination of some men, not in physical reality." Prof. Philip Noel-Baker also argues that there can be no civil or military defence against a major nuclear attack.
Peace, according to Russell, cannot be secure, and the possibility of war cannot be eliminated as long as there are so many sovereign States in the world with their armed forces. Laski insists that "the notion of an independent sovereign State is, on the international side, fatal to the well-being of humanity." Russell maintains that in order to secure peace and to prevent war there must be a World Government, having at its command all the armed forces of the world and a monopoly of all the major weapons of war. In his opinion, the political organization of society must be extended until it reaches its culmination in a World State which must unite all nations on an equal footing. Without the creation of a World Government, war, he thinks, cannot be prevented by mere individual pacifism, i.e., by mere unwillingness on the part of the individual to go to war. Russell, in fact, doubts the efficacy of individual pacifism and relies upon political pacifism for the prevention of war. As early as 1916 he pinpointed the importance of a World State for the prevention of war. In The Prospects of Industrial Civilization (1923) Russell writes: "The only ultimate cure for war is the creation of a World-State or Supre-State, strong enough to decide by law all disputes between nations."

It may be noted that the idea of an International or World Government is very old. Russell's father, Viscount Amberley, was an internationalist. In his essay on 'Can War be avoided?' (1870), he derided all wars except in self-defence, and put forth the suggestion for the formation of an International Government for securing peace.
and the avoidance of war. He wrote: "Peace can only be secured among the members of any nation when they all recognise a common authority which, supported by the united strength of the whole body, is able to enforce its decrees upon any refractory individual. This common authority must have no scruple to use force when occasion demands." Pierre Dubois and Dante in the 14th century, Erasmus and Silly in the 16th century, Emeric Crucé, William Penn and Hugo Grotius in the 17th century, Abbe de Saint-Pierre and Jean Jacques Rousseau in the 18th century — all had envisaged and developed in their own way the idea of a Supra-national Authority or World Government. "The necessity for some form of international consolidation," as one writer points out, "has been an essential point in every international treaty evolved in the past, from Pierre Dubois."

In his book, The Impact of Science on Society (1952), Russell lays down four essential conditions of a stable world order. These conditions, which are reiterated in his Human Society in Ethics and Politics (1954), are as follows: (a) a World Government with a monopoly of armed force; (b) an approximate economic equality among the nations of the world; (c) a more or less stationary population; and (d) provision for individual initiative. These conditions are regarded by Maurice Cornforth as "the day dreams of imperialism." These conditions may appear utopian and unrealistic in the present circumstances. But even so, we think that it is useful to keep them in mind in changing and modifying the social, political and economic institutions of the world. John Strachey rightly points out that our
aim will be short-term if we do not aim at something, the attainment of which requires changes in present circumstances. According to Russell, a World Government is desirable for two reasons - (a) for the prevention of war, and (b) for securing economic justice. But it is primarily for the prevention of war that a World Government is desirable because war, he thinks, creates the grossest forms of economic injustice.

Russell, however, does not advocate the total abrogation of State sovereignty. He only urges its limitations and restrictions. Russell distinguishes between the civil and military functions of a national State and says that only its military function should be vested in the World Government, leaving the national State free in its civil functions, i.e., in its administrative, legislative and judicial functions. In other words, there should be, according to him, only one military State in the world which should not interfere in the local or domestic affairs of a national State unless they do not seriously threaten the cause of peace. Such affairs as internal economic development, education, religious institutions, etc., are matters of local importance and should, therefore, in his opinion, be left to the control of a national State. But Russell contends that the International Authority should exercise a certain degree of supervision over all education and should forbid the teaching of doctrines which it considers subversive.

In his unpublished essay, 'Outline of a Political Philosophy' (1943), Russell writes: "An international authority, if it is in a
position to prevent great wars - I do not think little wars can be prevented - must possess certain powers, legal and military.

"As for legal powers: It must have the right to determine national boundaries, and if necessary to change them in response to a plébiscite. It shall have the right and the duty to examine all treaties existing at the time of its creation, none of which shall thereafter be valid without its ratification. No subsequent treaties shall be binding except with its assent. These powers shall be exercised by an international legislature. Next, there will have to be an international judicial authority, to decide when an illegal use of force has occurred, either by one State against another, or by a faction within a State. Finally, there will have to be an executive to declare war against a law-breaker, and to conduct plébiscites when necessary."

According to Russell, the World Government must have an executive, a legislature and a judiciary of its own. He maintains that the executive of the World Government should be responsible to the legislature, and that its function will have to ensure loyalty of the national States to the World Government. An international judiciary, he argues, is necessary to formulate international law which must be as binding upon all nations as municipal law.

In the above unpublished essay, he further writes: "As for military powers: There will have to be an international armed force, possessing a monopoly of the more powerful weapons of war, such as
aeroplanes, battleships, tanks, etc. National armies should be limited in size, and possess only such weapons as would be necessary for maintaining internal order. The international armed force should, in each unit, be of mixed national composition, so that no large section of it could be animated by a unified national bias. The men to occupy the higher commands should be selected by the international executive."

Russell argues that an International Government should possess an army in order to stop and prevent the illegal use of force by national States, and to enforce its decisions by means of its superior power upon any recalcitrant State or States. He is, of course, too rationalistic and optimistic to think that an International Authority will need an armed force only at the initial stages of its functioning. The use of force in the relations between nations, in his opinion, cannot altogether be dispensed with. But he maintains the view that force in international relations should be used not by any national State, but only by the Supra-national State. Russell points out that it should be the duty of the International Authority to prevent civil war because civil war may easily develop into international war, as the Spanish civil war nearly did.

Apart from these legal and military powers, the International Authority, as Russell says, should have certain other powers and functions. First, it should have the power to control the production and distribution of food and important raw materials. Important raw
materials, according to him, should be rationed to all States by
the International Authority according to a system sanctioned by
it and in accordance with the principles of justice and aptitude for
their use. Secondly, it must have the power to stop the loss of
fertility of soil and to prevent the wasteful methods of agriculture.
Russell lays special stress upon this particular function of the
World Government because, according to him, a certain degree of
economic prosperity in all nations of the world is an essential
prerequisite of a stable world order. There should be, in his
opinion, an international agricultural body, the functions of which
should be (a) to explore ways and means for the conservation of
soil; (b) to give advice to the government of a national State on
scientific and technical methods of production; and (c) to make such
methods available to the cultivators. In his book, Sceptical Essays
(1935), Russell lays down the following functions of the World
Government: (a) allocation of territory to the different national
States; (b) restriction of movements of population across the
boundaries of different national States; and (c) the rationing of
raw materials as between different States. According to him, the
power of the International Authority will be primarily economic and
will rest upon the possession of raw materials and the control of
financial credit.

With almost all the advocates of the World Government,
Russell agrees that the World Government should be federal in
character. "The only way to world peace," says H.G. Wells, "is world
federation." Kant wrote in the 18th century that the only real
guarantee of a permanent peace between nations is the establishment of a federation of free "republican" States.

According to Russell, the World Federation should be divided into a number of subordinate federations, each of which should be composed of approximately equal and fairly homogeneous population sharing many common interests. He, however, points out that no fixed and rigid arrangement can be laid down regarding the constitution of subordinate federations. In his view, the number of representatives of each subordinate federation to the legislature of the World Federation should be fixed according to its size. There should be a constitution for the World Federal Government in which, he thinks, the relations of the World Government to the subordinate federal governments should be clearly defined. In Russell's opinion, each subordinate federation should also have its own constitution. He holds that the World Federal Government should leave each subordinate federation free in its internal affairs, and intervenes only when it indulges in some unconstitutional activities.

But how can a World Government be brought about? Russell is not sure about this. He has been accused of being inconsistent for suggesting different and contradictory methods at different times for securing peace. John Strachey brings out this contradiction in Russell's point of view when he writes: "With a far too narrow logic, Bertrand Russell has swung from at least considering the possibility of a preventive war at the beginning of the nuclear age, when Russia had no nuclear weapons, to the advocacy of policy which
must lead towards the surrender of the West today." 112 Russell, of course, justifies his own position by saying that with changing conditions he has to change his own views.

As early as the First World War Russell foresaw the growing 114 power and importance of America in world politics. In his essay entitled 'Hopes and Fears as Regards America' (1922), Russell writes: "Apart from the Russian Revolution, the most striking result of the war has been the world-supremacy of the United States." In 1926 he prophesized that it was America which would rule the world 117 in the future. Russell, however, at that time rejected the possibility of the formation of a World Government through the domination of a single Power. But in 1938, he pointed out that a World Government might be established by the victory of either the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R., or by the most powerful of neutrals in a 119 next war. In his essay, 'America: The Next World Centre' (1938), Russell says: "Almost every country in the world exaggerates its own importance; America alone does just the opposite. To every intelligent European who comes to the United States fresh from the distractions, despairs, and insanities of the Old World, it is evident that the future of civilization, and the chief possibility of hope for mankind, is to be found in America." In his essay, 'World Government: By Force or Consent?' (1948), he asserts that a World Government can be established through the ultimate victory of America and her allies in a next world war. In this article, Russell rejects the possibility of the formation of a World Government, at least in the first stages, through voluntary co-operation of the various nations of the world.
In Sceptical Essays (1935) Russell rules out the possibility of the formation of a Supranational State through a voluntary agreement or organization. He argues that a voluntary organization, like the League of Nations, cannot secure peace because of the very important fact that it lacks coercive power. He is of the view that a World Government at the initial stages must be brought into being by the threat of force. It must be brought into existence, he observes, by a financially strong State or States.

In his unpublished essay, "How to secure world peace" (written about 1924), he urges that an International Government must grow out of a combination of strong commercial Powers willing to preserve peace for the sake of their own prosperity. Here says Russell that if there is to be an International Authority willing and able to prevent war, it must aim at power and not only at justice. To quote his words: "Love of justice is too weak in the majority of mankind to produce the vigorous action which will be needed for the establishment of an international authority. By all means let love of justice be the ostensible and conscious motive; but it will have to be reinforced by another, possibly unconscious, which will make a stronger appeal to instinctive passions. This motive, I fear, will have to be love of power." All disputes between nations, he further notes, must be resolved through arbitration, and this must be done on a basis of compromise and adjustment rather than on a legal basis. Disputes between nations, he writes in the above unpublished essay, are "too few and too heterogeneous to be provided for by legal code laid down in advance."

In Unpopular Essays (1950) Russell again points out that a
World Government cannot be established by voluntary agreement, and that it should be instituted through the decisive victory of America in the next world war. He writes: "A world empire of either U.S. or the U.S.S.R. is therefore preferable to the results of a continuation of the present international anarchy. There are, however, important reasons for preferring the victory of America." He thinks that the victory of Soviet Russia in a future world war will bring about an erosion of freedom of thought and opinion, and will lead to the establishment of a bureaucratic and totalitarian regime throughout the world. In *New Hopes for a Changing World* (1951) he maintains that an International Authority cannot be established through consent alone. "I do not believe," he says, "that the human race has sufficient statesmanship or capacity for mutual forbearance to establish a world Government on a basis of consent alone. That is why I think that an element of force will be needed in its establishment and in its preservation through the early years of its existence." He puts forth the view that a World Government can be brought about through the superior and preponderant power of a State or a group of States.

So long as Stalin was alive, Russell was very much critical of Soviet Communism and favoured the formation of an International Government through the hegemony of America. In 1941 he wrote: "I have no doubt that the Soviet Government is even worse than Hitler's, and it will be a misfortune if it survives." His hostility to Soviet Russia went so far as to make him suggest in 1948 the threat of a nuclear war against Russia. In his letter,
dated May 1948, to one Dr. Walter Marseille, Russell wrote: "Communism must be wiped out, and world government must be established. But if, by waiting, we could defend our present lines in Germany and Italy, it would be an immeasurable boon. I do not think the Russians will yield without war. I think all (including Stalin) was fatuous and ignorant." Russell is, however, more often than not misunderstood for suggesting a nuclear war against Russia. Russell urged such a measure against Russia because of her rejection of the Baruch proposals. In his letter to Dr. Marseille, he wrote: "As soon as Russia rejected the Baruch proposals I urged that all nations favouring international control of atomic energy should form an alliance, and threaten Russia with war unless Russia agreed to come in and permit inspection." In his Autobiography Russell points out that in 1948 he advocated a nuclear war against Russia, because he thought that it was by such a measure that Russia could be forced to adopt nuclear disarmament and be prevented from pursuing a destructive and aggressive policy.

During the forties and the early fifties Russell was very much horrified by Stalin's dictatorial and expansionist policy. He was so much horrified that he wrote in 1948 that "all the evidence seems to show that the Russian rulers do not believe in the possibility of genuine peace between Capitalism and Communism. One of them, they think, must destroy the other, either by war or by propaganda; and Dialectical Materialism has decreed that the victory will rest with Communism. Whatever might have been possible at one
time, I do not think anything can now be done to destroy the Soviet belief in inevitable conflict. This belief is derived partly from experience of Capitalist intervention in the early days of the Russian Revolution, partly from Marxian dogma, but partly also from a surviving belief in 'Holy Russia'. I think we are apt to underrate the element of nationalism, as opposed to Marxism, in the Russian attitude. I am afraid, therefore, that, unless the West can acquire a preponderance of power which the Soviet Government finds undeniable, the hope of securing peace by a delimitation of spheres is very slight."

The experience of the Second World War led him to believe that it was not by a pacifist attitude alone, but by the active rearmament of the West, that human liberty could be defended and the world could be saved from Russian barbarism and despotism. Russell, we must note, is not a pacifist in the accepted or popular sense of the term; he is "a militant pacifist" of extraordinary moral courage.

But during the 1950s there was a significant change in Russell's attitude and outlook. In *Human Society in Ethics and Politics* (1964), *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare* (1959), and *Has Man A Future?* (1961), he repeatedly warns us against another world war and passionately urges that a World Federation should be established through mutual agreement. He thus writes: "A much more desirable way of securing world peace would be by a voluntary agreement among nations to pool their armed forces and submit to an agreed International Authority." Russell is too optimistic to think that a common sense realization on the part of nuclear powers
that a world war will be disastrous for the human race will lead them to renounce war as a method of settling disputes. He argues that an International Authority cannot be established by victory of either America or Russia as neither of the parties can be cowed down by force for any length of time.

It was the possession of nuclear weapons by Soviet Russia that caused a change in Russell's outlook during the fifties. In his letter of August 28, 1954, Russell himself explains the cause of change in his attitude: "The main cause in my change of opinion is the shift which has occurred in the balance of forces." He further writes: "Russia acquired atom and hydrogen bombs much sooner than we expected. China became Communist. Western Europe failed to unite, and Western Germany is not yet rearmed. For all these reasons, of which the Russian possession of the bombs is the most important, it seems to me that a policy which was feasible in the first years after 1945 can now no longer achieve its objects."

After the death of Stalin in 1953, his attitude to Soviet Communism becomes mellowed to a considerable extent and his attitude to America becomes hardened. "Later I was brought around," Russell writes in his Autobiography, "to being more favourable to Communism by the death of Stalin in 1953 and by the Bikini test in 1954; and I came gradually to attribute, more and more, the danger of nuclear war to the United States, and less to Russia. This change was supported by developments inside the United States, such as McCarthyism and the restriction of Civil liberties."
unpublished essay entitled 'Should Britain Become Neutral?' (1960), he writes that "since the death of Stalin, Russia has, on the whole, shown less readiness for general war than the United States." His changed attitude to Soviet Russia can further be seen in his debate with Sidney Hook in 1968, where he says that "to risk the end of human life because we regard Communism as evil is fanatical, defeatist and pusillanimous in the highest possible degree." In 1962 he wrote: "I still believe that any world government - even one brought about by the Soviets - is preferable to no world government." It was especially after the Cuban crisis in 1962 that his attitude to Soviet Communism became very much favourable. In the Cuban crisis Russell congratulated Khrushchev for taking unilateral conciliatory measures, and censured President Kennedy for pursuing an aggressive policy. David Horowitz tells us that after Stalin's death Russell's attitude to Soviet Russia became less censorious greatly because of the influence of the writings of Issac Deutscher, the famous Marxist historian, with whom he had been in touch throughout the 1950s.

In the closing years of his life Russell regards America as constituting the greatest threat to peace, and applauds Soviet Union's desire for peace. He holds such a view mainly because of the Vietnam war. As he writes: "It became obvious that Russia no longer entertained hope of world-empire, but that this hope had now passed over to the United States. As my researches into the origins and circumstances of the war in Vietnam showed, the United States was
embarking upon military threat to the world. The fanaticism of America’s anti-communism, combined with its search for markets and raw materials, made it impossible for any serious neutral to regard America and Russia as equally dangerous to the world. The Vietnam war makes him realize that by appealing to its good senses U.S. imperialism cannot be persuaded to give up its aggressive and expansionist policy, and to come to an agreement with the socialist and communist countries. Peace, he therefore thinks, cannot be secured throughout the world and in Vietnam in particular unless there is a united and co-ordinated resistance all over the world against U.S. imperialism.

Though Russell becomes friendly to Soviet Communism after the death of Stalin, his attitude is by no means uncritical. He very severely condemns the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. In a statement made on August 21, 1968, he said: "The Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia illustrates the weakness of the Kremlin and its fear of elementary liberties in Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union has disgraced itself and the principles it invokes. I appeal to all socialists and communists in every continent who disapprove of this suppression to deliver individually and collectively their sharpest protests to Soviet Embassies and to organize demonstrations at them." In another statement made on August 25, 1968, he demanded the immediate withdrawal of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia. He said that the Soviet occupation "strengthens reactionary forces in the west and throughout the world." In his message to the Stockholm Conference on Czechoslovakia in 1969, Russell wrote: "Both before and since the Soviet invasion of last August, the Czechoslovakia leadership has been subjected to intolerable
Intimidation and blackmail, and to inhuman pressures daily. It cannot be said too often that such conduct has no place in socialist behaviour. It is clear to me that the Soviet Union's policy is to discredit the leadership, break the will of the people and reinforce bureaucratic rule. The Russians calculate that by intimidating the leaders, they will compel the country to capitulate, and much of their own dirty work will have been done for them."

Russell thus has had a constantly evolving view on the question of war and peace. However, it may be argued that during the period 1945-51 Russell was critical of Soviet Communism because at this stage he, as Prof. I.L. Horowitz observes, "reflected the well-grounded fears of a business civilization," and "accepted at face value the Churchillian thesis that only America could save the British Empire." But Prof. Horowitz's view that Russell's position on the question of war and peace approximates "the dominant political opinions of English orthodoxy," however true of his earlier views, cannot be accepted as reflecting his later position in view of the fact that in the closing years of his life Russell moves steadily to the left, and becomes very much critical of American imperialism. It is also difficult to endorse fully the view of Maurice Cornforth that Russell's pragmatic and positivist philosophy is a product of imperialist and monopoly capitalist ideology, and reflects "the complete bankruptcy" of the policies and views of monopoly capitalism.
II

Russell is of the view that an International Authority cannot be brought into being and be made stable unless the present tension and mutual distrust between East and West end. He thinks that "mutual fear," "a fear of loss of faith," and "ideological dispute" are the obstacles that prevent the nuclear Powers from following and adopting any conciliatory measure. But the neutral Powers, he thinks, are not inhibited by these difficulties and can, therefore, play a very important role in easing tension and lessening hatred between the big belligerent States. He writes: "I should wish to see a greatly strengthened neutral bloc studying the question at issue between East and West, offering solutions which should leave the balance of power unchanged and could therefore be accepted by both parties without loss of faith." In Human Society in Ethics and Politics (1954) he suggests that a Commission consisting solely of eminent Indians should be set up by the Government of India to inquire into the effects of a nuclear war upon neutrals and other Powers. Russell is too optimistic to think that all the big Powers will accept the findings of the Commission. In Fact and Fiction (1961) he says that a Commission should be set up by the two neutral Powers, namely, India and Sweden jointly.

Maurice Cowling criticizes this suggestion because, in his opinion, no government, even the Government of India, could be neutral in any genuine and useful sense. Russell seems to have accepted the
validity of Cowling’s suggestion. In the third volume of his *Autobiography* he thus writes: "If the contenders for world supremacy could be kept apart, perhaps the neutral nations could introduce the voice of reason into international affairs. It was a small hope, for I overestimated the power of the neutrals."

In order to mitigate mutual fear and suspicion between East and West, Russell pleads for a temporary moratorium for a period of two years. According to him, during the moratorium a small Conciliation Committee should be set up consisting of an equal number of members from East and West and neutrals. In *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare* (1959) Russell suggests that the Committee should consist of two Americans, two Russians, one West European, one Chinese and two neutrals. Among the neutrals, one should be an Indian and the other a Swede. In his opinion, the decisions of the Committee should be unanimous and its deliberations should be confidential. The Committee should endeavour to find means of lessening friction in different regions, and should not seek to give any net advantage to any side. Russell further suggests that in suggesting ways of diminishing friction in different regions the Committee should, as far as possible and practicable, respect the wishes of the inhabitants.

According to him, the U.N.O. cannot play any effective role in promoting peace and preventing war unless certain measures are adopted to reform it. First, China should be admitted as a member of the U.N.O. Secondly, the veto power of the big five States should be
abolished. And thirdly, the equality of representation of all 156 States in the General Assembly should be done away with.

In his speech (read in his absence) at the World Assembly for Peace at Helsinki in 1955, Russell said: "The first step should be a statement by a small number of men of the highest scientific 157 eminence to the effects to be expected from war." He fervently believes that a statement as to the effects of war by eminent scientists will make the nuclear Powers realize the folly of nuclear war, and will thereby induce them to renounce war as a method of settling disputes between them. With this end in view, Russell with the help of Albert Einstein, J.F. Joliot-Curie, Max Born and many other eminent men of science founded in 1957 an international organization which came to be known as The Pugwash Movement.

While commenting on Russell's suggestion, Jean Paul Sartre said in his speech at the World Assembly for Peace at Helsinki: "The declaration of atomic scientists proposed by Earl Russell will certainly have the effect of opening the eyes of those who will wish to keep them shut. It would in no way alter this new fact, that the fundamental character of peace today is that it is the object of collective and popular will." Russell is, of course, aware that for the sake of peace it is necessary to rouse and mobilize public opinion and to build an international movement of mass resistance against nuclear war. "It is not acceptance of war," he writes, "but resistance to it which is imperative if we are to survive." Russell thus, along with Kingsley Martin and others,
started in 1958 The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (C.N.D.). As President of the organization, he played a very important role in educating and mobilizing public opinion against nuclear armaments in England. Every reader of Russell's Autobiography knows that he resigned the post of the President of the C.N.D. and set up a Committee of 100 in 1960 in order to start a mass civil disobedience movement in England against nuclear war and armaments of mass destruction.

It is interesting to note that Russell, who once rejected Gandhi's teaching as 'medieval', accepts in the very late years of his life the Gandhian method of mass civil disobedience as the only effective means of bringing to general awareness the effects of nuclear war. In his speech delivered at the young Congress for Nuclear Disarmament in 1961 in Birmingham, he said: "We advocate and practise non-violent civil disobedience as a method of causing people to know the perils to which the world is exposed and in persuading them to join us in opposing the insanity which affects, at present, many of the most powerful Governments in the world."

In his opinion, constitutional methods are slow and only a limited success can be achieved through them. Moreover, he thinks that through constitutional methods it is difficult and often impossible to cause the most important facts of war known to the people.

To secure a stable world peace, Russell suggests certain realistic measures - (a) nuclear disarmament; (b) the abolition of nuclear tests; (c) the abandonment of the policy of instant
retaliation; and (d) the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons to Powers which do not yet possess them. With Dr. Albert Schweitzer, Prof. J. Robert Oppenheimer, and Prof. Philip Noel-Baker, Russell rejects as absurd and illogical the theory that peace can be maintained by increased armaments. On the contrary, they all argue that increased armaments will inevitably lead mankind to a deadly and disastrous war. According to Russell, it is paradoxical to believe that "we can only keep alive by preparing to kill each other." He also dismisses "the theory of deterrent," because war might occur through accident or through mechanical defect and human error. Even Herman Kahn also speaks of the possibility of accidental or unexpected war. As he writes: "Progress is so fast, the problems are so unprecedented, and the lead times for cultural assimilation so long, that it is difficult to believe that we will understand our systems well enough to prevent accidents, miscalculations, or the need for dangerous improvisation in a crisis or unexpected contingency."

According to Russell, in the modern world it is the piling up of arms that is the most potent cause of suspicion, hatred, fear and hostility between nations. He, therefore, insists on the need for universal disarmament as an essential pre-condition of a stable peace. He rejects the fear that "disarmament might cause a disastrous economic dislocation." This fear, he says, is fostered by those who are interested in the armament industry. Russell thinks that a peaceful and smooth transition from a war economy to a peace economy is possible. But in his view, neither America nor
Russia will agree to disarm unilaterally. What is, therefore, necessary, according to him, is "agreed disarmament of United States and USSR." Russell, however, wants Britain to disarm and give the world the lead in disarmament. He argues that there are several cogent reasons for British nuclear disarmament. First, he thinks that Britain has no defence against H-bombs. Secondly, Russell is of the view that the United States will not come to the aid of Britain in case Russia attacks her. On the contrary, he argues that "the U.S.S.R. will have less motive for attacking us if we are neutral than if we remain in NATO. The U.S.S.R. has not so far attacked any neutral." Thirdly, he points out that if Britain disarms herself, she could induce America and Russia more persuasively to disarm multilaterally. Russell explains these reasons in his unpublished essay, 'Should Britain Become Neutral?' (1960).

Russell regards disarmament as "a palliative and not a solution" to war. He thinks that disarmament, though profoundly important and desirable, will not be enough in itself to secure a stable peace, because whenever a war breaks out, every important Power will start manufacturing nuclear weapons. Moreover, it is possible, as Russell points out, for a Power to hide stocks of nuclear weapons. Herman Kahn also rules out total disarmament as a practical possibility. Nuclear weapons, he writes, "are relatively storable and would be simple to hide in large numbers. It is also relatively simple to put most designs back in working order."
great physicist, Prof. J. Robert-Oppenheimer, doubts the feasibility and practical possibility of inspection. "I doubt," he writes, "whether the agency entrusted with such inspection could even then have the motivation, or the personnel, or the skill, or the experience, or the knowledge, or the endurance to carry out such a dreary, sterile and policeman-like job."

Russell says that if disarmament is to be effective, it must be accompanied by a ban on nuclear tests. "It is high time," as Albert Schweitzer writes, "to realise that the question of continuing or ceasing nuclear tests is an urgent matter for international law. Mankind is imperilled by the tests. Mankind insists that they must stop, and has every right to do so."

According to Russell, the importance of abolishing nuclear tests lies in the fact that it would limit and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other Powers. Prof. Philip Noel-Baker regards the abolition of nuclear tests as "the first essential step in preventing other nations from joining in the nuclear arms race."

According to Russell, economic inequality, racial antagonism and ideological dispute are the three most important causes of war in the modern world. In his opinion, the World War I was caused by differences of economic interests and the World War II was due to the conflicts of economic interests and divergent creeds. He thinks that in the Third World War, if it ever comes, all the three causes will be involved. Russell, therefore, concludes that these causes are to be removed if war is to be prevented and peace to be secured.
Since a certain minimum of economic development and prosperity among nations is essential for a stable peace, Russell pleads for the speedy economic development of the poorer nations so that they can be brought to the level of economic prosperity with the richer nations. For the speedy economic development of the underdeveloped and undeveloped nations, he suggests certain empirical measures: (1) a policy of land reforms; (2) a certain measure of industrialization; (3) scientific and modern methods of cultivation; (4) a policy of population control; and (5) a gradual spread of education. Russell lays great stress upon population control as an important means of achieving quick economic development and, therefore, of securing peace. "... while great wars cannot be avoided," he writes, "until there is a world Government, a world Government cannot be stable until every important country has a nearly stationary population." He thinks that the high rate of population growth in underdeveloped countries can be stopped by a scientific policy of birth control.

In the opinion of Russell, there are three possible solutions to the problem of racial hatred and antagonism: (a) avoidance of geographical propinquity of racial groups; (b) a close and rigid caste system; and (c) complete racial intermixture and equality. He rejects the first solution because of its impracticability and on humanitarian grounds. He also dismisses the second one as it is "repugnant to modern ideas and in the modern world appears as a makeshift rather than a solution." Russell asserts that racial hatred and hostility can be removed only when there is a complete
equality and intermixture of races through intermarriage. John Lewis, however, doubts whether racial differences can be regarded as a main cause of war. But Arnold Toynbee views race feeling as an obstacle to the unity of mankind, and pleads for racial admixture for its removal. To quote him: "I think that race feeling is a menace to world peace and an obstacle to the unity of mankind, but I do not despair of seeing the rest of the world go the Mexican, Pakistani and Hawaiian way and become oblivious of physical and racial differences."

It is generally admitted that in the modern world ideological conflicts play a very great part in clashes between nations. Russell maintains that world peace will remain a deceiving myth so long as the ideological conflicts between Capitalism and Communism persist. He goes so far as to add: "Until the issue between communism and capitalism is decided in one way or another, world peace cannot be secure, whatever machinery may be created." He thinks that ideological fanaticism can be cured by the spread of scientific spirit, i.e., by the spread of the habit of judging everything by evidence and not accepting anything for which there is no evidence. This can be done, he points out, by a liberal system of education. According to Russell, security, prosperity and a liberal education are the three things needed to cure ideological conflicts and fanaticism.

Being an internationalist, Russell regards nationalism as "the most dangerous vice of our time," and as the greatest stumbling block to world peace. He, therefore, opines that a World
Government cannot be established and be made stable unless there is a diminution in the nationalistic feeling and a consequent growth of internationalism. In his unpublished essay, 'What is wrong with Western Civilization?' (1924), Russell writes: "To one who lives in Europe, it is natural to suppose that militarism and nationalism are the greatest evils of our time. I think it is true that they are terrible evils, and that the world cannot improve unless they diminish." To him, nationalism is a product and a development of herd instinct, a subjective principle, a passion, a sentiment and a psychological sense of belonging together. According to him, it is neither the affinity of race nor religion or language or a common historical background that constitutes a nation. He defines nation as a geographically located group of people who feel an instinctive attachment to their group. "What constitutes a nation is a sentiment," writes Russell, "and an instinct, a sentiment of similarity and an instinct of belonging to the same group or herd." His definition of nation is thus very much akin to the definition given by Ernst Renan in 1882 in a famous lecture entitled 'What is a Nation?'. Renan defines nation as "a living soul, a spiritual principle." Arnold Toynbee, the greatest historian of our time, views nationalism as "nothing material or mechanical, but a subjective, psychological feeling in living people." "Nationalism is," as Hans Kohn writes, "first and foremost a state of mind, an act of consciousness..."

"Nationalism in each nation," writes Russell, "consists partly of belief as to one's own nation's excellence, and partly of
ethical maxims supposed to follow from these beliefs. According to him, the essence of nationalism is the belief that a nation is the accredited guardian of some important universal idea. But this belief, he thinks, is a delusion, fostered by pride and self-interest. Nationalism, he points out, is often surrounded with a halo of patriotism and religious virtue. It, he thinks, often degenerates into madness and leads to a "collective insanity." In his opinion, rivalry is the essence of nationalism, and hatred is its root.

According to him, nationalism and industrialism are the two growing forces in the modern world and have two forms - one for the holders of power and the other for those who do not yet possess power and are struggling to free themselves. Capitalism and Socialism are the two forms of industrialism, and the two forms of nationalism are imperialism and the struggle for freedom or self-determination. Russell argues that all the chaos in the present-day world issues from a titanic conflict between the forces of Capitalism and Imperialism on the one hand, and Socialism and Self-determination on the other. Cobden and the Manchester School were optimistic enough, as he points out, to regard industrialism as a beneficial force in the sense that it would promote the growth of internationalism by bringing about an economic interdependence of nations. But Russell holds that industrialism, instead of mitigating in the least the evils of nationalism, has fostered and immensely strengthened the force of nationalism. To quote him: "Industrialism has encountered and unintentionally fostered a force as powerful as itself, namely, nationalism which has tended more and more to make
each nation an independent economic unit. It is through the interactions of nationalism and industrialism, even more than through the conflict of capitalism and socialism, that the world is being driven back into barbarism."

Russell thinks that nationalism is recent in origin. According to him, modern nationalism has grown up as a reaction against imperialism and foreign domination, and its origin can be traced back to the time when the French people under the Joan of Arc rose in collective resistance to the British conquest. In his opinion, it is the 18th century liberal doctrine that each nation should be free from foreign domination to pursue its own ambitions that is mainly responsible for the degeneration of nationalism into imperialism.

It must, however, be clearly understood that Russell is not opposed to the principle of nationalism as such. With J.S. Mill he is at one that no good international system can be built unless the boundaries of States coincide with those of nations. Russell always champions the cause of oppressed nations and supports their claim for self-determination. "I do not think," he says, "anybody can deny that the aspiration for freedom from alien domination is a sentiment deserving of respect..." It is not nationalism as such, but nationalism in its unlimited and aggressive form to which he is vehemently opposed. Russell distinguishes cultural aspects of nationalism from its economic and political aspects, and regards the cultural aspects as always good. He maintains that it is a wholly
rational and salutary principle that every important national group should be allowed to develop its manners, customs and traditions in its own way.

But Russell utters a note of warning that nationalistic feeling almost invariably breeds a sense of rivalry and hostility to foreigners. In practice, nationalism, he observes, often degenerates into imperialism. Russell establishes and substantiates his point of view with examples from history. Poland was, for a century and a half, under the control of Czarist Russia. But as soon as Poland became free, it embarked upon a war of conquest against Russia. France, no sooner it became free from the English domination in the 15th century, started a war of conquest against Italy. Instances can be multiplied ad infinitum. But what can be historically proved, according to him, is that nationalism always exhibits and breeds a tendency that culminates in imperialism. Russell, therefore, concludes that the claim to complete national independence on the part of every important group which happens to have the sentiment of nationality cannot be admitted as being compatible with the continued existence of human society. He thinks that the demand for self-determination by small nationalities can be met by the grant of local autonomy. In his words: "All the legitimate claims of small nationalities can be met by local autonomy; to grant more is to give way of anarchy. The rights of a nation as against humanity are no more absolute than the rights of an individual as against the community." In his opinion, the principle of nationalism should be accepted only in relation to the
internal affairs of the State. In his unpublished essay, 'Can Permanent Peace be Achieved, and How? (1953), Russell writes:
"Unfettered national independence should not be the goal. Independence should extend only to internal affairs; but external affairs should be the subject of an international authority."

Russell is always dead against colonialism and imperialism. "The main objects," he writes, "which should be served by international relations may be taken to be two: first, the avoidance of wars, and second, the prevention of the oppression of weak nations by strong ones."

In the thirties Russell condemned the British Government's imperialist and repressive policy in India in the most scathing terms, and supported India's demand for self-determination. In his Preface to *Condition of India* (1933), he wrote: "There has been no lack of interest in the misdeeds of the Nazis in Germany; they have been fully reported in the Press, and have been commented on with self-righteous indignation. Few people in England realise that misdeeds quite as serious are being perpetrated by the British in India. Large numbers of men and women, including many of the highest idealism, have been imprisoned under horrible conditions, often without any charge having been made against them and without any hope of being brought to trial.

"The elementary liberties that make life tolerable have been taken away from the inhabitants of India, for the crime of desiring self-government. ..."
During the thirties Russell was for many years the President of the India League organized by V.K. Krishna Menon, Monica Whately, Ellen Wilkinson and Leonard W. Matters. In his essay on 'England's Duty to India' (1935), Russell very explicitly supported India's demand for self-government. He wrote: "For my part, I hold that we ought to aim at complete self-government for India at the earliest moment possible without administrative chaos." In a letter, dated July 31, 1942, to the Editor of the New York Times, he strongly disapproved of the civil disobedience movement launched by Gandhi, and urged the grant of complete independence to India after the war. To quote him: "As a past president of the India League in England and a supporter for many years of the movement for Indian self-government, I feel that I should make clear my strong opposition to the present policy of Mr. Gandhi.

"I ardently desire freedom for India, and I consider that Mr. Gandhi's policy is likely to assist India's enslavement. I hope that the British Government will grant India complete independence, and not merely dominion status, when the war ends, and I should favour the immediate granting of such civil independence as is compatible with the military necessities of India and all the other threatened nations."

While supporting the cause of India's freedom, Russell wrote in his unpublished essay, 'The Future in India,' written during the Second World War: "No country's independence should be limited by some one other Power; there is no reason why Great Britain should
retain any special authority or responsibility in relation to the problems of India." In his article, 'To End the Deadlock in India' (1942), he said that India could be persuaded to cooperate with Britain in the war effort against Germany and Japan if she was promised complete independence after the war.

In 1920-21, Russell visited China and supported the efforts of the Chinese people to liberate themselves from the control of foreign Powers. In his article entitled 'British Policy in China' (1925), he cautioned the European countries against their treatment of China. In 1926 Russell protested against the firing upon unarmed crowds of Chinese students by British troops. "Since the advent of the Communists," as he writes in his Autobiography: "to power in China, the policy of the British towards that country has been somewhat more enlightened than that of the United States, but until that time the exact opposite was the case. In 1926, on three occasions, British troops fired on unarmed crowds of Chinese students, killing and wounding many. I wrote a fierce denunciation of the outrages, which was published first in England and then throughout China." In another article, 'British Folly in China' (1927), Russell protested against the British Government's policy in China. He wrote: "In all the long history of British blunders it would be difficult to parallel the present governmental policy in regard to China for immoral ineptitude." In his article, 'What is Happening in China?' (1926), Russell condemned in an unambiguous terms the oppression of the Chinese people by the British Government, and urged the British Government to adopt a more just and humane policy towards China.
Russell censures the U.S. Government's atrocious activities in Vietnam in the most condemnable terms. He supports the right of the Vietnamese people to determine their own destiny without any outside interference. He is certainly one of the very few British intellectuals to have very early realized the nature of Vietnam war. It was for the protection and preservation of imperialist interests, as he rightly points out, that the U.S. Government waged a war in Vietnam. To quote his words: "It is a war designed to protect the continued control over the wealth of the region by American capitalists."

In his message to the War Crimes Tribunal, he said that "the United States controls sixty per cent of the world's natural resources, but contains only six per cent of the world's population. For the purpose of protecting this empire, the United States capitalists have had to create a great army and military machine designed to destroy popular resistance to American economic control."

Russell very ably and nicely sums up the significance of the U.S. Government's barbarous atrocities in Vietnam in the following words: "The United States recognizes that Vietnam is not only an heroic and momentous event in the history of human affairs, but a dangerous sign for American power. It regards Vietnam in the way that Hitler regarded Spain. The Spanish revolution was capable of inspiring revolution in other European countries. The Nazis tried to crush this revolution with local fascists and also used Spain as a proving ground in which they could test inhuman weapons and experimental methods of mass murder. This is the deep significance of what the United States is doing in Vietnam." As he points out,
in many other parts of the world also, namely, in Peru, Colombia,
Venezuela and Bolivia, the U.S. Government is carrying out its policy
of inhuman torture and ruthless aggression. To him, Vietnam war
appears as "part of an historical development through which exploited
and hungry peoples are establishing their claim to the basic
necessities of human life." "The great meaning of Vietnam war," he writes, "is that the world revolution is continuous and the
counter-revolution is barbarous."

In 1966, Russell set up the International War Crimes Tribunal
to investigate the crimes committed in Vietnam in order to rouse
man's conscience and to create public resistance all over the world
against the U.S. Government's atrocities. Such eminent men like
Jean-Paul Sartre Issac Deutscher and Vladimir Dedijer were members
of the Tribunal. The Tribunal was founded by him in order to make
mankind aware of the terrible crimes perpetrated by the U.S. Government
in Vietnam, and "to unite humanity on the side of justice in
Vietnam." In his opening statement to the first session of the
Tribunal, he said: "We investigate in order to expose. We document in
order to indict. We arouse consciousness in order to create mass
resistance." Russell's activities in relation to the war in
Vietnam and the setting up of the War Crimes Tribunal were ridiculed
by the Western Conservative newspapers. He was even accused in a
New York Times Editorial for "an unthinking receptivity to the most
transparent Communist propaganda." He was accused by Time magazine
with 'obsessive' anti-Americanism. In a long obituary, The Times
commented that his public undertakings "became increasingly bizarre,"
and "obscured in his final years the extraordinary achievements of his long life; his influence on philosophy and, something the general public had better reason to remember, his genius as a popularizer of unfamiliar or difficult ideas." Sidney Hook very poignantly criticizes Russell's War Crimes Tribunal. The Tribunal was banned from meeting in England and France. It is interesting to note that even the Communist countries did not react favourably to the War Crimes Tribunal.

According to one critic, Russell's War Crimes in Vietnam is "violently partisan and shrill." The critic argues that the weakest part of the book lies in the absence of documented proof of alleged atrocities. Another critic writes: "Unfortunately his book (War Crimes in Vietnam) will do the cause little good. His trouble, like President Johnson's, is the credibility gap. He tells of horrors: some we all know are happening, and others we may suspect. But many of his charges are undocumented." The charge of his critics is unfair. In reply to his critics, Russell writes: "If anyone cares to study this book, however, I think that they will find it well documented. If I occasionally make a statement without giving the basis of it, I usually do so because I regard it as self-evident or based upon facts noted elsewhere in the book or so well known that there is no need to name the source."

In spite of adverse criticisms showered upon Russell, we think that the International War Crimes Tribunal has done a very commendable job in bringing to general awareness and in exposing the monstr-
character of the U.S. Government's atrocities in Vietnam. We think that anyone who reads the Pentagon Papers (1971), the proceedings of the War Crimes Tribunal and Noam Chomsky's book, At War with Asia (1971) will be easily convinced about the justifiability and practical significance of the Russell International War Crimes Tribunal. As Chomsky rightly points out, "The record of the Tribunal stands as an eloquent and dramatic appeal to renounce the crime of silence." Prof. John G. Slater writes: "What appraisal are we to make of his work against nuclear war and the war in Vietnam? I think it is incontestable that his efforts helped make both issues much more public. He provided large groups of people with a set of values for which to agitate." David Horowitz's comment is here worth quoting: "History has already vindicated the public acts of Lord Russell's last years: the historical record will show that the War Crimes Tribunal - the climax of what began as a lonely crusade - correctly characterised and identified a war of atrocity, a war conducted to maintain imperial dominance in Southeast Asia, a war representing the archetypal conflict of the age and the chief threat to mankind's future survival."

Russell, as we have seen, thinks that a World Government cannot truly become a reality and will remain a delusive hope without the growth of internationalism and a diminution in the feeling of nationalism. He opines that it is through a liberal system of education that the evils of nationalism can be checked and the growth of internationalism can be stimulated. In Principles of Social Reconstruction (1916), and in The Prospects of Industrial Civilization...
(1923), there is a chapter on education in which he diagnoses at length the defects of the modern system of education. Education, he thinks, is viewed in the modern world as a political institution to acquire power by a group over some other group, and has a political motive. "Almost all education," he writes, "has a political motive: it aims at strengthening some group, national or religious or even social, in the competition with other groups. It is this motive, in the main, which determines the subjects taught, the knowledge offered, and also decides what the mental habits the pupils are expected to acquire."

In his view, education is now-a-days used to promote national ends and to instil national pride. According to him, it is conducted in such a way as to teach the young certain faiths and beliefs, and to indoctrinate them in certain ideology and creed in order to promote their efficiency in fighting. He further points out that education today is used as a machinery to protect the status quo and to prevent fundamental changes. Instead of stimulating and encouraging the habit of free thought and inquiry, it is calculated, as Russell opines, to cramp the free and unhindered growth of mind and to impress upon the plastic and impressionable minds of the young the importance of conformity to a certain glib and dead level of thought and conduct. New ideas and thoughts are discouraged, because it is feared that they would lead to the disruption of old beliefs, faiths, privileges and institutions. Education, according to him, has become too much authoritarian, utilitarian and conservative, and lays too much stress upon authority
and obedience. Education has become wholly destitute of joy and pleasure in life, as the young are compelled to cramp their text-books in order to pass examinations and to achieve worldly success. The characteristics of the modern system of education have been summed up thus: "obedience and discipline, ruthlessness in the struggle for worldly success, contempt towards opposing groups, and an unquestioning credulity, a passive acceptance of the teacher's wisdom."

Russell thinks that education should promote reverence, justice and boldness in thought and action, instead of credulity, authority and too much discipline; and that it should stimulate constructive doubts and impulses, and love of mental joy and adventure. It should, as Russell maintains, foster free outlook, intellectual honesty, tolerance, broad-mindedness, the love of truth and the desire for knowledge. Education, he urges, should teach us not acquiescence or submission and to take anything for granted, but to doubt and judge everything. In other words, it should stimulate and inculcate in us the habit of a sceptical outlook and critical judgement.

Russell, as we have noted earlier, very strongly expresses himself against a State-controlled educational system. According to him, State education produces certain vices such as "nationalism, glorification of competition and success, worship of mechanism, love of uniformity and contempt for individuality." He points out that education under the control of the Church is also equally harmful.
It, he says, produces such vices as belief in nonsense and submission to authority. He is of the view that if education is placed under the control of the State or the Church, it will be used for catering to its ends. Russell holds that "the control of the super-State over education would be a positive safeguard against war."

Russell urges that it is especially the teaching of history that is to be radically changed if the growth of internationalism is to be stimulated and the possibility of war to be eliminated. Facts of history, he thinks, are distorted in each and every country to make the young believe that all that is good and virtuous belongs to their own country, and that all other nations are monstrously wicked and vicious. In his opinion, it is narrow, sectarian and bigoted history that is taught in schools and colleges. The purpose, he says, is to fill the minds of the young with a contempt towards foreigners. Russell writes: "Every country teaches history in a manner which inclines the young to think that their own side is sure of victory, and therefore to increase the proneness to war, which almost always in any case exceeds what is rational."

Russell asserts that in order to promote internationalism and to diminish the virulence of nationalism history should be taught in such a way as to make the young realize the importance of world-wide co-operation, harmony and peaceful co-existence. He puts forth certain practical measures to achieve these ends. First, books that are used in teaching history should be free from
nationalistic bias and falsehoods, and should be written by men who are imbued with a sense of internationalism, and must be sanctioned and certified as free from militant, chauvinistic and pedantic nationalism by an International Commission composed of men of learning and international outlook. In other words, history should be taught from an international point of view, from the point of view of mankind as a whole. Joad emphasizes the importance of teaching history from an international standpoint when he writes that "history should be studied not from one but from a number of national angles." H.G. Wells also points to the evils of nationalistic teaching of history. He argues that if world peace is to be made a reality, history should be taught in a different way. According to him, it is the history or the story of evolution and growth of human society, and man's increasing attainment of power and freedom that should be taught in history teaching.

Secondly, Russell points out that history in one country should be taught not by men of that country, but by men from other country. He writes: "History should be taught not only from the point of view of one's own country, but also from that of foreigners. If history were taught by Frenchmen in England, and by Englishmen in France, there would be no disagreements between the two countries, because each would understand the other's point of view."

Thirdly, Russell pleads for the establishment of an International University where teachers and students from all parts
of the world should be invited to teach and study. This will, he
thinks, afford them an opportunity for mutual exchange of thoughts
and ideas, and will thereby enable them to cultivate a sense of
internationalism and fellow-feeling and to overcome the narrow sense
of nationalism. The International University, according to him,
should be located in some neutral territory and committed to serve
two purposes, one the purely academic, and the other that of
creating and diffusing an outlook designed to prevent war and to
promote, loyalty or allegiance to international ideals. It will be
financed, in his opinion, by the International Authority and should
be open to teachers and students of all races, religions and
political opinions except those who do not subscribe to the ideas
of an International Government.

Fourthly, Russell suggests free trade among nations,
complete freedom of travel throughout all parts of the world, and
advocates "a very widely diffused teaching of sound economics" by
which he means the economics which lays greater stress on the
importance of co-operation than on competition in the progress of
mankind. He, in other words, advocates internationalism in the
economic sphere. Green stresses freedom of intercourse between
members of one State and those of another, and particularly freedom
of trade between nations as a step towards world unity. And
lastly, Russell says that there should be a greater diffusion and
a much wider knowledge of international affairs.

Last but not the least, Russell maintains that war can be
prevented from happening if there is a strong and passionate desire for peace. He believes that if there is the desire for peace, the economic and political forces that make for war can be curbed. In his unpublished essay, 'How to secure world-peace' (written about 1924), Russell writes: "It will not be possible to create the atmosphere for world peace until there is a widespread conviction that no issue is so important as the avoidance of war, ..." War, he says, cannot be eliminated until men realize the magnitude of the common danger that war poses and that war is physically or morally of no value. But Russell opines that war cannot be prevented by reason alone. War, according to him, is difficult to suppress because it springs from impulses. Russell, therefore, says: "It is the life of impulse that needs to be changed, not only the life of conscious thought." But he thinks that a great many of the impulses, such as the impulse to self-assertion and the love of rivalry and adventure, that lead nations to go to war are in themselves desirable for the growth and progress of society. Russell thus suggests that the State should provide opportunities and outlets for the satisfaction of the war impulses in practices and occupations that do not lead to war and violence.

Russell envisages three kinds of conflict, namely, conflict of man with nature, conflict of man with man and conflict of man with himself. According to him, it is war within that is always the source of war without. He, therefore, concludes that a world without war cannot be brought about unless men achieve harmony within, and cease to regard others as enemies to be vanquished.
With Aldous Huxley and other pacifists Russell thus discovers the real obstacles to world peace in individual souls. He writes that "the source of the trouble lies in the minds of men and not in any non-mental facts." Russell argues that the evils from which a man suffers today are mostly the creations of his own folly. "Modern man," he writes, "is a master of his own fate. What he suffers, he suffers because he is stupid or wicked, not because it is nature's decree." Whether there will be a world without war, or human life will perish in a war thus depends, in his opinion, upon man's ability to get rid of his own selfishness and stupidity.

Russell thinks that since war is rooted in such crude human passions as greed, envy, fear and pride, it can be cured only when men cleanse their hearts of these evil passions and learn love, sympathy and co-operation. He writes: "To stop war, we must not only work on Governments; we must cleanse our own hearts of the poisons that make war seem reasonable: pride, fear, greed, envy, and contempt." Russell thus finds in the moral regeneration of man the only ultimate cure of war. In his view, no material change will be an adequate and sufficient guarantee of man's continued existence on this planet unless there is a fundamental change in his outlook and morality. According to him, it is "Christian love and compassion" that man must learn for his survival. To quote his words: "... we have reached a moment in human history in which, for the first time, the mere continued existence of the human race has come to depend upon the extent to which human beings can learn to be swayed by ethical considerations."
Russell, as Robert E. Egner very correctly observes, consistently pleads for more benevolence in ethics and politics. Man, he thinks, suffers because his moral progress lags behind his technological progress.

Immanuel Kant in the early part of the eighteenth century pleaded for the moral development of man for the establishment of peace. "Politics in the real sense," in his words, "cannot take a step forward without first applying homage to the principle of morals." Aldous Huxley also lays stress upon man's moral development as the only ultimate cure of war. "Wherever we turn," he writes, "we find that the real obstacles to peace are human will and feeling, human convictions, prejudices, opinions. If we want to get rid of war we must get rid first of all its psychological causes." The U.N.E.S.C.O. declares that it is only man's moral and intellectual development that can secure peace and prevent war. The Preamble to the Constitution of the U.N.E.S.C.O. thus writes almost in Russellian terms that "since wars begin in the minds of men it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed and that everlasting peace must be founded upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind."

By laying stress on the moral progress of man as the ultimate cure of war, Russell centers the question of war and peace upon the feelings of atomic or alienated individuals and approaches the problem of peace from an idealist standpoint. Though Russell recognizes the importance of material and objective factors behind
war and for securing peace, his position on the question of war and peace is primarily psychological and subjective. "What I most wish to emphasize," he writes, "is that the obstacles to universal happiness in the present day are, at bottom, psychological, not physical, ..." His psychological approach is clearly manifest in his assertion that the root of all evil is man, and that the ultimate cause of war lies in the minds of men. However, it may be pointed out that Russell's conception of war and peace is not merely negative and static. On the contrary, it is very much positive and dynamic. Russell's pacifism does not aim at a mere cessation of hostilities. The peace that the world needs, according to him, is not a mere cessation of conflict between States, but a richer and fuller and more abundant life that would be possible only when war is abolished.

H.G. Wells, a great contemporary of Russell, distinguishes between two different Schools of pacifism, one is the International School and the other the Cosmopolitan School. The International School, as he says, views nations and States as very permanent and real entities, and seeks world peace through treaties and alliances. In other words, it approaches the question of world peace from the standpoint of nations. But the Cosmopolitan School, as Wells points out, does not think in terms of nations or States, and views the problem from the standpoint of the entire human race and mankind as a whole. "It does not," to quote his words, "seek world peace as an arrangement between states, but as a greater human solidarity over-riding states." Like Wells, Russell is no doubt a high priest in the sacred temple of the Cosmopolitan School of pacifism; for his pacifism is deeply and emotionally rooted in his humanism.