CHAPTER V

RUSSELL'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY

SOCIETY AND MORALITY
SOCIETY AND MORALITY

Man is not merely an individual being but a social being so much so that he cannot help living in a society if he really wishes to keep to a civilized way of life which is totally alien to the other non-human beings despite the fact that they, too, have their own herd and flock as the cases may be. What is more, the question of 'good' and 'bad', 'right' and 'wrong' and any other ethical concepts can never be conceived of unless men's actions and behaviours are viewed from social standpoints. So long as a man remains a sane member of the human society, his actions and behaviours are expected to virtually conform to such a set of norms as to promote individual and general happiness through peaceful and enlightened human relation.

No one can deny that the concept of society is totally impossible if man's role as its constituent part is not taken into account. So, the first and foremost obligation of a man is to make the society an ideal institution where rational and intellectual judgement can aptly handle the rein to control the unbounded and irrational greed for gross materialism and the ignorant but overwhelming tendency to submit to the false beliefs and bestial spirits discerned by some predatory people. It may be suggested that everyone should strive for healthy growth of human intelligence and moral handling of socio-political, economic, religious and academic perspectives of life. Again, another point to take note of is that each individual being is gifted with certain amount of inner potential to do something for his own life and the society as well. So, he inevitably needs a wholesome social situation for boosting his calibre, and also realizing his mundane aspirations through a rational way. Unless such social aspects as mentioned above are made free from
evil motivation, prejudices, dogmas and other false beliefs that lead to the undesired effects of immorality and irrationality, they invariably cause tremendous harm to the entire set-up of the human society. Therefore, moral qualities like freedom, justice, compassion, benevolence, sympathy, fellow-feeling and many others are being recognized as the basic norms to regulate the different aspects of social life as mentioned above in order that a sound social situation can be entrenched for meaningful living. That is why we have, here, proposed to make an analytical study of what sort of moral views Bertrand Russell used to profess throughout his life to get his most desired world in reality for the peaceful progress of the human race. His moral views on the following aspects of life in relation to society have been supposed to be adequate enough to open an avenue through which one may easily roam in the world which is expected to be regulated by his sense of social morality.

**Russell's Views on Freedom:**

Desire for freedom is deeply rooted in all living beings. Both the living creatures and plants need a free atmosphere in which nothing is expected to stand in their way of natural growth, physically as well as mentally. The term freedom bears somewhat different meaning in the human world as men are being guided not only instinctively but also rationally. As the progress of civilization depends upon the behaviours and actions of men, what sort of freedom is actually desired for the moral progress is to be considered here in view of our attempt to make an analysis of Russell's moral philosophy as he devoted his whole attention to the perennial good of mankind. Men must follow certain rules framed by the society in which they live. That is why Rousseau says that man is born free, but everywhere in chain. Moral rules and codes should be universal in the sense that every human being is a member of universal human society. Unless there is a certain set of restrictions on the behaviours of man, society will consequently turn into chaos. Now, question arises as to where the necessity of freedom actually lies.
Since the beginning of the organized society, certain restrictions have been imposed on the conducted behaviour of men with the purpose of achieving 'good' for the society as a whole. These restrictions are not always and everywhere the same; they may vary from one society to another. If the general good be the chief purpose of such restrictions on human conduct and behaviour, the ethical rules become, no doubt, very important. Here, freedom means, according to Russell, the right of men to think rationally and scientifically how far human behaviours, ethical laws, social restrictions, traditional customs and any kind of imposition on men's thinking and acting are based on truth and reason and how far they are conducive to the expected general 'good' of humanity. Freedom may be divided into different categories, but the inner essence of freedom, whatever category it may be, implies the right to assert one's views if they are really rational, truthful and humanistic. The need of freedom in its broader sense is well elaborated in the following words of Lord Russell:

"In the modern world, the principle of growth in most men and women is hampered by institutions inherited from a simple age. By the progress of thought and knowledge, and by the increase in command over the forces of the physical world, new possibilities of growth have come into existence, and have given rise to new claims which must be satisfied if those who make them are not to be thwarted." ¹

Human beings are extremely selfish in the sense that they think of their own survival at the cost of, if need be, other living beings and plants. For this purpose, they do not hesitate to be fiendish towards other animals and plants in the name of perpetuating their civilization. In the like manner, there are some people who want to have their views and judgements persistently powerful and influential on the minds of the rest although it becomes evident that such views and judgement are not at all based on any sense of rationality or scientific truth.

Russell never supports the mental trend that one powerful community should keep the weaker under suppression; rather he vehemently opposes it. Russell thinks that this type of motive of the powerful does not bring forth any good to the general population. The motive of the powerful for enjoying all advantages over the weaker may be said to be at the root of the social evils such as cruelty, ignorance, persecution, war, homicide and others. Here our main concern is to deal with how Russell elaborates the evils that hamper the pure freedom of man required for achieving universal good of mankind at large and a healthy human society enriched in moral values.

Russell stresses the point that freedom is needed to do what is good for man. It is a "requisite for many kinds of good things, but good things have to come from the impulses, desires and beliefs of those who enjoy the freedom".² So, Russell supports that men should have freedom of discussing the matters mostly related to the welfare of mankind in the scientific and rationalistic light. If it is curbed, usually by those who hold power, the result, almost inevitably, is to promote injustice and oppression. Lord Russell in his essay Freedom and the Philosophy states that "injustice and oppression imposed by a dominant caste leads sooner or later to violent revolution and that violent revolution is apt to issue either in anarchy or in a new tyranny worse than that which has been overthrown."³.

Observation may make us aware of the fact that one cannot enjoy the fruits of true liberty if one does not show proper respect for the liberty of others. Mutual respect among the members of the society, for doing something good, is a very essential social condition for the healthy progress of the society concerned. Generally, envy and love of power, as Russell suggests, cause ordinary human beings to interfere with lives and actions of others in order to enjoy a kind of non-human pleasure. When the desires and actions of some people are checked by some external authority, the world turns into an unhappy place for those people. That is, the

². Fact and Fiction. op.cit., p. 50.
world is not an equally free world for all people at the same time. The strong oppress the weak or the majority oppress the minority, or the love of violence oppresses the peace-loving people. The love of power of any form may be innate in an ambitious man. If nobody were allowed to enjoy such power, the desire to tyrannise would be much less than it is at present. Again, if the dominating attitude of the power-loving people be annihilated very soon, a situation of discontent for the oppressed will continue to prevail to the worst effect. Russell views that threats and terrorism must be prevented from occurring for the next time, otherwise cruelty will be rife in the relation of men with men. Russell says: "every use of the power of the state needs, therefore, to be very closely scrutinised, and every possibility of diminishing its power is to be welcomed provided its does not lead to a reign of private tyranny." 4

From the above words, it can easily be understood how much Russell was obsessed by the power-loving tendency of common men under their control. Such tendency of domination, as we have mentioned above, has various facts such as political, economic, religious, ethical, cultural, racial and so forth. In every sphere of life freedom is considered most essential to do something novel but useful for the good of general life. It is only through freedom that the proper growth and development of the inherent talent of a man for doing anything good may come to light, and thus be used for the benefit of the society. Though Russell is an earnest supporter of freedom, he also opposes the granting of it by the recognized authority to anyone whose action may harm the interest of the humanity. No freedom is to be granted for irrational passions, evil deeds, inhuman and immoral behaviours.

In the essay *The Future of Mankind* Russell states:

"I have spoken of liberty as a good, but it is not an absolute good. We all recognize the need to restrain murderers, and it is even more important to restrain murderous states. Liberty must be limited by law, and its most valuable forms can only exist within a framework of law." 5

---


Here, of course, Russell suggests that 'the law' must be framed for the interest of mankind. Like murder, any other social evils are there which need to be prevented form occurring through rational and sane endeavours. Russell is ready to condemn those who want to oppose freedom whether in the political or in the intellectual sphere. He thinks that such men are always dominated by apprehension of the evil consequences that may result from the unbridled human passion. Those people are really dangerous for the society. On the other hand, Russell views that evil passions must be curbed in order to keep the world free from the consequences of such passions. If such passions grow in the minds of the authoritarians, the society must collapse sooner or later. On these grounds Russell is opposed to granting freedom to some inhuman passions so that they do not get any scope to cause any injury to the general health of the society.

For those people who earn their livelihood at the mercy of some great organized forces or power-groups freedom of thought do not appear to be easy. They do not raise any voice of protest against injustice that is committed to them in fear of losing the source of living. This is indeed not an ideal way of living, rather a morose condition. But in a civilized society, whatever be the political system, a sane citizen should have the freedom to think creatively and point out what is good and what is bad in the proper intellectual and rational light. So he says:

"The teachers, like the artist, the philosopher and the man of letters can only perform his duty adequately if he feels himself to be the individual directed by an inner creative impulse, not dominated and fettered by an outside authority." 6

The cases of Socrates and Galileo may be referred to in regard to this point quite aptly. If the universal human society is to gain the benefit to be derived from the best brains and minds, they must be given the proper scope and liberty for the undeterred expression of their calibre.

Russell also voices for religious freedom, free press, free speech, freedom from dogmas and superstitions and many other forms of suppression that he comes to know during his long life-span. He never supports the passions that give rise to false beliefs such as pride in nationality, race, sex, class and creed. Pride in these matters are always prone to keep other's nationality, race, sex, class or creed in suppression. This ultimately generates a sense of antagonism among the people who follow the above matters in different ways and interpretations. Such prides are to be considered 'sin' as they divide the people into different groups by breaking the chain of unity into pieces. He also voices for the freedom of women from male domination which makes the relation between husband and wife very impure and narrow, that is, the relation of marriage becomes one of master and slave, instead of one between equal partners. In the "Wimbledon by-election of 1907", Bertrand Russell as a contestant campaigned widely in support of Women's suffrage, though he lost the election. His view on the freedom of women from male domination is well reflected in the essay The Status of Women where he writes that teaching men and women to love equality and liberty is "the beginning of all reform in personal relations; and until this is done people will continue to degrade and depress those with whom their lives are passed."  

It is commonly inferred that opposition to academic freedom is most likely to degrade the society to the level of grave backwardness. It should not be thwarted by war, and affected by any other evil temptation and action. If the academic freedom is not permissible for all, men of merit and talent do not get the proper scope to give full expression to "their beliefs and hopes for mankind, whether they be shared by many or by few or none. New hopes, new beliefs, and new thoughts are at all times necessary to mankind, it is not out of dead uniformity that they can be expected to arise".  

Thus, one may feel privileged to pass a judgement by pursuing the views of Lord Russell on freedom that it should be rational, creative and humanistic in its essence rather than licentious, persecutive, atrocious, sadistic, vindictive, dominating and above all negative. Freedom should not be subject to law; on the contrary, freedom is needed to frame law that may be acceptable to the whole community, not to favour the privileged who are comparatively few in number in that community itself.

Lord Russell, with regard to political freedom, passes his view that modern age is much more liberal than the ancient ages. "Liberty", the watchword of the French Revolution, has taught the human race, all over the globe, the lesson on the importance of political liberty which consists in man's spontaneous longing for becoming free from even the slightest trace of political domination of any powerful group or political ideology. But Russell is very contemplative as to how such freedom is to be achieved. He rather prefers the way of arguments to violent war through which the oppressed may strive for such political freedom to enjoy unhampered exercise of all their political rights as citizens.

As regards the economic freedom, Russell is of the view that the poor and the down-trodden should try to be free from the chains of the exploitation in order that they may live at least with the minimum dignity of life. The privileged are found to regularly show humility and neglect towards the working class people who are, no doubt, pitifully in an inferior economic position of living. It is Russell who wants to say that economic deprivation is not so unjust as the humiliating neglect and hatred shown to the lives of the depressed class. So he pleads that honesty and self-respect are not to be judged on the scale of economic position. Innumerable people are there who are earning their livelihood by hard working without doing
anything harmful to the society. He says in the essay *Eminent Men I Have Known*:

"In actual fact, I have quite as often impressed by men and women of no eminence, what I have found most unforgettable is a certain kind of moral quality, a quality of self forgetfulness whether in private life, in public affairs, or in the pursuit of truth, I had at one time a gardener who could neither read nor write, but was a perfect type of simple goodness, such as Tolstoy loved to depict among peasants." 9

But this does not mean that one should remain economically oppressed to live a life of honesty, goodness and other moral virtues. Economic freedom means that people should get the required necessaries as demanded by their needs for leading a secure economic life with all the moral virtues.

What Russell thinks about the future of liberty is also to be brought into purview of our discussion about his concept of freedom in relation to the moral progress of society. Liberty will survive if people give up the habit of indoctrinating the young with mutual hatreds and with the belief that pursuit of the traditional dogmas without any scientific enquiry of them should be the justified way of living and also the belief that one may earn proper superiority by dominating others forcefully and unjustly. It is also worth mentioning that social liberty cannot be expected to exist for long provided the people do not cut off their attachment to the dogmatic certainty of various issues related to life and society. Russell's point is that man should be rational in their thoughts and actions; then only, future of liberty may be envisaged as bright. He says:

"If liberty is to survive in the world and if mankind is not to perish in futile suicide, it will be necessary to learn to act like our rational man at the fork in the road, and not like the devotee of geographical dogma".10

---


He also professes that mere scientific analysis of the social and natural events are not sufficient to keep up liberty, side by side it is also necessary to educate the people about the importance of freedom to have the proper fructification of different norms and ideals related to ethics, politics, economics, cultures and others which are supposed to bring in happiness to life in general. Men must be made conscious of the values which can benefit them provided such values are not differed and misinterpreted by the dominating forces in different spheres of life. Russell has his robust hope that people of posteriority will always fight for freedom to achieve the general goodness of life by virtue of it.

**Morality and Politics:**

In the present context, man cannot live without politics inasmuch as politics is the guiding force as to how a modern state is to be governed. As politics is the part of life today, on what sort of moral sense politics should be based is to be essentially dealt with in the light of moral philosophy. So, here our main concern is how Russell wants to determine the role of politics in the light of his moral philosophy and what it should do for the progress of mankind under political system. It is a fact that human beings constitute the nation, and a nation is controlled and conducted by the rein of politics. That is why it becomes evident that a nation requires a just and efficient government for the common good and progress of all the members that belong to it. In other word, it can easily be assumed that under that political system which is shorn of honesty, ethical values and humanitarian motives, no nation can be expected to march ahead through the path of true social progress; social life under such system will never turn out to be happy and dignified. The question of social honesty and justice is closely associated with what is known as political morality of a nation. The widely professed "World Government" of Lord Russell cannot be expected to bear any effective significance if its basic principles are not founded on political honesty supported by humanitarian morality either.
Russell himself was the epitome of protests against political domination of the strong nations over the weaker ones, misuse of democratic values, suppression of men's right to speech, political atrocity of any form and, above all, war. He holds the view that these evils are not found in the system of Guild Socialism which he calls the best political system for people's progress in all the dimensions of socio-political life. He also simultaneously, voices for a sound International Relation among the existing nations which is wanted to be enriched with the sense of universal brotherhood and rational arbitration. He stresses the point that all the countries should strive for an unshakable International politics for universal benefit and keep watch so that this type of politics does not get affected by the lop-sided, defective and immoral attitude of any nation. In this context he sharply points out that sound International relation is, in no way, possible unless the nations of the world adopt some common programmes to serve their common purpose "which seem more important politically''.

In addition to that, a sound International relation also needs an international law to actuate such global situation. Framing of such a law, according to Russell, is not easy and simple. Nevertheless, he hopes that such law will prevail very soon at the initiative of the true lovers of mankind. He says:

"There is hope that law, rather than private force, may come to govern the relations of nations within the present country. If this hope is not realized we face utter disaster; if it is realized, the world will be better than at any previous period in the history of man." 12

Russell maintains that political relations among the nations based on wholly wrong ideals are very bad indications of unrest and uncertainty for the nations of the world. This type of political hostility may ultimately lead to war between two nations if it is allowed to persist for long. His grave concern is that the world must be rescued from the pit of wrong political ideals If it is not done, faulty and

12. *Unpopular Essays*, op.cit., p. 55
deformed political relation will turn into a "source of suffering, devastation and sin" for the subsequent generations of the human race. Therefore, the political ideals of all the countries are to be made in such a way that people may live peacefully without showing mutual enmity and hatred. For this purpose, politicians of all the nations are required to give priority to the constructive views and common interests of the diverse people who compose the world. Thus, politics should aim at adjusting the relation of pragmatic desire for domination of the power-hungry rulers. According to Russell, no political system should violate the basic principle of not doing harm and injustice to any section of the world population. All people should fully realize the worthlessness of the 'good' that is intended to acquire by force and injustice. Force may be effective in acquiring material goods, but impotent so far as moral good is concerned. If any political system be guided by such force, that system is sure to breed "competition, envy, domination, cruelty and almost all the moral evils that infest the world." He is not going to mean that material goods are not at all necessary; he is only opposed to a political system in which the powerful and privileged are given the full scope to enjoy unbounded material happiness at the cost of moral virtues. So he comments:

"Political and social institutions are to be judged by the good or harm that they do to individuals. Do they encourage creativeness rather than possessiveness? Do they embody or promote a spirit of reverence between human beings? Do they preserve self-respect?"

Russell also holds the view that politics suggests a government, and the essence of the government is to remove all kinds of evils by using force, if need be, for the benefit of the masses. The use of force, of course, is to be supported by law which is oriented to the protection of the people from any anti-human behaviours.

14. Ibid, op.cit, p. 11
15. Ibid; p. 13.
and actions. For example, legal prohibition of murder is supposed to diminish the total amount of violence in the world. Any attempt to do violence to others must be restrained forcefully by the government concerned. Russell observes that "although individuals and societies should have the utmost freedom as regards their own affairs, they ought not to have complete freedom as regards their dealing with others. To give freedom to the strong to oppress the weak is not the way to secure the greatest possible amount of freedom in the world." 16

Russell also favours World Government on the chief argument that, if suitably constituted, it can prevent all types of violent activities like wars. He himself witnessed the sorry state of the world politics leading to two great Wars during the first half of the twentieth century. He regrets that such a deplorable state of international politics prevails "owing to the fact that no international government exists". 17 In his work Has Man a Future he has given expression to his view that it is technically possible to establish the World Government "which would be able to exert its power everywhere and make armed-resistance virtually impossible." 18

Political institutions have also a great role to play in making the people morally honest and virtuous. Good political institutions may weaken the impulse toward force and domination in two ways. Russell says that such institutions first may increase the opportunities for the creative impulses and second, by diminishing the outlets for the possessive instincts. The more men learn to live creatively rather than possessively, the less their wishes will lead them to thwart others in their liberty. So Russell voices that power should not concentrate on a particular group for a long period, because "the diffusion of power, both in the political and economic spheres, instead of its concentration in the hands of officials and captains of

17. Ibid. p. 20.
industry, would greatly diminish the opportunities for acquiring the habit of command, out of which the desire for exercising tyranny is apt to spring." 19

So far as democracy is concerned, Russell emphasises that tolerance is absolutely essential for the success of democracy. If the people of one nation cannot tolerate the political principles of other nation, every difference of opinion may, in the long run, lead to war or any kind of national enmity. Democracy requires both the individual initiative and the submissive attitude on the part of the minority to the majority. The man who has strong political convictions should argue for them and do what he can to make them the convictions of the majority, but if the majority proves adverse, he should submit with a good grace. 20 He also suggests that no fanatical belief that causes harm to the society is allowed to work in a democratic system as it plays a divisive role among the people. On the other hand, people should have the sufficient knowledge of their rights in society, then only, true democracy is possible to persist for the socio-political progress of man. He also maintains that democracy is futile if men's mind cannot be made free from the fear of domination. Similarly, War-mongering may taint the notion of democracy since the democratic nations are always expected to settle any political disputes through discussion. Political problems are created by men, not by nature, Therefore such problems may also be solved by the rational and humanitarian understanding of men, and it is a very important aspect of what is known as political morality. Unless and until the belligerent attitude of the strong towards the weaker is wiped out, political atmosphere of no nation can remain stable. It is also true that an unstable political system is, in no way, conducive to the progress of the society either materially or morally. On these grounds, Russell, throughout his life, stresses that no nation can achieve peace and prosperity if the political activities are not carried out with a profound sense of morality. Russell hopes that such humanitarian zeals in political activities are only practicable in Guild Socialism that he advocates to be the best Political system.

Russell also rightly observes that what he means by political morality is hardly found in capitalism which he condemns on several grounds. His first objection to capitalism is that it promotes war among the nations. It also nurtures the sense of pugnacity in the minds of those powerful people who want to command others all the time. As regards the political activities of capitalism with which he was well familiar, it may be said that all such activities are designed to serve the purpose of the Capitalist class at the cost of the working people. He says: "So long as capitalist society persists, an undue measure of power will be in the hands of those who have acquired wealth and influence through a great position in industry and finance." 21

As we have mentioned above, it is Guild Socialism which Russell earnestly advocates as he thinks that the spirit of creating rather than possessing is the chief motto of the people that live under such system. He also hopes that political life may comparatively be happy in the system of Guild Socialism as the men are likely to be guided by such a spirit of creativeness. Referring to the spirit of creativeness Russell comments:

"This is the way of life recommended in the Gospels, and by all the great teachers of the world. Those who have found it are freed from the tyranny of fear, since what they value most in their lives is not at the mercy of outside power. If all men could summon up the courage and the vision to live in this way in spite of obstacles and discouragement, there would be no need for the regeneration of the world to begin by political and economic reform: all that is needed in the way of reform would become automatically, without resistance, owing to the moral regeneration of individuals." 22

Russell further stresses the point of democratic equality, that is, in democracy he maintains all members should have the scope of enjoying political and

22. Ibid., pp 139-140.
economic rights equally. No man of conscience agrees to the system in which few should enjoy all the good things while the many are deprived wretchedly. If this type of political order is allowed to continue, the oppressed are bound to revolt against injustice and equality. Without the sense of self-respect, the politically oppressed people cannot secure their rights in the society. Only by virtue of self-respect, a man can remain undominated by those who are in power. So Russell maintains:

"If a man has not this quality, he will feel that majority opinion, or governmental opinion, is to be treated as infallible, and such a way of feeling, if it is general, makes both moral and intellectual progress impossible".23

The question of political morality cannot be isolated from the question of the importance of science and art, human relations and the joy of life. He professes the view that the soundness of a political system needs to be judged by the effects of such matters of social life of any country. Russell voices for socialism as the best political system because the above matters of life are more valued and justified under this system. The question of political morality becomes very clear and vivid from the feelings of Lord Russell which are well reflected in the following words:

"The world is a long way from realizing these conditions and therefore we must expect vast upheavals and appalling suffering before stability is attained. But, while upheavals and suffering have hitherto been the lot of man, we can now see, however dimly and uncertainly, a possible future culmination in which poverty and war will have been overcome, and fear where it survives, will have become pathological. The road, I fear, is long, but that is no reason for losing right of the ultimate hope."24

Morality and Economic Affairs:

Bertrand Russell, though not a great theorist of economics, gives vent to his own views on what sort of morality is to be followed in relation to economic affairs of a state in his various writings just as he deals with his own sense of political morality to have a happy world for mankind where everybody is expected to live in keeping with all human values and virtues. It is, of course, evident that he is not so extensively involved in elaborating this particular factor of social living as he is in other social factors like religion, education, international relation, world peace and others. Whatever he has to say of different economic systems like Capitalism, Socialism, Syndicalism, Guild Socialism etc. is aptly reflected in his distinguished work *Roads to Freedom*, though not in comprehensive analysis.

Russell is of the view that the present world is largely infested by the evils like injustice, cruelty, war-mongering, economic domination etc. which are supposed to be the result of faulty economic system almost in all the countries excepting a very few. In his own country England, Russell witnessed the defects of the economic system where a rift between the powerful and the working class noticeably prevailed. He says:

"The present economic system concentrates initiative in the hands of a small number of very rich men. Those who are not capitalists have, almost always, very little choice as to their activities when once they have selected a trade or profession; they are not part of the power that moves the mechanism, but only a passive portion of the machinery. Despite political democracy, there is still an extra-ordinary degree of difference in the power of self-direction belonging to a capitalist and to a man who has to earn his living." 25

In all his writings about economic affairs of a state, he stresses that a sense of morality must be working in the relation among producers, distributors, consumers

and the ruling agency for a smooth progress of men both politically and economically. If such morality is not followed in the economic affairs, Russell apprehends, the young people, educated and uneducated, will find themselves "plunged into a world full of injustice, full of cruelty, full of preventable misery. The injustice, the cruelty, and the misery that exist in the modern world are an inheritance from the past, and their ultimate source is economic." 26

The absence of sound relation between the producers and the consumers is sure to mutilate the general health of state economy which consequently gives rise to a number of socio-political disturbances causing mistrust and misgiving among the people. Russell is vehemently opposed to any kind of economic exploitation and oppression. He also suggests that society can be free from any kind of economic conflict provided the working class and the downtrodden are given the required material support with due honour by the rich. So long as the working class and the downtrodden remain hated and oppressed by the rich and privileged class, economic factors will adversely affect the general progress of the nation. That is why Russell stresses that the nation must adopt a new moral approach to its economic affairs if social discontentments and disturbances need to be brushed aside for the moral progress of the community and peaceful co-existence of all the members concerned.

For Russell, capitalism is at the root of many socio-political evils that hamper the modern mind to go ahead with any humanitarian mission. He regrets that even the so-called educated people have not come forward to abolish them in the greater interest of the common masses, Capitalism fosters unjust distribution of wealth so that it may be heaped in the hands of the rich by depriving the working class of their due share. It is a system in which "the tyranny of the holders of power is a source of needless suffering and misfortune to a very large section of mankind; but power remains in few hands, and tends, if anything to grow more

concentrated" 27 Similarly, he also holds that war is the creation of capitalistic economy and it has posed a threat to all who desire a better world. The economic system which cannot save mankind from such an appalling disaster is certainly undesired by the majority of the world people.

Anyway, Russell voices for a complete reconstruction of our whole economic system if the economic disparities are to be removed from the society. He says: "Capitalism and the wage system must be abolished; they are twin monsters which are eating up the life of the world. In place of them we need a system which will hold in check man's predatory impulses, and will diminish the economic injustice that allows some to be rich in idleness while others are poor in spite of unremitting labour; but above all we need a system which will destroy the tyranny of the employer, by making men at the same time secure against destitution and able to find scope for individual initiative in the control of the industry by which they live." 28

Lord Russell advocates a better system of economy that can be established by democracy. Such a system, according to him, should aim at four chief purposes: first, it may aim at the greatest possible production of goods and at facilitating technical progress; second, it may aim at securing distributive justice; third, it may aim at giving security against destitution; and forth, it may aim at liberating creative impulses and diminishing possessive impulses. So, he hopes that people, as a whole, will be happy in such an economic system where the predatory instincts of acquiring riches, economic injustice, tyranny of the employer and other forms of economic disparities are no longer found.

Russell, in his essay Work and Pay says that the ultimate fact in economics is that Nature only yields commodities as the result of labour, and it is an undisputed truth. So, it can easily be assumed that any kind of injustice and ill treatment committed to the working class in enjoying their due share may lead to

27. Political Ideals, op.cit., p. 23
political revolt and social unrest. Here lies the question of morality as to how the producers, the workers, the consumers and any other persons who are directly or indirectly related to the process of production, distribution and consumption should behave among themselves in order to live in a healthy economic system. Russell is also familiar with the pros and cons of socialist economy in the like manner that he is with capitalistic economy. From his experiences, he prefers socialist economy to the capitalist one. Thus, his concept of economic morality may be understood clearly from his preference of socialism to capitalism. He thinks that a worker must get economic stimulus to work for the society in which he lives. Russell himself lived in a pro-capitalist society where he happened to see many people enjoying idleness and affluence through the mere accident of distinction between the rich and the poor. He supports socialism because;

"it was inspired by the wish to diminish the gap between rich and poor. In all directions, there has been a revolt against injustice and inequality, and unwillingness to build a brilliant superstructure on a foundation of suffering and degradation."

Russell also wants to say that in the capitalist economy the wage-earner is not paid for his willingness to work but only for his utility to employer. Consequently he may be plunged into utter poverty if the employer dismisses him at any moment. Russell fears that such destitution is likely to produce undeserved suffering in the life of a worker, and thus, deteriorates the social position of the sufferer. Russell maintains that such social evils may be "remedied under any system of Socialism."

Whether it be industry or trade, Russell favours that the situation should always be made agreeable to the employees, or the spirit of working may tend to diminish. As regards the hours of work Russell's declaration that "the whole community could be kept in comfort by means of four hours' work a day" is really
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surprising. Moreover, he likes to suggest that people are to be taught, not only one trade, or one small portion of a trade, but several trades, so that they can vary their occupation according to the reasons and fluctuations of demand. So far as management is concerned, Russell prefers that it should be constituted by the representatives as in politics instead of being run by a single owner. He also advocates that payment to the worker in an industry is not to be made only for work actually required and performed but for willingness to work. Likewise, the dread of unemployment or loss of livelihood may haunt men like a nightmare if they are not paid for their willingness to work. Attempts should also be made by the concerning people to diminish the disagreeableness of different trades by cultivating a sound economic motive. From the above traits of Russell's view on economic affairs, one may easily conclude that Russell always seeks such an economic situation in which the working class and the poor alike can live without any fear of economic constraint and humiliating behaviours from any different section.

Lord Russell, as a social thinker, maintains that no one is to be haunted by the dread of poverty or driven into ruthlessness by the irresistible longing for wealth. Distinction of social classes pains Russell very much. So, he believes in economic equality. On the other hand, aspiring employees should be given the proper scope to rise in life according to their merits. Anyway, Russell thinks that the need of economic morality is deeply felt with a view to giving rise to such a world where most of the nightmares that lurk in poverty can no longer exist. Moreover, men's ambition to reach the higher position in life should always accompany a noble purpose of contributing something to the benefit of mankind. In such a world, science, labour-saving inventions, technical progress of all kinds and other mechanical aids are also expected to play a very useful role for the further continuity of human race.

As regards the role of money in social dealings, Russell says that too much attachment to money is harmful though worship of money is not a new thing. He says man has other values to honour with more intensity. In the essay "Property",
he states that man loses a certain amount of happiness being haunted by the fear of losing money. The happiest men and women according to Russell, are those "who are indifferent to money because they have some positive purpose which shuts it out." 32 Similarly, Russell further states that the mania for increasing production has turned men's thought away from much more important problems. He rather suggests that men may devote their time more to science and art, mental cultivation and intelligent pleasure instead of being too much engrossed in materialistic pursuits. He fears that people will be mentally handicapped by too much pursuit of money and production at the cost of other human qualities.

Russell observes that all institutions of a state rest upon two things: Property and power. He wants to say that both property and power are very important factors for the happiness of individuals. But they are very unjustly distributed. Man, though he should not be much money minded, must have certain amount of property which is possible to acquire through honest means. But the hope of possessing more wealth than one should have to meet the needs of life is not to be encouraged at all as "it compels men to close their minds against justice and to prevent themselves from thinking honestly on social questions". 33 His opinion is that property should be distributed in such a way that no one suffers any kind of injustice in having his proper share of earning. If possible the injustice of destitution and wealth should never be allowed to occur in society. Then, the fear of economic injustice will be over, people will have a new hope for a better world.

In Capitalist system private ownership of land and capital is a distinctive feature of state economy. As Russell is opposed to capitalism, he always condemns such a feature of private ownership. The chief objections to it are that it stunts the lives of men and women, that it enshrines a ruthless possessiveness in all the respect which is given to success, that it leads men to fill the greater part of
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their time and thought with the acquisition of purely material goods, and that it affords a terrible obstacle to the advancement of civilization and creative energy" 34

Such type of morality has been attached to the economic affairs of a state by Bertrand Russell. Unless and until, the evils concerning the economic sphere of a country are rooted out with a strong attitude to achieving economic justice for all, the life between the affluent and the poor is sure to adversely affect the general atmosphere of the society causing endless misery and suffering to the oppressed section.

Russell hopefully supports that there must be economic equality in the standard of life of the different parts of the world. So long as there are rich countries and poor countries, there will be envy on the one side and possible economic oppression on the other. If world peace is sought, people of all countries will have to continually move towards economic equality. In his famous work Has Man a Future, it has been stated that without a World Government universal stability is not possible. He emphatically reveals that only a number of economic conditions may make the notion of World-Government an effective reality. Russell's view on what economic morality should be for a good world has been epitomised in the following words:

"If a World-Government is to work smoothly, certain economic conditions will have to be fulfilled. One of these, which is beginning to receive widespread recognition, is the raising of the standard of life in what are now under-developed countries to the level which prevails among the most prosperous populations of the West. Until a certain economic equality among the different parts of the world has been achieved, the poorer nations will envy the richer ones, and the richer one will dread violent action on the part of those who are less prosperous." 35

34. Ibid, pp. 35-36.

35. Has Man a Future, op.cit., p. 130.
Morality and Education:

In a civilized society, the role of education to make the individuals 'good citizens' is profoundly significant and indispensable. So, education is desirable for all human beings of the universe for their moral progress so much so that mankind may live in a refined and well-habitable situation. What role education had played in the past is not the main concern of Russell; his chief concern about education is what sort of education can actually help men cultivate their rational outlook and moral exercise for a peaceful and progressive world-situation. So, his views on education are not merely meant for a particular country or community, but for all human beings of a civilized world. It is universally accepted that men are to be educated in order to make them know what they are, what they can do, what they should require and how they should do. He is sure that education which is meant to maintain "Status quo" without any innovative and progressive plans in it can no longer be useful for the present human society.

Robert E. Egner, in his work Bertrand Russell's Best comments that Lord Russell was "an ardent leader of those who held that education ought to emphasise scientific methods of enquiry rather than the transmission of a settled body of knowledge. He refused to compromise with those who adopted persecution, censorship and other controls over education". 36 Certainly Russell has his own outlook about education which is somewhat different from the age-old ones. He judges that education is needed to make people more civilized, rational, liberal and enlightened. It should develop the intellectual and moral qualities of men. Intellectually, an educated man should have "a certain minimum of general knowledge, technical skill in one's profession, and a habit of forming opinions on evidence; morally, of impartially, kindliness and modicum of self-control." 37 Moreover, an educated man is expected to have refined zest and joy of life, respect for law,
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justice as between man and man, and an attitude not to do any harm to any section of human race. Russell also says that human civilization will face hindrance in every step if education is not spread among the people for cultivating the above habits.

Russell does not support any system of education conducted by states or Churches which is considered subservient to them. Education should not be oriented to serve the political and religious purposes; it should be oriented to serve the intellectual and humanitarian purposes. If education does not become conducive to the growth of mind and spirit, young learners will be stunted in their "mental and spiritual life." 38 Education should be given, according to Russell, in a more liberal spirit, with more attempt to show its ultimate uses. Freedom in education is, thus, very essential to develop impartial views in the minds of the young learners. Under coercion, a child tends to respond with indignation and hatred. It is feared that if the child cannot give vent to his hatred, it festers inwardly, and ultimately distorts his normal disposition throughout the rest of his life. This does not mean that a learner should get the absolute freedom of his behaviour. He says: "Freedom is the most difficult element to secure under existing conditions. I am not an advocate of absolute freedom, for reasons which we considered in our earlier chapter." 39

Whatever may be the 'reason', Russell always advocates that students should get such a situation in which they can achieve full growth and development of their inner merits.

So far as elementary education is concerned, Russell says that no religious body or state which is dominated by religion should be allowed to run schools where religious themes become the main part

of the syllabi. A religious body is always hesitant to grant freedom to the children to acquire the truth by enquiring into Nature, nor does it allow them to accept the views that are opposed to the leaders of the institutions. If the free enquiry is checked on the most important matter in the world "the child is met with dogma or with stony silence." Prevention of free enquiry does not help the students develop an independent mind and acquire novel thoughts about the natural truth; rather it makes them more dogmatic, and ultimately the path for further progress gets blocked. So, education ought to foster the willingness to know the truth, not the traditional conviction that some particular creed is the truth.

Certain mental habits which Russell thinks to be against life may be found in his essay *Education*, where he states:

"Instead of obedience and discipline, we ought to aim at preserving independence and impulse. Instead of ruthlessness, education should try to develop justice in thought, instead of contempt, it ought to instil reverence, and the attempt at understanding; towards the opinion of others it ought to produce, not necessarily acquiescence, but only such opposition as is combined with imaginative apprehension and a clear realization of the grounds of opposition. Instead of credulity, the object should be to stimulate constructive doubt, the love of mental adventure, the sense of worlds to conquer by enterprise and boldness in thought." 41

This is what Russell wants from education for the young learners for the proper intellectual shape to their minds and thoughts. His opposition to obedience and discipline appears to be very shocking at the very first stage; but he is not going to mean that students should shun the true sense of the two terms. He simply means that students are not required to be much slavish in attitude and passive in spirit. But, on the contrary, everybody in society should try to make their visions enlightened and rational.
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As Russell is a liberal thinker, he maintains that education ought to be free from any kind of religious dogmas and superstitions. In the essay Religion in Education he puts a question to the general people: "How can any conduct which is genuinely desirable need false beliefs as its motives?" If we want to have good conduct through education, then, that goodness cannot be found in religious dogmas. In religious education, many doubtful propositions are taught to be true. He says: "religious teachers are teaching what is false, since, whether true in fact or not, the propositions in question are emphatically not certain." Another objection is that religion underestimates the intellectual virtues. It has no proper admiration for the men of first rate intelligence. He boldly states that religious education is more likely to give courage even to the stupid to resist the authority of educated men. Moreover, it is opposed to the teaching of evolution as there is not a single word of Gospel. What morality is taught by religion is based on Gospel authority which the religious people follow more closely and more devoutly than anything else. So, Russell says that blind support of Gospel authority is a "serious defect in the ethics taught in Christian educational establishment."

So far as the subject of sex is concerned, Lord Russell says that the knowledge of sex and its role in human life should not be treated as impure. Those whose opinions on sex matters are traditional do not want such a subject to be the part of education. On the contrary, those who view the traditional sex-code with doubt support that such matters are to be included in education through rational interpretation. Russell stresses that sex should be a part of education and "information on sexual subjects should be given in exactly the same tone of voice, and in the same manner as information on the other subjects. And it should be given with the same directions." He, thus, thinks that proper education of sex may save
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the society from any kind of sexual perversity and other forms of sexual evils. For him, it is important in all dealings with the younger people to prevent them from acquiring the notion that sex is impure, nasty and furtive. Rather, students should take up such subject with intelligence and social dignity. Actual moral approach to sex matters may be possible only through such education as Russell views.

As regards patriotism in education, Russell suggests that false history, false politics, false economics of one's own nation are to be taught as such teaching is bound to arouse a sense of hatred and alienation towards other nations. He, of course, does not like to depreciate love of home, love of one's native country, a certain degree of pride in its historical achievements if they really deserve pride, and other sentiments of one's nation. Teaching of politics and patriotism should not lead the students to think that "all the wars in which their own State has engaged are wars of defence, while the wars of foreign States are wars of aggression". Russell disapproves the educational matters of the Western World to make their children much loyal to their own state. They are so taught to believe that "foreign nations have no moral standards, and, as the British national anthem asserts, that it is the duty of Providence to frustrate their knavish tricks, a duty in which Providence will not disdain to employ us as its instruments."

Patriotism of the nationalistic type is also strongly condemned by Lord Russell as a form of mass hysteria to which men are unfortunately liable, and against which they need to be fortified both intellectually and morally. Why Russell disapproves nationalism is substantiated by the following words written in the essay Patriotism in Education:

"Nationalism is undoubtedly the most dangerous vice of our time—far more dangerous than drunkenness, or drugs, or commercial dishonesty, or any of the other vices against which a conventional moral education
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is directed. All who are capable of a survey of the modern world are aware that, owing to nationalism, the continuance of civilized way of life is in jeopardy. This, I say, is generally known to all persons who are well informed as to international affairs."48

Anyway, to get rid of such malady of patriotic teaching Russell suggests that history should be taught in exactly the same way in all countries of the world, and history text books ought to be drawn up by the League of Nations. History should be the world history rather than natural history, and should emphasise matters of cultural importance rather than wars. It is Russell's concern that children should learn the faults of their own nation before they learn the faults of other nations. By such self analysis they can decide as to what they should do in relation to their dealings with other people. From the above discussion we may summarise that nationalistic patriotism as a part of education should not be encouraged; instead, the lessons on universal brotherhood and peace are to be emphasised for the education of children.

Russell's views on education for the young generation are very constructive. Students ought to be taught to preserve what is good for all human beings, not the national power of the past. He regrets: "The wish to preserve the past rather than the 'hope of creating the future dominates the minds of those who control the teaching of the young."49

Thus Russell cherishes the hope that education must open a new vista before the people of the world making them fully aware of what they should actually do for the rational and moral progress of men. If education be guided by a creative purpose, and be not much concerned about the passive awareness of dead facts, certainly a new world is possible to lead the human race through a progressive path. Propaganda in education is never supported by Russell as it always aims at giving partial judgement and causes division among the people. It has
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been found that propaganda in relation to politics, religion, emotion, national pride etc. are harmful for mankind as a whole. But propaganda about values may be supported provided it becomes intellectual rather than emotional. In his essay "Propaganda in Education" he stresses that "an attempt should be made to free boys and girls, as far as possible, from the influence of propaganda by teaching them methods of arriving at impartial judgement" 50 He holds that belief in falsehood either through propaganda or through organised teaching is very rarely useful. Education. Therefore, should not be treated as a means of propaganda for political, religious, ethical and national purposes instead of treating it as a truth-finding process. He says that students should get proper knowledge of justice, honesty, and other human virtues through the medium of education. If education becomes politically and religiously motivated, it cannot give the knowledge of truth which is the very foundation of intellectual development.

**Functions of Teachers:**

In imparting education to learners what sort of role the teachers are expected to play is to be counted very seriously. If the teachers do not feel inwardly the urge to teach the students with moral spirit, education is sure to turn out to be useless business. Russell says that the first and foremost requirement on the part of a teacher is that he must have a feeling of intellectual independence to render his service in an appropriate way. Thus, he must have a clear conception of the services which a teacher is expected to perform for the community. The teacher should lead the community through a right path to acquire true knowledge. Unless it is done, it is quite likely that the nation will be misled by a number of prejudices and false beliefs to the despairing consequences of political calamities. Russell realizes that "the defence of the state in all civilized countries is quite as much in hands of teachers as in those of the armed forces" 51 as reflected in the essay The Functions of a Teacher.

---
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Another important role that a teacher is required to play is that teachers should act as the guardians of the nation besides mitigating the heat of current controversies in different spheres of life. It is generally viewed that the teachers are the right persons in society to instil a refined and civilized attitude in their pupils. It is also true that no man can be a good teacher unless he has feelings of warm affection towards his pupils and a genuine desire to impart the lessons on value. Above all, a good teacher should endeavour to generate a noble sense of tolerance in his pupils towards others' nations and others' views as well. So, Russell says:

"The teachers should open vistas before his pupils showing them the possibilities of activities that will be as delightful as they are useful thereby letting loose their kind impulses and preventing the growth of a desire to rob others of joys that they will have missed."\(^{52}\)

It is evident that teachers are the bearers of education and also of civilization. Therefore, it is expected by all that the teachers should try their best to innovate and impart what is best of education for the continuity of mankind through an honest way.

**Morality and Scientific Advancement:**

Nobody can deny that science is playing a very pivotal role in the present civilization and will also be playing a very determining role either in material progress or in destructive activities as the future people wish to choose. But what role science plays in the moral growth of men is to be taken into account inasmuch as without a parallel growth of morality with that of material and mechanical prosperity, society cannot offer anybody the ethical goal of life. It is undeniable that the social effects of scientific techniques have been many in number to be widely important for the existence of civilization. Precisely speaking, a modern

---
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man cannot think of his existence apart from science, since every aspect of his life is connected with the contribution of science and technology. Not only the physical life, but also our moral life has been much influenced by science as it has been able to dispel lots of superstitions, dogmas, traditional beliefs of no practical value and many other harmful customs from the ways of living and thinking of the modern man as a whole. People can now, under the impact of scientific knowledge look at life in a completely novel way bringing forth a new philosophy wherein the conception of men's place in universe is somewhat different from that of the earlier centuries. Science also enables the holders of power to realize their purposes more fully than they could otherwise do. In the work *The Future of Science*, he states:

"If their purposes are good, this is a gain; if they are evil, it is a loss. In the present age, it seems that the purposes of the holders of power are in the main evil, in the sense that they involve a diminution, in the world at large, of the things men are agreed in thinking good. Therefore, at present, science does harm by increasing the power of rulers." 53

Anyway, Russell is sure that science is no substitute for virtue though it may help us intellectually and technically. Human society is based on a co-operative relation that exists among the men. So, it may be argued that science should be applied in such a way that this essential relation does not receive any blow, or the use of science will turn into a curse instead of a boon.

Though science has brought about lots of changes in the way of living, Russell is sure that these scientific inventions may not contribute much to the attitude of men to living a good and honest life all the time. He apprehends that science may cause great harm to the people if it is not used wisely and morally. Russell does not want a man of science to say with honesty that his business is to provide knowledge only, and he is not responsible for what use is made of such scientific knowledge by the other members. He is afraid, society will have to face

lots of miseries if the scientific knowledge is used for evil purposes by certain unworthy authority. This is the point that the scientists should take note of very sincerely. They can "suggest and urge in many ways the value of those branches of science of which the important practical uses are beneficial and not harmful." 54

It is true that human beings themselves can make a good world, and that is why they should listen to the scientist as to what they say about the good of the world.

Russell tends to lay much stress on the point that the contribution of science to the progress of civilization will be of no avail if human beings tend to throw away all the rational virtues and a sound morality which are necessary for peaceful and happy living in the world. He wisely acknowledges that

"science has diminished poverty and could have abolished it, if politicians and economists had had any sense. It has greatly diminished disease and increased the vigour of healthy people. It has supplied a great variety of amusement. It has improved education and softened the rigours of childhood and prison. He has given us a new conception of the dignity of men". 55

These are, beyond question, the good effects of science on human life; so science is a boon on us so long as we can enjoy these effects in an unabated manner.

But there is the other side of the coin about which the human society is much concerned today. The dreadful scientific weapons, nuclear bombs, poison gases, and other forms of life killing inventions can never be regarded to be useful, in the least, for mankind. Again the sentiment of the powerful and wealthy to make their power over the poor by virtue of scientific means permanent, is by no means, commendable, rather condemnable. Thus if the privileged class wants to live in the Ivory Tower by the economic and political prosperity which may be
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achieved through scientific advancement keeping the working class far away from
the bare necessities of life, a rift between the two groups is sure to come into
being, and a deplorable collapse of socio-political atmosphere is imminent. It is
desired that scientists must follow an ethics of doing good to society through their
various categories of inventions that are used in the fields of education, to medicine,
agriculture, industry, commerce, communication, and so forth. What is desirable
is that the socio-political system of a country ought to be very sincere and careful
in guiding the uses of science for welfare of men.

How mankind is going to maintain its existence in future also worries Russell
to a greater extent. As he comes to witness himself the devastating war activities
during his own life time, he is therefore, very much anxious about the future
continuity of the human race in civilized form. He has given full vent to his
apprehension about the adverse affect of science on the judgement of men in the
essay Science and War. He says:

"If human life is to continue in spite of science, mankind will have to
learn a discipline of the passions which, in the past, had not been
necessary. Men will have to submit to the law, even when they think the
law unjust and iniquitous. Nations which are persuaded that they are
only demanding the barest justice will have to acquiesce when this
demand is denied them by the neutral authority. I do not say that this is
easy; I do not prophesy that it will happen; I say only that if it does not
happen the human race will perish, and will perish as a result of science".

Man cannot live long without the blessings of science though science is
not free from dangers that may cause tremendous harm to the human society. It is
the foremost duty of man to check the bad and hostile impact of science, or science
will not be useful for mankind at large. Russell further views that if the war-mongering
attitude of the belligerent nations are not suppressed to the lowest
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level, mankind, one day, will certainly face its extinction. Unless men become rational in using these fatal weapons and cultivating a good sense of human relation irrespective of nationalities and creeds, civilization is sure to meet with its doom later or sooner. Russell doubts whether people are going to be judicious and rational enough about their future survival. Nevertheless, he suggests in the essay *Science and War* that "a clear choice must be made within fifty years, the choice between Reason and Death. And by 'Reason' I mean willingness to submit to law as declared by an international authority. I fear that mankind may choose Death, I hope I am mistaken." 57

From the above words of Russell it becomes clear that science is not destructive of its own. It is the socio-political system that uses the destructive inventions for its own benefit at the cost of common people, and because of such a narrow mentality of the powerful groups, the common people are to turn out helpless victims. The need of morality to guide the scientific advancement may well be comprehended from the following words that he writes in the essay *Science and Happiness*:

"Where science does good, it does so of its own nature since it shows how to avoid obvious evils; but when it does harm, it does so only owing to remediable defects in our economic and political system. If these defects are remedied, its effects would be wholly beneficial." 58

As Russell views, it is men who can give proper moral shape to the uses of the scientific inventions. If it can be done, science, when applied to human affairs, will remain an invulnerable source of happiness for all human beings. However, from the above discussion, we may assess Russell's position as a Moral Philosopher in relation to social morality which, according to all conscientious people, is of urgent need for the happy existence of mankind.
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