CHAPTER-VII

Russell on Peace

The survey that we have made above about the reaction of Russell to wars and scientific weapons may be regarded as the very background of his voice for world peace till the last day of his life. The evil impact of wars on human society is viewed by Russell as a curse to humanity. As he was a humanitarian thinker in the true sense of the term, he devoutly professed that war must be abolished, or else, human race would pathetically meet with its doom. His profound love for mankind, therefore, was actively urging him to call upon the peace loving people of the world to stand against war of whatever form it may be and work unitedly for permanent peace in which men belonging to the different creeds and countries can live honestly and morally. He started his mission for peace with the breaking out of the World War I in 1914 as he could visualize a dark picture of large scale death and destruction as the aftermath of the War. He admits in the first chapter namely 'The First War' of his Autobiography, volume II that the First World War made him think in a new light about the further existence of the human race on this planet and gave rise to a number of fundamental questions in his mind about human nature. He, at first, could not believe that Europe would be so mad to plunge into war without paying any heed to what might be the outcome of such their warring behaviours. He could not anticipate that the deadly scientific weapons were most likely to be used for mutual killing either.

As the first step of his peace mission, Lord Russell started collecting signatures of a large number of professors and fellows of Cambridge against the possible involvement
of England in the World War I which was almost about to break out. All the signatures were published in *Manchester Guardian* a leading local daily of London. But strangely enough to Russell, on the very first day of war all the people who were apparently pacifists changed their minds and decided to take side with England, their motherland, against the Triple Alliance. He sarcastically writes: "I was interested to observe that many of the pacifist politicians were more concerned with the question which of them should lead the anti-war movement than with the actual work against the War."¹

Lord Russell remained firm in his decision to do something against the beastliness of war. Having seen the 'Battle of Marne' in which England had to suffer tremendously, he felt as if he had heard the voice of God ² that commanded him to raise voice of protest against war at any cost. The national propaganda of all the belligerent nations was going to sicken him gravely. He thought that barbarism would come anew. The massacre of young children wrung his heart. This kind of cruelty made him take strong decision to devote his life and time to the cause of peace. On the other hand, it is also true that the general people always desire peace though they are found to come forward to support their respective nations at war out of nationalistic patriotism. He says:

"I believe that the desire for peace is almost universal, not only among the soldiers, but throughout the wage-earning classes, and specially in industrial districts, in spite of high wages and steady employment. If a plebiscite of nation were taken on the question whether negotiations should be initiated, I am confident that an overwhelming majority would be in favour of this course, and that the same is true of France, Germany, and Austria-Hungary."³

Russell's life-long struggle for world peace was backed by his view that human virtues and intelligence will be pathetically lost if the people are allowed to indulge in futile carnage. He wants to make people realize that war is not important at all, but peace is indispensable for human survival which may be possible to have only through a sound
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and healthy international relation among all the nations. Cherishing such a broad view in his mind, he became a devoted member of the No-Conscription Fellowship (N.C.F.), an anti-war organization of England which called upon the young people not to join army with the purpose of going to the war being intoxicated with the sense of blind nationalism. When the original members of the Committee were sent to prison on the charge of launching anti-national activities, Russell became the acting chairman of the new committee braving all the governmental measures that might be expected to befall him. In this position, Russell had to travel around lecturing against war. He says:

"There was a great deal of speaking to be done up and down the country. I spent three weeks in the mining areas of Wales, speaking sometimes in halls, sometimes out of doors. I never had an interrupted meeting, and always found the majority of the audience sympathetic so long as I confined myself to industrial areas. In London, however, the matter was different."4

As a member of the N.C.F. Russell had to go to prison in May, 1918. Even after release, he could not resist himself from devoting his time to the business of N.C.F. Then he developed a good intimacy with Clifford Allen, the founder of the N.C.F. Russell had to address several occasions organized to launch protest against the prevailing war-mongering of European countries. Once he was invited to give lecture on peace in a gathering organized by the Clergyman of the Brotherhood Church who himself was a pacifist of remarkable courage. There he faced a violent situation created by the supporters of war, but somehow could manage to escape any attack. Russell says this was the first incident of this type in his life. In this regard he writes:

"On this occasion, however, the mob set fire to the pulpit and the address was not delivered. These were the only occasions on which I came across personal violence; all my other meetings were undisturbed. But such is the power of Press propaganda that my non-pacifist friends came to me and said: "Why do you go on trying to address meeting when all of them are broken up by the mob?" 5
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Anyway, regarding the motto of N.C.F. Russell says that it voices for International friendly relations instead of enmity and violence. In the Inter-Allied Socialist Conference organized by the N.C.F. in 1917, Russell had the occasion to address the delegates who came to attend it from different corners of the world. In a very touching manner he made the address in which his voice for World Peace may easily be perceived. The beginning part of the address has been quoted below:

"Comrades, on behalf of the No-Conscription Fellowship we desire to greet you fraternally on your visit to Great Britain and to express our earnest hope that your deliberation may lead to the rebuilding of the International and the re-establishment of friendly relations between the peoples of the world. Long live the International! Our Fellowship is only a small organization, but we believe that it stands for an ideal much bigger than its number. It is a "fellowship" for common counsel and action of men of enlistment age who are not prepared to bear arms in the event of conscription, whatever the penalties for refusing." 6

Russell's numerous articles written on the theme of Peace, and published regularly in "The Tribunal" issued by the N.C.F. could largely influence the peace-loving people. Though he could not save the world from the jaws of the World War I by doing whatever possible on his part to oppose such an orgy of killing and destroying, he was, nevertheless, steadfastly adhering to his mission for world peace till his death through which all the people of the world were expected to lead a happy life without being deceived, denied and dishonoured by the selfish, powerful and domineering sections.

Let us now look into the various traces of his activities that he undertook to establish peace in the world against the destructive trends of wars with their negative consequences. His arguments in favour of a universally peaceful situation are also to be brought to light by us. We may get a clear idea about Russell's concept of war in his
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different writings related to the subject. In the essay *The Imminent Danger of War*, he distinctly mentions that,

"War is not a convulsion of nature like an earthquake; it is a result of human volition, and human volition can prevent it. But the time in which to prevent it is probably short, and pacific action, if it is to succeed, must be swift and resolute; moreover, it must be individual, not merely governmental." \(^7\)

He holds that the love of national independence and security is very strong in every great country, and that is why the holder of power prefers the risk of war however appalling to being at the mercy of an International force. The choice appears to be wrong inasmuch as no nation can preserve its security without keeping good terms with other countries. So, Russell advocates an International *Armed Force* to prevent hostilities among the nations and defeat easily any probable rebellion. Moreover, the new weapons—both nuclear and bacteriological, if be necessary, would have to be confined entirely to the International force for the sake of collective security. In his work *Unarmed Victory* he states:

"The only ultimate and secure means of preventing wars employing methods of mass destruction is World Government. There are exactly the same reasons for world government as there are for the Internal governments of separate States." \(^8\)

Thus, the *World Government* will have to have a monopoly of all the major weapons of war. And if an *International Armed Force* is to be formed, it must be composed of individuals from many different nations and of many different races. This type of International Armed Force controlled by World Government may prove to be an effective way of making the world safe against war. If it is not done the world is sure to face its doom. So, he voices in the essay *The Happy World* that our world needs rational
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creative hopes instead of destructive attitude. It needs 'yes' feelings rather than 'no' feelings. He calls upon the people of the world to preserve 'yes' feelings instead of the 'no' ones.  

Russell also maintains the view that complete abolition of war-mongering attitude is not possible at all. He is afraid that the war may, in future, take a more dreadening form than the previous ones being equipped with more scientific warfare. He likes to suggest that the obstacles to the permanent abolition of war are mainly three, and they are political, economic and psychological. Permanent peace can never be realized unless these obstacles are removed from the path. Regarding the removal of political obstacles, Russell suggests a World Government with full power to exercise its control on the other nations. He says:

"So long as the sovereignty of separate states is unrestricted, war will be liable to occur. It is obvious, also, that a merely legal restriction will not suffice; it must be possible to compel obedience to International law. The easiest way to secure this result will be to confine national armed forces to the older weapons, and to make air warfare the exclusive prerogative of the world government."  

As the prevention of war is the urgent need of time, Russell suggests that the World Government is the only reliable authority to keep all nations free from the contamination of war. The point to take note of here is that all the legislative and judicial functions of such a government must aim at universal peace as the first object. If it is not done, Russell fears, the causes of dispute will multiply and "Wars will become more intense owing to the growth of public spirit."  

(Essay : Dangers of Creed Wars). If World Government is not constituted, the controlling of the warring nations will stand as a very diabolic problem for any peace-loving nation on individual effort.

The point that economic injustice among the rich and the weaker widens the gap between these two groups is to be reckoned seriously as suggested by Russell. Any imbalance in the economic relation between two nations is very much prone to give rise to mutual hostility which may ultimately lead to war bringing in sorrows to both the nations. As peace itself is not possible without social and economic justice, the World Government must pay heed to such problems with a view to eradicating the imbalances. That is, no rich nation is to be allowed to exploit the weaker nation for economic benefit as was done by America in the case of Vietnam. It may be hoped that, under a better economic system "race hatred will grow less and at last die out." Russell is of the view that the basis of the prejudice against alien races is economic.

Another significant factor to abolish the warring attitude from the minds of the big powers is the psychological preparation of the weaker to face boldly any atrocious war instead of meek submission to the physical strength of the aggressors. Humble submission to power cannot solve the problems of society. Russell stresses the need of educating the people physically, morally and intellectually to keep them away from indulging in violence and cruelty of war. If people get so prepared, then the possibility of war will be quite less. The education system needs to be oriented in such a way as to impart the children lessons on peace. They are also to be taught the lessons which can help them develop their moral character. A. C. Grayling remarks:

"Russell never had inflated expectations of education. But despite the disillusionment promoted by his practical experiment in school teaching, he retained his characteristic liberal belief that it is chiefly on education that hopes for a better world must focus...... Despite everything, he never lost hope that vital, brave, sensitive and intelligent people could be brought into being if only they are given the right kind of guidance in childhood." 13

Unless the children are given the lessons on morality, brotherhood and peace, their attitude to war cannot be eradicated totally from their mind. Students must get

psychologically prepared to condemn war of any form and try to be mentally prepared to refrain from any kind of warring sentiment. Such type of lessons are to be imparted, according to Russell, not only to the children of the weaker classes, but also to those of the capitalist group so much so that the new generation may easily wash away the germs of war from the global society irrespective of creeds and nationalities. Thus, he attaches much importance to moral teaching to make the children psychologically prepared for not getting involved in any kind of anti-human activities. In the essay Conditions for Permanent Peace, he states:

"Impulses of envy and cruelty, under whatever disguise, must be recognized for what they are, and must, so far as possible, be prevented from influencing conduct. The sense of justice must be cultivated, from the nursery onward. Men must learn to value, for others and for themselves, such things as happiness and intelligence, and there must be a wish to make human life a co-operative effort after ends that all can enjoy." 14

In addition to this type of education, Russell has something to say in relation to what is known as Non-resistance. The method of Non-resistance is a kind of passive approach to peace through which the atrocious and domineering forces can easily derive sets of advantages over the weak and humble sections. It is true that no war breaks out if the domineering and atrocious forces are not allowed to carry on their misdeeds without facing any protest. Russell does not want to have this type of peace in which the suffering people remain submissive like cowards to the evil designs of the powerful. This is an instance of Non-Resistance to avoid war. In contrary to that, he voices that no powerful nations should be allowed to carry on their evil designs over the meek and weaker nations for humanity's sake. In such cases, the International Authority must come forward to obstruct the atrocious groups. He views that the use of force in such cases is justifiable just as the use of force by police is justifiable if it is applied for the cause of general
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good, not for the interest of a particular party. So, he argues:

"In International affairs, if there were a council of powers, strong enough to restrain any aggressive nation without great difficulty, any army or navy employed in obedience to its orders might be regarded as a police force, and justified on the same grounds on which the police are justified. I think there is more hope of ultimately achieving universal peace by this method than by the adoption of Non-resistance."  

Now we are concerned with the question - "when are these political, economic and psychological obstacles to the path of the abolition of war going to be removed for establishing permanent peace as viewed by Russell?" Is the hope of an end to the war-mongering attitude of the Big Powers still very distant? Before getting very satisfactory answers to these questions, Russell observes that American power will stand as omnipotent before the European countries unless they cease to quarrel among themselves. So, he does not want an International Government to be backed by American power. It is his fervent suggestion that the people of all powerful countries should give up the habit of dominating others, and thus, try to eradicate any kind of socio-economic injustice so that the weaker section may also enjoy a congenial situation where they can live happily, freely and rationally without having any sense of being hated, deprived and humiliated. If this is not done, there is more possibility that the picture of long cherished world peace will turn out more indistinct to the worries of the people of the world.

Since war is also destructive of ideals in the same way as it is of life and other material wealth, no nation can win it without destroying life and property to a greater extent. Nations at war are usually more concerned with the question of victory than with the question of diminishing the extent of losses on either side caused by killing and destroying. That is why Russell says that the important thing during a war is to diminish the extent and devastation of the war by every possible means."  

16. *Which Way To Peace*, op. cit., p. 21
on either side is much better than the victory of even the most righteous cause. As war is the act of organized community, only the organized community can prevent it provided both sides want to be guided by the true love for humanity. It is war that makes the world unstable and obstructs the rational and scientific growth of civilization. Moreover, it is to be noted that the huge amount of money that is spent by a nation in manufacturing armament might have produced something better for the common people. If all the members of the world raise objection to spending public money so lavishly in making war-weapons putting their warring impulse under control, the fear of being bombed at any moment will cease to haunt the minds of the people belonging to both the sides. Russell observes that mankind requires something more to mitigate the powerful forces of nature than any highly sophisticated armament in order to enshrine in peace in the global society. He says:

"The world will need a widespread change in individual outlook, which cannot be achieved by any difficult, complicated, or partial policy, but only by a resolute belief, as strong as the passions that make for war, and appealing to feelings as deeply rooted in human nature". 17

The above discussion, thus, makes it evident that the people of the world must undergo certain changes in their economic, political, psychological and cultural behaviours with a view to creating a congenial situation for securing permanent peace.

Let us, now, throw light on what Russell likes to say on racial antagonism as the cause of conflicts among different races of the world. Such rifts and hostilities as found between the French and the British, the white and the coloured, the Americans of English descent and the Red Indians may add fuel to fire so far as war is concerned. In the present world the numerically important races are the whites, the Mongolians and the Negroes. The inhabitants of India are a mixture of Aryan and Dravidian elements; the Semites, both Arabs and Jews are in some degree racially distinct form other white men. Of all these races, Russell views, "the three great divisions- White, Mongol, and Negro are politically the most important." 18 When a particular race seeks to despise the other, automatically
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a kind of antagonism arises between the two. Thus, when the feeling of superiority becomes insecure, a hostile fear attempts to subdue the inferior, and this is how faction between two different races gears up, and ultimately, it becomes conducive to waging war. If peace for all the people of the world is sought, a rational and humanitarian approach to the mutual dealings of the races is utmost necessary. For abolishing such racial prejudice, Russell suggests that as the racially distinct populations have to live side by side, the "only real solution is complete intermixture". Though people may object to it, it is true that all the great nations like German, Russian, British, Athenian, Indian etc. are the results of racial mixture. Thus, Russell, referring to such nations, maintains that people must do away with their prejudice regarding racial intermixture if world peace is really sought by them.

Russell is also of the view that people may refrain from being involved in war, if they can overcome the narrow bounds of creeds and ideologies. But it is not an easy task for the larger section of people. So, he says: "I do not suggest that this is easy, but it will become gradually possible when both East and West have ceased to be a menace to new freedom." Secure peace is not possible if rift between the nations in relation to race and creed persists long. Again the predatory nations undoubtedly cause a great harm to the world unity which is the first and foremost condition of world peace.

Bertrand Russell always voices for the universal brotherhood upon which the permanent peace may be possible. Internationalization including Russia, Germany and other big powers can only bring in universal brotherhood that is expected to render world peace. If men are free from oppression and domination of the belligerent nations, the way to peace may also be paved. It is undeniable that peace

cannot be achieved through domination and oppression. In the paper *A Pacifist Revolution*, he states:

"We stand for freedom: freedom to live, freedom to grow, freedom to love. Under our present competitive system, men are driven into mutual hatred; every worker is more or less rival to every other, and envy becomes the instinctive feeling of men towards each other." 21

Russell fails to grasp why the warring nations become so mad to dominate and destroy other countries at the large scale loss of their own lives and property in the action. If all people come forward to settle a dispute through rational and humanitarian deliberation, war may certainly be avoided. Here, the neutral authority has a great role to play in debarring both the sides from indulging in war by persuading them not to do so. Moreover, the first and foremost duty of the pacifists is to enlighten the minds of the national leaders so that they come to fully realize the negative outcome of war. Russell is sure that without peaceful situation, progress cannot be expected to make paces for the benefit of mankind as a whole. The following words of Russell are very significant:

"There is a new hope in the world, a hope as great as the horror out of which it has grown. Men's minds and hearts have been moved to questioning such as no smaller disaster could have produced. They grow weary of the orgy of hate and death, and turn, with a joy which is still timid, to more generous thoughts of the possibility of freedom and life." 22

The pacifist may, thus, inspire those suffering people who need freedom, brotherhood and the minimum honour to live as human beings. He hopes, all the pacifists of the world will come forward to strive for peace as desired by all sane people. Lord Russell was equally concerned at the undercurrent of Cold War between communism headed by Russia and capitalism headed by the United States. It was Russell's fear that the cold war may one day take the form of nuclear war with the effect of vast devastation to the human race. He came to know that both Russia and America were madly interested
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in manufacturing nuclear weapons to the great fear of the common people. Again, it is worth mentioning here that the fear of nuclear weapon came to the minds of the masses for the first time in 1950 during the Korean War when President Truman called a press conference to announce that he was considering a nuclear bombardment of China. As a result, China also parallelly felt the need of nuclear weapons in order to guarantee its continued independence. Similarly, during Cuban crisis in 1963, the rift between the Soviet union and America grew wider, and the fear of nuclear armament became more vital again. Regarding the deadliness of nuclear war, Russell writes:

a) A large scale nuclear war would be an utter disaster, not only to the belligerent, but to mankind, and would achieve no result that any sane man could desire.

b) When a small war occurs, there is a considerable risk that it may turn into a great war; and in the course of many small wars the risk would ultimately become almost a certainty.

c) If all existing nuclear weapons had been destroyed and there were an agreement that no new ones should be manufactured, any serious war would, nevertheless, become a nuclear war as soon as the belligerent had time to manufacture the forbidden weapons.

Russell asserts that all these three unimaginable catastrophes may easily teach men a lesson that they must find a way, wisely and intellectually, of avoiding any kind of war as all wars are, today, very much prone to be nuclear in character. In a nuclear age, the first and foremost concern of mankind is the question of survival through world peace. Russell regrets that all the big powers are going to be concentrated on accumulation of nuclear strength instead of preparing the ground for world peace. Really it is a profound misfortune that the whole question of nuclear warfare is entangled in power politics. The virulent and passionate conflicts among the powers are at the root of such a grim nuclear fear that threatens everybody. So, Russell suggests:

"If we are to think wisely about the new problems raised by nuclear weapons, we must learn to view the whole matter in a quite different way. It must be

23. Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare, op.cit., p. xi
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viewed, as some new epidemic would be viewed, as a common peril to be met by concerted action." 25

As Russell observes, the history of disarmament process from the Hiroshima incident to the present day is not very encouraging. What he fears is that both the East and the West are equally destined to be doomed if any nuclear war breaks out as the result of the irrational hunger for power of the war-mongers. According to Russell, nuclear test should be suspended by the universal authority in the greater interest of the human race. He offers two very significant grounds for such suspension. First, such test may distribute radio-active poisons throughout the world causing, in many cases, Leukaemia and Cancer. It may further cause abnormality to the new-born babies which is a more aggravating problem for all. Second, the powers which are not in possession of any such weapon may not be interested in manufacturing them by complying with the suggestion of the International authority. 26 Such observations of Russell claim that all the big powers of the world should come to a general agreement to cease the manufacture of nuclear weapons with the noble purpose of restoring peace in all parts of the world. In this particular line he highly applauds the proposal of Khrushchev for complete and general disarmament, but, to the worst misfortune of mankind, the western countries are found to be largely reluctant to accept such proposal. Russell comments on such behaviours of the west in the following way:

"This was grievous error which would not have been committed if the west had genuinely desired disarmament. Instead of investigating Khrushchev's proposal, the Western Power put forward proposals of their own and thereby kept alive indefinitely the futile contest of argument and counter argument." 27

Now it becomes evident that no nation, however big in nuclear power can exist peacefully by acquiring strength more and more in this line; rather its position is almost like that when someone lies at the mouth of a dormant volcano. Men must totally abolish
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war from the surface of the earth if permanent peace is sought. If the powerful nations
do not come forward to abolish war, it is feared, man will drop out and the planet will
perhaps be happier without us. For this purpose also Russell feels the need of the World
Authority to solve such chronic problem. He says:

"The creation of a World Authority, which is an obvious necessity if the
danger of nuclear war is to be averted, has always been opposed by Russia. If
Russia is to be brought to accept any kind of International Authority, it will
have to be one which does not give a definite superiority to non-communist
powers." 28

Russell also vehemently opposes the manufacturing of H-bomb since it increases to a
great degree the likelihood of nuclear war. It is a fact that, after the United States, Russia,
Britain and France devoted much attention to multiplying nuclear weapons, and this nuclear
gesture appalled Russell quite gravely. In the chapter 'H-bomb' of the book Has Man a
Future, he regrets:

"It is extraordinary, and very depressing to observe how the arm race distorts
the moral sense. If I deliberately caused cancer in one person, I should be
considered a monster of iniquity, but, if I deliberately cause it to some thousands
of people, I am a noble patriot." 29

Russell also fears that there is the possibility of The Doomsday Machine with
the capacity of destroying the whole population of the world if the international anarchy
and scientific skills are allowed to go side by side. He fervently appeals to the people of
the world to stand unitedly against such mad behaviour of the war-mongers for the sake
of humanity. He is equally apprehensive of chemical and bacteriological warfare that
may occur as the result of the beastly behaviour of the war-mongers. Who knows one day
manned-satellite containing H-bomb may also diminish the human race from this planet?
This being the case, Russell voices for certain changes in men's outlook so far

as world peace is concerned. He is almost sure in his apprehension that under the 
hovering clouds of war with the fatal nuclear weapons no man can live freely and creatively. 
So he says:

"I do not know what horrors may be in store for us, but no one can doubt that, 
unless something very radical is done, scientific man is a very doomed species. 
In the world in which we are living, there is an active and dominant will 
towards death which has, so far, at every crisis, got the better of sanity. If we 
are to survive, this state of affairs must not continue." 30

In his anti-war mission for establishing permanent peace in society, he detects 
fanaticism about creed and ideology as one of the serious causes of war. There are so 
many people who do not hesitate to prefer the extermination of mankind to the defeat of 
their ideology and creed. The conflict between communism and capitalism also rests on 
such a fanatical attitude. Again, religious fanaticism has given rise to continuous conflicts 
between Catholics and Protestants, Christians and Mohammedans and so forth. No one 
can deny that such type of fanaticism may be aggravated unless a rational approach is 
made to bridge up the gap that exists between two opposite ideological views. So, he 
suggests that people must learn to be tolerant and be guided by conscience in order to 
usher in a happy living condition in the global society that may be acceptable to all. 
He maintains: "we must remember that no one is infallible, not even ourselves, and that 
no dogma is so certain as to afford an excuse for widespread cruelty" 31 In the like manner, 
fanaticism about nationalism is also to be avoided as far as practicable for the same 
purpose. He is sure, as history shows, nationalistic fanaticism is very much likely to lead 
the people to hate and torture the people of other nation. Thus, conflict is inevitable 
between the nations and ultimately it may pollute the sense of world peace. It is, of 
course, true that to bring about change in attitude of the national fanatic is not a very easy 
task; "but it is one which will have to be undertaken before world peace can be secure and 
before any International Authority can win general acceptance." 32

30. Ibid, p. 41
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Russell advocates that education must bring about changes in people's outlook, teach the students not to cherish any derogatory attitude to other nation. Rather, the chief moral object of education is to instil a sense of brotherhood into the minds of the young children. It should also teach the students, as Russell views, how to acquire the merits of civilization and rational behaviour instead of arousing in their minds sense of alienation towards other nation. He asserts:

"what the world most needs in education, as in other department of human life, is the substitution of hope for fear, and the human realization of splendid thing that life may be if the human family co-operatively will permit itself to realize the best potentialities."33

These are some of the significant suggestions of Russell to bring about changes in our outlook inasmuch as we seek world peace for better living. If man can shape their outlook as suggested by Bertrand Russell, there is much possibility that people of the world will be able to avert the third World War and thereby save the human society from the mouth of destruction. No conflict between nation and nation is to be encouraged, they should, instead, be controlled to a very weak position so that the question of nuclear warfare cannot come to surface.

Lord Russell not only raised his voice of protest against warfare but also took certain active steps by getting involved in a number of anti-war associations in support of world peace for the general progress of mankind. His first involvement in such anti-war activities was when he came to dedicatedly work for No-Conscription Fellowship (N.C.F.) an anti-war organization of England which came into existence side by side with the World War I.

It was an organization with the sole object of dissuading the young people from joining army in order to participate in World War I. Through this organization he could meet the Conscientious Objectors and united them as far as possible to stand against the World War I in support of world peace. He did his best to draw the attention of many
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peace-loving people to the support of his argument that war, in whatever form it may be, is to be obstructed at any cost for the good of the human race. It is also noteworthy here that he was sent to prison by British government for the offence of active involvement in such peace-mission. He says: "From the middle of 1916 until I went to prison in May, 1918, I was very busy indeed with the affairs of the No-Conscription Fellowship." 34

Russell's speeches were so convincing, impressive and effective that the munition workers also tended to be pacifist. Having seen the success of Russell in persuading the munition workers, the war office felt it necessary "to issue an order the I (Russell) should not be allowed in any prohibited area." 35

His voice for world peace became more resonant during the Vietnamese war as he started an organization namely "National Conference of Solidarity" (N.C.S.) to launch a national movement in Britain to actively support the people of Vietnam in the nineteen sixties though the conflict between Vietnam and America first started in nineteen thirties. In his speech to the National Conference of Solidarity, London, held on June 4, 1966 he says: "I welcome you to this National Conference of Solidarity, which has been convened solemnly to create a national movement in Britain of active support for the people of Vietnam" 36

In Russell's view The United States was a force for suffering, reaction and counter revolution the world over. The Americans were so cruel that eight million people were placed in concentration camp under forced labour. People were subjected to experimental weapons such as poison gas causing blindness, paralysis and convulsions to the victims. Napalm and phosphorus were dropped on the most densely populated areas. Russell could not tolerate it, and so he took initiative in forming this Conference against the American war-mongering. Regarding its purpose he says:

"the purpose of this conference is to build a movement in Britain worthy of the heroism of the people of Vietnam themselves; a movement which will

34. Autobiography, Vol. II op.cit., p. 31
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not equivocate or pander to the economic power of the United States. We wish to build a movement capable of exposing the sordid squalor of our Prime Minister's subservience and greed." 37

Another chief purpose of the National Conference of Solidarity was to form War Crime Tribunals to search out the victims and witnesses of the great panoply of horrors perpetrated on Vietnamese people by America. He writes:

"Our campaign for solidarity, our War Crimes Tribunal, our films, our books, our meetings and our material help must have one aim; the victory of the Vietnamese over the tormentors. And I express the wish that this victory may herald similar victories of the oppressed everywhere until the day when our own people reclaim their government and transform it into an instrument of good." 38

Besides, Russell was also actively associated with the organization "Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament" (C.N.D.) which was formally started in January, 1958. Russell was the main speaker in almost all the meetings held in connection with C.N.D. He writes: "Moreover, interest in the C.N.D. quickly spread, soon there were committees formed in different parts of the country, and then regional committees. Many meetings were held, at some of which I spoke." 39

Thus, Russell was a very ardent supporter of peace till the last day of his life, that is, February 2, 1970. Ralph Schoenman, in his essay Bertrand Russell and Peace Movement, has aptly remarked that "Bertrand Russell's preoccupation with question of war and peace was lifelong." 40 Here someone may put a question about Russell's support to England against Germany in the World War II in spite of his repeated voices for disarmament. Truly speaking, the World War II was the result of German proliferation under the leadership of Hitler. The Nazis became so destructive and horrorful that they terrorised
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the whole world to its doom. Lord Russell, a rationalist and humanitarian, felt it necessary as demanded by time, to support England in her different initiatives for warfare against the Nazis whose cruelties and atrocities were vigorously marching ahead to snatch away the freedom of all the European countries except of their allies. It was gravely feared by Russell that the Nazis would have crushed all the nations that opposed their views, had they not been obstructed on their way even by waging war against them as was the need of the moment. In support of his stand Russell says:

"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" 41

From the above words of Russell it becomes very clear that Russell's motto in supporting England was not 'War for War's sake'; on the contrary, it was 'War for humanity's sake'. Had England not been successful in thwarting Hitler, only Terror would have reigned in all the European countries for long, and thus the terms liberty, humanity, morality, and others would have been cast away from the framework of civilized living. So, Russell's support to England in the Second World War should be recognized as a very wise means to restore world peace by putting down the fascist forces.

Nevertheless, Russell is of the view that passive resistance to any aggression may be much effective than any active resistance with the help of destructive weapons. If the people of a country can stand unitedly without any division among them against any aggression, they can, Russell thinks, one day win a spiritual victory. Mahatma Gandhi, in India, did so and ultimately won the freedom movement in 1947. This type of victory is far more important than any victory won by guns and bayonets. The following comment

of Russell passed in his essay *The Philosophy of Pacifism* is very noteworthy so far as his view on passive resistance is concerned:

"Passive resistance, if it were adapted deliberately, by the will of a whole nation, with the same measure of courage and discipline which is now displayed in war might achieve a far more perfect protection for what is good in national life than armies and navies can ever achieve, without demanding the courage and waste and welter of brutality involved in modern wars." 42

To conclude, it may be said that peace cannot be made permanent either by any pacific mission or by any organization unless it is desired by the most of the people of the world. But, mere desire for peace is not sufficient to make it permanent; the so-called patriotic feelings of different nationalities must turn into unblemished love for mankind and profound sense of universal brotherhood based on mutual moral obligation. Narrow nationalism which envies the prosperity of others and imagines such prosperity to be hindrance to its own progress is always liable to make the path of World Peace uneven and hazardous. Again men must glorify the victory of reason over brute instincts and also that sort of patriotism through which one's country may earn admiration from others instead of fear and hatred. So long as hate and fear and pride are praised, war can never, as Russell views, become an impossibility. It is time, men must awaken their heart and mind to a new light in which they can see that war is both wicked and foolish. If the permanent world peace can be achieved, Russell thinks "there is a hope that our children may live in a happier world, and look back upon us with the wondering pity of a wiser age." 43

This is chiefly what Bertrand Russell arduously strives for throughout his life as a peace activist. (Essay: Is a Permanent Peace Possible).
