

World Governance in Selected Writings By Bertrand Russell: Utopia or Ideology

BENMECHICHE Hacene*

Mouloud MAMMERI university -Algeria *hacenedz2002yahoo.fr*

Received:14-09-2019 Accepted:10-02-2020 Publisher online:03-01-2020

Abstract: This article studies the idea of “World Government” as envisioned in a series of essays published by Bertrand Russell in the period of the Cold War. It draws upon the theoretical categories introduced by Karl Mannheim in *Ideology and Utopia* (1936) to account for the nature of the reconstruction schemes the author advances to spare human society a possible apocalyptic nuclear confrontation. The study has shown that Russell’s liberal outlook is **utopian** insofar as it has shown advanced positions regarding self-determination, the dissemination of progress and cooperation toward the reconstruction of a peaceful and prosperous world. However, given the technological abyss separating the industrial West in the 1950s from the rest, an open “World State” would be another form of imperialism in disguise. The risk involved is that this “global utopia” whose rulers monopolize military, legislative as well as economic power, would turn into an institutional and **ideological** instrument of control in the hands of the technologically powerful few.

Keywords: Russell; World War ; world state; Governance; reconstruction; conflict; peace ;progress; Utopian ; ideological; open society; human society; Liberal; power ; order.

1. Introduction.

The two World Wars were major traumatic experiences to the human race. Fuelled by ideologies of nationalism and racial superiority, they had caused unprecedented human and material losses and stirred new fears for the future of the human race. The emergence on the world stage of two ideologically opposed blocs, the liberal west and the communist bloc, both of which had developed nuclear arms to achieve

* Corresponding author.

world dominance, made the prospects even gloomier. This titanic ideological contest, “the Cold War”, could at any time evolve into a nuclear conflict between the two superpowers and bring human civilization to an end.

Given that impending disaster, and in face of the failure of the existing international institutions to arbitrate conflicts and prevent destructive wars, the consolidation of peace became an urgent challenge. It was in that period, that Bertrand Russell, a British aristocrat, academic, and pacifist produced a series of essays calling for a “New World Order” characterized by stability, peace, shared human progress and prosperity. To this end, Russell, who was a logician, projected the reconstruction of the human society as a “World State” that would transcend racial, ethnic, ideological and national barriers. The new state, thus reconstructed, would be controlled by a “World Government” that would represent the interests of the whole by granting lasting peace, spreading progress and freedom to the backward parts of the globe, and sharing the resources of the planet through an abolition of frontiers. The guarantee of free access to resources and markets to all would render useless the traditional expeditions for expansion or conquest. Considering his views on religion and science, peace and governance, self-determination and national sovereignty, Russell’s ideas have been the object of various critical appraisals.

Review of the literature.

In his Introduction to *The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell* professor Egner hailed Russell as the most widely read and debated thinker; and one who had had the most ‘profound influence on the course of modern philosophy’ (1961, p: iii). From a conservative stance, Bertrand Russell was labeled as a libertine and advocator of the over man theory. In an article entitled “Bertrand Russell: Prophet of a New World Order”, David J. Peterson (2000) charges Russell of having ‘lent his authoritative voice to the eradication of [. . .] the moral order’ assimilating him to a disciple of Nietzsche who had pronounced

the death of the Christian God and called for a ‘transvaluation of values’. Indeed, Russell, who was a free thinker, considers that Christian religion and its moral values are incompatible with a scientific civilization.

Paul Meier, another critic, reads the discourse of “internationalism” which underpins Russell’s militancy for world peace and world governance as a conspiracy of Anglo-American intellectual elites. Meyers suspects that under cover of the quest for peace and the prevention of a nuclear conflict, advocates of globalism like Russell and H. G. Wells were actually serving the hegemony of the rising liberal West. As an example of this ‘conspiracy’ for a U.S. leadership of the world, Meyers cites the philosopher’s strong support of the “Barruch Lilienthal Plan” of 1946. The plan which was put to Stalin for approval included three basic ideas: the institution of a World Government to replace the U.N., an International Agency for Nuclear Energy, and the suppression of the right of Veto. The plan was meant to grant Americans exclusive monopoly of nuclear power and control by the West of the U.N Executive Council. Russell went further since he suggested threatening the Russians with an atomic strike to have them sign the plan. His reputation as a pacifist suffered severe damage but he continued to militate for one world power convinced as he was that it was a lesser evil than a world in which rival nations with a nuclear potential may lead to the apocalypse.

Oddly enough, Russell’s advanced views on international relations, workers’ control, and the nature of the utopian ideas that inform his political writings have not received enough attention. It is all the more perplexing that critical studies of the utopian genre have not included his ideas for analysis. Neither have his ideas on decolonization and the construction of an open society as popularized by Karl Popper (1947) been the object of critical analysis by scholars belonging to the Third World despite his commitment to self-determination, education, and

progress in favor of the peoples of the traditionally colonized lands in Asia and Africa.

Issue and Hypothesis.

Although Russell did not write a utopia in the conventional sense, a formal utopia, this study is premised on the assumption that his writings, as a social and political thinker, are informed by utopian aspirations which deserve closer examination. This paper, accordingly, explores the following hypothesis: in a world made strongly organic by technical progress and tighter economic relations, the traditional forms of military or colonial domination had been rendered unpopular, obsolete, and dangerous. His plea for decolonization, the development of the “backward areas” of the globe, population control among “the prolific races”, and the monopoly by a World Government of military power and all natural resources, reads, in fact, as a plea for the protection of the human kind under the leadership of a liberal industrialized West. Like E. Bellamy (1888) and H. G. Wells (1906), he felt that the contradictions of the capitalist system could be solved through a World Government that would globalize liberal values and practices to the rest of the world under the supervision of intellectuals and scientists committed to the happiness and welfare of their fellow men. By so doing, competition for resources or markets between firms, trusts, and nations would be prevented, and with it the impending disaster awaiting the human kind in case of a major conflict. Thus, the utopia which was traditionally confined to an ideal nowhere would assume a global scope.

To read the nature of Russell’s schemes for the future organization of the human society, I have drawn upon the definitions put forward by Karl Mannheim in his ***Ideology and Utopia***: (1926). Recent studies in the nature of the U.S/ U.K. “special relationship” are also summoned to back up my claim that the quest for a global order may serve as a form of discourse that partakes of an aspiration to project the constructed idealized Anglo-Saxon self onto the rest of the world.

Peace, Stability, and New World Order.

Russell's concern about the impact of technical progress on society was expressed as early as 1924. In an essay entitled "Icarus or the Future of Science" (1924), he voiced his fears that given the economic and political conditions prevailing then, 'science will be used to promote the power of the dominant groups rather than make men happy'. He feared that like Icarus, governments were using scientific and technical progress unwisely and so may very well lead human society to ruin or back to barbarity. The reason is that scientific and technical advances have not polished Man's instinct of rivalry and his lust for power, which has greatly reduced the positive impact of technical progress. For industrialism to achieve the *summum bonum*, 'the human instincts of rivalry and power lust need to be artificially curbed' (ibid).

To achieve a balance of technical progress and human happiness, Russell writes, certain scientific disciplines need to be developed further. He believes that the laws of heredity discovered by Mendel and which have promisingly been applied to agriculture could be used

to improve human society. Eugenics, along with anthropology, psychology, and sociology, could contribute to the engineering of a better society through the "engineering" of the desired social subject. These ideas have been the object of a satirical treatment by Aldous Huxley in **BNW** (1932). He was convinced that the Industrial Revolution which began in England should '**conquer**' the world (emphasis mine). He was adamant that economic integration will result in political centralization. 'Industrialism', he writes,

still has great parts of the earth's surface to conquer. Russia and India are very imperfectly industrialized; China hardly at all. In South America there is room for immense development. One of the effects of industrialism is to make the world one economic unit: its ultimate consequences will be very largely due to this fact. But before the world

can be effectively organized as a unit, it will probably be necessary to develop industrially all the regions capable of development that are at present backward (Russell, 1924).

Unfortunately, however, industrialism had rather been achieved at the expense of the country peasants and the laboring urban classes at home, and through the expropriation and exploitation of “subject populations” abroad in the name of progress, racial superiority, or freedom of trade. The First World War which had just ended was eloquent enough on the extent of the damage that technical progress combined with imperialism fuelled by feelings of nationalism or racialism could produce.

From Nationalism to Globalism.

Russell considers that progress and modern industrialism, which have led to the evolution of human organization from clans and tribes to nation states, have also brought about a struggle between nations for the acquisition of raw materials and markets which would insure or preserve their domination. Thus, the labor saved by machinery and the surplus of commodities produced is squandered in financing war rather than improving the general standard of life. Military power becomes the inevitable instrument in the quest technological, industrial, and national prestige as he observes that

[I]t is science above all that has determined the importance of raw materials in international competition. Coal and iron, and oil especially, are the bases of power, and thence of wealth. The nation that possesses them and has the industrial skill required to utilize them in war, can acquire markets by armed force and levy tribute upon the less fortunate nations. War is often resorted to to possess these sources of power. (ibid)

Science has been used by nations to increase their military power which in turn is used to control raw materials and markets without which power is quickly lost to a potential rival. Hence, science has

created the conditions for a globalized economy in favor of the most advanced nations and made the use of power nearly ‘a necessity’ to keep economic supremacy. However, with the development and use of nuclear weapons during World War II, the possible proliferation and use of these weapons in the future, the risk of a nuclear apocalypse was imminent and with it the impervious need to ward it off.

Russell argues that just as the nation as a modern form of political organization had been made possible by technical progress in the 19th century, further technological development has enhanced international economic integration thus imposing political globalization as a more appropriate form of organization which fits a *de facto* economically globalized world. As technical progress has increased governments’ control over education and the media of press, it has become easier to influence the taste and opinions of large numbers of people and thus insure economic dependence and ideological allegiance to the powers that control the market and politics. In an over organized world, Russell writes, a man’s thoughts and acts are, to a large extent, determined by the groups to which he belongs. Control by a world government of education and mass media alongside the control it exerts over resources and trade would in the long run produce social subjects with the desired outlook.

The U.S.A as a Paradigm for World Governance.

The solution to a potentially destructive international conflict lies in the institution of a planetary organization, a World Government that would prevent wars. He believed that owing to the speed of technical progress, the world would soon evolve toward

[. . .] one producing and consuming unit. If when that time comes, two rival groups contend for mastery, the victor may be able to introduce that single worldwide organization that is needed to prevent the mutual extermination of civilized nations. [. . .] There would be at first economic and political tyranny, [. . .] and a drastic suppression of

liberty but [in the end], the vanquished will give up hope and accept the subordinate place assigned to them by the victors in the great world trust (Russell, 1924).

Interestingly, Russell's evocation of "world trust" reminds us of the dream of Julian West, Bellamy's hero in *Looking Backward 2000-1888*, in which U.S industrial system naturally evolved from a number of private trusts competing for control of the market into a national trust, before it spread to the rest of the world. Later, H. G. Wells in his *Modern Utopia* (1906) envisioned a planetary system under the rule of elites of legislators and executives he called the "Samurai".

In an essay written in 1952, Russell agrees with Marx and mainly John Dewey that the function of philosophers is no longer 'to interpret the world but to change it' ("science and Values", pp 635-646). He argues that in a globally organized system of production scientists and philosophers should help to produce not only appropriate structures but also an outlook that would sustain them. He believes that in a world that is organized as a single unit of production and consumption, a World Government, even if it were to rely on nothing but armed force, would reduce the events that threaten civilization. This government may be cruel and despotic at first but it is necessary if the human scientific civilization is to be preserved.

One notices that Russell condones the use of power by the mightiest nation to govern the world in the name of economic efficiency, peace and human civilization. He is convinced that hope for salvation lies in the benevolent domination of the world by one group which would spare competing nations mutual destruction. Notwithstanding the reserves he expresses as to the possible imperial temptations of such a system, Russell names the United States as a model of economic and political system that would progressively permeate the world, and evolve into an orderly economic and political global state.

Despite his aristocratic descent, Russell considers that the U.S. society is the best suited model for the construction of a global system of governance. As a new nation, it is the outcome of exceptional historical development. Symbolically, it is the Promised Land, the New World, the asylum for mankind, the Beacon on the Hill, the land of opportunity, of liberty, equality and happiness, but above all, the land where the first form of federal government was successfully instituted. The U.S. economic, cultural, and political success story seems to entitle it to serve as a paradigm of economic success, political organization, and human happiness for the rest of the world.

In an essay entitled “The Taming of Power” (1938), Russell argues that the quest for power has guided men’s actions throughout history; but so has the quest among philosophers and social thinkers for ways of taming this power. Among the various systems that have been considered and tried out, Russell seems to favor democracy in spite of the risk involved that the system may be subverted into tyranny by popular demagogues. To prevent such perversion, democracy has to be ‘sustained by economic conditions, propaganda conditions, and psychological and educational conditions’ (Russell, 1961, pp: 663-664). It is democracy, he observes that has checked the power of monarchs and reduced the power of industrialists by making trade unionism possible. Within small states, direct representation is possible, but in the case of large states where different groups coexist, a federal system combined with devolution may insure the representation of the interests of the different groups without threatening the whole system with anarchy or disintegration. Russell remarks that this system of government that had been perfected in the U.S.A. could serve in the constitution of a World Government in which the authority of the national or local governments will be subordinate to the authority of the “World State” in such strategic matters as peace, education policies, access to raw materials, and War (Ibid: 665-666).

Writing in a period rife with ideological struggle, Russell was convinced that next to technical progress, the outbreak of a major conflict which seemed imminent had made the constitution of a World Government inevitable for various reasons. First and foremost, a world government would prevent a major war resulting from conflicting national interests. Next to this, it would help to disseminate the boons brought about by technical progress. Further, it will found a human society in which the best will be allowed to emerge. Last but not least, it will grant unrestricted access to resources and markets in a world from which frontiers and private ownership are banned. Again, he takes the U.S.A. as an example and argues that a federal system will grow into a more centralized system with time although 'the sentiments and interests of the constituent units are stronger than the sentiments connected with the federation' (Ibid, p: 666). He gives as an example of evolution towards more centralization the growing influence of the U.S. Federal Government and its institutions over that of the individual states since the constitution was drafted. The U.S. War of Secession is a case in point of the growing control of the central authority over its peripheral constituents. It follows that a federal World Government, once instituted, would follow the same course, even in case of rebellion and conflict with one of its national governments. Save for matters connected with peace, education, and the property of raw materials, certain tasks like taxation, health, security are to be devolved to national governments. Russell is well aware that there might be cultural or psychological resistance at first. However, if democracy and the comforts that technical progress and justice provided are spread to the different parts of the world, fear, envy, and the risk of war will diminish.

Along with this Federal World Government, economic democracy, a free press, and education for freedom will limit abuses of power. By economic democracy, Russell conceives a system in which the world state, acting on behalf of citizens, owns and controls certain strategic sectors such as land, raw materials, and energy to prevent concentration

of economic powers in private hands. This will help to correct the errors of communism in which an oligarchy of party members who exercise bureaucratic control on the economy accumulate both political and economic power, which, combined with the control of mass media, will give the party absolute power. Another measure against abuse of power depends on the existence of a free press that would denounce corruption, monopoly, of power, or injustice to check the temptations of oligarchs or plutocrats. Education should work toward the suppression of strong emotions of fear, hate or love; all of which lead to radical ideology because of the blind submission they may inspire to a creed or a leader. Education should foster rational evaluation rather than dogmatic belief. It should, as far as possible, avoid strong emotions which lead to collective hysteria that prepares for war and annihilation. In short, Russell, advocates a liberal education

[. . .]which regards the welfare of the state as residing ultimately in the welfare of the individual [by contrast to education in] a totalitarian state which regards the state as the end and individuals merely as indispensable ingredients whose welfare must be subordinated to a mystical totality which is a cloak for the interests of the rulers. (ibid, p: 680).

Peace, salvation, progress, and happiness for humanity seem to lie in the institution of a new centralized world order that would have the monopoly of military power and certain strategic resources, and work towards the abolition of national frontiers, feelings and allegiances. However, this society as the one advocated by Popper(1946) should remain open to criticism and improvement?

Globalization or Americanization?

To prevent the nuclear peril, Russell advocates ‘empiricist liberalism which is not incompatible with democratic socialism [. . .] in a politically divided but technically unified planet. . .’(1947,p:467). The need to develop this outlook and to institute a World Government

stems from the fact that nations' economic systems have developed from activities based on the quest for private profit, 'economic interdependence, instead of producing friendliness tends to be a cause of hostility' (Russell, 1961: 699-704). Russell goes on to explain that military power plays an important part in economic competition for it grants access to raw materials, energy, and markets. Politics is subservient to economy. The quest for economic domination has been the main cause in the development of human association from the state of tribes, to that of nations, and to alliances of nations to ensure victory. However, in a world where the contending powers have developed mass destruction nuclear weapons, the greatest victory lies in the enforcement of peace and the prevention of war. Peace was a strategic necessity if human civilization, nay if human life was to continue. As long as there were many sovereign states with diverging interests, Russell observes, war cannot be prevented. The only hope lay in the creation of a unique sovereign power that would represent the interests of the whole humanity (*ibid*).

Attributes of the World Government.

To preserve peace and insure the welfare and happiness of the human kind, the World Government should have complete monopoly of power. By power, Russell means not only military power but equally the natural sources of energy such as coal, oil, uranium, or any other form of energy that scientific progress may come to develop. Monopoly of all major weapons by the army of the World Government, combined with a total loyalty of this army to the World Government would empower this supreme authority to prevent conflicts by arbitrating and settling disputes between local states. A legislative body dependent on the new hegemon will pass laws binding all the local states, and the World Government will have an irresistible power to enforce them. Recourse to war between local states will be deterred as any use of force by these latter shall bring deserved punishment (**Ibid**).

This World Government, Russell explains, ‘may owe its origin to consent or to conquest’. It may be the national government of a state which has achieved world conquest. Russell believes that the U.S.A., owing to its economic dynamism and military power, its federal constitution and democratic culture, its leading role against Nazism, and then Communism, possesses the required assets to be the seed that would, with time, grow into the global authority so eagerly sought for. To prevent resistance, affluence and a certain level of comfort should spread to the “backward states” which concomitantly will supply the energy, raw materials, and markets necessary to the world industry to thrive and prosper. ‘It will be impossible’, Russell writes,

to feel that the world is in a satisfactory state, until there is a certain degree of equality and a certain acquiescence everywhere to the power of the world government. And this will not be possible until the poorer nations of the world have become educated, modernized in their technique, and more or less stationary in population (p. 702).

The emancipation and development of the formerly colonized areas, then their integration in a globalized economy will reduce envy and feeling of injustice, and add to the common wealth and welfare of the human kind.

Ethics in the Globalized World.

Along with the centralization of power in the hands of a World government made inevitable by stronger organic links between nations and the impervious necessity to preserve peace, freedom and personal initiative should be encouraged if progress is to take place; Russell writes in “Individual and Social Ethics”(Russell, 1961:357). Freedom of initiative through devolution should be granted to national states, local governments, groups and individuals if despotism and injustice are to be prevented. Men may even inspire or lead revolutions against the new world order in case it proves iniquitous on condition that the leaders of such revolutions are imbued with a deep respect for law.

Russell cites 1688 and 1774 as examples of successful revolutions because they did not lead to anarchy although they reinforced democracy and freedom. These revolutions, which are the core of the Anglo-American liberal tradition, managed to strike a balance between order and individual initiative. Scientific enquiry and technical progress have diminished man's dependence on nature and expanded his empire over it. However, thirst for power inherent in men's nature has remained as strong as ever thus turning knowledge and progress into instruments of subjection and alienation. To prevent injustice, ethics should encourage men's creative impulses that do not lead to the subjection and suffering of their fellow men.

Colonialism is another ethically unacceptable form of institutionalized subjection and injury which is incompatible with a globalized human society. In an essay entitled "The Next Half Century" (704-710), Russell suggests to work progressively toward the self-determination and independence of the colonized territories in Africa and Asia. The period following the defeat of Nazism, Militarism, and Fascism was particularly propitious for a discourse of liberation, self-determination and international cooperation toward stability and peace. Russell had two strategic objectives in mind. The first and most urgent was to contain Soviet ideological and military influence by establishing a balance of power in favour of the liberal West. The next step consisted in the reconstruction of the world in a form that would spare humanity further injustice and destruction. To that effect, Russell suggested replacing the traditional colonial relations based on military domination, economic and political annexation, by a new world order in which the newly independent states would keep privileged relations with the metropolis. The West, once peace was secured, should 'find ways of raising Asia and Africa to the economic level of Western Europe if not America' (Russell, 1961:705). For example, the French and the English should work toward the modernization of their former colonies which with time would be integrated in the globalized

economy. This could be done through investment to modernize infrastructure, agriculture, and industry in the backward areas of the world. Meanwhile, population should be educated and encouraged to practice birth control to prevent the depletion of the planet's resources.

The new system will present a double advantage. Besides helping to overcome native suspicion in European imperialism, it will replace costly unpopular military occupation and economic exploitation by close, voluntary cooperation within a globalized liberal system and prevent anarchy or communism from taking root in the newly decolonized areas. Thus, independence, together with improved education, birth control, and tight relations with a stable technologically advanced west will result in economic prosperity in Asia and Africa. This prosperity, in turn, will benefit the Western nations by granting them access to energy and raw materials, prosperous markets, and a better educated and highly skilled labour force (ibid).

To preserve peace and institute global a governance respectful of human rights, Russell, calls for scientists to join their voices to prevent a nuclear conflict 'lest what Western civilization has achieved may be forgotten in bitterness and poverty' ("If we Are to Survive these dark", *New York Times*, Sept. 3rd, 1950). This can be done by translating the ideals embodied in philosophy and social theory into practical actions. In other words, Russell is a pragmatist who believes with Karl Marx and John Dewey that the value of ideas is measured by their capacity to transform society. 'Contemplation', he writes, 'if it is to be wholesome and valuable, must be married to practice; it must inspire action and ennoble aims of practical statesmanship. While it remains secluded in cloisters, it is only a means of escape' (ibid, 682).

As a scientist and a pragmatist, Russell believes that technical progress has given man power and control over nature and his fellow men and has enabled him to change the world for the better. He believes, together with empiricists and pragmatists, that truths are those theoretical tools that enable men to achieve suitable ends. They will

remain valid as long as they constitute suitable means to desired ends. In their contest with the metaphysical and religious interpretation of the world scientific truths have come out victorious, Russell observes in ***The Impact of Science on Society*** (1971). Traditional religious dogmas find no support in science as science has proven that nature is governed by immutable laws. By scientific and technical knowledge, man is now master of his fate as he has acquired mastery over natural phenomena. Considerations of good and evil are no longer the monopoly of religion but of science which has supplanted it in the interpretation and control of the world. Science not religion is the source of ethics in a modern technologically oriented world. Reflecting about the leading role of intellectuals and scientists in modern societies, Russell notes:

In the world of value, we are greater than nature. In the world of value, nature in itself is neutral; neither good nor bad; deserving of neither admiration nor censure. It is we who create value and our desires which confer value. In this realm, we are kings and we debase our kingship if we bow down to nature. It is for us to determine the good life; not for nature, not even for nature personified in God. (“What I believe” 1957, p: 371).

It is, therefore, the responsibility of scientists, not that of the clergy, to define the good society and work to its realization.

The good society, for Russell, is necessarily one guided by knowledge and inspired by love. Although both knowledge and love are necessary, love is in a sense more fundamental. People seek knowledge in order to find out how to benefit those whom they love. ‘Love makes us benevolent’, Russell notes, in “Individual and Social Ethics”, ‘and knowledge increases the impact of our benevolence (1961:358). Ethics is improved by knowledge. Science is subservient to ethics. However, since the value of actions is decided by those who hold power, ethics are usually set by the mighty to serve and preserve their collectively organized interests. Those in power often cooperate to instill into the minds of the social subjects all forms of value judgment that sustain the

order. The good life depends on the good society; and the good society depends in the last resort on the will and interests of those who wield power. Russell who was culturally immersed in the English liberal tradition could not fail to praise liberal values and present the U.S.A as a paradigm for the good society.

Making the bed to the Rising Hegemon.

Recent developments on the world scene, especially since the end of the Cold War in favor of the liberal west seem to confirm the rising of the U.S.A. as a leading world power. David Grondin(2006) observes, the U.S.A., which alternates hegemony with imperial practices, is gradually remapping the world in accordance to its national narrative, self-perception and strategic interests. Commenting on the modern reterritorialization of the world, Grondin notes that the national state is the 'primary locus of political, economic and cultural organization [in which] the state reinvests its nation with new meaning' (2006: 3). However, when we take into account the U.S. growing global influence, facts seem to run counter to the official story. Grondin observes further that

When considering global power, the resulting map is necessarily an approximation, an interpretation, a codification of reality. The globe in its entire cartographic representation is of interest to the U.S. because it has global power, responsibilities and interests (Ibid).

As a modern nation and hegemon, the U.S.A. is a product of its founding text (the U.S. constitution) which it has authored, and which in turn determines its outlook and constrains its actions. This founding narrative, constantly revisited to fit new challenges, turns into a dominant discourse which gives identity to the U.S. nation, statesmen, and citizens; fashions their representations, and orients their praxis at home and worldwide.

In recent times, especially after the 9/ 11 terrorist attacks on the U.S. symbols of power and the subsequent American intervention in

Afghanistan and invasion of Iraq, the scenario envisioned by Bertrand Russell is beginning to materialize. Some provisions taken by the neo-conservative think tanks and executives under the G.W. Bush's administration seem to confirm the global unilateral role of the U.S.A. The Global War on Terror and the National Security Strategy (2002) which take the whole globe as their field of action, heedless of international legality, public opinion, and the resentment and fear that these actions can engender, betray the imperial pretensions of the U.S.A.

From Exeptionalism to Liberal Millenarianism.

Because of its exceptional history, the U.S.A. has always incarnated, in the minds of its people and leaders, novelty and leadership. It has alternatively been viewed as "an empire of liberty", an "empire by destiny" then "an empire by invitation" to defeat Nazism and then contain Soviet communism. The end of the Cold War in favor of the liberal West and the demise of the Soviet Union seem to have consecrated the victory of capitalism and the liberal version of millenarian ideology over the dream of the dictatorship of the proletariat which was assimilated by liberal thinkers to totalitarianism. Today, liberalism has become a matter of common sense. As such, it has turned into an ideology that sustains U.S. interests. 'The presumption that liberal values [as stated in the U.S. Constitution] are **self-evidently true**' (emphasis is the authors'), Patrick Thaddeus Jackson and Daniel Nixon observe,

underscores the possibility that other societies could be more like America in practice given the proper incentive or tutelage. Hence, the familiar spectacle of American presidents making appearances in foreign countries and pressing those countries to enact such liberal institutions as free market economy, the separation of [religion]and state, and increased freedom of the press. While non-Americans resent such actions, in the United States, they are seen as the simple reaffirmation of things that Americans **know** to be **true**(emphasis is the

authors'). America imagines the rest of the world as somehow, at base, just like America if not for the distortion produced by ideology, corrupt regimes, and the historical effects of culture.' ("Representation is Futile? "American Collectivism and the Borg", in *Hegemony or Empire* p.11).

Hence, imposing liberal values as commonsensical is a form of ideology that constrains the actions of the social subjects .Acting outside common sense is a form of folly that must be corrected lest it disrupt the prevailing order. It must therefore be treated accordingly. This explains why countries that ignore the expectations of a liberal world hegemon are diplomatically interpellated or forcefully constrained.

Conclusion: Bertrand Russell was writing in an age of distrust, fear, and real danger into which he attempted to infuse some measured hope. The hopes placed in science and technical progress was thwarted by the ends that were achieved: exploitation and subjection at home and abroad, totalitarian ideologies, and international competition, which had resulted in two World Wars.

By Mannheim's standards, Russell's project for a "World State" under the authority of a "World Government" are utopian in nature insofar as they tend to transform an unpleasant reality; an ideologically divided world threatened by destruction into an ideal united world where cooperation harmony and peace prevail. His militancy for the decolonization and development of the then colonized areas in Africa and Asia deserves our attention and respect, and partakes of the same utopian aspirations to secure a better future to the human race.

On the other hand, the choice of the U.S. form of federal government as a model to imitate in the construction of the World State, and the fact that he condones recourse to coercion to this end may be interpreted as an ideological siding with the liberal West and U.S. global influence. In a world made strongly organic by technical

progress and consolidated by a political union, from which frontiers would have been erased, offers the advantage of granting the technologically advanced liberal nations free access to markets, energy, and a selected qualified labor force as is the case today. Resistance, opposition or sedition from one the peripheral constituents could bring about legitimate and legal action from the world power.

In Spite of his opposition to U.S. imperialist practices in Vietnam, as he had set up a War Crimes Tribunal which condemned the U.S. Government for war crimes there, Russell seems to have unwillingly made himself the accomplice of neoliberals' hegemony.

Globalization is a form of discourse that sustains a return to the monopolistic trends of modern monopoly capitalism. In a post Cold War atmosphere in which economic, cultural and ideological diversity are demonized by the liberal victors, pressure is often exerted, and "wars on terror" are waged to discipline the "rogue elements", spread the values of freedom, democracy, human rights, and consumerism everywhere, and convince the recalcitrant states to integrate them the global Leviathan.

References

- A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations from the Cold War to Iraq.
Edited by John Dumbrell, New York: Palgrave Mac Millan, 2006.
- Fominaya, Cristina, Flesher. ***Social Movements and Globalization: How protests, Occupations and Uprisings are Changing the World.*** Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.
- **Hegemony or Empire? The redefinition of U.S. Power under George W. Bush.** Edited by Charles Philip David and David Grondin, England and USA: 2006.
- Keane J.,and P. Meiers. ***Global Civil Society.*** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Mannheim, Karl. ***Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge.*** San Diego, New York, and London: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1936.

- Peterson David, J. "Bertrand Russell: Prophet of a New World Order." **New Oxford Review**: 35-40, June 2000. Available at: <http://www.catholicculture.org>, accessed in October 2015.
- Popper, Karl. **The Open Society and its Enemies; the Spell of Plato**. London: Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1947.
- Robertson, Roland. **Globalization, Social Theory, and Global Culture**. London: Sage, 1992.
- Russell, Bertrand. **The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism**. London: Allen and Unwin, 1920.
- "Icarus or the Future of Science". London: Allen and Unwin, 1924.
- "Science and Values"(1959), in: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Laeter E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 90-107).
- "Individual and Social Ethics"(.....), in: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 357- 366).
- "What I Believe"(.....), in: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 367-390).
- "The Taming of Power"(.....), in: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 663-681).
- "If we are to Survive this Dark Time". **New York Times**: Sept.3, 1950, in: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959** Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 682-687).
- "What would Help Mankind Most?" (1951). in: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.
- "World Government", (1951). In: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.
- "The Next Half Century"(1951), In: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.
- "Science and Human Life"(.....), In: **The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russerll.:1903-1959**. Edited by R.Egner and Lester E.

Dennon, New York: 1961.

- "Life without Fear", (1951). In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russertl.:1903-1959***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961.

- "Science and Human Life", In: ***The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russertl.:1903-1959***.Edited by R.Egner and Lester E. Dennon, New York: 1961, (pp, 716- 725).

- ***The Impact of Science on Society***. London: Unwin Paperbacks, 1976.

- Wallerstein, I. "Globalization or the Age of Transition" ***International Sociology***: 15, (249-265).

- Wells, H. George. ***A Modern Utopia***. London: Chapman and Hall, 1906.

-Zunino Marcos. "Subversive Justice: The Russell Vietnam War Crimes Tribunal and Transitional Justice". ***In International Journal of Transitional Justice***, Vol.10, Issue 2, July2016, pp. 211-229. Available at <http://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijw007>