

Momir DJUROVIC  
Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts  
WAAS Trustee

## THE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE OF 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY: NATIONALISM vs. GLOBALISM\*

### INTRODUCTION

For the most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, ideological discussions and debates have been focused on liberal versus conservative, left versus right. In the early of 1990 s, governments started to deregulate financial markets by increasing size and fast-track liberalization of the global trade system, and started to remove the major restrictions on immigration. Thus, the world in 21 century has become very interdependent and different from what it was even in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is generally recognized, in this century, that the process of international integration has increased substantially, both at the intensive and at the extensive margin. On the intensive side, trade flows have largely increased, both in volume and in spreading, while foreign direct investments and international financial transactions have increased at even higher rates. This has introduced the new ideological divide which in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is emerging as globalism versus nationalism and the relations between them. It will be fought out, not only among nations, but within nations, too.

The year 2016 might be recognized as a global turning point, jointly with 2008 (the global financial crisis), 2001 (the 9/11 attacks), and 1989 (the fall of the Berlin wall). This is the year when the battle between globalists and nationalists became the central issue of conflict within and across many nations, especially in Europe and the United States. It can be understood in different ways but it may be remembered as the year that the Western world turned away from—or at least slowed down—its long march toward globalization and transnational entities.

---

\* All papers are printed as submitted.

## GLOBALISM/ NATIONALISM

Since the end of World War II, technological progress and global integration have resulted in globalism, a new world order centered on free trade, open borders and interdependent economies, and recently in massive migration. The globalism is the idea of opening up borders such to bring the entire world together under one economic and political umbrella, considering that world peace can be achieved through the creation of a single system of international law. On the contrary, nationalism protects the sovereignty of individual countries in order to preserve the culture, laws, and economy of such society. Right now these two ideologies are in direct conflict with one another within the political systems of many nations, as the people push for national sovereignty and the elites push for globalism. Globalists see nationalists as hopelessly parochial, while nationalists see globalism as big threat. But the facts are that both systems have their positive and negative attributes which should be taken into account.

Globalism as an ideology was constructed around the idea of economic determinism. The assumption was that economic growth and liberalization would lead inevitably to political change, growing democratization and prosperous middle class that would help maintain political stability. The result being that we live more and more within algorithms.

On the surface, globalism sounds like a great idea: preventing large-scale world/nuclear wars, increasing the free flow of people, capitals, goods, services and information across borders, and even facilitating greater diversity within the cultures of different nations. The question is: are these trends a result of the current political agenda behind globalism or are they a natural phenomenon that was happened due to societies evolution?

The globalization is not considered by all as positive and many think of it as a threat. It has been criticized for benefiting only some elites and undermining the lives of many others, while already devastating economic and introducing social consequences on the majority of the world population, and producing mass immigration trying to redistribute poor people to rich countries. It has resulted in tremendous changes at the political and the cultural levels. It has resulted to major wars attempting to integrate any country resisting integration into the New World Order defined by neoliberal globalization, what has been a double edge sword. The globalists have underestimated the collateral damage and they has inflicted upon workers.

On the other side globalism has resulted in many benefits, such as the ever best standard of living, longer length of life, more people dying because of eating too much rather than due to hunger, better health care and many more while the humans has become own worst enemy. Furthermore, the climate change, migration of refugees, nuclear weapon, technological disrupt, universal basic income are not national but global problems and as such have to be fought on global level.

The globalists strongly support high levels of immigration. Many on the left argue that western countries have a humanitarian obligation to take in new immigrants due to climate change or because they have lost everything due to neo-conservative policies of foreign military interventions. In that sense the "integration"

is usually acceptable, but “assimilation” is controversial. The globalists generally support transnational organizations. The globalists frequently accuse their opponents of racism.

More specifically the process of globalization involves complex technological systems (TS). Technology has often led to the creation of strongly monopolistic markets and lower market and information costs, as well as in elimination of barriers for new goods and services. The technology and globalization, especially over past several years, lead to ever greater inequalities. This is especially apparent in the case of “digital economy”. The inequalities are present within countries as well as between countries. Since politics is organized principally around the nation state, it is the level and change in inequalities within countries that is the most potent source of tension and debate. The effects of technology and globalization on inequality are neither inevitable nor entirely predictable. Techno-globalists wishing to dismantle all worldwide barriers to economic or technology flows, suggest a “liberal” global economic system based on technologically improved infrastructure. In that sense technological developments are conceived as the main facilitator and driving force of most of the globalization processes. The techno-globalists, most of whom live in the Anglo-Saxon countries claim that technology makes globalism irresistible.

Finally, the other problems associated with globalism are brain drains of developing nations and its secret wars. The developing nations become the grounds for secret proxy wars of larger nations; such as the current situation in Syria where the US and Russia are fighting a proxy war against each other.

The question you have to ask yourself is: does one want globalization? One dictating power of the world. The goal of one religion and the loss of individual right? A globalized, borderless world in which nation states have been abolished, or does one like to continue with a world that remains partitioned into separate states?

The earlier expectations that were raised by “Friedmanism” (after Tom Friedman) had been that those who embraced the principles of globalism would create a more prosperous world free of conflict between ethnic groups, religions and nations. It was believed that it would gradually weaken the power and influence of those who promoted the anachronistic values of identity, as well as the power of the reactionaries who would try to exploit any political backlash against globalization and would call for restrictions on the flow of capital, goods and people.

The threats of ISIS and global terrorism, refugee crises and turmoil in the Middle East, as well as the failure of many politicians to be sensible voices in a world with serious obstacles had pushed people into irrational worldviews. Such, the nationalism spreading across the globe can be seen as a failure of liberal-democratic orders throughout Europe and America to provide people to co-exist and live peacefully despite differing worldviews, religious, and political viewpoints.

The nationalism has a long history and it has always been something that people fight for promoting and defending a particular culture and way of life. It is, at the same time, used by politicians to promote national unity and patriotism. Simply put, nationalism is identification with a country and a belief in the commonality of the values and people of that country. The new nationalists seek to

regain control over their own countries. Their targets are global structures such as the European Union, the World Trade Organization (WTO), NATO, the United Nations and the NAFTA. The nationalism is causing massive shifts in political power throughout the world. Although the anti-establishment movements of third world countries and the first world nations are ideologically incompatible with each other, the truth is that most of these populist movements are actually based upon the same position of being anti-globalist, and being pro-nationalist.

Despite some of the shortcomings that arise from nationalism, there are still many positive issues. Such, a return to nationalism can be a positive shift away from globalism by re-establishing national sovereignty in countries so that they are free to democratically determine their own destiny. Nationalism is not only the fight for freedom and democracy; it could be the first step in furthering the idea of decentralizing power in society. As such the new nationalist wave has started and shocked the supporters of globalism. This new nationalism is the vital center of Brexit and the election of Donald Trump.

On a cultural level, the world has moved from national cultures to mixed cultures, resulting in a homogenized global culture rather than national. The new forms of identification, across nationalism and globalism, suggest they may be generating paradoxically cosmopolitan modes of nationalism. This form of nationalism differs from ethno-nationalism, and contrasts with civic nationalism<sup>1</sup>. Such, what is defined as particular and universal depends in large on power relations, with “cosmopolitans”, especially in core states, blind to their own particularism. Fundamental disagreements over human nature and the moral value of parochialism, show that globalists and nationalists disagree about the moral value of patriotism.

To understand why nationalism and right-wing populism have grown so strong so quickly, one must start by looking at the actions of the globalists. They initiated many of events which have caused right-wing nationalist reactions in many countries. Such, the conflict between globalists and nationalists is likely to be front and center in many Western nations in the coming time. It might probably rise up in Europe until the European Union either achieves “ever unity” or else breaks up and returns to a trading block of nation-states with lower aspirations for union. Certainly, nationalism will not be a right issue to fight global problems.

In brief, those who have advocated for the ideology of globalism and worldwide economic integration seriously overlook potential dangers that could result from large parts of society who feel as if they were left behind due to the world's economies integrated together. Those sentiments and real feelings might be explanation why the Brexit pool was successful. Such developments can explain the emergence of Trump, or recent happening in Catalonia, Scotland, Lombardy, and others, too. In that sense fundamentally the ideology of nationalism is providing, at present, a meaningful and energized alternative to the ideology of globalism

---

<sup>1</sup> A form of nationalism that enlists universal values — such as democratic and human rights — in the service of nationally-defined political ends.

Can the nationalists earnestly provide a durable world peace? Whereas the globalists have idea of takeing over the whole planet and controlling of every aspect of life through a One World Government, the nationalists are more about preserving national sovereignty and territorial integrity, taking a much more decentralized view of governance and recognizing that people everywhere are best served at the local level. It looks the globalists would be only 'successful' when promoting a perpetual war economy, trying to own every natural resource in sight and control every level of government either directly or indirectly. In contrary the nationalists are often forced into a military action to simply protect their people and territories.

Nationalists predict that globalism and its four horses of the apocalypse—free trade, immigration, financial deregulation and same-sex marriage—will destroy families, communities and nations. The first phase is establishing NAFTA and EU, next The world government. In that sence many on the right want to slow down the rise of multi-culturalism in order to preserve the already established cultures within its borders, istancead of uniting around the common enemy.

## EPILOGUE

It looks that the globalism project, economic unity plus liberalism, has been failnig. It has succeeded to accelerated global economic growth, at the same time, accelerating the growth of the services and information-based sectors in the economies of industrialized West. From that perspective, globalism as the example of the idea of economic determinism, failed to materialize and proved to be an illusion.

On other side nationalism has had a great deal of difficulty surviving in this world, and some would argue that it has become less important. However, others argue that nationalism is benefiting from globalization and is becoming more important than ever. It seems that as people respond to corporate globalization, nationalism is being adapted. The driving forces of this are religion, language, ethnicity, philosophy, patriotism, xenophobia...

Not to loose from mind that humans want to belong to a group, to maintain a sense of collective identity and to have roots in the past. When these needs are not in balance, the political man returns and a political backlash to achieve new equilibrium is inevitable. Brexit and Trumpism may be indication that a political backlash is taking place right now and that nationalism is on the rise. Both concepts, nationalism and globalism, have an important position in the contemporary world. There is a sign that a certain rebalancing between these two forces is creating a basis for a new equilibrium in industrialized societies.

All this shaws that the political and economic elites may have to slow down their efforts to liberalize global trade, deregulation of financial markets and open borders to new immigration. They need to reexamine some aspects of the ambitious globalization agenda: such as supranational institutions. They need to return more power to national governments. Certainly, at the same time, it would be impossible to stop the world and get down and close borders to trade and immigration. Obviously more impossible would be for single person or community to fight climate change and technological disruptions locally, especially when

we are not able to predict consequences of them. Has the issue of global economy but national patriotism become noble, but not only matter of identity? Is this the future ideology?

It's clear that society is going through a transition, wherein it's realized that globalism in its present form is not the answer best suited to society's needs. While nationalism might not be the final frontier for the current tide of populism, it seems that it may be the first step in ridding the world of the globalism, and as such fighting contemporary capitalism. It might be understood once the world returns to national sovereignty it will then further decentralize power within each nation's border. It does seem that one international system of politics and law is far too standardized and not good enough to meet the diverse needs of the planet. Furthermore, it delegates far too much power to a very small group of individuals, which can be incredibly dangerous. It's hard to believe that such standardisation would be an ideal issue for a social system. While globalism clearly seems to be failing, the question is whether or not nationalism is a credible replacement?