Theories and Practices of Nationalism Term Paper

Will nationalism survive globalisation? Or will globalisation, in its current information technology mediated version, lead to the fading away of nationalism and nation-states?

Zubair Abid (20171076)

Abstract

Something summary of paper

Introduction

- There is an interesting dichotomy between the "globalisation is dead" messages and the "globalised society is the future" crowd. Which is the case?
- We are more specifically looking to see if and how it would impact the existence of Nationalism and the nation-state.
- For understanding Nationalism we rely heavily on Scholte (2005), and we compare it against the various theories taught in class. Special emphasis will be given to the theory of the minimal self-reproducing unit required to sustain a community, introduced by Gellner (1983)¹

Globalisation is not dead; What even is it?

• To make a case, we need to know what globalisation is in the first place.

What globalisation is not

- Searching for Globalisation, we are met with a flood of articles announcing that it is dead most, from the financial fields. Hence you have Saval (2017) writing on the "fall" of Globalisation due to (then) recently elected world-leaders opting for "nation first" approaches, or Michael O' Sullivan calling for a "new [multipolar] world order" (2019).
- These operate under an understanding of "globalisation" as a synonym for "internationalisation." Such a definition is not beneficial to begin with due to the redundancy. It also reduces globalisation to the limits of internationalisation, which by definition conceives the idea of nations as the primary political unit.
- Another common thread is to align it with liberalisation removing official border constraints on international trade and the like – making globalisation about the spread of contemporary neoliberal macroeconomic policies.³

¹More specifically, Gellner specified the need for a community to sustain an independent educational system if it hoped to sustain itself in modern society (see Gellner 1983, 32). We will explore this later.

²See (Scholte 2005, 52–54), on how definitions should try to "advance knowledge," and why the new word should not be expressible as a synonym for another existing concept.

³Scholte (2005), pp. 56

Globalisation as a shift in social space

• For definition, we primarily use the proposal put forth by Scholte (2005) - globalisation as a shift in the social space, expressed through the spread of transplanetary and supraterritorial connections between people.

// Ending lines: Globalisation makes sense, but how does it matter?

Why do people herald the death of the nation-state?

Outline

- Introduction
- Globalisation is not dead
 - Even though some economic arguments claim is
 - Define it, and give examples where you agree (5 definitions, cases against or for each in brief)
 - General agreement with the book, and mention how this will all factor in
 - Overall: summarise the book. 600 words.
- Why would people herald the death of the nation-state?
 - There's the whole globalisation OP not-fad respatialization thing. Global village, Economic liberation, yada yada.
 - Globalisation != Internationalisation, does not necessitate nations.
 - The internet eased communication in unreal, unexpected fashion. Two-way communication. State seemingly does not control this dimension. Most arguments were from earlier.
 - Gellner did say Nationalism was a weak force, a well tended garden
 - Scholte says the State remains, but its character shifts. Possible over-appearement (but perhaps not to democratic globalisation)?
 - Bemyeh. Will get to responses to him later.
- Looking at history of nationalism, comparing against globalisation and viability:
 - Anderson's Imagined Community: No other
 - Kohn's Replacement for God: No cause
 - Gellner's Nationalism came first (so I don't forget: in Gellner's chicken and egg problem, the egg came first)
 - Hobsbawm's Invented Tradition: Maybe but how?
 - (Maybe) De-universalisation of literate high culture (in new shape)?
 - (Maybe) Alike to the "Colonial Indian Elite?" Football idea.
- How information-mediation may actually help nationalism:
 - Already exists a long-distance nationalism (Anderson)
 - Becomes worse with the internet (Eriksen, Conversi)
- Also other theories, that I cannot back as strongly, leaning towards...
 - Not viable due to violation of Gellner's nationalist sentiment in global economy, and also the other way with global social respatialization
 - Nations as emotional conduits to rouse support for state governance
 - Most people do not move, and Facebook is a social bubble. Weak, but in need of a Gandhian figure.
 - What is key is control over devices of reproduction: schooling and mass communication.
 The government controls, but corporations...
 - Pobodnik mentions that capital has not managed to reacquire autonomy from political regulation, but especially with tech sector being new ground, lots of gaps showing up in the national framework (methodological territorialism from Scholte). The new East India Company.

- Globalisation would require policy implementation, but those in charge of education either favour national interests (government) or neoliberal interests (corporations). No framework for reproduction.
- Statelessness as an example, unable to continue without a framework of reproduction and trampled effectively by the advent of communication and fast, convenient travel.

References

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. Nations and Nationalism. Cornell University Press.

"Globalisation Is Dead and We Need to Invent a New World Order." 2019. The Economist, June. https://www.economist.com/open-future/2019/06/28/globalisation-is-dead-and-we-need-to-invent-a-new-world-order.

Saval, Nikil. 2017. "Globalisation: The Rise and Fall of an Idea That Swept the World." *The Guardian*. http://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/jul/14/globalisation-the-rise-and-fall-of-an-idea-that-swept-the-world.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2005. Globalization: A Critical Introduction. Macmillan International Higher Education.