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ABSTRACT

The goal of the thesis is to provide a critique of nationalism and its effect on international relations. It is also to look at alternatives to nationalism as human forms of organization and to see if they are viable. The main theories employed here are those of realism, which is tied to theories of nationalism, and cosmopolitanism. There are references to other theories but realism and cosmopolitanism are the basis of the main theoretical discussion. The theory of cosmopolitanism is also linked to the theory of social constructivism, which is an important part of the dissertation’s argument. The thesis follows the format of a critical literature review. It uses the already large amount of literature on nationalism and its alternatives for its sources. The thesis will posit that nationalism plays a more negative role in today’s international affairs than positive. However, it contains elements which are positive also and some of the reasons for the behavior linked to nationalism are accepted as parts of human nature. The thesis also looks at alternative forms of human organisation. It posits that there are and have been alternatives to nationalism. Although many of the alternatives have their own pitfalls or appear unrealistic in the present time, they are nonetheless accepted as something to be worked on or worked towards. The thesis supports moves towards more global governance and the promotion of cosmopolitan notions of coexistence. The thesis also posits that an acceptance of human particularism must be incorporated into any projects to foster more global cooperation. Hence, projects for more international harmony must redefine how interests are defined and how peace and security are reached as opposed to merely basing future forms of human organization on ethics alone.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to evaluate the place of nationalism as form of organization for human societies in the 21st century. It analyses nationalism’s effect on the conduct of international relations. It then goes on to ask what possible alternatives to nationalism might be.

This project was undertaken as I feel that nationalism has passed its usefulness in many parts of the world and is used by elites for their own benefit, which is often to the detriment of their own citizens and hinders international cooperation. Nationalism is often neglected in the study of international relations (Halliday, 2004:522). That stated, nationalism has a strong connection to the stalwart, international relations theory of realism. Realism posits that nation states are the main actors in international relations and that the leaders of these states act in a way to maximize the benefits for those states and, thus, its citizens (Morgenthau, 1985:4-6, 8-12). We can understand these citizens as the members of the nation which inhabit any particular state.

Therefore, the main objects of analysis are the ideas of nationalism themselves and the consequences of them. This will be done by examining the opinions of writers on the topics of nationalism and alternatives to it.

There are many types of nationalism and there is not enough space in this thesis to look at all of them. There is some kind of nationalism present in all countries. The thesis does not aim to provide a critique of all such nationalisms. Rather it aims to provide a general analysis of nationalism as a form of human organization. In providing such an analysis, it is necessary to look at alternatives to nationalism. This will be touched on throughout but has its own specific section in the alternative visions chapter of the thesis. Here are some of the sub-questions addressed in the thesis: ‘Do human beings (still) need nationalism?’, ‘Can nationalism be overcome? (If so, how?)’, ‘What are the alternatives?’.

I believe the topic in important because of the conditions of the age. Never before have there been so many people on the planet and so many connections between them. This new world of ever increasing globalization is as full of promise as it is problems. Nationalism can be one of the problems in a new world order such as this one. As human beings develop, they also create more and more ways to damage each other and their environment. Therefore, it would
seem logical to limit and manage the potential to damage on a global scale as this potential already has a global reach. Nuclear weapons, resource depletion, killer diseases and a plethora of other phenomena can and do affect the future of every human being on the planet. For many unlucky souls such phenomena are already having an adverse effect on them. Nationalism already stands in the way to resolving such problems as countries often behave in a selfish manner, based on short term national interests. Nationalism pushes states apart and provides them with excuses not to cooperate on global and regional issues. Hence this is why this is an important topic to look at. The connection between nationalism and international relations is this.

It also feeds into the debates of international relations theory, that between realists and cosmopolitans (Shapcott, 2008:194-205; Marchetti, 2008:120-1). It relates also to beliefs, about how the world works, in the social sciences. The positivistic, realists believe the world should be studied the same way as it is in the natural sciences as there are laws to be uncovered (Morgenthau, 1985:4; Cox, 1986). Phenomena occur and such phenomena should be studied to determine future outcomes and theories about how the human world functions. Cosmopolitans, on the other hand, take a more social constructivist approach. They see the study of human beings as being different to studying the natural sciences. The object of study is able to and does change behavior based on knowledge and other factors. Therefore, human beings are the masters of their own destiny and are able to change behaviours. This is the strong normative element contained in cosmopolitanism. Hence, the study falls into an already present debate in international relations and contributes a fresh perspective for further discussion.

There are three main discussion sections. The first deals with the case for nationalism, the second the case against and the third alternatives to nationalism. Each part outlines arguments made by various critics and analyses their validity. These chapters are followed by a results chapter.

After much discussion, the results of the thesis will posit that, in general, nationalism is defunct. It will not state that all elements or all kinds of nationalism are in this category. However, nationalism in relation to the international system is seen as more of a negative phenomenon than a positive. Therefore, some ideas are taken from within the cosmopolitan perspective and melded with an acceptance that human beings can be particularistic egoists.
The results section discusses the idea of pooled patriotism as an alternative to the nationalism which is prevalent now.
2 METHODOLOGY

I used qualitative research methods for this thesis. My chosen research method was theoretical analysis. This was performed through secondary research. The dissertation is essentially a critical literature review, as it looks at the work of others and provides a critique of it.

One reason I chose qualitative methods is because the thesis is a theoretical piece for the most part. Although there are references to examples from the real world these are used to illustrate arguments made from within theoretical perspectives. Therefore, a short historical background is necessary to outline the history of nationalism and various examples are provided to assess its effects on the sphere of international relations.

I chose these methods because they were the most suitable and realistic for a project of this kind. The thesis analyses the theoretical perspectives’ claims by looking at what they argue for and scrutinizes such claims by looking at historical evidence and the arguments put forward in counter theories. There has been ample research carried out on nationalism and opposing perspectives, such as internationalism and cosmopolitanism, to permit the writing of this thesis by employing only secondary research.

That said, the thesis does not rely on any primary research. Thus, there is no first hand evidence from field work carried out by myself and no direct communication with people who have experienced first hand the events described in this piece. Relying on information interpreted by other scholars can sometimes lead to inaccuracies and biased points of view, which is the unfortunate reality of using a secondary research style.

The problem with writing a thesis of this kind is that it is very theoretical. There is no real ways quantify the findings of the study. There have been countless theories put forward on the topics discussed here and it is impossible to analyse all of the points of view on the subject. The word and time constraints of a dissertation of this kind mean that decisions had to be made to include the works of some scholars and to exclude others. Although it will make the piece more succinct this will also mean that many aspects cannot be discussed here, even though they may be relevant.
3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As with any thesis of international relations there is a theoretical element to it. In fact this piece is heavily reliant on theory as it is, in essence, a discussion of ideas about how the world works and how it should work. The empirical evidence is brought in from various cases to give weight to theories used in the piece and to see if the ideas put forward stand up in reality. The subject of nationalism could be tackled from different angles and by using varying theories. However, for the purposes of this essay realism and cosmopolitanism will be employed. This decision was made due to the fact that realism is the theory which is best placed to defend the nationalism outlined in this paper. Cosmopolitanism has been chosen due to the fact it offers an alternative to nationalism and is part of the critique of nationalism (Fine, 2007:2; Marchetti, 2008:125-6). Cosmopolitanism contains many strands and most cosmopolitans are not in agreement about where the boundaries of it are. However, this is the same with theorists of nationalism, realism and most other theories. Although cosmopolitanism can appear more unwieldy, as its proponents are often in disagreement about what the essential cosmopolitanism is and even if this is possible, how to define it (Ozkirimli, 2005:139-40, 149-50; Fine, 2007:1-2; Hollinger, 2001:237; Vertovic and Cohen, 2002:20-1). With that in mind, the reader will be conscious that this author has chosen to take the parts of cosmopolitan theory which best suit the arguments of this piece.

As stated previously, nationalism has often been neglected in the study of international relations. As this is a thesis for the field of international relations there has to be a strong connection made between international relations theory and the subject of the study. Therefore, theories of international relations provide the backbone of this piece.

Realism is the classic theory of international relations. Realism posits that nation-states are the primary actors in international relations and they act in a narrow, self interested manner to maximise relative gains in an anarchic system (Terriff, Croft, James and Morgan, 1999:30-51). Based on this thinking, nationalism would seem to fit best as an ideology strongly linked to the notions of this theory. The particularistic nature of nationalism and its emphasis on self determination echo the tenets of realist theory.

Realists see the world as a zero sum game, each state (or rather the leaders of each state) seeks to survive and get the best possible position it can for itself in a competitive, anarchic system (Boucher, 1998:30-1). Therefore, there is constant competition for resources as nation
states seek to preserve themselves at the least and dominate the system at most. The theory is pessimistic about human nature, seeing human beings as naturally aggressive and unlikely to find ways to cooperate (Sheehan, 2005 15-6; Garnett, 1975:11). International peace is temporary and the system passes through times of stability and instability. Any form of institution above the state or out of the control of states is unforeseeable. Any attempt to do so is seen as an attempt by powerful states to gain power over weaker states through such institutions. Therefore, it is still the states which remain the main actors, even if their will is carried out in a more indirect way.

Nationalism is the tool of leaders on the state level and in the international system. The notion of acting in the national interest is taken for granted as a primary behaviour of states. The idea of the national interest is an abstract concept itself, open to interpretation. As already discussed, realists give clear definitions of the interests of states. The national interest can be seen as putting the welfare of the nation state and its people above all else, whether it be at the expense of other actors or not (Morgenthau, 1952:172). International relations has long operated on such principles. It is exemplified by participation in wars of conquest, resource wars, non-compliance to international treaties and norms, collective security organisations, alliances, bandwagoning and other activities which can only be justified in terms of the national interest.

From the information presented above, it can be stated that nationalism and realism are natural bedfellows. Nationalism being a tool which allows leaders to pursue policies, which they claim are in the national interest. Nationalism can be generated and provide populations willing to support their leaders (or at least be in fear to challenge them) in times of crisis and even die for their countries in drastic times which may call them to do so. This is the process in which human beings are constantly reminded that they are part of a nation without often being conscious that they are being reminded of it (or ‘flagging’ can be used to describe this entire process) (Billig, 1995:93). This can be done through the placing of flags on buildings, singing the national anthem at school, the use of national symbols on money and many others. The idea of a nation, and belonging to it, is seen as the highest point of belonging. Slavenka Drakulic (Cited in Ozkirimli, 2000:167), in her book *The Balkan Express*, describes how in the Yugoslav Wars (1991-95) peoples’ identities were encouraged by governments to be completely defined in narrow terms of their nationality instead of any of the other identities they might possess (Such as their profession, their political orientation or
personality). Thus, in times of crisis, the importance of national identity is often called upon to trump other identities in binding people together. Hence, the preservation and protection of the nation, the state and its culture is of the utmost importance to realists and nationalists alike. These nationalists need not be extreme right wing xenophobes, but merely those that see the world through a particularistic lense, in that all peoples of the world must be grouped into nations and accept the responsibilities and rights that go with that.

The nation state system itself encourages such thoughts. The fact that the vast majority of human beings are citizens of nation states and are represented as members of a nation state compounds the existing structures. The structure enforces the belief that it is essential to take care of fellow citizens first, that it is imperative to look out for the interests of our respective nations foremost and that all members of other nations will behave in the same manner. It is these beliefs contained in the previous paragraphs that this dissertation attempts to interrogate.

If nationalism is being questioned then there must exist alternatives otherwise, criticisms would be hypocritical. Criticisms of nationalism come from within different theories of politics and international relations. The theory employed in this essay, however, is that of cosmopolitanism.

Cosmopolitanism has its roots in ancient Greece. However, much of today’s discussion about cosmopolitanism references the works of Kant from the late 1700s (Kant, 2006). There are many approaches to cosmopolitanism and depending who one reads it can be interpreted in different ways. However, some of the most common definitions include opposition to nationalism, a belief in an interdependent world and that this interdependence means that human beings should strive for world citizenship, global justice and global democracy (Fine, 2007:2).

Cosmopolitanism is a universalist approach to social science. It is descriptive but more normative. It’s proponents buy into the theory not just because they see it as something taking place but rather something that they want to pursue (Fine, 2007:2-4; Held, 2002:320). Therefore, it contains a strong social constructivist element. Cosmopolitans are generally against nationalism and see it as an obstacle to global cooperation and human development.

Why though is cosmopolitanism in opposition to nationalism?
[A] major problem that condemns the theories of nationalism to normative failure: the issue of transnational exclusion. In a world in which interaction is so intense and individuals are so profoundly affected by decisions taken abroad, this lack of reciprocity, clearly exemplified by the lack of common political institutions is unacceptable. (Marchetti, 2008:126)

It is on such beliefs that many cosmopolitans base their criticism of nationalism.

Cosmopolitanism has strong liberal foundations and has many proponents who are from the leftfield (Vertovic and Cohen, 2002:1). However, it is not of the Marxist orientation as it stresses democratic principles and tolerance of differences over economic ones, although there is an element of this and certain thinkers will stress the economic aspect more than others (Singer, 1972; Unger, 1996). Its emphasis on justice and equal treatment for all human beings betray its opposition to particularistic nationalism (Pogge, 1994:9; Nussbaum, 1996:7; Linklater, 2002:145).

As stated earlier, there are many variants of cosmopolitanism. The job of cosmopolitanism in this paper is to provide a critique of nationalism and to also offer alternative forms of human organization. The descriptive element will be important to show evidence in support of this position but the main effect of the cosmopolitan analysis is normative in character. The cosmopolitan outlook ties strongly to that of anti nationalists.

In the preceding paragraphs the theories of the essay have been presented. As explained, realism is the logical theoretical foundation which supports nationalism. Its pessimistic view of human nature and its emphasis on the particular provide the foundations for the form of nationalism discussed in this dissertation. Cosmopolitanism is the antithesis of this position. It is a universalistic theory which will be employed to point out weaknesses in the nationalist discourse and to give an alternative vision to that of the nationalists.
4 DEFINITIONS

Smith states that there are two broad kinds of nationalism, civic and ethnic (1991). The civic variation is based around principles of political community and common values. An example of this could be the United States, which is based around such principles but is open to others to become part of the nation if they agree to accept ‘Americanism’. Whereas the focus of the ethnic variety is on blood ties, common history and membership to such nations is more exclusively defined. Examples of this could be the countries of the former Yugoslavia, with their emphasis on ethnicity as acceptance into the nation. Other scholars could give different definitions and it is of course possible to find nationalisms which fall outside and in between such definitions. However, it is not possible to examine all these here. These definitions provide at least a framework which we can attempt to place different nationalisms into. The intention of the thesis is to provide a critique of nationalism in general, therefore, variations of both civic and ethnic nationalism are examined in the piece.

Therefore, these are the types of nationalism looked at. However, how do such nationalisms come into being? What is the cause of nationalism? The paper now turns to definitions of that to give reasons for the existence of nationalism. According to Brass (1979:40-1), nationalism is

the process by which elites and counter-elites within ethnic groups select aspects of the group’s culture, attach new value and meaning to them, and use them as symbols to mobilize the group, to defend its interests, and to compete with other groups.

This started centuries ago. Good examples of this would be World Wars 1 and 2 in which elites used nationalism to get their populations to go to war for them (McDonough, 1997:7, 69, 105).

Hobsbawn and Ranger go even further than Brass. They believe that elites invented traditions in order to control increasing demands for democracy and rights from their populations, and thus the nation and the state replaced old social cohesion (Hobsbawn, 1990:10; Hobsbawn and Ranger, 1983:264-5, 303). Such definitions fall under the modernist tradition of nationalism and see the nation as an artificial construct (Ozkirimli, 2000: Chapter 4). A good example of this can be seen in the revolutions of South America. The leaders of the revolutions overthrew the control by the Spanish Monarchy, only to split the freed lands into separate states, in which almost all regions were multiethnic and did not speak a common
language (Conniff, 2005:88-9). The American Revolution against the British crown was started as the elites of the US did not want to pay tax to the Queen of England. Thus a nation was created to benefit the landowning class of the former colony (Wood, 2005:28-44).

The paper bases its critique of nationalism on the afore mentioned definitions of nationalism. There are others who would disagree with such claims. However, the definition of nationalism is not the objective of this thesis and those who wish to delve further into this can find comprehensive summaries of major theories of nationalism in Ozkirimli (2000), Hearn (2006), Smith and Hutchinson (1994).

Now we move to the other variable which needs defining, that of a ‘globalizing world’. Globalization is the ‘intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa’ (Giddens, 1990:21). Thus human destiny is becoming more and more interconnected. Again it is possible to find other definitions but this is the one used here.

What are we trying to replace nationalism with? Cosmopolitanism is the counter notion used in the argument of this thesis. Cosmopolitanism has various definitions also. For Appiah (2006:XV, XVIII-XIX) cosmopolitanism is a belief in the value of all human life and that human beings are obliged to help those in need. He also believes that we should respect differences between societies and individuals and at the same time find ways to coexist. Such definitions are more open to interpretation and are more flexible than others. Other interpretations are more institutionally based. Kaldor (1999:216) and Held (1995) refer to cosmopolitanism as the existence and promotion of governance above the nation state. These could be things such as the United Nations (UN) and European Union (EU) in today’s world. Marchetti (2008) and Monbiot (2004) even talk of a global democracy with a global government and parliament, or at least are more explicit about it. Thus these latter definitions are also questioning the legitimacy of the state and not solely nationalism as Appiah does. The thesis operates on the notion that there exist the more ideational/attitudinal cosmopolitanism, the institutional variety and everything in the middle. Basically the cosmopolitans are searching for a way to create a more peaceful harmonious world order, they just sometimes differ about how to reach such a goal. Nussbaum (1996:4) talks about the symbiosis of cosmopolitan and patriotism. This is the idea that human beings should seek to move their patriotism (or at least a portion of it) to humanity. This will be returned to later
during and after the main discussion as the thesis tries to posit alternatives and adjustments to nationalism.
5 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Nation states have been a monumental success for human societies and nationalism has played a significant role in their success. Nationalism itself has communitarian roots (For a definition of communitarianism see Sennet, 1998:142-3). The enlarged community of the nation state has come a long way since the humble beginnings of primitive hunter-gatherer village communities. The idea of the sovereign state was formalized by the treaty of Westphalia in 1648, however, nationalist movements were not prevalent for well over a century after that. The French and American revolutions were the first substantive national revolutions and from this point onwards the ideas of nationalism and the nation state have progressively spread across the globe.

These nation states (at least in the industrialized world) have placed obligations on their citizens and in return have given their citizens rights. Nationalism has been at the forefront of revolutions to aid oppressed peoples in their battles against colonial masters (For a good example of nationalism’s use against colonialism see Blackburn, 2009:17-23). Nationalism has aided the democratic development of states by turning people into citizens. Calhoun states that nationalism creates ‘large-scale collectivities in which most people could not conceivably enter into face-to-face relationships with most others’ (1997:46). Since nationalism’s birth it has come in many forms, depending on how it has been used by those that seek to exploit it as a tool for human organization. These varying types of nationalism remain today.
6 INTRODUCTION TO ANALYSIS

From here is written the main body of the thesis. It contains three main discussion sections which seek to address the dissertation question. Those three sections are as follows: the case for nationalism, the case against nationalism and alternative visions. Within each of these sections there will be sub-sections that go into more detail into specific areas and answer sub questions that arise from the discussion, as well as providing questions for further thought. Within these sections there is also analysis of the points made so there is a crossing over between elements of the sections. Also there is a section titled results, which is a reflection on all the arguments and it attempts to come up with a final response to the main research question. Finally there is the conclusion which reflects on the thesis in general and posits questions for further research.
7 THE CASE FOR NATIONALISM

In this section the views of scholars who could be considered pro-nationalist are outlined. At the same time their views are critically evaluated. This chapter looks at arguments made on the following topics: the national interest, liberation theory, the public good argument, inequality between states, the preservation of national characteristics and the importance of identity, human nature and that there are different kinds of nationalism.

The National Interest

Hans J Morgenthau is seen as one the key scholars in international affairs academia (For a description and brief analysis of Morgenthau’s work see Griffiths, Roach and Solomon, 2009:50-56). Morgenthau does not define himself as a scholar of nationalism but his work undoubtedly creates a link between the nationalism studied in political science and the realm of international relations. His work is more an attempt to show how he believes international relations are conducted and the limitations of them. He is from the realist school of international relations and his notion of the national interest is one of the most important aspects of his work, useful to this paper. He wrote that the national interest is ‘the one guiding star, one standard thought, one rule of action’ in foreign policy (Morgenthau, 1952:242).

The national interest can be seen as the projection of nationalism from within the state up to the international level. The thinking behind it is that self interest and the desire for the survival of the nation state and its culture shape the behaviour of states. All states will seek to secure the survival of the state, the nation, its values and culture. Morgenthau believes the earth to be an edgy planet which in turn places limits on the behaviour of international actors. For him, discord is ever present in the international system because human beings are inherently aggressive therefore foreign policies based upon rational morality do no cede results in the long run. (Morgenthau, 1985:3-4).

If one takes a positivist approach of analysing the world based on what can be seen it is possible to make out what Morgenthau postulates. This being that states are acting in an anarchic system, attempting to gain the best possible position for themselves. Even though a lot of institutions of international governance have been created, states are still the main
decision makers in such institutions and in international affairs in general. The providers and protectors of populations remain governments (at the very least functioning democratic ones) who have to take on this role to mitigate internal conflict.

It is obvious that Morgenthau it negative about there being a reachable high level of cooperation between states, as is the case for most realists (Gilpin, 2002:247; Burchill, 2005:32; Mearshimer, 1990; Waltz, 1988:619). Therefore, human nature naturally imposes limitations on cooperation. That said, Morgenthau is not similar to his realist counterparts as he believes that there are normative reasons for why states should behave self interestedly. His logic being that, nations should look out for their own interests as any attempt to make foreign policies of universal moral values is equal to moral imperialism and would lead to even more strife between nations. (Morgenthau, 1985:13). Based on this he postulates that it is impossible for human beings to act differently but to try to do so the world would end up with even more conflict than before. Hence, cooperation can only be found in cases where the states involved can make relative gains, in that no actor gains much more or loses much less than the others in the act of mutual cooperation.

In Morgenthau’s eyes this phenomenon is not only what is but also that it is a positive aspect. He goes on to describe the ‘moral dignity of the national interest’ in that the sole responsibility of governments to take into account only the welfare of their own citizens (1952:33). According to this train on thought every policymaker must consider only the interests of their society as all the other policymakers are doing the same and there is no possible alternative reality. This alone creates justice in the world. Therefore, with no mechanism of global justice installed, this can only be carried out on a state by state level, thus making a balance of power which mitigates conflicts (Morgenthau, 1985:13). The anti-Americanism of recent years can be seen as an instance of societies attempting to avoid the influence of a superpower which is trying to make a world in its own image.

These preceding paragraphs have been included to show not only the notion of the national interest but to illustrate the connection between major international relations theory and nationalism. The paragraphs outline the ethical and epistemological stance employed by realists in their thinking about nationalism. The following paragraphs go on to look at the work of thinkers who are not necessarily directly linked with the field of international
relations but who’s work relates to it. In these paragraphs, themes touched on in the first section will be further analysed and new elements will also be introduced and reflected on.

**Liberation Theory**

In conjunction with realist notions of power and domination, many commentators see wars of liberation as a positive in the international system (Beiner, 1999:4, Berlin, 1991:251; Tamir, 1995:16). This is based on the nationalists’ belief in self determination and that peoples prefer to rule themselves as opposed to being ruled by an outside power. Therefore, wars of liberation are seen as a way of overthrowing imperialism and allowing human beings to fulfil their rightful destiny as a free people. As Morgenthau stated earlier, domination of the system by powerful states and institutions will lead to more conflict. For this reason it could be posited that that is why wars of liberation are happening, to rebel against unjust systems. According to this thinking, if there is less domination of the system by great powers or institutions there will be less strife.

First let the issue of imperialism be addressed. This is easy when one looks back to the heyday of colonialism. The European powers treated the people of their colonies as second class human beings and exploited their resources and labour for their own ends. Virtually every corner of the world experienced the hardships of European rule. It is hard to justify this domination and therefore very difficult to be opposed to nationalist movements in these former colonies.

Nationalist movements against colonial rulers can be seen as an almost self fulfilling process. The colonisers define themselves by treating the ruled as ‘others’. These ‘others’ are not seen as being from the ‘in group’ and are thus not treated as equals (Elia and Scotson, 1999:71). The splitting of areas into countries with borders, that did not exist before, adds to the growth of nationalist movements. The creation of bordered regions mimics the shape of the European state and thus encourages the growth of nations. Over time the members of the subjugated population grow disgruntled with the system, their own leaders emerge and the cycle is complete. Then nationalist movements are born. By ‘othering’ the subjugated population the oppressors sow the seeds of their own downfall, based on a clash of nationalisms. Imperialist nationalism vs. the nationalism of liberation. It would appear that the only option for such
downtrodden peoples is to make their own nation to struggle against the imperialist nationalism of the oppressive powers. It is a self fulfilling discourse, as the imperial powers, in creating boundaried nation states, sow the seeds of revolt.

However, there are those who are not so enamoured by the claims that nationalism frees people. In 2010 the populations of Martinique and Guiana voted against having more autonomy from their colonial ruler, France (BBC, 2010c). Also, the national revolutions to overthrow oppressors often do not lead to better outcomes (Habermas, 1994:127; Halliday, 2000; Canovan, 1996:107). Fighting for one’s freedom is a noble endeavour but it does not mean that the outcome will be better than what already exists. The oppressed can find inspiration in non-nationalist ideologies as well. The US supported ex-dictator of Cuba was ousted by supporters of international communism (Cuba was heavily controlled by Washington at the time. See Lieve, 2004). Attempts have been made for revolutions based on such principles to happen and the creation of a world system based on socialism (the prime example being the October revolution in 1917 which eventually led to the creation of the Soviet Union). Therefore, it is possible to galvanize populations around other ideas separate from nationalism, such as communism, Europeanism, pan-Arabism, Islam and many others. Whether such ideologies are what we believe to be positive is irrelevant. The point was to illustrate the argument that imperialism can be fought against without strong nationalist elements.

On the other hand, in the case of the October revolution, the new system imposed in the Soviet Union turned into a disaster as various dictators forced their ideas on their populations through propaganda and the barrels of guns (Thompson, 2008:243-333). A blanket of forced community was thrown over the area known as the USSR. Eventually the peoples living under the Soviet sphere of influence took it upon themselves to separate from each other based on the idea of territorially defined nations. The nature of the forced ‘union’ from the dominant centre of Russia and the reaction to it seemingly vindicate the nationalists/realist position that the artificial imposition of order above the nation level is not only wrong but does not work in practice. The effect of the union was in fact to create a new imperialism.
Public Good Argument

There is an argument which states that nationalism is an essential ingredient for the survival of the modern nation state and for there to be social justice (Miller, 1995:162; 2000:32; Moore, 2001:85-7). This being that nationalism acts as the glue between group members (or in fact makes the group itself) and between the group members and the state (i.e. the government). The nationalist feeling drives people to do things they might not otherwise do, is the theory. Without this binding effect the people would not care for one another and the nation state would break up or be taken over by some outside power.

In essence there needs to be this particularistic symbiosis. Without it the nation state would collapse as individuals and small groups took care of particularistic interests at an extremely low level. One only has to look at the nature of failed states. In Somalia, a classic example, there has been ongoing civil war since 1991. The UN had to intervene in 1992 and in 1995 after pouring money and military deployments into Somalia the UN left in failure (Natsios, 1997:77-95; Clarke and Herbst, 1997:239-52). The country remains in a state of civil war with several factions involved, including a weak western back government, Islamic insurgents and pirates (Al Jazeera, 2010). The same can be said of countries such as Afghanistan and Sudan whose elites have failed to use nationalism effectively to consolidate control of their territory and populations under the banner of one nation (Foreign Policy, 2009). In these cases the state – population symbiosis is interrupted and members of population and the state act in a self interested manner. This further destabilises the international system as problems spill over borders to affect regions and even across continents. It presents an argument for keeping nationalism as a tool to secure the citizen - state relationship and prevent the disorder that can result from it. In light of such evidence it could be argued that nationalism needs to be flagged to act as glue which can provide social justice within societies and for their future generations.

This is the argument that a healthy dose of nationalism is needed (Benner, 1997:191-2). As mentioned previously scholars of nationalism believe it is needed for states to function. Therefore, the examples given show that state delgitimization and a lack of national unity lead to a breakdown. On the other side critics have argued that a lack of promotion of a moderate, civic nationalism can lead to ethnic nationalism (Barber, 1996:36; Benner, 1997:191-2). A relatively recent example could be that of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s.
Yugoslavia had been a country since the end of World War 1. However, since the death of the unifying leader Josip Broz Tito in 1980 and the collapse of communism 1989 in Eastern Europe separatist voices had been ever increasing which eventually led to the various wars and eventually divided the republic into several new countries. Ethnic tensions resurfaced as there had been a lack of promotion of unifying civic nationalism in the republic since Tito’s death (Ramet, 2002:4-9; Rogel, 2004:16-7).

However, what is a healthy amount of nationalism? Where does it end? The stable countries of the West still go to war when it is in their interest. A recent survey showed that England is the least patriotic country in Europe, with up to 66% of the population not knowing when the national day is (Doughty, 2010). Despite this, the UK has been to war twice in the last decade in the name of protecting the nation. It has been argued that the illegal invasion of Iraq has created more likelihood of future terrorist attacks on the UK (Chatham House, 2005). Most of the other EU countries, with supposedly very moderate nationalist tendencies have been involved in invasions of other countries and their politicians have been criticised by the UN for misleading their publics on immigration figures and creating fear of immigrants (BBC, 2002). Therefore, it is possible to see that even in the supposedly good examples of states which promote a moderate nationalism/patriotism there is a tendency to create undue tensions. As Billig (1995: 38-59, 93) states, nationalism is flagged everywhere and all states are guilty of it. It is not only the preserve of those on the periphery.

**Inequality Between States**

Miller, as in the case with Morgenthau, is apprehensive about the potential for international cooperation as the differences in power between countries will mitigate fairness ‘The distribution of costs and benefits in the agreement that emerges is likely to be determined largely by the relative bargaining power of the various parties’ (Miller, 2007:76). Thus, cooperation will benefit actors in already powerful positions and cooperation will not take place if the powerful see no benefit for themselves.

Echoing the tenets of realism, each state/nation has to look out for itself. It is difficult to argue against this based on the structure of the international system. The US and the EU
espouse the benefits of the free market but maintain tariffs imports and subsidise inefficient national industries (Stiglitz, 2002; Frith, 2006).

However, nationalism can also work against smaller countries in the international system. Nationalism promotes the division of strong countries from weak ones but also weak ones from weak ones. Weak states do not band together to counter-balance the strong so nationalism often promotes competition between the weak whilst the strong benefit. The Iran-Iraq war took between 500,000 to 1 million lives (Al-Khali, 1989:259). The countries involved were both Muslim, neighbours, relatively poor and went to war over national prestige. Whilst this was taking place the US and USSR reaped the benefits of selling arms to both sides (Wright, 1989:46).

**Preserving National Character and the Importance of Identity**

Another claim is that nationalism preserves national characteristics which are necessary to keep the world interesting and to give people an identity, which is important to them (Tamir, 1993:30, 85-6; MacCormick, 1999:193; Nielsen 1999). Wouldn’t the world be a boring place without national characteristics? Imagine a place where everyone ate the same food, listened to the same music, worshipped the same God and so on. Nationhood provides fuel for people to preserve their differences. People do not all want the same thing. Clearly a world order completely based on Western values would be a disaster in the eyes of many people.

Just because some system or way of life seems the best for one group it does not automatically translate as the same for others. The world is a mosaic of cultures and nationalism can help to preserve those cultures by promoting their traditions and preventing other cultures from encroaching upon them. Apart from this intrinsic value, there is a sense that peoples’ identities are something which they consciously desire.

All people have some kind of identity and a national identity is something that is often forced upon us but that we soon embrace. Culture is the essence of this identity. If one looks at the world we occupy it is possible to see the desire to preserve what we have all around us. Discussions about the banning of the wearing of the veil have sparked all over Europe in recent years with many governments considering bans and Belgium being the first to implement an actual ban on the burka (BBC, 2010a; 2010b). This can be seen as an effort to
preserve secular and Christian identities in European countries and to homogenise populations. Similarly the Gulf states’ attitudes to non-Muslim religions are even more reactionary in their attempt to conserve their culture. In most, the work of non-Muslim missionaries is banned and in Saudi Arabia any display of non-Muslim religions is outlawed (BBC, 2005a). Perhaps it could be said that groups find their identity by ‘othering’ out-groups (Petersson, 2006:31). Therefore, it is desirable to maintain our national characters not only to make the world a less boring place but to make people feel secure in their existence.

This writer can agree that a world of sameness would be boring and would argue that in fact cosmopolitans, are in favour of a world of different cultures (Appiah, 1996:22; Anderson, 1998:267; Hannerz, 1990:239). Furthermore, the fact that people desire an identity and would want to preserve it is not challenged here. However, to what extent can this position be indulged?

For sure all people have some identity when they are born and will grow up in a society in some part of our planet. Therefore, is it necessary to flag the national identity all the time? How much is our desire for our identity a product of us and how much is it a product of flagging? The national characteristics which make up our world of nations are not static and have changed dramatically over the centuries. The change is a natural process of contact with other cultures and incorporating parts of these other cultures into our own cultures. ‘Humans are curious and adventurous animals: they travel, they migrate, they trade, they fight, and they plunder. And they report back what they have found out about ways in which others live’ (Waldron, 2000:232). In fact it is impossible to shut out the outside, especially in a globalizing world. The cultures of other nations are beamed into our living rooms and can be found in stores on our high streets. Cultures of groups have always influenced other groups. Before there were even televisions or motorised vehicles, culture was spread through process of war, conquest, trade and travel. This process has never stopped, it is just happening faster now. It is difficult to imagine a planet where there was no influence across borders and even if it were possible it would certainly make our world dull, which is the very criticism levelled by those who seek to preserve a cultural mosaic. Effectively it would be a world of North Koreas stuck in time with no contact with the outside and can only be imagined as a sterile and regressive existence. In fact a completely artificially managed system that holds back peoples’ desire in the name of ‘preserving culture’. It attacks the notion of self determination that nationalists themselves seek to defend so fervently.
The point of this criticism is not to criticise the nation and nation states but rather to show that there are different versions of national organisation which help to nurture different identities. The different ways that national organisation is done lead to different outcomes. Rather the identity does not exist on its own but is cultivated. Of course we are influenced by the environment we are socialised in, be it by the natural environment, our family or the socialising apparatus of the state. Therefore, the argument is that we will socialise anyway. It is a good thing to socialise human beings to be good citizens, there is no argument against that here. What this writer disputes is the need to nurture identities which pride themselves over others and live in suspicion of those ‘on the outside’. In our time is this necessary and has it ever been?

For the majority of people nationalism is too entrenched in their psyche to simply get rid of it. This goes beyond the justification argument. It is a fact of the world we live in (Ozkirimli, 2005:90). Even if it is undesirable how is it possible to overcome it? As Michael Billig (1995:93) suggests, we are constantly being presented with nationalist images in the states we occupy. Even if individuals or groups of people want to overcome nationalism it would be so difficult. How would the flagging of nationality be overcome by something else? It would have to be invented and promoted with the same rigour as the flagging of nationhood has been. Therefore, for those that seek to argue against a post nationalist world, they use the facts of everyday life to show that the contrary just is not taking place and that it is unlikely to in the near future.

**Human Nature**

Miller, in the same vein as Morgenthau, believes that the current order of things is as good as it gets for the human race. Human beings’ particularism is a natural facet of human nature (Miller, 2000:25). Thus, to try to change the state of affairs is impossible due to human nature. As with Morgenthau, Miller takes human beings’ egoist nature as placing parameters on potential cooperation past a certain level.

On top of this it has been pointed out that human beings are naturally particularistic by nature and even though nationalists see nationalism as a good thing they also see this part as inevitable and a simple fact of life (Miller, 2000:25; Walzer, 1999:215; Kymlica, 1997:64).
This is the communitarian position which nationalists ascribe to. For example, we are more likely to help those that we know. People help friends to get jobs, lend them money and other items based on familiarity and trust. Human beings are much less likely to do this with strangers. The same could be said for times of crisis. We are more likely to seek out and aid the ones we love than any random person who may also be in grave danger. Some nationalists even allude to the nation as some kind of extended family structure (Tamir, 1993:99; Miller, 1995:655-6) which is there to provide a level of particularistic aid on a level never seen before. After all, before modern nation states there was little given by rulers to their subjects in return for their loyalty. So for the nationalists, human beings have already reached such an optimal level of organisation which can lead to charity between them that it is hard to see anything more than this (Miller, 1988:661). These positions would appear to tie into the realist belief that nation states are and will remain the principle actors in international affairs (Gilpin, 2002:237-8). It also panders to the realist notion that human beings are rational actors in that they are selfish in nature, which is part of their survival instinct. Human beings are particularistic but this is one aspect of their essence. Human beings of course want to secure their survival and it is an instinct which we and all other animals are born with. However, there are differing degrees to which this operates. Many people all over the world give money to charity, organisations are formed to carry out aid work and foreign governments help each other in the case of natural disasters. It could be argued that such phenomena are acts of altruism. The actors involved have reached a level of economic security which they assess as being high enough to contribute some of their resources to a cause which they do not benefit from financially. Take the Ethiopian famine of 1984. The famine inspired ‘an extraordinary surge of compassion and generosity from peoples and governments around the world, prompting the greatest single peace-time mobilisation of the international community in the twentieth century’ (Meredith, 2006:332). To add to this, these acts can also been seen as particularistic. Firstly in that those involved receive gratification from helping others. Secondly that those involved may see helping others as part of a larger, long term goal to provide peace and prosperity across the globe, which will in turn make themselves more secure. Realists are always quick to point out the rationality of looking for relative gains but perhaps increasing overall gains in fact increases the likelihood that we will be more secure in the long term. The logic being that problems which spill out across borders can contain themselves before they grow bigger and in turn affect us. The recent impact of
pirate attacks and hijacking in the Indian Ocean of international vessels has been felt in countries all over the world. The Somali pirates look for what they can as their state has failed to provide the means of their existence (Tharoor, 2009). The failed state of Somalia is a prime example of how the problems of a state can spill out into the wider world.

It has also been suggested that human beings find their identity by identifying characteristics in others which they do not have themselves (Armstrong, 1982:5; Petersson, 2006:31). Hence, communities, or nations in this case, define themselves not only in their joint similarities but more so in their differences to other nations. This in turn binds groups together. The implications of this theory could be interpreted as distressing if true. It means that human beings. In accordance with realisms’ positivist credentials the world is perceived not only as a dangerous place but one where human behaviour is static and unchanging. War has existed for thousands of years and conflicts between tribes even longer. This remains a problem today.

The criticism of this position is that it depends how human beings use these boundaries they create. There are no fixed rules to such boundaries and they change over time. There is nothing to say that they can’t become more inclusive. A boundary does not mean that there will be conflict or no cooperation between groups. The same as it is possible to find examples to the contrary it is possible to find examples to support the other position. It was not so long ago an extreme form of ‘othering’ was thrust upon Europe by the Nazis and Fascists in the 1930-40s. Since that time most Europeans have managed to accept pooled sovereignty between states, and thus nations, in the form of the ever expanding EU. Although racism remains a problem in Europe, and the world over, EU citizens are able to travel and work in each others’ countries legally and do so with few problems. 91,000 workers from new EU member states registered to work in the UK in the first 5 months of joining the EU (BBC, 2004). Europeans have not given up their national identities, rather, they have learned to interact with ‘others’ in peaceful coexistence. ‘Othering’ need not be an obstacle to cooperation, it depends how it is exploited by elites.
Different Kinds of Nationalism

To criticise the position of the anti-nationalists it can be posited that the nationalisms employed in each case are different from each other. The nationalism of the US is very different to the nationalism in Sweden. The pride of the nation, which is used to stimulate nationalism, is often based around military successes and the belief of superiority over others (Lieven, 2005:77-8; McFaul, 2002). The small population of Sweden takes pride in its large welfare state and projects to aid world peace and its support for the UN (Tragardh, 1999; Cordier, 1999). This is not to say that Sweden doesn’t flag the nation and that the nation would not be willing to fight if needed. It merely suggests that their nationalism is more pacific, less malign, and therefore less dangerous to global stability and perhaps even aids the development of more cooperation between states.

Chapter Summary

In this section some of the arguments for nationalism have been laid out and scrutinised. The previous paragraph makes clear that not all nationalisms are the same and some have more positive elements than others. It has been outlined that particularism is an element of human nature but not its totality. Furthermore, the level of particularism can be adjusted. Similarly how interests are defined can be enlarged from looking at the local and short term, up to the regional, global and long term, depending on perception of interests. National characteristics and having an identity are important to people and make the world more interesting. However, it is naive to believe they are formed naturally and that influences from outside the nation state can be completely prevented to preserve such identities and characteristics. Rather the state and elites put at lot of effort into cultivating nationalism and thus it makes it changeable but also difficult to get rid of it as it has been so imprinted on peoples’ everyday lives. Nationalism can aid weaker states against strong ones but also drive a wedge between weaker states too. It can aid democracy by tying citizens and government together in a social contract and can promote social justice within states. However, it is unclear what a healthy amount of civic nationalism is. Liberating oppressed peoples and allowing self determination is a positive aspect of nationalism’s use. The overthrow of oppression may not always lead to something better though and there may be ways to do this without being explicitly nationalist. Finally, acting in the national interest is a default setting of statesmen and in fact their job
which may make common rules of conduct in the international system but leaves interests defined very narrowly and often leads to worse long term consequences.
8 THE CASE AGAINST NATIONALISM

As previously stated, nationalism has been a driving force in the development of human societies. That said, there are those who criticize it for having outlived in usefulness, at least in many of its forms (Nussbaum, 1996:4-9; Fine, 2007:2; Marchetti, 2008:122-6). This section looks at some of those arguments. The arguments consist of: nationalism is no longer useful in a globalizing world, nationalism is immoral, elites use nationalism for their own ends and that national identity is constructed.

No Longer Useful in a Globalizing World

The world has changed a lot since the creation of nationalism as a form of human organization. In the ever globalizing world of today, human dilemmas (for instance pollution, terrorism, resource depletion, overpopulation) transcend borders more than at any other time in history and thus the need to govern the international system is becoming more important (Gready, 2004:12). Therefore, nationalism and the sovereignty of the nation state are under attack by the forces of globalization. In this case, there are normative arguments that can be leveled at nationalism as well as empirical evidence that it is under fire. The fact that so many phenomena are going past the state level to the regional and the global leaves nationalism looking inadequate to deal with today’s world. Narrow self interest now can lead to paralysis on issues that affect the future of the entire species. Things such as resource depletion, pollution and overpopulation are all aspects of the world which grow in importance with every passing day and cannot be managed without cooperation and compromise. The selfish, inward looking nationalism present in so many countries is outliving its usefulness.

This is not to say the nation state should disappear or that that is even close to happening. There is nothing to say that states will disappear, rather that their behavior will change. This is the prescriptive approach taken by cosmopolitans as opposed to that of the positivist realists who see states’ behavior as fixed and are pessimistic about change, as earlier described.
As can be seen from history, the employment of nationalism has led to many disasters and undesirable events. Halliday states that

We welcome diversity and the legitimacy which nationality brings, but we should also recognise the down side - not just the wars, the massacres, the intolerance, but the everyday nastiness of much nationalism, its petty mindedness, its meanness, the endless self-serving arguments, the vast culture of moaning, whingeing, kvetching, self-pity, special pleading, that ‘narcissism of small differences (2000:158-9).

Colonialism, the world wars, the cold war, the various wars of separation and annexation, genocide and many other phenomena which contain malignant forms are driven by nationalism or at the very least contain elements of it. The continuation of the current course would lead to similar previous outcomes, only with more profound consequences.

**Nationalism is Immoral**

This next point looks at the particularistic notion of loyalty in nationalism. The idea that the state gives and in return it asks for the unquestioning loyalty and contribution, and sometimes sacrifice, of its members. Nationalism asks the members of a society to follow their leaders and accept what is dictated to them for the good of the nation. As has already been explicated, it is often said that nationalism is used as the tool to create social justice in the world. In that it creates a bond in which the members of nations support each other, and in the particularist vision of the world this is the only way to achieve justice between individuals (Miller, 1995:162; 1996:418; 2000:32; Taylor, 1999:228; Tamir, 1993:120-1). The following paragraph is an attempt to question this thinking.

The first criticism lies in the idea that it is the best thing for individuals to remain loyal to their country whatever the alternative may be. For example, the Nazis decided to kill Jews in the 1930s and 40s to redistribute wealth to what they considered were the true German people. People who disagreed with this point of view, if found out, were considered traitors to the cause. However, most right minded human beings would find little to criticize in taking a critical stance to this activity. Therefore, there are limits to national loyalty. A person might themselves benefit financially from the extermination of Jews but may choose not to condone it (or to oppose it, as many Germans did). This is an act of disloyalty to the nation as the critical citizen is making a decision which goes against benefitting the German nation.
Nationalism is used today in similar ways. Nationalism was used to silence critics of the US war on terror in the US. Those who question the authenticity of the claims of the Bush administration and its strategy to rid the world of terrorism are criticized by intellectuals and media as being unpatriotic and anti-American (New York Post, 2001; O’Reilly, 2004:12m 40s; Krauthammer, 2003; D’ Souza, 2002; Ajami, 2003). Citizens that criticized the war may have benefitted financially from lower oil prices, the work of reconstructing Iraq, the testing and resulting sale of weapons used in Iraq but they felt that it was not the right thing to do. In these cases it is the moral thing to do to question, and abandon if needed, the nation. Loyalty cannot be based on group membership and the benefits it brings alone. Nationalism, depending on what the agenda of those using it is and if it is used to support such horrific actions then it should be challenged as immoral and dangerous when used in such a way. To support the state whatever it does is not noble, it is blind self interest and fear led. This narrowly defined form of nationalism encourages selfish behavior which damages the relations between international actors and thus a stable and mutually beneficial international system.

Elites Use Nationalism for their Own Ends

It is often the country’s elite (or the creation of a state) that we are supporting with our nationalism. The state generates support through flagging, as was mentioned several times earlier. But there is also a power at work between elites and the state. As was outlined before, elites are involved in the generation of nationalism. Elites can employ different types of flagging, for example media, to garner support for their position. Here we can use the US as an example. The Fox news network, owned by media tycoon Rupert Murdoch, constantly flags American nationalism. Bill O’Reilly, in the run up to the Iraq war in 2003 repeatedly told American viewers that not supporting their military once the war began was unpatriotic and to ‘shut up’ if they had opinions to the contrary (2004:12m 40s). Media does the same in other countries too. Just take the UK for instance. The best selling daily tabloid newspaper The Sun constantly reminds readers to be nationalists. Recent editions have war veterans claiming they ‘would still fight Argentina’ over the Falklands Islands if needed (Willetts, 2010) (It has long been believed that oil reserves lie close to the Falklands islands and were recently found by a British oil and gas explorer (Webb, 2010)).
Many of the most influential sources of media take right wing positions and support right wing parties. Why? The ideologies of right wing parties lead them to be friendlier to business interests and wealthy elites (Philips, Doole and Lowe, 1994:112-3), which leads on to another point.

The thinking behind nationalism is that it goes beyond class. The idea of the nation is that all of its members have a special bond and all members are there to look out for each others’ interests. However, this is rarely called upon until the elite is threatened or has an interest it wants addressed as evinced in the examples in the previous paragraph. Essentially nationalism aids elites in their battle to manipulate populations to their own ends. It stops class struggle by binding the lower classes to struggle in the cause of the nation (Hobsbawn and Ranger, 1983:264-5).

Earlier the liberation theory of nationalism was looked at. It was explicated that nationalism is often employed in opposition to oppressive forces. However, some critics have suggested that nationalism has often developed in places where populations lived well already and were often not exploited. Breuilly (1993:412-3) uses the example of Magyars (in what is now Hungary) in the Hapsburg Empire and comments on how they in fact received privileged treatment from their ‘oppressors’ but despite this developed a nationalist/separatist movement. Orridge (1981:181-2) cites the cases of the Basque country and Catalonia as being the most developed parts of what is now Spain, when they developed strong nationalist movements and the case of Belgium which was highly industrialized when it split from the Netherlands. This is not to say that nationalism cannot be a force for good but that often it is generated for self identified groups to simply gain more.

**National Identity is Constructed**

The notion that identity is something which occurs naturally is false and therefore saying it is something which must be protected is susceptible to criticism. Identity is cultivated. As stated throughout this piece, elites work hard to ‘flag’ nationalities. Often myths and traditions are invented to stoke the embers of nationhood. It is believed the Scottish bagpipes originally came from Egypt (Appiah, 2006:112-3). It ties into the social constructivist element of
cosmopolitanism which sees our world as a product of human beings’ input and not something with eternal rules.

As nationalists claimed earlier, there is a strong particularistic element present in human nature. Furthermore, human beings have formed communities since as far back as archeologists can look. It is just that now the form of community has changed. The particularistic part of human nature must be accepted, it is a survival instinct which all animals have. However, it is only one aspect of human nature and should not totalize the perception of human nature. To add to this, it varies to the extent it is prevalent between individuals and groups, as given in examples earlier. The evidence that communities have changed their form over time is a testament to the fact that the rules of human organization can and do change over time. The questions this poses is ‘how is it possible for such changes to come about?’ and ‘why?’.

**Chapter Summary**

Echoing the previous chapter, it is possible to see that national identity is constructed and thus identity can be changed for better or worse. The elites that generate such identities have often done so for their benefit. Nationalism and the loyalty it breeds can be anti-humanist. The cultivation of nationalism to the level where people will do anything in the name of their nation can lead to a total disregard or even active hostility for the people not considered part of the nation. As mentioned previously narrowly defined national interests contribute to non cooperation and/or even jeopardize the future of the human species in general. Globalization is spreading various harmful and potentially harmful phenomena across borders and hence providing more reasons to look past narrowly defined national interests.
9 ALTERNATIVE VISIONS

As seen there are strong critics of nationalism. They believe that nationalism is difficult to justify and provide evidence against those who argue in favour of a world based on nationalist principles. However, those that are keen to point out the weaknesses of nationalism must also be put under the spotlight. Karl Marx criticized capitalism throughout his life but could not justify his criticisms without providing his own vision about how human interaction should be. Therefore he (along with Engels) wrote his manifesto for revolution and the imposition of a socialist order. In that same vein, the cosmopolitans now have a chance to offer their thoughts about how different the world could be. Herein lies an analysis of some of their ideas. The questions looked at here are ‘Is it possible to replace nationalism with something else?’, ‘Are the conditions ripe for a cosmopolitan world?’, ‘How would a cosmopolitan order look?’, ‘Is such a thing desirable?’. Cosmopolitanism needs no introduction to tie it to international theory as it is a theory of international relations itself.

Is it possible to replace nationalism with something else?

In history there have been several previous attempts to overcome nationalism. Halliday (1988:92-7) believes there have been three great internationalist projects which he calls, hegemonic, liberal and revolutionary. In such projects it is possible for human beings to organise around different principles to those of nationalism. Revolutionary internationalism is that of the Marxists. Marx and his many successors failed in their attempt to create global socialism. Hegemonic internationalism is that of empires, which so many nationalists have fought to free themselves from. The Pax Britannica and Pax Americana could be cited a good examples of this. Such empires manufacture not only obedience but influence the international system with their culture, business practices, political system and so on. Some would argue that the liberal internationalism which embraces the free market and individualism is the spawn of such empires (Gray, 1999:100-110). As well as these three types of internationalism there have existed others. Religion can be seen as another type of internationalism. Muslims often feel more affinity with their religions than with their nationality. The sectarian division between Sunnis and Shias in Iraq is a key obstacle to the making of a strong Iraqi identity to support a democratic Iraqi state (Anderson and Stansfield, 2004:11). Islam took over Pan-Arab nationalism as a force for mobilization in the Middle
East and Islamic world (Milton-Edwards, 2000:137; Vatikiotis, 1987:42-4). Christianity and other religions also create a kind of internationalism. The Vatican had a huge influence over Europe in medieval times, with crusades consisting of men from all corners of the continent going fight in the name of God. The global justice movement is another kind of internationalism. The same can be said for a host of other groups which organise themselves on non-nationalist grounds on a global scale.

The previous paragraph has shown that there are alternatives to nationalism as there have been, and are, a notable amount movements which have tried to overcome nationalism or at least to lessen it. Even though this is the case, nationalism still exists and people around the world still desire to be part of a nation. These are some of the possible alternatives to nationalism. Some have failed and others are ongoing. Such alternatives have thus far been unable to overturn nationalism and appear to be far from that point still. Many cosmopolitans see their field of study as holding the key to superseding nationalism. It falls to them to turn the current conditions into a new order.

**Are the conditions ripe for a cosmopolitan world?**

As seen, Halliday believes that there have been several attempts to bring people of different nations together for causes other than the nation, such as the free market or socialism. Furthermore, globalization has spawned other smaller scale movements (for instance environmental and student organisations) which have members from all over the globe and that the process is encouraging ‘understanding, prosperity, peace, freedom, tolerance or whatever the particular holds dear’ (Halliday, 1988:188). Thus, this is part of the move towards a post-nationalist world.

To add to this, the ‘rapid growth of transnational issues and problems has spawned layers of governance both within and across political boundaries’ (Held, 2002a:306). Therefore, the globalizing world is more than just grassroots activism and Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs). The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), World Bank (WB), International Criminal Court (ICC) and UN are a handful of the organizations which seek to govern at the global level. Such organisations have come into being in reaction to past tragedies and travesties and to maintain stability and promote peace and prosperity across the globe. For
example the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) was created to manage the oceans and seas for the benefit of all humanity. The pollution generated by mass shipping needs to be regulated for the benefit of future generations and the IMO is there to regulate the activities of vessels.

Held thinks that the conditions of a cosmopolitan order are not only present but that the development of a world based on cosmopolitan principles has already begun ‘The idea that human beings are in a fundamental sense equal... [is] already enshrined in, and central to, the laws of war, human rights law, and the statute of the ICC, among many other international rules and legal arrangements.’ (2002b:23) The statement is a counter claim to scholars who believe that nationalism and the national interest are the overriding guiding principles in international affairs and that humans cannot work past their own narrowly defined particularism. There have never been as many international governance institutions as now and this does not appear likely to recede.

Academics, like Halliday and Held, describe processes of globalization and cosmopolitanism but also try to encourage these processes by prescribing normative advice. Despite the fact that the reality does not always equate to the research, the research shows new approaches to new issues which international relations has often left unattended. The problems facing human beings today often put the species and the planet in danger, hence, it is of the highest importance to encourage global governance.

The afore mentioned argument could be criticised for being idealistic. Much of the research produced by academics on cosmopolitanism refers to phenomena that have not taken place. Thus it could be criticised as being overly theoretical. Realists often employ the ‘prisoners’ dilemma’ game theory to critique the notion that human beings can overcome their particularism to cooperate. Actors, (in this case states) defect on mutually beneficial outcomes to try to maximise their own gains as they foresee that all the other actors are going to follow that path (Poundstone, 1992). One only has to look at international negotiations throughout history to see that statesmen try to get the best deal they can for their country. Take for example the Copenhagen Climate Summit. The more powerful countries worked out a deal to cut emissions to a level acceptable to them while many of the weaker countries wanted higher cuts but were largely ignored (Vidal, Stratton, Goldenberg, 2009).
Furthermore, nationalism has remained in existence. To compound this, the number of states has been increasing and separatism has been prevalent across the globe. The nation state is still the main actor in international relations and the provider of services to its citizens. Nationalism affects external relations as the national interest remains the primary objective of national governments. Thus far cosmopolitanism has failed to muster enough support and resources to overtake nationalism.

On a positive note however, imagination is an important part of human development. The EU for instance is a case in which narrow nationalism has been subdued to create a voluntary system of mutual benefits. There is no forced community in the EU, states either opt in or out. The main point though is that the EU project was created by statesmen and academics that gave their knowledge and pushed for its creation (Thody, 1997:2). Therefore, the discussion of possible realities and the writing of prescriptions for problems is an important, if not the most important, part of making things come into being in the human world.

**How would a cosmopolitan order look?**

**Global governance argument**

There are many different opinions about how a post-nationalist world would and should look. Halliday, who is not explicitly cosmopolitan (although he alludes to it. See 1988:198) but rather critic of nationalism (2000), does not prescribe a world government as an option. He prefers something similar to what already exists and for it to be developed further. He refers to global governance as his preferred option, where ‘the management of world affairs is distributed across a range of institutions, some with distinct competences, some with overlapping responsibilities, some organized by states, some by private business co-ordination, some by NGOs’ (2001:130). This is a scenario where states and institutions share power. Thus nationalism is counter balanced and its impact is lessened. The problem with this approach is that it does not democratise the international system and it could be argued that it just moves power from states to faceless, unaccountable institutions.
World government argument

There are those that go even further and posit that not only should we rid the world of nationalism but that there should be some kind of world government (Marchetti, 2008; Monbiot, 2004). The problem with such theorizing is that it appears as though the human race appears so far from achieving such lofty goals.

It could be argued that a cosmopolitan order based on the human rights charter and a world government based on western values of democracy is impossible. The feasibility of creating a world government is criticized by some cosmopolitans themselves (Freeman, 1999:61). With so many different political systems, interests, levels of education and the task of actually creating the bureaucracy itself makes the mind boggle. The idea of one person, one vote on a global scale is honourable indeed but for now the human race appears a long way away from any such reality.

A more realistic alternative, but still a leap of imagination, is opting for a system of nations and states which gives autonomy to each region/state to run its own affairs. There should only be management at global and regional levels unless there is an extreme case of human rights abuse. Dialogue is fine to resolve human rights issues but force should only be used in extreme cases. This could be termed neo internationalism or post internationalism.

This is something which can be exploited by cosmopolitans. In any cosmopolitan world order it would surely be impossible to have just one huge state with a central government controlling everything. As stated before, any system would have to operate with some kind of centralized power dealing with global level issues with a subsidiarity of institutions dealing with issues as they get smaller. This is a way to rebuff and/or satisfy the nationalists and cultural conservatives who want to have autonomy within their borders. The very fact that many states have not been able to consolidate their control is an advertisement for regional autonomy within loose federations. This could be one way to mitigate the nationalism of large powers and create some kind of global balance of power among regions.

Change of mindset

The less institutional approach posited by the likes of Appiah (2006: XV, XVIII-XIX) is another alternative. The ideational nature of it means it implies less formal structure and rather a change of mindset. In effect this is an exercise in education of populations, a
promotion of enlightenment if you will. It would of course need state involvement but people
would be compelled more in this approach, as opposed to bound as in the institutional
approach. Grassroots activism would be important in changing the system from below.
Governments, intellectuals and community workers would be important players in such a
project.

Many cosmopolitans have close links to the global justice movements (Monbiot, 2004;
Boaventura de Sousa and Rodriguez Garavito, 2005) and seek to create a world order based
on already existing value frameworks such as those of human rights and/or social justice. At
first glance it seems a fair and worthy attempt to bind different nationalities under a simple
universal values system. In effect, if all states rigorously apply the tenets of the UN
Declaration of Human Rights the world will be a fairer and more rational place. This could be
where ‘cosmopolitan patriotism’ comes in (Appiah, 1996:22-6; Nussbaum, 1996:4-17). This
is the promotion of layers of responsibility. According to this theory, human beings are still
attached to their local identities and need not change those but they must also accept their
responsibility to humanity. In effect this is also a part of their identity which should be
promoted.

This approach suffers from some of the disadvantages of the institutional approach though. It
could be argued that global social justice is not feasible because of education and different
values which would lead to mass disagreements. To add to this, as many have pointed out,
the Human Rights charter is still not enforced in so many countries in the world. It exists and
has many signatories but many of those signatories are human rights abusers themselves.
‘Sixty years after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the United
Nations, people are still tortured or ill-treated in at least 81 countries, face unfair trials in at
least 54 countries and are not allowed to speak freely in at least 77 countries’ (Amnesty
International, 2008). In this approach there is little to force compliance. It relies on
governments and non-governmental interest groups to promote cosmopolitan ideas of justice.
Enforcing a Human Rights declaration or social justice charter would be left in a similar
situation to now if institutions were not altered or developed to promote and enforce
cosmopolitan values.

Is such a thing desirable?
Held believes that the world has reached a point where the issues to be remedied threaten the current way of life and the existence of the species (Held, 2006:157). Hence, a cosmopolitan order must replace nationalism so as to secure the future. ‘With the resurgence of nationalism and unilateralism... Clear, effective and accountable global decision making is needed across a range of global challenges’ (Held 2006:164). Nationalism has far from gone away and Held believes it should hence it is on us to encourage the development of a cosmopolitan order. His quote is to criticise the nationalist mentality in relations to our times. For an example of this in real life one can examine the Bush administration (2000-2008) to see clear example of the narrow nationalist behaviour. Bush claimed that he would not agree to the Kyoto protocol as it would damage the US economy (Bush, 2005). This in turn damaged efforts to combat climate change as the US was the largest producer of greenhouse gases that year (BBC, 2005b). Bush is not considered a nationalist in conventional political definitions, just a centre right president heading a liberal democratic state. Nationalism is the default setting for leaders when other avenues of rational argument have been exhausted or if they are attempting to appear tough to their electorate.

Waldron, (2000:242) believes that ‘we hold disparate views about justice and follow different traditions but still live unavoidably side by side with one another, we have to come to terms with one another’. Hence, it is a fact of life that societies will come into contact with others. This has been happening for thousands of years and is likely to continue more than ever before. And if globalization is unstoppable it is necessary to find a way to ensure general well being to secure peace and security. Thinking of mutual benefit can be a selfish action, it depends on one’s perception.

If each state behaves without considering the welfare of other states the international system becomes more insecure and realism is vindicated. Compromise and cooperation are needed. World leaders are constantly meeting each other and are in contact to find ways to manage global affairs. The G20 or the Copenhagen climate summit are clear examples of such activity. The current climate is one in which there is more dialogue between decision makers.

As stated previously, many scholars of nationalism believe that nationalism will remain but also believe it is a positive in the world. Martha Nussbaum sees things differently. Any ‘human being might have been born in any nation.... We should recognize humanity wherever it occurs and give it... our first allegiance and respect’ (1996:140). It is difficult to
deny the rationality of such a statement. Borders are artificial and all human beings should have equal treatment based on each individual and not to be judged on the country they happen to be a citizen of. Many international regimes were made to promote this idea. A more just international society is facilitated by institutions such as the ICC and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

However, it could be argued that it is not the solution to go around the world spreading a single world view. The imposition of such values may be arrogant and even impossible. As previously stated, for many the imposition of a one size fits all system seems abominable. To a lot of observers the system of human rights and democracy appear as projections of Western values. These values are often perceived as being the wrong ones by those that oppose them and thus the wrong ones to impose in their societies and in any part of the world. Cosmopolitanism is an idea developed in the West - although it has spread out to include proponents in non Western countries (Robbins, 1998:2) - and it is often perceived as cloak for Western domination (Glazer, 1996:64). Therefore it will always be open to the criticism that it represents the imposition of Western values on the rest of the world.

**Chapter Summary**

Our globalizing planet is likely to continue globalizing whether we like it or not and the problems that go with it will continue to grow too. Therefore, it is important to promote ideas of global governance. That said many perceive such efforts as an attempt by the powerful countries to exploit the weaker and such institutions could be and are used in such ways. Promoting a new order based on world government, extending the governance that already exists or promoting cosmopolitan ideas of coexistence all have obstacles to overcome. Apart from the already mentioned suspicion that such things are there to benefit the West, education, different values, design, legitimacy, compliance and a host of other issues stand in the way of these ideas. However, many aspects of the propositions put forward are already play a part in international affairs. The imagination of scholars, statesmen and many others has been an engine to promote the cosmopolitan values and global governance institutions which are familiar parts of today’s world. Attempts at other orders have been made in the past and have either failed or have altered and parts of those remain today in their revised forms.
10 RESULTS

The answer to the research question posed is contained in the following paragraphs and is based upon the arguments and counter arguments examined in this piece. The cases for and against nationalism have been outlined and some alternatives have been looked at too. From this discussion it has to be said that no concrete conclusion can be drawn. However, this writer believes that there is a strong case against nationalism. The human species has reached a level of interconnectedness that requires thinking past the old, narrow, self interested dogma of nationalism. The fact that human societies have changed over time and that human beings have been able to overcome divisions groups means that the world is one in which human beings are able to shape. This is not to say that this is an easy process. It has taken thousands of years to get to where the human race is today. The past few thousand years, and especially the last century have seen radical changes though. The future depends on human beings’ ability to adapt to what is coming. This depends especially on the work of world leaders, intellectuals, the media, teachers, civil society and any person who has the ability to influence and inspire those around him/her to higher goals.

However, it is clear that there is a reality which is different to the ideal. Human beings remain with particularistic attachments, as they always have, and have a desire for identity, which in the current moment is prevalently that of being a member of a nation. The nation state remains the main provider of welfare to its citizens (although not everywhere) so it is a logical survival strategy to support it. This in itself does not pose a problem. Neither does the desire to preserve national characteristics. Trying to homogenize identities by force or doing so in times when identity is under threat can lead to a backlash of the thing that the process is attempting to overcome: nationalism/tribalism. Thus, it is important to give societies the autonomy to decide how they want to organise themselves. Only if there are gross violations of human rights or threats to global/regional peace and welfare should societies outside of our own be pressured, be it with words or by force if needed. Furthermore, societies should have the right to decide how much of the outside they want to let in. Things such as foreign television, products, immigrants or a host of other phenomena are some examples. If such
societies feel as though their national identity is threatened by outside influences then being directly confrontational with those societies is likely to encourage more fear of the outside and more likely a turn towards nationalism. The most successful societies of the present are those which are democratic and open. This is example enough of what can be done if nations are open to new ideas, new people and new ways of doing things.

As stated people are entitled to self determination and under this banner falls the right to separate from old structures, as in the case of liberating a people from oppression. It is even a right to liberate a people from a non oppressive structure. If it is the democratic choice of a people and especially if it is carried out in non-violent way, there is no reason to deny a people who choose to identify themselves otherwise.

The biggest criticism of nationalism is against its employment in chauvinistic forms. If human beings were nationalistic about sporting achievements or which country was the biggest provider of world aid there would be few reasons to worry about nationalism. Unfortunately in most cases pride does not end (or even begin) with such things. When nationalism is used by elites to control populations to their own ends or to advance short term, selfish interests that is when it starts to become cumbersome. In such forms it can promote the competition between weak states to the benefit of the strong and the pursuit of narrowly defined national interests which often do not directly benefit the citizens of the country pursuing those interests and most definitely makes international relations more insecure. That is the aspect of nationalism which can longer be justified, if it ever could have been.

Thus, now it is time to turn to the suggestions looked at in the alternative visions section. The general outlook of this section is about moving organisation to something higher than the nation state. As stated the human race still seems far from achieving anything as grand a democratically elected world government. However, this writer would support moves towards enhanced global governance and perhaps even government. In agreement with the cosmopolitan social constructivists, I see the world as that of our making and not something outside of our power. For this to happen the average human being’s level of education would have to jump significantly and real democracy would have to become the prevalent system of government the world over.
The current system of global governance is far from democratic and this makes it lack legitimacy compared with many nation states, where people are able to vote on decisions and about who leads them. However, such institutions are needed and provide the backbone to build on for the future. It is not a question of getting rid of them if they are not working as they should be but rather reforming them to make them work better in benefitting the development of an international community.

Nationalism has to be altered to encourage societies to take pride in things different to what they do now. The focus on ‘getting the most for ourselves’ and being suspicious and hostile to outsiders is to walk the path to further discord. If nationalism cannot become some kind of ‘pooled patriotism’ then it could be the doom of the species.

Pooled patriotism can be seen as linked to the development of the earlier mentioned ‘cosmopolitan patriotism’. The idea that local identity and attachments are fine but that there is a higher calling of ethical responsibility to humanity. The attempt of the thesis here is to build on this idea more and meld it with elements of an institutional approach with an acceptance of the notion that human beings have strong particularistic tendencies, as nationalists would state. Hence pooled patriotism is where explicit loyalty to the nation is just one loyalty. Pooled patriotism accepts that human beings can be particularistic and have their survival instincts. However, on issues that go past borders and affect at the regional and global level, there must be a desire cultivated to reach mutually beneficial outcomes. Thus pooled patriotism goes hand in hand with pooled sovereignty, which is promoted to deal with transborder issues. The time of a state’s complete sovereignty over its territory and affairs is over, if it ever really existed. In the EU for example there is formal pooled sovereignty but in most of the rest of the world there is informal pooled sovereignty as there are few International Governmental Organisations (IGOs) which have formal control of what happens in the international system. Going back to the EU though there is already a kind of pooled patriotism coupled with a formal pooled sovereignty.

The EU contains states and nations with their own identities, executives, national interests, culture and so on. However, above all this there is an EU super structure which European citizens are also a part of. The EU commission, parliament and its other institutions work
to cultivate a European identity with things such as the EU flag, ERASMUS student exchange, Schengen, a single currency and possibly even a European defence force (Wintour, 2008). Things such as the single currency pool the sovereignty of states and thus there is a common interest in taking care of the currency. Therefore, patriotism is pooled as it is necessary that other countries’ economies are in good condition so all can get the highest benefit. This is still in its early stages but the EU is working hard to create a common European identity whilst allowing each nation to keep its identity (EU, 2008: Article 9).

Therefore, in the EU, patriotism is extended beyond borders to ensure peace and prosperity in a regional system. As stated, it is something which must be cultivated, in the same way that nationalism has been. As previously mention I believe that it is already possible to see elements of pooled patriotism coupled with pooled sovereignty and the EU would be a prime example of this. Therefore, there needs to be the promotion of more supra-structures with formal ties to cultivate a pooled patriotism. Without such formal recognition and institutions to support it, it will be difficult to create a pooled patriotism. The reason that cosmopolitan patriotism does not have enough weight behind it is that it is posited as an idea but is not coupled with the desire for formal institutions to promote it and it is focused more on human rights and tolerance as opposed to international cooperation (Appiah, 1998:91-111). It is also based on the principle that it is necessary to think of other human beings’ value alone as a reason for being a ‘cosmopolitan patriot’ but lacks an argument to play to human beings particularistic side (Nussbaum, 1996:4-17). Pooled patriotism recognises self serving concerns. However, such concerns are placed in the larger context that phenomena such as global warming, resource depletion and the like affect or will affect all peoples. Hence it inspires the need to take other actors into consideration when decisions are taken as other actors are likely to be careless if we are too. This will in turn affect us. To make negative global and regional phenomena easier to deal with, the idea of pooled patriotism should be promoted. It accepts that human activity is often self centred but reframes interests as being long term (generational) and binds the interests of many actors as one. The thesis accepts the realist/nationalist belief that human beings’ particularism is ever present but seeks to alter cosmopolitan values to accept that particularism needs to be taken into account in any cosmopolitan theory.
The EU has an advantage as it has recognised this and its engineers have promoted its condition. Of course people may feel strongly about issues outside of their country but without a feeling of tied fate, encouraged by a strong institution, states are likely to continue pursuing narrowly defined national interests. The efforts of cosmopolitans and humanists are likely to remain more academic or at least move at a much slower pace. This could be remedied if such efforts are joined with a recognition that transborder phenomena are creating global, informal pooled sovereignty which needs the promotion of institutions to manage these phenomena coupled with pooled patriotism.

As stated earlier the particularistic part of human nature, our survival instinct, is a big factor which challenges cosmopolitan projects. For instance, when people talk about ‘fortress Europe’ (the restriction on people and products entering EU borders from non EU countries) it is an ‘us’ and ‘them’ scenario. As previously discussed, ‘othering’ is something which is present in human beings but that can be overcome. In Europe there is a lot of ‘othering’ to those in the Islamic world but ‘othering’ has lessened significantly between Europeans since the end of World War 2 (Gole, 2006; Creutz-Kamppi, 2008). Despite there having been wars for thousands of years in Europe this now appears impossible between EU members. The world we live in has been constructed by human beings therefore all is changeable under the right conditions. However, it must be done with the knowledge of all the negative parts human nature and not with naivety. Therefore, it falls again to those with the vision and ability to influence and inspire, to transform the current shape of nationalism. In the same way that nationality has been constructed, those who seek a new order can aid the reconstruction of a broader identity.
To summarise briefly then, nationalism is becoming less useful and more malignant in the international system. Although it may be necessary for less developed countries to use elements of it to solidify a functioning state, nationalism is often used to create more discord in the sphere of international relations. Thus alternative ideologies must be developed to foster a fairer and more secure international society. The world is already in a phase of informal pooled sovereignty, where no state has complete control over its territory and affairs as various phenomena continually ebb the ability of national governments to act unilaterally. In such a climate it is necessary to develop international institutions further to manage the effects of globalization at a macro level and with representation from the world’s people. To manufacture the support for such institutions and their development a pooled patriotism should also be developed. This is an ideology in which citizens extend their concerns from just their own countries to other areas of world, where there is a recognition that phenomena affect not only the local but the regional and global. Thus, pushing human beings to commit more strongly to finding long term solutions to long term global problems, which transcend borders and often affect, or will affect, the majority of humanity.

The final point is on that of flagging. As stated before, the nation is something which must be created. Not all countries have achieved a high level of national unity and stability and perhaps for them flagging is necessary for them to become an effective partner in the nation state system. In the stable, advanced democracies, with populations that live in relative comfort, flagging is still prevalent. The question to ask such countries is: is it still necessary to flag? Would the system breakdown if flagging stopped? These are question for further research. However, seeing all the benefits that people have from living in such societies, there seems little reason as to why they would want to destroy it. If the state performs its functions perhaps there is little need to keep stoking nationalism as people will not desire the breakdown of the citizen – state relationship. What if flagging of supranational organisations was performed? Would such flagging boost pooled patriotism? Perhaps flagging can be harnessed for post nationalist purposes. As stated though, these are only speculations and topics for another study.
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