

САЊА ИВИЋ*
Институт за европске студије
Београд

УДК 327:323.2
Прегледни рад
Примљен: 29.01.2018
Одобен: 23.02.2018
Страна: 105-118

GLOBALIZATION, REGIONALIZATION, FRAGMENTATION: POSTNATIONAL vs. NATIONAL POLITICAL PARADIGMS**

Summary: Globalization has been one of the most contested phenomena of the past three decades. There was a proliferation of discourses on globalization which lasted until 2008m when the world financial crisis occurred. Nevertheless, there is still a number of debates concerning the nature, effects and future of globalization. Both the postnational idea of political community, as well as regionalism and fragmentation reflect the need to escape or revise the nationhood. Globalization, regionalization, and nationalism are forces that overlap one another - sometimes cooperative and sometimes antagonistic. This paper aims at investigating whether the age of nation-state is over in light of phenomena of globalization, regionalization and fragmentation. It also investigates the recent paradigm shift and paradox of growing nationalism in the postnational era. Huntington's article about clash of civilizations and the persisting power of nation-states was published in 1993, when the Treaty of Maastricht came into force and when there was a proliferation of literature on postnational constellation – of postnational nature of contemporary politics. Unfortunately, more than twenty years after the publication of Huntington's idea, it can be argued that he was right. Various political crises today such as: Russia-Ukraine crisis, migration crisis, Brexit and so forth reflect a step back to nationalist paradigms.

Key words: globalization, regionalization, fragmentation, postnational, national

Discourses of Globalization: Postnational Values Advocated by Globalization

We are witnessing major world transformations: Brexit, Russia-Ukraine crisis, Europe's migration crisis, new Russia-Turkey relations, terrorist attacks in Europe (which are transforming Europe's migration crisis into a security debate), Donald

* sanja_ivic1@yahoo.com

** Овај рад је представљен у склопу предавања које је ауторка одржала у NATO Defense College-у у Риму, 8. септембра 2016. године. Рад је настао у оквиру пројекта 179014, који финансира Министарство просвете, науке и технолошког развоја Републике Србије.

Trump and new public political discourse and so forth. Some political scientists argue that Brexit, Donald Trump's US election victory, and the rise of populist parties in Europe are the most obvious signs of the new nationalist wave.

The era of globalization is paradoxical – the world is simultaneously coming together and coming apart. “A wide and diverse range of social theorists have argued that today's world is organized by accelerating globalization, which is strengthening the dominance of a world capitalist economic system, supplanting the primacy of the nation-state by transnational corporations, and organizations and eroding local cultures and traditions through a global culture” (Kellner, 2005: 172). Globalization is often described by concepts of post-Fordism, postmodernism and emergent logic of capitalism. It includes circulation of ideas, habits, goods and people on transnational level.

Globalization started in the Western world between 1980 and 1988 and is considered to represent a paradigm shift which occurred after the collapse of communism and the end of the Cold War era. “Especially since the end of the Cold War, it has become almost a ritual to attack the state and the state system and to celebrate the end of Westphalian system and its eventual replacement by a postmodern, post-sovereign order ruled by the forces of globalization and regionalization” (Kacowicz, 1998 :18). The *Treaty of Westphalia* (1648) designed the nation-state system based on sovereignty and territoriality and this idea of state is challenged by postnational world order.

According to Habermas (2001), globalization mostly affects security of nation-states, state sovereignty, national identities and democratic legitimacy of nation-states. In the contemporary, postnational era, nation-states lost the capacity to address various kinds of problems such as: environmental disasters (acid rains, holes in the ozone layer, earthquakes etc.) that transcend borders and cannot be overcome by relying on the abilities of individual states. The same can be argued about problems of terrorism, organized crime, human trafficking and so forth. In the postnational era, nation-states don't have the capacity to act in certain areas. On the other hand, by establishment of military and economic blocks (such as NATO and International Monetary Fund), global health organizations (such as the World Health Organization), and universal human rights discourse, the traditional concept of borders has changed, since new mechanisms of governance are formed (Habermas, 2001). These mechanisms are not tied to a certain territory, and they are beyond the nation state. In other words, there is a shift of competences from national to postnational level.

Globalization embraces various contradictory phenomena: neoliberalism and fragmentation; the idea of global peace and religious fundamentalism; transnational organizations and terrorism; prosperity and inequality. Terrorism has increased in the era of globalization. New acts of terrorism in the post-Cold War era are directed against citizens and not only against governments. “Forty years ago there was no single religion terrorist movement worldwide. In the 80's only two of 64 known terrorist organizations were animated by religious faith” (Stibli, 2010: 2). Terrorism based on religious fundamentalism is the dark side of postmodernism and globalization. These terrorist attacks show us the destructive side of global flows of

technology, goods, information, ideologies and people. It is very difficult to fight terrorism, since these terrorist attacks cross borders and can affect anyone or any region at any time. According to Jean Baudrillard, “globalization creates the conditions for its own destruction” (Baudrillard, 2004: 126).

There are various approaches to globalization. Representatives of modernist perspective perceive globalization as a process of homogenization of the world based on capitalist, consumerist culture (which is often described by metaphor of “McDonaldization”). On the other hand, this process of homogenization is produced by globalized media. According to advocates of postmodernism, globalization is a source of hybridization that implies synthesis of global and local level, resulting in the creation of increasingly complex human relations.

In political science, there are two main approaches to globalization. Fukuyama’s thesis on the age of globalization as the “end of history” (Fukuyama, 1989) and Huntington’s antithesis on “the clash of civilizations” that will dominate global politics (Huntington, 1993). Fukuyama argues that globalization means the “end of history”, the triumph of Western liberal democracy and the end of conflicts. To be sure, he said, some conflicts may happen but the global conflict is over. This means that “the future will be devoted not to great struggles over ideas, but rather to resolving mundane economic and technical problems” (Huntington, 2003: 31). This point of view is closely connected to the assumption that increased interaction among peoples – trade, investment, tourism, media, electronic communication etc. – is generating a common world culture.

However, now we witness that Fukuyama’s approach was rather naïve – globalization didn’t produce the end of history and global conflicts. Huntington’s antithesis on clash of civilizations seems more realistic. Huntington argues that Fukuyama’s perspective is false and it is rooted in the Cold War perspective that the only alternative to communism is liberal democracy. However, it is wrong to think that because Soviet communism has collapsed, the West has won the world for all time and that representatives of all other cultures “are going to rush to embrace Western liberalism as the only alternative” (Huntington 2003: 66).

Benjamin Barber (1992), another American political scientist expresses the similar perspective, arguing about the strife between “McWorld” and “Jihad”. Barber employs the metaphor of “McWorld” in order to portray Western values and culture based on consumerism, while he uses the term “Jihad” in order to depict various national movements which aim at defending traditional idea of nation-state and national identity. However, this is a simplification and the clash of civilizations today cannot be captured only by binary opposition McWorld/Jihad as there is a variety of national movements that cannot be designated by the term “Jihad”. Barber wrote his article, which is widely cited, before 9/11 and other terrorist attacks and this is probably the reason of this simplification. Jihad and religious fundamentalism are grotesque consequences of globalization and the dark side of postmodern age.

Huntington’s idea of clash of civilizations was often criticized as it is also based on simplification. Huntington perceives Western civilization and various other civilizations and cultures as monolithic. But he even admits this and argues that we

need simplified paradigms to be able to understand causal relationships among phenomena, generalize about reality and predict future developments (Huntington, 2003: 30). According to Huntington, the fundamental conflict in the post Cold War world order will be cultural. "Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics" (Huntington, 1993: 22). This clash of civilizations is based on binary oppositions: we/they, West/the Rest, liberal/conservative and so forth.

Huntington (2003) argues that people define their identity by what they are not. The similar point of view is advocated by French philosopher, Paul Ricoeur. According to Ricoeur, the "self" is constituted through our relationship with other. Identity can be perceived as *ipse* (Latin), selfhood - identification, but also as *idem* (Latin) – sameness, which is constructed only through relations with others (Ricoeur, 1992). Without others we could not be ourselves. This can be argued also about national identity, not only personal identity. As increased communications, trade and travel multiply the interactions among civilizations, people increasingly give greater relevance to their cultural and national identity. Suppressing nationalism by postnational values advocated by globalization is counterproductive. Nationalism grows. In the same way in psychology, suppressing emotions is counterproductive as it leads to neurosis.

Huntington's article about clash of civilizations was published in 1993, when the *Treaty of Maastricht* came into force and when there was a proliferation of literature on postnational constellation – of postnational nature of contemporary politics. Unfortunately, more than twenty years after the publication of Huntington's idea, it can be argued that he was right. Various political crises today such as: Russia-Ukraine crisis, migration crisis, Brexit and so forth reflect a step back to nationalist paradigms.

However, the perception and role of nation-state has changed and thus it cannot be perceived from modernist perspective. Contemporary nation-states are suffering losses in sovereignty, functions and power (Huntington, 2003: 35). Another phenomenon is the transfer of power to non-state actors - to large multinational corporations, to NGOs and even terrorist organizations. "International institutions now assert the right to judge and to constrain what states do in their own territory" (Huntington, 2003: 35). So this is this difference between modern and postnational understanding of nations and nation-states.

The challenge to the nation- state in the contemporary world includes three levels: subnational, transnational and supranational. Subnational level stems from the essentialist definitions of local and regional identities based on tradition, religion, language and so forth. Transnational level includes multinational corporations, NGOs and other organizations which diminish the power of nation-state. Supranational level represents ideas of political identities that transcend national boundaries; for instance, Europeanness and the European Union as a supranational political community.

Habermas (2001), on the other hand, distinguishes three historical tendencies that can be considered the start of redesigning the relationship between citizenship and national identity. The first is German unification, the liberation of Eastern European countries and ethnic conflicts in Eastern Europe. The second refers to the development of European integrations and the development of supranational political forms, and the third refers to mass migrations.

Paradox of Growing Nationalism in the Postnational Era

The European Union was supposed to be supranational community that is strengthening the role of postnational understanding of law, economy, citizenship, identity and borders. In the light of recent events in Europe, the following question may be posed - is the European Union coming back to the state before integration? The terrorist attacks in Europe in 2015 and 2016 are transforming Europe's migration crisis into a security debate, spurring calls for closing exterior European borders and questioning the Schengen Agreement. In this way, free movement – one of the fundamental pillars of the European Union - is put at risk.

Due to these security reasons and various types of crises, the European Union is coming back to the ideas of nations, nationalism and binary oppositions: we/they, European/non-European, Christianity/Islam, self/other and so forth. Everything that was supposed to be overcome by the idea of European integration (for instance, common values, freedom of movement, no borders, multiculturalism, tolerance etc.) is put into question. So it is exactly how threats and crises influence postnational concepts and tend to return them to modernist concepts (states, nations, borders).

A certain kind of irony may be identified in Brexit. In some way, it is paradoxical as Britain actually had “a far more flexible, independent arrangement with the EU than most other member states — yet it still voted to leave. The U.K. is outside the eurozone and retains control of its own currency. It's also outside the visa-free Schengen Area and has kept more control over its borders. Britain's economy grew almost 3 percent last year, compared with a nearly stagnant eurozone. In the U.K., youth unemployment is running at just 13 percent, according to the Office for National Statistics, compared with 45 percent in Spain and a staggering 48 percent in Greece. Britain's prosperity has attracted a wave of migrants — witness hundreds camped in Calais waiting for a chance to jump on a truck to Dover — but according to Eurostat, 14 other EU countries actually accepted more migrants per capita last year than the U.K. did” (Matthews, 2016a).

Britain's decision to quit the European Union is a seismic moment for Europe as it points to the fact that nationalist political paradigms and discourses became European reality and put into question Europe's supranational nature. The European Union represents the dream of a Pan-European identity and a collective future of the continent. Brexit fundamentally undermines that vision and puts into question the idea of European identity as Brexit decided that *British* is not necessarily synonymous to *European*. Brexit might be the beginning to the end for ideas of

greater international coordination and a reversion to early modern concepts defined by *Treaty of Westphalia* (1648).

Brexit reflects tension between Europeanization and globalization. The main problem in the contemporary Europe is reflected in the fact that the European Union wants to be efficient part of global economy and keep some kind of European specificity, European identity, but there is a lack of vision, lack of solutions how to do it (Žižek, 2016). According to Slavoj Žižek (2016), one of the most prominent postmodern thinkers, this tension between globalization and Europeanization is also reflected in Brexit as the UK will even more be open to global capital now. Britain did not reject globalization, but Europeanization as it was against a number of EU initiatives (EU funding for food banks, Schengen, it was outside Eurozone and so forth).

After Brexit, there is a proliferation of nationalist public political discourses. In France, National Front leader Marine Le Pen designated Brexit as “victory for freedom” and she argues that in France and some other EU countries the same referendum should be organized (Matthews, 2016b). Dutch anti-immigration politician Geert Wilders said it was time for a Netherlands Nexit vote, while Matteo Salvini, the leader of Italy’s Northern League, tweeted that “heart, brain and pride defeated lies, threats and blackmail. THANK YOU UK, now it’s our turn.” (Foster, 2016). The anti-immigration Sweden Democrats declared that they were ‘waiting for Swexit’ while Beatrix von Storch of Germany’s Eurosceptic Alternative für Deutschland party wrote that “the EU has failed as a political union”. Euro-skepticism also runs deep in Poland—where the new right-wing prime minister, Beata Szydło, ordered EU flags be removed from the podium where she gave her first press conference, in November. In Hungary, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán is frequently critical of the European Union (Matthews 2016b). In the case of Scotland, Catalonia and Flanders the main topic is not just leaving the European Union, but their own countries.

The European Union is facing a number of crises: demographic, migration, political, economic, financial, identity crisis and so forth. These crises require collective response that these nationalist politics are making very hard. “Optimists (...) see Brexit as a trigger for Europe; a shock therapy that acknowledges the failures of the current arrangements and tries to see a new mode for governing that takes into account national realities while preserving Europe’s open markets, borders” (Foster, 2016) and identity. Reframing democracy for postnational age is necessary. “At present, ideas of postnational democracy are largely imaginary: voter turnout in 2014’s European elections was 43% with votes seemingly determined by national preoccupations” (Kirby, 2016).

The perception of paradox of nationalism in postnational era is further intensified by its European context as it was expected that the European Union overcomes parochial nationalism and moves towards postnational, postmodern political community. As Rogers Brubaker pointed out: “Europe was the birthplace of the nation-state and modern nationalism at the end of the eighteenth century, and it was supposed to be their graveyard at the end of the twentieth” (Brubaker, 1996: 1).

From all these examples it can be concluded that economic and political dimensions of globalization and Europeanization coexist with resurgence of nationalism. There are even more examples. The number of countries in the world has increased dramatically since the World War II and that continues to this day (for instance: South Sudan, East Timor, the question of independence of Kosovo, Kurdistan and so forth) In early 1990s, we witness disintegration of Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe provoked a major reappraisal of nationalism and its political significance (Sabanadze, 2010: 2). Another example of fragmentation as a process which occurs simultaneously with globalization are minorities and non-state peoples of Western Europe such as the Basques and Catalans, Scots and Welsh, who have reasserted their rights to national autonomy and, in some cases, national independence. Catalonia independence battle is the recent case.

The Basque case responds to another claim that globalization is involved not only in the production of new forms of nationalism such as those in Eastern Europe, but also in reviving old, minority nationalisms in the developed, Western world (Sabanadze, 2010: 15). “The origins and root causes of Basque nationalism date back to the end of the 19th century and long predate globalization. However, its intensification and militarization occurred after Spain embarked on the process of democratization, opening up to foreign influences and engaging in global integrative process” (*Ibid*: 15). The Basque case, therefore, also appears to confirm the assumption that with increasing globalization nationalism tends to intensify.

Another example is the partition of Belgium – a hypothetical situation which has been discussed by both Belgian and international media, especially in the context of political crisis in Belgium between 2007 and 2011. The question of separation of Dutch speaking region, Flanders, and French speaking region, Wallonia was discussed. This situation is paradoxical as this occurs in Belgium, the center of the European Union which is supranational political community based on postnational values. These are all liberal Western democracies that appear unified, but they are not like that beneath the surface. In this view globalization and nationalism are processes “that are deeply connected through dialectical and causal links” (*Ibid*: 3). “The ‘paradox’ of nationalism in the era of globalization is based on the assumption that nationalism is, by definition, a force of isolation and protection that is incompatible with globalization and its integrationist tendencies” (*Ibid*: 6).

However, if we take into account postnational elements of nationalism, then the binary opposition national/postnational may be overcome. “The whole posture of the relationship between the national and the postnational has to change” (Kirby, 2016). Postnationalism does not mean the end of nation and contemporary nationalism is different from nationalist movements of previous era. The world has changed and even national idea is revised, it is not what it was in the past. Contemporary nationalism also has a postnational dimension. “It is important to not only constitute oneself as a nation to have a legitimate claim on statehood but also to be recognized as such of other nations – members of the international community” (Sabanadze, 2010: 10).

Critics of globalization perceive it as a contemporary mode of colonialism – neocolonialism. However globalization does not lead to more homogenous world as: general rules and models are interpreted in the light of local circumstances and different cultures and traditions. Secondly, growing similarity imposed by globalization provokes reactions. Advocates for many cultures seek to protect their heritage or assert their cultural and national identity. That is why fragmentation is integral part of globalization (Lechner & Boli, 2015: 3). “In many states, including those in the developed world, regional movements exist promoting substantial autonomy or secession” (Huntington, 2003: 35). State governments have lost the ability to control the flow of money in and out of their country and are having increasing difficulty controlling the flows of ideas, technology, goods and people (*Ibid*: 35). State borders have become increasingly porous. Regionalization coexists with nationalism and with globalization (Kacowicz, 1998: 18). Thus, both the postnational idea and regionalism or fragmentation – reflect the need to escape or revise the nationhood. “Globalization, regionalization, and nationalism should be captured and studied as forces relative to and overlapping one another, sometimes antagonistic and sometimes cooperative toward each other, but never harmonious” (*Ibid*: 3).

By establishing the Committee of the Regions, which is given an advisory role, in the framework of the *Treaty of Maastricht* (Article 198a), for the first time entities below the level of nation state were recognized within the EU legal discourse. And after this first initiative, there were many other examples. Assembly of European Regions established *Udine Declaration on Regional Identity* in 2007 which considers the development of regional and European identities and aims at diminishing the gap between the global and the local, and between rich and poor European regions.

The development of regionalism certainly contributes to the strengthening of regional and local identities and enables the solution of everyday problems that citizens face, which are overlooked by the nation state. As I already mentioned, different forms of ethnic nationalism still exist in Europe (for example, Catalan, Flemish, Breton and Welsh movements), but in the contemporary Europe so far, before Brexit and Catalonia independence battle, they were focused on formulation and implementation of their politics in the European context. The radical separatist regionalisms such as the Basque ETA movement are considered anomalies in a European context. The basic argument for development of regionalism is that local entities - regions, provinces or major cities – are more familiar and, therefore, more competent to solve their own problems than remote bureaucratic systems in capital cities of nation states or in Brussels.

Some political scientists (for instance, Kratochvil, Lapham, Peter van Ham) speak of neomedievalism as a parable to describe postmodern Europe, comparing the postmodern character of the European Union with the political structure of Europe during the Middle Ages. This comparison stems from the fact of multiple competences and functions in the European Union, which was also a characteristic of the medieval European order based on decentralized authority and pluralism of power. Feudal Europe, from 8th to 14th century, was divided into many autonomous systems of government, the network of kingdoms, principalities. Cities developed

different social and political structures and often had independent systems of government defined by charters. An important feature of this period was the disintegration of state authority.

Feudal Europe is completely different from state-centric system established by the *Treaty of Westphalia* in 1648, which regulates bilateral relations as follows: 1. The world is divided into sovereign states that do not recognize any higher authority; 2. The principle of sovereignty of states and fundamental right of political self determination is advocated; as well as 3. The principle of legal equality between states; the principle of non-intervention of one state in the internal affairs of another state. Unlike the Westphalian model, medieval Europe consisted of a system of overlapping territories and pluralism of power relations and identities. The medieval Europe metaphor, can serve as a good starting point for imagining new, postmodern political space. Characteristics of both medieval and postmodern Europe are: the complex meanings of the concepts of borders and space; multiple authorities; multiple identities and affiliations; transnational elites; and the disappearance of a clear distinction between "public" and "private" (Van Ham, 2001). However, medieval Europe does not include postnational or transnational identities, while the European Union includes not only subnational and national, but also postnational identities.

The Wider Context of Political Paradigm Shifts

Political and social changes are always connected to scientific discoveries and changes of the perception of the world/collective consciousness (this is well-known from the work of Karl Jung and Hegel).

Globalization may be perceived as a new paradigm which explains contemporary world – a paradigm shift which replaced old Cold war paradigm. The idea of “paradigm shift” is introduced and explained by Thomas Kuhn in his *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). Paradigm shift consists of displacement of one paradigm, which has become incapable of explaining new or newly discovered facts. This old paradigm is replaced by a new paradigm which better explains these phenomena.

What happened in the history of mankind that enabled scientific revolution, progress, industrialization, the rise of nation- state? What enabled Enlightenment and modernity and in the end globalization itself?

There are three major paradigm shifts that made our world as it is today. The Copernican revolution was paradigm shift from the Ptolemaic model which placed the Earth at the center of the universe. The second significant paradigm shift emerges with development of print capitalism. Benedict Anderson connects universalism of national community and new nationalist discourses with the development of print-capitalism “which made it possible for rapidly growing numbers of people to think about themselves, and to relate themselves to others, in profoundly new ways” (Anderson, 1983: 52). The third significant paradigm shift stems from development of information and communication technologies and transport, that made possible the

idea of cyberspace and other postnational categories which enabled the phenomenon of globalization. This period of globalization is defined by Frederic Jameson, one of the most important postmodern authors, as the third stage of capitalism (Jameson, 1991).

Frederic Jameson (1991) argues about three stages of capitalism. The first stage of capitalism is market capitalism (this is the period of Industrial revolution in XIX century). This first stage of capitalism includes industrial capital in national markets. The second stage of capitalism is monopoly capitalism (it represents the rise of modernism). This is the age of imperialism - world markets are monopolized by a few nation-states. The third stage of capitalism is multinational/consumer capitalism (postmodern age) - which places an emphasis on the media and advertising industries and consumption rather than production of goods (*Ibid.*).

The key figure in debates exploring the line between postmodernism and globalization is Jean Baudrillard, French sociologist and philosopher. According to Baudrillard (1994), in the age of globalization we live in a world of simulacra. Reality is replaced by hyper-reality constructed by global media. In simulacra created by media there is no distinction between true and false, the real and the imaginary; cause and effect, subject and the object, and so on. Illusion is no longer possible, because the real is no longer possible (Baudrillard, 1994: 19). This is tragic ontological and epistemological condition.

Globalization is being accompanied by the emergence of a cybersphere, which is coexistent but distinct from the natural biosphere (Beynon & Dunkerley, 2000: 33). It is composed of artificial spaces, virtual communities which are developing their own agendas, interests and values beyond, behind and beneath the nation state (*Ibid.*). "Simulation in the global flow goes beyond the old realist dimensions of space and time, sender and receiver, medium and message, expression and context as the world's complex webs of electronic media generate boundaries of new hyper-space" (*Ibid.*: 34). The virtual spaces that Jean Baudrillard labels "neo-worlds" are now at the very heart of global postmodernism. The nature of cyberspace exists in mappings, simulations, imageries and various kinds of networks of postmodern world.

Capitalist consumer culture and development of information and communication technologies changed human relations and human beings. Everything is mass producible. We are in situation where artificial is creating artificial is creation artificial and so on. Everything produced by media is motivated by consumer mentality and consumer culture. Even contemporary political discourse and behavior started to resemble show business. And this is exactly what consumer culture does and this is how it transfers into the realm of politics.

Donald Trump's politics is the main example. Some political scientists are surprised by politics and behavior of Donald Trump. However, there is nothing surprising here if we are familiar with the concept of *Zeitgeist* or spirit of the age, spirit of the time. *Zeitgeist* is the intellectual fashion or dominant school of thought that typifies and influences the culture of particular period of time. Donald Trump's politics is in accordance with the spirit of the age of postmodernism, which was descri-

bed even twenty years ago in the work of Baudrillard, and other postmodernist thinkers. Trump is a representative of postmodern understanding of politics and public culture. Trump's politics reflects postmodern idea as it is:

- Challenging traditional political culture (I am referring to lack of conventional behavior and manners).
- Making media spectacle (which is in accordance with postmodern consumerist, political culture)
- Reflecting novel ideas which overcome political binary oppositions: for instance, Trump's calling for closer relationship between U.S. and Russia (Fandos, 2017). This is also postmodern characteristics, as postmodern thought merges ideas which haven't been combined before : kitsch and fine art in the realm of art; West and East in the realm of politics, and so on.

Modernism reflects belief in reason/progress, while postmodernist idea reflects the fall of grand narratives (liberalism, Marxism, idealism) and all kinds of comprehensive explanations and theories. Modernism includes binary oppositions (we/they, national/postnational, West/East and so forth), while postmodernism overcomes binary oppositions. Modern capitalism emphasized production, while postmodern capitalism emphasizes consumption. Modernism reflects belief in continuity/tradition, while postmodernism is breaking with tradition. Modernism is based on national paradigms, while postmodernism includes postnational and transnational paradigms. Modernist politics is a politics of brotherhood based on fixed notion of identity. It is established by the *American Declaration of Independence* in 1776 and *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* in 1789. The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* is also based on politics of brotherhood. Article 1 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* states: "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

Jacques Derrida (2005) and other postmodernist thinkers argue that there is nothing like "natural brotherhood" when it comes to concepts and categories such as community, nation and culture. Derrida states that he aims at deconstructing, "namely, the Greek, Abrahamic, Jewish, but especially Christian and Islamic privileging of the figure of the brother in ethics, law and politics, and particularly in a certain democratic model" (Derrida, 2005: 57-58). Derrida proposes politics based on friendship, and not on essentialist, exclusive categories such as nation. Unlike the modernist politics based on fixed identity of brotherhood, postmodern politics of friendship leaves room for understanding diversity and otherness.

The question of diversity is significant in the context of globalization as globalization is often perceived as Western imperialism – Westernization, imposing Western liberal values to the world. But imposing liberalism is contradictory to liberalism itself as it undermines its main principles. That is why John Rawls, a well-known political thinker argues that certain kinds of non-liberal regimes should be tolerated as it would be illiberal to impose a liberal global order on those peoples who don't share all liberal values (Rawls, 1999). Of course, these non-liberal regimes should not be aggressive and they should include thin conception of human rights.

Liberal values do not represent an absolute truth. Otherwise, they would represent ideology, which is contradictory to the basic idea of liberalism itself. Consequently, there is a need for redefinition of the main presuppositions of modern conception liberal values. Contemporary human rights discourse is based on the idea of universality of human nature and reason. However, in this way human rights are based on fixed concepts and have a metaphysical foundation. Human nature is described in essentialist terms and it is not perceived as constructed and contextual. The American Anthropological Association criticized the basic ideas and concepts of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. This Association argues that human beings cannot be understood apart from their cultures and societies. Subsequently, the nature of human rights is contextual.

That is why some political scientists make a distinction between international norms and rights and interpretations of these norms and rights. Rawls coined the term “overlapping consensus” which refers to the idea that peoples and representatives of different cultures and societies may agree upon the basic norms or principles of justice (Rawls, 1993). However, they will not agree upon the interpretation of these norms, which they would always interpret in accordance with their cultural, religious, philosophical and political background. The similar point of view is expressed by Charles Taylor, another liberal political thinker, who argues about the *fusion of horizons* – a cross-cultural dialogue which will lead to understanding different cultures and beliefs (Taylor, 1994). The *fusion of horizons* is a concept coined by German philosopher, Hans Georg Gadamer (1975). It stems from the premise that individuals always come from different cultural, historical, religious and political background that influences their way of thinking. The fusion of horizons is a dialectical concept which may be defined as a cross-cultural dialogue that transforms human understanding. This leads to learning to move in a broader horizon and to opening up for diversity. John Rawls and Charles Taylor outline a new ethics of social and political relations in the new millennium.

Conclusion

This paper investigates discourses on globalization and postnational values advocated by globalization. It emphasizes the paradox of nationalism in the postnational era, which occurs due to various contradictory phenomena that globalization embraces. Globalization coexists with fragmentation and regionalization and they all represent attempts to escape or revise nationhood. This paper offers wider context in which political paradigm shifts occur and outlines an ethics for the new millennium, which is based on Gadamer’s idea of *fusion of horizons*.

Литература:

1. Anderson, Benedict (1983): *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London, New York.
2. Barber, Benjamin R. (1992): "Jihad Vs. McWorld", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 269, No. 3, pp. 53-65.
3. Baudrillard, Jean (1994): *Simulacra and Simulation*, University of Michigan Press, Michigan.
4. Baudrillard, Jean (2004): "This is the Fourth World War: The Der Spiegel Interview With Jean Baudrillard" *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies*, Vol 1, No1, Available at: http://www2.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol1_1/spiegel.htm
5. Beynon, John H. and Dunkerley, David (eds.), (2000): *Globalization: The Reader*, Athlone, London.
6. Brubaker, Rogers (1996): *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
7. , Derrida, Jacques (2005): *The Politics of Friendship*, Verso, London, New York.
8. Fandos, Nicholas (2017): "Trump Calls for Closer Relationship Between U.S. and Russia", *The New York Times*, January 7, Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/07/us/politics/donald-trump-russia-united-states.html>
9. Foster, Peter (2016): "After Brexit, Europe Faces an Existential Crisis", *The Telegraph*, June 24, Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/06/24/after-brexit-europe-faces-an-existential-crisis/>
10. Fukuyama, Francis (1989): "The End of History?". *The National Interest*, pp. 1-18.
11. Gadamer, Hans Georg (1975): *The Truth and Method*, Seabury Press, New York.
12. Habermas, Jürgen (2001): *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*, trans. and ed. by Max Pensky, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
13. Huntington, Samuel P. (1993): "The Clash of Civilizations?", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3, pp. 22-49.
14. Huntington, Samuel P. (2003): *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, Simon & Schuster, New York.
15. Jameson, Fredric (1991): *Postmodernism, Or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
16. Kacowitcz, Arie M (1998): "Regionalization, Globalization, and Nationalism: Convergent, Divergent, or Overlapping?", *Kellogg Institute Working Paper No. 262*, pp. 1-47.
17. ,Kellner, Douglas (2005): "Globalization, Terrorism and Democracy: 9/11 and Its Aftermath" in P. Hayden and C. el-Ojeili (eds.), *Confronting Globalization: Humanity, Justice and the Renewal of Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
18. Kirby, Graham (2016): "Brexit, Democratic Values and the Post-national World we Live in", *Disclaimer*, July 6, Available at: <http://www.disclaimermag.com/politics/brexit-democratic-values-and-the-post-national-world-we-live-in-3709>
19. Kuhn, Thomas (1962): *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
20. Lechner, Frank J. and Boli, John (2015): "General Introduction", in: Lechner, F. J. and Boli, J (eds.). *The Globalization Reader*, Wiley Blackwell, UK.
21. Matthews, Owen (2016a): "Europe's Primal Scream", *Newsweek*, June 29, Available at: <http://theweek.com/articles/632850/europes-primal-scream>
22. Matthews, Owen (2016b): "Brexit Wounds: The Decision by British Voters to Leave the EU is Unlikely to be the Last Anti-establishment Uprising in the West", *Newsweek*, July

- 8, Available at: http://www.freebook11.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Newsweek_Europe_-_July_8_2016.pdf.
23. Rawls, John (1993): *Political Liberalism*, Columbia University Press, New York.
24. Rawls, John (1999): *The Law of Peoples*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
25. Ricoeur, Paul (1992): *Oneself as Another*, trans. Kathleen Blamey, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
26. Sabanadze, Natalie (2010): *Globalization and Nationalism: The Cases of Georgia and the Basque Country*, Central European University Press, Budapest.
27. Stibli, Florin (2010): "Terrorism in the Context of Globalization", *Academic and Applied Research in Military Science*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 1-7.
28. Taylor, Charles (1994): "The Politics of Recognition", In *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, ed. by Amy Gutmann and Charles Taylor, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
29. Van Ham, Peter (2001): *European Integration and the Postmodern Condition: Governance, Democracy, Identity*, Routledge, London, New York.
30. Žižek, Slavoj (2016): Slavoj Žižek on Brexit and the Future of the European Union (interview), 5 July, Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2OzV53zj1P>

ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЈА, РЕГИОНАЛИЗАЦИЈА, ФРАГМЕНТАЦИЈА: ПОСТНАЦИОНАЛНЕ vs. НАЦИОНАЛНЕ ПОЛИТИЧКЕ ПАРАДИГМЕ

Сажетак: Постнационално сагледавање политичке заједнице, као и регионализам и фрагментација, одражавају потребу да се ревидира националност. Глобализација, регионализација и национализам су силе које се преклапају - понекад су кооперативне, а понекад антагонистичке. Циљ овог рада је да у светлу појава глобализације, регионализације и фрагментације преиспита питање националне државе. Такође истражује недавну промену парадигме и парадокс растућег национализма у постнационалној ери. Хантингтонов чланак о сукобу цивилизација и перзистентној моћи националних држава објављен је 1993. године, када је Уговор из Мастрихта ступио на снагу и када настаје пролиферација литературе о постнационалној констелацији - постнационалној природи савремене политике. Више од двадесет година након објављивања Хантингтонове идеје, може се тврдити да је био у праву. Руско-украјинска криза, миграцијска криза, Брегзит и разни други савремени облици политичких криза у глобалном контексту, одражавају корак назад ка националистичким парадигмама.

Кључне речи: глобализација, регионализација, фрагментација, постнационално, национално