THE NATION IN THE GLOBALIZATION ERA

Cdor. Dumitru TOADER, PhD*
Lect. Daniela NAGY, PhD**

The nation integrates the populations into a community of citizens whose existence legitimizes the internal and external action of the state. The latter, an instrument of the nation, is acting at the same time to integrate populations by citizenship and to act in the world of nations - political units. Globalization is no longer based on expansionist impulses, but on new infrastructures and means of global governance and exercise of governance, which have altered power relations in the present world.

In the era of globalization, the traditional correlation between the national organization of the military, namely the national defense and the territorial nation-state, has undergone transformations in the sense that the elaboration of a national defense policy, starting from the defense strategy decisions up to the deployment and the use of military force is integrated into a matrix of institutionalized consultation and cooperation mechanisms, both bilateral and multilateral, both formal and informal.

Keywords: nation; state; ethnicity; citizen; democratic nation; civic nation; citizen community; national state; globalization; sovereignty; autonomy; national defense; security globalization; military power; security policy.

The globalization we are seeing or adapting to today, makes us admit that there is a diminution of civicism and political ties. What is important in globalization is that this, by being at the level of the whole of society, through its different modes of manifestation, will have a particular impact on the human condition in its entirety, influencing the whole human system of values. In a first attempt to show what characterizes it, we can say that globalization is characterized by the internationalization of economic activities and the existence of networks that disseminate information and knowledge, the phenomenon of globalization evolving concurrently with that of integration and regionalization[1].

In addition to a historical and ideological analysis of the nation, a sociological analysis is needed to understand whether the modern democratic nation will be able to provide the social link in the future, as it did in the past. The political and economic independence and sovereignty of each nation is today severely constrained by the constraints of globalization of economic exchanges and of relations between political units. In addition, the internal evolution of democracies, in which collective life seems to materialize on the production and distribution of wealth, tends to shake the existing political idea of the origins of nations.

All of these make us ask how much it is possible for a democracy to ask citizens to defend it *at the expense of life*. In democracy there is no supreme sacrifice, the individual with his interests has taken the citizen's place with his ideals.

On the territory of Europe, European identity grows from national identity. Does this mean that the Romanian nation is abandoning its identity spirit, centuries of faith, blood and song? Is it possible to reconcile the project of unification of the continent with the principle of the right to identity?

Europe's future challenge is to promote an inclusive society based on respect for and recognition of fundamental rights, diversity and equality. It is regrettable that today, on behalf of security and protection of democratic and European values, a perfect climate has been created to limit the rights and freedoms whose enforcement has been achieved in many years of activism. The fact that there was initiated a debate with regard to the creation of borders within the Schengen area is perhaps the most significant example of

***"Henri Coandă" Air Force Academy, Brașov*
e-mail*: dredaot28@gmail.com
****"Henri Coandă" Air Force Academy, Brașov*
e-mail*: nagydaniela@yahoo.com

the relationship between racism and xenophobia and the abolition of rights and freedoms. There are countries in the European Union which, especially since the refugees' crisis has worsened, have decided to make exceptions and re-establish internal borders.

The full of hatred rhetoric toward immigrants, which, with media's complicity, associates them with terrorism or crimes such as sexual assaults, thefts or acts of violence, ends up being transmitted to the population, which, in turn, accept drastic limitations not only of the rights and freedoms of immigrants but also of their own rights and freedoms.

From nation to civic nation

In the past, the main tools in the study of nationalism were the theories elaborated by researchers who were usually historians or political scientists. They proposed NATION definitions based on the historical analysis of societies bearing this name as a causal relationship incongruous with nationalism. If this report is evident from a historical and ideological point of view, it does not explain the logical mechanism by which the *concept of nation* is being built, which is why a sociological approach is required to come up with data-based theories resulting from empirical knowledge of societies such as those practiced by Max Weber, Marcel Mauss, Norbert Elias, etc.

Thus, sociological theories are also based on the comparative analysis of the social link between people to observe what constitutes and what makes it work in different types of historical communities. It is well known that in modern societies, the social link is essentially a political one, that is, a national one, from which it follows that the nation must be studied in political terms, that is, taking into account the representations and institutions that give sense and materialize the way in which the life of a community is led.

Given its essentially political nature, the nation is fundamentally different from ethnicity, where the social link is of a cultural nature being a historical and cultural community. The objective elements invoked by specialists in the field (who insisted on the preeminence, in time and in terms of legitimacy, of ethnicity on the nation), language, origin, territory, etc. are not the carriers of an *a priori* identity. If we accept that the modern nation

is a political community, the history of the different nations shows that the ideative nucleus that has always animated the materialization of the abstract idea of the nation is the same. Two dimensions define this nucleus, sovereignty and integrity. The nation exercises its sovereignty, internally, by integrating the populations that make up the national society, and externally, asserting itself as a historical subject in a world order based on the existence and on the relations between nations - political units (states - subjects of international law).

The political organization and the democratic principle that underpin it make the modern nation a special kind of organization. Integration is an ongoing process, thanks to which the feeling of national belonging is constantly being built.

What characterizes the modern nation, irrespective of its concrete historical form, is openness to the citizens of other states as well. Depending on certain criteria established in accordance with the cultural tradition, the values and norms of a particular society, the state representing the nation determines the ways in which citizens of other states can acquire citizenship. These criteria are more or less drastic or demanding, but openness exists as a principle. Because the nation (as an abstract idea) brings together citizens, they are all equal among themselves, and their belonging to the community is based on the internalization of a system of norms and values, defined mainly in political terms. In principle, anyone can integrate into the community of citizens, that is, a national community that is governed by democratic rules.

It is unanimously recognized today that *democracy* is not an invention of the modern age. But modern political theory has the merit of highlighting two ideas that fundamentally differentiate modern democracy from the ancient one, namely the practice of representation (which showed the need and importance of power delegation) and a new conception of citizenship that has a universal character.

The citizen community is based on all these ideas, all of whom share the same values, are equal, participate in the exercise of power, and agree that anyone sharing the same values and meeting certain criteria established according to a rational policy can also become citizen, i.e. a member of a state belonging to the state. This theory gains even greater importance today, taking into account migrations

of populations from one territory to another, determined by economic, social, political, natural factors or in the wider context of globalization.

The transcendence of individual or group peculiarities through the abstract political identity common to all is specific to the civic nation. The capacity to integrate it results from the rapport, dynamic by definition, which is established between the political (abstract and normative) project of a community of citizens and the concrete, cultural, historical, social characteristics of the populations that make up this community and which the state organizes in society.

If, from an analytical point of view, the idea of a nation is based on transcendence through politics, the assumption of primal identities and the affirmation of political identity as a citizen, to explain the possibility of concrete materialization of the civic nation, sociological analysis emphasizes internalization or socialization. Generally speaking, it allows the acquisition of common norms and values and makes possible the integration of the individual into a group. As regards the citizen community, the civic nation, the state has organized the education that provides to a great extent this process of socialization and especially of political socialization. The national social connection thus begins by recognizing a public domain, a common one, in which private identities are overcome by political identity, ensuring equality for all. Integration through national institutions (and especially through school) has created, as Dominique Schnapper claims[2], a specific social habitus.

The sociological analysis thus shows that the civic nation has become concrete by being the source of an identity, morality, passions and behaviors. But even more importantly, it has become concrete in that the dignity of people is no longer linked exclusively to a particular place in a family or statutory group, but to their quality of universal individual and citizen.

Nation – ethnic group/ethnicity

In social life and even in scientific literature, the notion of *ethnic* and *national* is often used undifferentiated. The nation is a special form of political unit whose specificities ought to be analyzed. Like any political unit, the nation is defined by its sovereignty, inside and outside the state. Its specificity is that it integrates the populations into a community of citizens whose existence legitimizes the internal and external action of the state.

The nation differs from the groups that are not politically organized. Thus, ethnic groups designate groups of people who consider themselves the heirs of a historical community (often formulated in terms of common ascendancy) and who share the will to maintain it. In other words, ethnicity is defined by two dimensions: the historical community and cultural specificity.

The revival of the concept of ethnicity has become a key term of contemporary scientific literature, especially in the US[3], where the ambiguity between the two notions of nation and ethnicity is maintained. For example, rediscovering within the United States, the force of belonging to separate communities and designating the ethnic group at the same time as blacks, Irish Americans, Italian Americans, Jews, and Indians, sociologists could avoid continuing reflection on the nature of the individual's belonging to collective: racial in the case of blacks and Indians; national in the case of Irish and Italians; national and/or religious for the Jews. It could thus neglect the rise of the taboo problem of the breed even if it is said that it is a social concept – or of culture – which has often become socially allowed to observe what was once called race – to define the groups.

In some situations, ethnicity has been and is at the root of some forms of discrimination in society such as racism and xenophobia. Racism is the process of discrimination due to the beliefs and ideologies produced in the 19th and 20th centuries by Frenchmen Jules Soury, Joseph Arthur de Gobineau and Charles Maurras, or German Alfred Rosenberg, according to whom, human races can be classified from inferior to superior on the basis of different fundamental biological characteristics with which they seem to be endowed. Racism implies that people are unequal according to ethnicity to which they belong, the belief that peoples are unequal as such, and social and cultural differences are explained by biological and hereditary differences between human races.

Closely related to racism is xenophobia, which refers to both hatred toward a different ethnicity, culture or religion, and to the fear of unknown people and unknown concepts. Xenophobia

is often generated and exacerbated by social inequalities when associated with ethnic or religious differences, as it happened in Transylvania, during the Austro-Hungarian empire, in Northern Ireland (Ulster), between Protestants and Catholics, in Algeria, during the French occupation, in South Africa, during the apartheid, in the United States, between African Americans, white Americans and Hispanics, or in Europe, between settled populations and nomadic Roma populations, or between Christian and Jewish populations.

Those who belong to ethnic or minority groups, politically or legally dominated, have a direct interest in recognizing the legal equality and political rights of all – equality that compensates, at least partially or symbolically, for the inferiority of the status. Because minority or legal populations have understood better than others what they are protecting, they have been particularly keen on the principles of democratic citizenship. For example, at a stable socio-economic level, African Americans hold a higher rate of participation in elections than other ethnic groups in the United States.

Nation - state
There are also comments on whether it is appropriate for the nation to be confused with political unit (the state). The term *nation* designates the political units whose sovereignty is recognized by the international community. Thus, today's scholars leave aside an analytical distinction that the first thinkers of the nation did not ignore. The French authors, marked by the threat of revolutionary experience and the proclamation by the *Third State* of the nation as a new source of political legitimacy, made clear the distinction between political unit (the state) and the civic nation. Thus, Renan distinguished between nations such as France, England and most of the modern European autonomies and the other *forms of human society*, namely the large agglomerations of people such as China, Egypt, the old Babylon, the tribe model of the Jews and the Arabs - or the fortress, flowing the Spartan or Athenian model-the non-homeland communities, maintained by a religious connection such as that of the Israelites, of the Persians – confederates, following the pattern of Switzerland, America – relationships such as the one that the breed, or rather the language, establishes between different branches of Germans, different branches of Slavs[4].

Mauss explains how he came to distinguish between the nation and the political unit (state). He classifies human societies into four large groups according to their level of integration, i.e., at the level of political integration, polisegmentary, clan-like or tribal societies, then integrated societies in ascending order by the presence, force and constancy of a central power[5]. Mauss therefore adds to the criterion of political integration that characterizes any political unit organized by a stable central power, that of citizenship that allows the modern nation to differentiate from other political units - which makes it clear that there is still a large amount of societies and states that do not deserve the name of the nation in any way. Reemploying the same distinction in the introduction to the *Paix et Guerre entre nations*, Raimond Aron states that the nation, in this case is the equivalent of any political organization, territorially organized, and that international relations are relations between political units, the latter concept covering Greek fortresses, the Roman or Egyptian empire like the European monarchies, bourgeois republics or popular democracies[6]. It is, in fact, the sense Adam Smith gave to the nations when he wrote *The Wealth of Nations*.

Also in this sense, the term is used in the study of the discipline – Study of international relations. The same assimilation between the nation and the political unit (state) led in 1919 – at a time when the democratic nation seemed to be acceptable as the universal way of political organization – to create the League of Nations and to organize the political order in nations that were not, some Eastern European countries, but political units. The increase in the number of new states after the Second World War, recognized by the United Nations, expresses the existence of new states or new nations – political units.

Max Weber does not ignore the distinction between the state and the nation – first of all, the nation is not the same as the people of a state, i.e. belonging to a political community. He also gave extra value to small nations in terms of their democratic quality and culture.

The state enters the nation within a space; the nation is a territorialized political unit. Unlike the Greek *polis*, founded and formed by a group of people who could carry it with them over the seas, the modern nation associates a political

organization with its territory. Thus, populations in the diaspora, even if they continue to support cultural, religious or economic ties across borders, do not form a nation. Territory opposes the logic of social organizations based on family or clan solidarity. The concrete space defines the borders within which laws are enforced, and common practices that define the abstract space of politics are exercised. The right to a homeland is still partly recognized by the nationality law.

The state constitutes the nation in the full sense, giving it shape and ordering the social system around it. The nation cannot remain the pure abstraction of a community of citizens, even though relations between civil society and the state have always been specific. As the case may be, the state, the collective values and the common institutions were those that had the role of motor, or one or more of the ethnic groups that, for example, in Eastern Europe, claimed their organization as a nation, which is, to be considered a sovereign state. The state institutions facilitate a nation to have historical continuity.

Nation - nationalism

Finally, the distinction between the nation as a historical reality and nationalism must be made. This term also means either ethnic claims of being recognized as nations, that is to say, to coincide with the historical-cultural community (or ethnicity) and political organization, or the will of the nations already established to affirm themselves in spite of others. Criticism toward nations often concerns nationalism. The conflicts, for example in the Balkans, are not national, but ethnic or nationalist conflicts, showing the inconsistency of the national tradition of former Yugoslavia, which was attempted to be constituted in the nation in 1919, starting from the Serbian, Slovenian, Bosnian, Albanian ethnic groups, etc. Recent Anglo-Saxon political science deals with nationalisms in the sense of claiming to create a nation rather than the nations themselves[7].

Effects of globalization on nations

Globalization opens the national space for the flow of people, goods, capital, technology, information, determining, under political and economic auspices, the establishment of links between the different (horizontal and vertical)

levels of organization of society. It can be measured by comparing the statistical data provided by the past decades: from the value of the foreign capital invested, the density of the commercial network, the number of multinational corporations, international non-governmental organizations and governmental organizations, to military expenses, the multinationality of military-industrial scales, and diversity of the actors involved in the armament trade.

Globalization has a universal character in the sense that it has affected the structure of all components of the global social system – political, economic, military, social, religious, ecological subsystems etc. From this perspective, we can also speak of a specialization of globalization, i.e., of political, military, social, financial, technological, ecological globalization and, last but not least, economic globalization.

Globalization has an appreciable amount of positive and negative effects. Positive elements include: the amplification and liberalization of trade, investment and financial flows, the expansion of democratic values, the protection of individual identity, the protection of the environment, and the *free movement* of security.

From a free market perspective, globalization will generate unprecedented prosperity as more nations will participate in the global economy, and technological and financial flows from developed countries to the least developed will lead to an equalization of wealth and the development of the whole world.

Globalization expands communication bridges between citizen communities. It has enough channels for it, such as multinational companies, NGOs, education, the Internet, which, in the informational era, are of great benefit to international migration and increased human contacts.

Globalization also has negative effects, such as: the fall in security for all indicators, the globalization of local and regional chronic phenomena, the globalization of large organized crime (trafficking in arms, drugs, people), the radicalization of ethnic and religious fanaticism, and terrorism. Related to culture, globalization breaks down cultures into *subcultures*: rap, homosexuality, etc., or *niche* cultures, which do not provide integration solutions for their constituent individuals. Negative issues are multiple also because globalization is an

uncontrolled, ungoverned process. It is, in a way released from political control.

Effects of globalization on national security

Faced with the risks and threats that come with globalization, states find themselves fully discovered and realize the truth that global security has little to do with the traditional rise of national military power or allies. The global expansion of terrorism and the terror of weapons of mass destruction have prompted the world's states to understand that fighting them could be most effectively done by increasing efforts to promote security through co-operation.

Security through co-operation offers a more optimistic outlook on global security. It is based on foresight and partnership actions, opposes the use of force and is open to the participation of all interested states. It has as objectives the prevention of war and the possibility of creating the necessary means for initiating and conducting an aggression. Co-operation security is carried out through international and regional organizations (UN, OSCE, ASEAN, OSA, OUA, Arab League, etc.), governments and non-governmental organizations.

The new global security architecture is backed by the reform of security institutions, a process that strengthens global security structures, transforming them into more powerful and more representative institutions.

Component of global security, national security, after the end of the Cold War, has a new dimension, because now the threats to it are becoming more diffuse and no longer exclusively military. The proliferation of terrorist, cultural, ecological threats to national security risks calls for various means – military and non-military, national and international – which lead to an interpenetration of the national security element with the regional or global security, capable of ensuring stability and security through co-operation and coordination mechanisms, regionalization and globalization of military and security relations.

*Some implications of globalization
in the military field*

Contemporary military globalization raises serious concerns about the significance and practice of sovereignty and state autonomy. Military power has played a fundamental role in the evolution and institutional form of the nation-state. The national defense capability by autonomous military means is central to the modern sovereign state concept. In the *era of globalization*, the traditional correlation between the national organization of the military, namely the national defense and the territorial state-state seems to undergo some transformations.

Compared with the beginning of the 20th century, when, as World War I and World War II demonstrated, decisions to threaten and use military force constituted the prerogative of national governments. Multilateral defense and security arrangements complicate, if not compromise, governments' decision-making in this regard. The development of defense policies and defense management in advanced capitalist states is no longer a national problem. The development of a national defense policy, from decisions on defense strategy to military deployment and use, is integrated into a matrix of institutionalized consultation and cooperation mechanisms, both bilateral and multilateral, both official and unofficial.

The existence and growth of the role of the UN and NATO, other international fora (OSCE, UN Conference on Disarmament, etc.) have helped to *extend* the process of developing and managing defense policy across national borders. Globalization has stimulated the institutionalization and improvement of a security and defense system in the Euro-Atlantic area, complementary to national security. There are few aspects of the national security policy on which the developments in international life of the last decades have not been impressed, that even the intelligence agencies have developed their own form of dialogue.

However, both realities and trends do not prefigure the end of the national armed forces, nor move towards a functional specialization of national military roles, and in no way involve international military integration with the loss of national identity.

The doctrine of national security is one of the essential and defining principles of the modern notion of sovereignty. The autonomous capacity of the modern state to defend the nation from external threats is a primordial component and the essential premise of the traditional conception of sovereignty. Modern states, the military, have always wanted to be independent. Contemporary era, marked by the processes of globalization has led to a

reconsideration of the idea and practice of national security[8]. For many states, the *national security* strategy almost no longer distinguishes itself from the *international security* strategy together with other states, forming a *security community*.

Inside this *security community*, defense and national security strategies are formulated within institutionalized alliance systems, consultation and co-operation being the basic security policy mechanisms. The development and pursuit of national security objectives are inseparable from the development and pursuit of collective security. Even countries that have sought to achieve a high degree of autonomy in national defense (e.g. France) or maintain a formal policy of neutrality (e.g. Sweden) have joined the *extended security community*.

Globalization is basically associated with a global, dynamic, evolving, facilitating, and constraining structure. The structure is heavily stratified, since globalization is deeply uneven. This reflects both existing inequalities and generates new processes of inclusion and exclusion, new victors and losers.

Conclusions

The confusion of terms in social life – nations, ethnicities, nationalisms – is rarely the fruit of chance. Words are the objects and tools of ideological and political conflicts. Therefore, willingly or not, they are used in an equivocal manner. In social and political life, since the nineteenth century, ethnicity is designated as the people. To call ethnicity – a scientific concept – a people – a political term, means, implicitly or explicitly, to give it the right to claim political independence, the right to become a nation – a political unit. If, even in the scientific literature, ethnicity is often confused, the reason is that during the period of nationalism, ethnicity can claim, in the name of the people's right to dispose of themselves, recognition as a nation-political unit.

If we assimilate the nation of the state, it is because each state claims the expression of a democratic nation. The ambiguity of the term nation in social life is that it is necessarily linked to the modern principle of political legitimacy and the basic social bond.

The nation-state is far from having used its propulsion force, be it good or bad. And this force must be judged by a lack of efficient, unitary and majority/ unanimously accepted institutions for managing global issues. For over a generation, the trend of global politics was to weaken statehood. After September 11, 2001, the main problem of global politics is not to find ways of restricting statehood, but to build it. For individual societies and for the global community, state frailty is not a prelude to utopia, but to disaster[9]. Beyond global developments and theoretical discussions about the new approach to international relations, individuals see the source of national security in the state. For them, this is possible due to all the existing legislation at a given moment, to free access to justice, to the trust that the population usually has in the army, and to the foreign policy of the state with its most visible and comprehensive segment, the bilateral relations promoted in cooperation with entities of the same nature.

If ethnic feelings and passions continue to exist within civic nations, as Anthony Smith has extensively demonstrated, there is no need to draw the conclusion that there is no difference between ethnicity and nation. The nation is not confused with either ethnicity or the state. It is defined in a dual dialectical relationship with the former through which it takes shape in social reality. The political recognition of ethnicities, integrated into the nation, leads to disintegration and helplessness. The state, when it becomes too strong, tyrannical or totalitarian, absorbs the nation and destroys the community of citizens. Between ethnicity and state, there must be made room for the nation.

The study of national security from the perspective of integration and globalization processes, with all the chances and opportunities that they bring, but also with the many challenges imposed, is a necessity that has forced many scholars of the field to give it a vast space of investigation.

NOTES:
1 I. Iovănescu, I. Done, *Studii și cercetări de istorie a gândirii economice*, Expert Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006, p. 202.
2 D. Schnapper, *La communaute des citoyens. Sur l'idée moderne de nation*, Editions Gallimard, 1994, p. 32.
3 J. Crowley în *Delannoi – Taguieff (ed)*, 1991, p. 187.
4 E. Renan, *Qu' est-ce qu' une nation? Et autre essais politiques*, Paris, Presses Pokcet, Agora, 1992.
5 M. Mauss, *Euvres, Les fonctions sociales du sacré*, Paris, Editions de Minuit, 1969, pp. 581 - 585.

6 R. Aron, *Paix et guerre entre nations*, Paris, Calmann – Lévy, 1962, p. 17.

7 E. Gellner, *Națiuni și naționalism*, trad. Robert Adam, Antet Publishing House, Bucharest, 1997.

8 M. Ozunu-Vasile, *Interesele naționale majore în domeniul securității*, in "Revista Trupelor de Uscat", no.1, 1994, p. 50.

9 F. Fukuyama, *Construcția statelor. Ordinea mondială în secolul XXI*, Antet Publishing House, Bucharest, 2004, p. 45.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aron R., *Paix et guerre entre nations*, Paris, Calmann – Lévy, 1962.

Baumab Z., *Globalizarea și efectele ei sociale*, Antet Publishing House, Bucharest.

Crowley J., *Delannoi – Taguieff (ed)*, 1991.

Fukuyama F., *Construcția statelor. Ordinea mondială în secolul XXI*, Antet Publishing House, Bucharest, 2004.

Iovănescu I., Done I., *Studii și cercetări de istorie a gândirii economice*, Expert Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006.

Mauss M., *Euvres, Les fonctions sociales du sacré,* Paris, Editions de Minuit, 1969.

Gl. (aer) Orzeață Mihail, PhD, *Opinii privind provocările viitorului pentru securitatea națională – conflictele interetnice și religioase*, GMR, no. 3/2003, gmr.mapn.ro/Arhiva-pdf/2003/Revista-3.pdf.

Ozunu-Vasile, M. *Interesele naționale majore în domeniul securității*, in "Revista Trupelor de Uscat" no. 1, 1994.

Renan E., *Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? Et autres essais politiques*, Paris, Presses Pokcet, Agora, 1992.

Șandru Daniel, *Globalizare și identitate din perspectiva postmodernității*, www.symposion/Sandru Symposion. I.pdf

Schnapper, *La communaute des citoyens. Sur l'idée moderne de nation*, Editions Gallimard, 1994.

Smith A.D., *The ethnic revival in the modern world*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1981.