

# Nation Busting - The trouble with globalism



<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>

[Globalism, neoconservative, paleoconservative, Internationalism, and how Globalism is advancing it's agenda.] Our World

---

## Nation Busting - The trouble with globalism

[http://www.amconmag.com/06\\_02\\_03/feature.html](http://www.amconmag.com/06_02_03/feature.html)

June 2, 2003 issue

The American Conservative

By Robert Locke

Globalism is a central issue of our time, but its definition has become slippery. It is confused with globalization, an error that globalists deliberately encourage. The two are fundamentally different: globalization is an historical process, a fact of how things are, but globalism is an ideology, a set of opinions about how things ought to be.

[To my mind comes "another 'The ends justify the means' case". How about your reaction?

Before you were poisoned by the opening paragraph

Did you know globalization and globalism were 2 separate things?

If you thought of it at all, do you think we would all be better off under one Global government, or as a series of Nations? That is, are you, at heart, a globalist or a Nationalist?]

Globalism is the ideology that advocates the liquidation of nations. Its opposite is nationalism. Globalization, on the other hand, is not an ideology at all. Ultimately, it is just the growth of communications and trade, and it has been happening since 1492. The classic lie about globalization is its recency. For example, when did it first become possible to send \$100 million from New York to London at the push of a button? 1976? 1966? 1956? No, 1866, when the trans-Atlantic telegraph opened.

[Globalism is opposite of nationalism, so Nations would become States, as in the United States.

Did you realize Globalization had been going on since 1866?

When we first were able to sail around the world, opening trade anywhere in the world with anyone. Would that not be when Globalization started?

Or did Globalization start when all the "known world" came under one Empire?]

Globalism the ideology masquerades as globalization the fact in order to gain sympathy by feigning inevitability. Debates on its desirability are portrayed as futile. But if it is inevitable, why must its advocates push so aggressively?

[When is the last time you were able to sit down and discuss something logically, from top to bottom?

Do you believe the author's statement about feigning inevitability?  
Is this a common tactic used in other arguments?  
Try any vice teenagers might be involved in from time to time....  
Is "futile" a valid argument?  
If "futile" were true, would that invalidate debate?]

Globalism is a deliberate political choice, no more inevitable than socialism. Its key exemplars like the United Nations, free-trade extremism, the European Union, and mass immigration are political constructs that could be abolished tomorrow. This is not true of such aspects of globalization as the Internet, the passenger jet, or the 40-foot container.

[Do you agree Globalism components could be ended in short order, if some agreement was reached?  
If yes, Why?  
If NO, Why? (You thought you were avoiding something, didn't you? :)  
Globalization seems to be more durable. Do you agree?  
If No, why? How does it seem to you?  
If yes, why might it be more durable?  
Of the 3 examples given, there seems to be a common denominator. What do you perceive. (My answer is at the bottom of the page AFTER you've given yours.)]

Globalization can exist without globalism. World trade as a percentage of world GNP was roughly as high in the pre-1914 heyday of the gold standard and European imperialism as it is today, but the Western world was then staunchly nationalist. The anti-nationalist spin that is put on trade today is not an intrinsic part of the exchange of goods and services with foreigners. Japan has based her economy on exports for 50 years without ceasing to be one of the most nationalistic and culturally distinctive nations on earth.

[The point here is the only linkage between Globalization and Globalism is "globe". The two are not linked although there appears to be an effort to make that linkage. Do you agree with this point?

Does there seem to be a natural linkage between Globalism and Globalization in your mind, a natural predisposition to think this way?

If yes, do you believe this is because of the similarity in words or because of propaganda?

I used the word, propaganda. The author seems to have an opinion someone is attempting to pull a fast one on us. My question is ... have you heard enough to be able to separate fact and fiction from each other? Have you heard enough yet to pick apart the truth of this matter?

If no, then can the word "propaganda" be used without further prejudicing the reader - YOU.]

The problem with globalism is not free markets but free-market extremism, a peculiar kind of right-wing Jacobinism that has no place in authentic conservatism. In the U.S, this means taking free trade beyond its common-sense limit of reciprocity with friendly nations and opening our markets to nations, like Japan, which keep their markets closed to us, and China, which nakedly proclaim their military hostility to us.

[Was Globalism's definition ambiguous to you before this last paragraph?  
Would you say Globalism is opening up nations and trade for political (and ideological) reasons rather than economic reasons?  
Is it always clear what trade is common sense?  
Can trade, relations between nations be common sense for one group and not for another?  
Does everyone agree on the same facts, the same assumptions, the same goals?]

**Globalism** is sometimes confused with internationalism in order to depict resistance to globalism as resistance to fruitful co-operation between nations. But **internationalism**, whatever mischief it may produce, is predicated on relations between nations, precluding their outright dissolution. Unfortunately, it is a small and intellectually seductive jump from believing in co-operation between nations to believing that the co-operative arrangements can be abstracted to function on their own without the nations that produced them. Many former internationalists are now globalists.

[Do you have a better idea of what Internationalism is?]

Globalism appeals to the libertarian Right because this group mistakenly equates the liquidation of nations with a reduction in the power of their governments. But this does not follow. Open borders, for example, benefit immigrants at the expense of citizens and nourish big government by importing poverty and other social pathologies. Worse, the decline of national governments, as Britain has learned under the European Union, is often accompanied by the growth of more distant, more autocratic, and less accountable authorities. The erosion of a nation can easily proceed hand-in-hand with the cancerous bloat of its government: just look at the suffocation of Russia under the dead hand of the Soviet state.

[Would you think fewer nations would make the nation governments smaller?  
Does it seem reasonable if the boss body of administrators handled things, then the subordinate body would have less to do?  
How about if the boss body of admins just set rules and the subordinate body had to implement the rules plus provide proof positive to the bosses they were following the rules?  
Then the boss administrators would have to set something up to monitor the subordinates compliance with their rules.  
Does this make sense?  
How about if the bosses setup health coverage for everyone? What would the subordinates do if the bosses did everything?  
What if the subordinates didn't think the bosses did enough? Would they not provide additional services?  
If the subordinates provide additional services, do they not have to set up the entire organizational structure to support it?  
The example was given of the EU being farther away. Does it seem reasonable?  
Let's look here to sort of test the reasonableness of distant, less accountable authorities.]

Who is more accountable? The city council or your US Senator?

Who is more accountable? Your school board or the US Dept. of Education in Washington.

When you want to get something controversial changed in School board, what sort of cop out response are you likely to get?

We would like to, but Washington requires..... ???]

Because of the ascendancy of neoconservatism during the time that globalism has flowered, it has been suggested, both by paleoconservatives and by certain elements on the Left, that the two are identical. But although **neoconservatism is almost always globalist, it is not intrinsically identical with globalism. Neoconservatism is conservatism corrupted by globalism.**

[**neoconservatism** - An intellectual and political movement in favor of political, economic, and social conservatism that arose in opposition to the perceived liberalism of the 1960s.

James Zogby's definition: "Neo-conservatism is the secular political philosophy that defined the reaction of a group of former liberals to what they felt was the Democratic party's policy of appeasement toward the Soviet Union--most especially the USSR's treatment of its Jewish population and its relations with the Arab world. They were a small but influential group of writers, commentators and government officials."

Gdfrey Hodgson's definition: "Perhaps the absolutely fundamental neoconservative idea was the need to reassert American nationalism or patriotism or "Americanism" or "American exceptionalism": the idea that American society, however flawed, is not only essentially good but somehow morally superior to other societies"

**paleoconservatives** - Paleoconservatives were actually a diverse bunch but generally agreed that we should have an isolationist, "America First" foreign policy, regional culture and politics versus big government and pop culture, protection for American workers (*economic nationalism*), a stoppage or large curtailment of immigration, and a defense of America's European and Christian identity. Throughout the 1990's, they pitched fierce battles against their two main enemies: neoconservatives and liberals. Such battles included debates over the Gulf War, foreign aid, NAFTA and the WTO, immigration, the bombing of Serbia, the conservative attachment to the GOP, Confederate symbols and various racially charged issues.

From a little more research I can give you this alliteration. A Christianity which has been influenced by our Culture is said to be Secular. Secular it may be, we still call it Christianity, as if it still was. So neoconservative is also polluted by an additional concept.]

Neoconservatives adopted globalist ideas because they made sense for winning the Cold War. They did not, however, adapt when that war ended, and **these ideas have run riot now that the constraints imposed by that war have gone.** The desirability of exporting capitalism and a worldwide military presence are both Cold War ideas. They once served a vital American interest by undermining the Soviet Union, but they do nothing for us now. **Exporting capitalism today merely enhances foreign nations' competitiveness against us.**

This had some consolations when it made Japan the bastion of capitalism in East Asia. It has none today, when her long-term geopolitical interests are not identical with ours and

she is financing the economic growth of an openly hostile China.

[Is this true, an opinion, or do you lack information?

Does the language "run riot" help you understand the issue or does it help you understand the author?

Exporting capitalism.... Does this statement ring true?

What is "capitalism", exactly, which we can export?

Does this statement seem desirable?

Does Spring Hill benefit by exporting capitalism?

To our enemies?

To our competitors?

Does the State of Tennessee benefit or hurt by exporting capitalism?

Does the US benefit or get hurt by the export of capitalism?

Are we financing, to some degree, economic growth in China?

Is China hostile?

Is Japan hostile?

Is China a competitor?

Is Japan a competitor?]

It took two World Wars and a Cold War to undo America's allegiance to George Washington's warning against "entangling alliances" and to drag us into a worldwide military presence, but given that the founders had no experience of ideological aggression like Marxism, this was rational under the circumstances. Those circumstances are, however, over. Al-Qaeda is not the USSR. Furthermore, because of its religious character, a return to America's Christian particularism -- rather than the construction of the kind of counter-universalism we arrayed against the universalist pretensions of Marxism -- is the needed strategy against it.

[Was George Washington right with warning us against "entangling alliances"?

Should we have "alliances"?

If yes, with what sort of countries?

Could we survive as a nation without "alliances"?

Do you suppose there are any nations without "alliances"?]

It is sophistry to invent messianic objectives for American foreign policy in order to rationalize an obsolete habit of projecting power. Sometimes military presence abroad is called for, but our default presumption in favor of projecting power into any available vacuum has led us into pointless involvements in places like Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti. It is one thing to project power in order to shape the international order in favor of real American security interests but quite another to do so out of some ideological mission to replicate our system all over the world.

[Is the statement true, on the face of it?

Do we push our ideological system around the world without security interests?

Without any interests?

Is security the only kind of interest which justifies projecting Power?

How about using power?]

Reproducing the American system worldwide ultimately implies world government, as intellectually honest globalists like Clinton Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott have admitted. Globalism is often equated with world government, but this is a half-truth. Though the drive to create world government rationalizes globalism, destroying the nation-state can go on whether or not world government is built on its carcass. The drive to create world government could fail, and, having dismantled viable nation-states, globalists could leave the world in chaos.

[Is it true the American system worldwide = world government?

Which form of American system? The one spoke of in the Constitution or the one being practiced by the Elites today?

Would you like a world government if you could elect its senators and congressmen and president as you do in the US? That is, Tennessee might get one congressman, the US might get 2 senators nationwide, and you could vote for the President.

If you are counting, pretend you have 2 presidential candidates. One is Chinese and the other is Brazilian. Neither are capitalist.

Do you think the US would vote 100% for just one Presidential candidate?

Even if the US did, which one seems like a sure thing?

Do you feel represented?

Is that the American system which is moving toward one World Government?

Which seems more likely. The Nations will appoint representatives in the World Government or The Nations will elect representatives in the World Government.

I have an idea. There is a germ of truth here, but the author has missed it. If America is influencing a World Government, what exactly is that influence? Is it our "system" or it something else?

Hint @ bottom, later, if you need it.]

Globalism also emerged because both Right and Left responded to the Cold War by interpreting their missions as a supranational battle of ideas rather than the well-being of the concrete American nation. As a result, at the end of the Cold War, both the **dumber** elements of the world Right and the **smarter** elements of the world Left came to the same conclusion: the nation-state was obsolete as a vehicle for furthering their ideas. The Right wanted more capitalism, the Left wanted more equality, and the nation-state, a natural bulwark against extremism of either kind, stood in the way of both. So they set about undermining it.

[Are you reading an editorial or information?

When you reads adjectives like this, do they influence your opinion?

What sort of information would you need to be able to determine if a subset of people were truly "dumber" or "smarter"?

What does such a statement do to the rest of the article, no matter how factually accurate it may be?

Is this statement true? "Right wanted more capitalism"

If true, why?

Is this statement true? "Left wanted more equality"

If true, why?

Is this statement true? "nation-state, a natural bulwark against extremism of either kind"

Suggestions below, later, if needed.]

The smart Left has admitted to itself -- whether the dumb Left that forms its rent-a-mob gets it -- that **capitalism cannot be overthrown**. If the **inevitability of capitalism makes economic equality within nations unattainable**, the next-best thing is economic equality between nations. To **see free-trade extremism build up the incomes of the Chinese at the same time as it impoverishes American manufacturing workers is immensely satisfying to them**. Some have openly said so.

[We need discernment. Can capitalism be overthrown?

Do we want to overthrow capitalism?

Is the author telling us leftist are anti-capitalist? The leftist leaders rarely admit this, but rather claim our capitalist system needs refining. Who is being more genuine?

Is economic equality unattainable?

Is economic equality desirable?

Is capitalism a failure without economic equality?

What would economic equality look like?

This example of Chinese / American trade. Does it smack as a sound example or flawed?]

Because the smart Left has abandoned socialism, it no longer wants the strong nation-states that central planning implied. It now sees the existence of separate nations as an unacceptable redoubt of human inequality. Separate nations give peoples with histories of brilliant political and economic achievement, like Englishmen and Americans, the free and prosperous lives that their forebears have earned while at the same time consigning peoples of inferior ancestral achievement to lesser existences. Therefore, erasing the distinctions between nations -- the "borderless world" -- is the new leftist egalitarian project. Mass immigration into the First World from the Third is a key part of this project, because it forces the citizens of the First World to share their superior way of life. **Globalism's socialist roots are clear in that it denies that nations are the property of their citizens, property they are not obliged to share with foreigners.**

[What is another world for this?

"Redistribution".

How does "Redistribution" work now, in the United States?

How is it working in the Globalist world?]

The "technocratic" Left, which is just the power-hungry Left grown sophisticated, **sees global institutions as a way to achieve policies that could never be imposed by national governments subject to democratic accountability**. Because national sovereignty is the key barrier to achieving this, globalism attacks national sovereignty.

**National cultural identity gives peoples an emotional attachment to their national**

sovereignty, so globalism attacks national cultural identity too. In America, this assault takes the form of **PC assaults on American history and the revision of American culture to a universalist culture**. In Britain, it takes the form of **guilt over long-vanished and frequently defensible colonialism**. In Germany, it equates any German nationalism with the **Third Reich**. In the Third World, it takes the form of **imported American junk culture**.

[Wait, amongst all this, there was something said which is HUGE with me. All the rest of the points I'm sure you already knew, being it was "guilt", "guilt", "guilt", and through various brainwashing methods. But there is something else.

We have called it Pop Culture. We have called it Post Modern. We've called it Humanist. We've called it a tragedy. Little did I expect to see the author call it "junk".

Is "junk" a valid description?

What are the consequences on the 3rd world from imported "junk"?]

Globalism is contemptuous of any culture that cannot be bought and sold. It wants a homogeneous commercial pop culture designed to narcotize docile consumers and make the rootless cosmopolitanism that it produces seem sophisticated. Philosophically, globalism views culture as an arbitrary particularity or as mere entertainment.

Globalism does not value the distinct cultures of the world: **it is only interested in Third-World cultures as a means to subvert the historic cultures of the First World**. Its cultural incoherence, which postmodernism tries to systematize and aestheticize, is a product of its split between the **right-globalist impulse to make culture commercial** and the **left-globalist impulse to make it subversive**.

[Do you feel used, thinking of using one culture on another in order to achieve political ambitions?

What do you think about making culture commercial? It means, what?

What do you think about a submissive culture? It means, what?]

If this subversive itch sounds familiar, that is because **globalism is the key successor to Marxism**.

- It claims to represent the **inevitable outcome of the laws of economics and a more efficient form of economic organization**.
- It claims to **serve the well-being of the populace but requires an elite cadre of experts to impose it**.
- It claims to be **independent of any particular nation, but it depends utterly on one nation's military power to enforce its system**.

And rather than coinciding with the "withering away of the state," it in fact requires the expansion of government power.

Globalism gratifies the same mental pathologies as Marxism and is therefore perfect for disillusioned intellectuals looking for a new home. It claims to be an **empirical theory but is in fact a "beautiful idea" invented in the abstract**, which can only be maintained by

ruthlessly concealing or rationalizing away inconvenient facts. It offers its devotees the opportunity to believe that they are a special in-group that is more advanced than everyone else. And like Marxism, globalism has a genius for **inspiring disloyalty to one's country**.

[What does the "empirical theory..." statement mean?

Does it seem true?

Is it a good thing to "inspire disloyalty to one's country"?

In certain cases?

Every?]

Like Marxists, globalists realize they need global military domination to impose their vision, so they set about manipulating America into providing it. Their **basic doctrine is that the United States must project power wherever it is lacking and maintain indefinite global military supremacy**. This is sold as a means to maintain American security, but in fact the agenda is to uphold the globalized world order. Their ultimate intellectual coup is to redefine American security not as our ability to protect ourselves from harm -- globalists have no interest in defending our actual borders -- but as the security of the globalist system (*which we are falsely told is just America writ large*) worldwide.

Ironically, globalism is often depicted as a mask of American self-interest. It is indeed used as a **rationalization for some assertions of American power, but it also inexorably dissolves the very bases of this power** because the United States, as the most open society on earth, is singularly vulnerable to its corrosive forces. We can call this the "**neocontradiction**." **For example, American free trade with China builds up China's industrial base, yet we presume we will always be so much richer than China that we will endlessly be able to afford to contain her military expansionism. Worse, this same trade depletes our own industrial base and economy, reducing tax revenues and forcing us to borrow** from Japan to pay for expensive military deployments. This arrangement gives Japan a quiet veto on our use of force.

[In other words, as we use our wealth to promote America, there is a wealth transfer going on. The promotion is not free. We get poorer, they get richer. Do you agree?]

Advocates of indefinite American global hegemony project American economic dominance into the future with the insouciance of a British colonial secretary circa 1889. They cannot ask hard questions about the **significance of relative economic power** because globalism seduces America's power elite precisely because of this unstated **assumption that America will effortlessly dominate a globalized world**.

They are in for a rude awakening, and soon. **If the dollar falls by half** -- the standard estimate for what it would take to bring our unsustainable trade deficit back into balance -- we will have to double our contributions to international organizations in order to maintain our clout. In fact, **all our international spending will have to double to retain our position**.

If America's share of world GNP, now at 25 percent, falls to 12 or 13 percent, which is what this decline implies, we will no longer have the weight in the world economy to play as large a role in setting its rules as we now do. The prestige and credibility of the so-called American model of economics will decline too. The world will not listen to the idealistic economics of a declining nation.

[So, we can retain American dominance easily? True / False?

Can you think of examples where it makes you wonder if America is dominant even now?

]

The longer we premise our foreign policy on being the sole superpower, the harder our fall will be. The sooner we abandon this delusion, the easier will be our return to our natural status as a large, prosperous, and powerful nation -- among others. The sooner we face the inevitability of a multi-polar world, the more of a head start we can have in arranging our place within its inevitably complex web of alliances.

[Do you think we should not behave as the sole super power?

If we abandon this position soon, will the world have greater peace?

Do you think there might be a power vacuum?

Does it seem likely we will NOT be able to find our natural status later, if we continue to behave like a sole super power?

Below, if you wish, is my response to that. No peeking early.]

Here at home, globalist neocons assume continued Republican dominance even though their devotion to mass immigration is destroying the Republican Party by importing Democratic voters. But because, for globalists, ideologies are more real than empirical facts, those globalists continue to spin contorted verbal rationalizations to cover up this fact of political demography.

Foreigners, please understand that the aspects of American policy you find obnoxious are really aspects of globalism. Therefore, you should be anti-globalist, not anti-American, just as America was anti-communist, not anti-Russian.

[Whew! Tough and long article....

How would you describe your position on Globalism now?

Has it changed since the beginning of the article?

Do you know all there is to know about Globalism?

Are you confident you have a true picture of Globalism?

Are there some areas of Globalism you would like more information to increase your confidence you have a true picture of Globalism?]

---

Economic is the common denominator.

Who is the Worlds only super power? Don't people tend to fall in line with the leader, be it a Nation, City, Church, or Club? Thus said, is it a projection of power, our system, or something a whole lot more basic than that which creates followers and also adversaries?

How can nations be described as a natural bulwark against extremism? The US was very Capitalist and Individualist in the beginning. Japan and China had long histories of devotion to one supreme

ruler, as did most Asian countries (*i.e. The King and I*). Germany under Hitler, and fascist governments in general are, well fascists (*that is, one point of view - extreme*).

This idea of not being a Champion today because we'll get old someday is nothing more than appeasement. The idea if we roll over and act weak and submissive, even when we believe we are right and have the power to back it up, will make other nations more "friendly" towards us is nuts.

First off, there isn't payback like that. No nation warms up to another nation because they are milk toast.

Second, nature abhors a vacuum, and so do Nations. If the US backs off, some other Nation will take it's place. Before the Iraq war, France, Germany, and Russia did what they could to circumvent US interests for their own. There would have been no concessions for rolling over.

If a basketball game, if you keep your best 2 players on the bench to be nice to the other teams, no one gives you a break in return.



<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>