ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL

NATIONALISM, POPULISM, AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: AN INQUIRY INTO IDEOLOGICAL TENSIONS AND NORMATIVE CHALLENGES

M.A. THESIS

Saman NAJAFI

Department of Political Studies

Political Studies Programme

JUNE 2024

ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL

NATIONALISM, POPULISM, AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: AN INQUIRY INTO IDEOLOGICAL TENSIONS AND NORMATIVE CHALLENGES

M.A. THESIS

Saman NAJAFI
(419201010)

Department of Political Studies

Political Studies Programme

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Umut UZER

JUNE 2024

İSTANBUL TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ ★ LİSANSÜSTÜ EĞİTİM ENSTİTÜSÜ

MİLLİYETÇİLİK, POPÜLİZM VE KÜRESEL YÖNETİM: İDEOLOJİK GERİLİMLER VE NORMATİF ZORLUKLAR ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Saman NAJAFI
(419201010)

Siyaset Çalışmaları Anabilim Dalı

Siyaset Çalışmaları Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Umut UZER

HAZİRAN 2024

Saman NAJAFI, an M.A. student of ITU Graduate School student ID 419201010, successfully defended the thesis entitled "NATIONALISM, POPULISM, AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: AN INQUIRY INTO IDEOLOGICAL TENSIONS AND NORMATIVE CHALLENGES", which he prepared after fulfilling the requirements specified in the associated legislations, before the jury whose signatures are below.

Thesis Advisor :	**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Umut UZER** Istanbul Technical University	.....
Jury Members :	**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emine Aslı ÇALKIVİK** Istanbul Technical University	.....
	Prof. Dr. İlke CİVELEKOĞLU Istanbul Ticaret University	.....

Date of Submission : 01 June 2024
Date of Defense : 24 June 2024

To my mother, who passed away in September 2021, her unwavering belief in the power of learning and personal growth remains a guiding force in my life.

FOREWORD

I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Umut UZER, whose guidance and expertise have been invaluable throughout this research. Their insightful feedback and support have significantly contributed to the quality and depth of this study. I am deeply appreciative of the time and effort they have invested in mentoring me and helping shape this research into its final form.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences at Istanbul Technical University for providing a stimulating academic environment and the resources necessary for my research. The department's commitment to fostering intellectual growth and its encouragement of interdisciplinary inquiry have been essential in the completion of this work. The support from faculty members and fellow students has been a source of motivation and inspiration throughout this journey.

Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the invaluable recommendations and critiques offered by the jury members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Emine Aslı ÇALKIVİK and Prof. Dr. İlke CİVELEKOĞLU. Their thorough evaluations and constructive feedback have been instrumental in refining my research, ensuring that it meets the highest academic standards.

Lastly, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Görkem GİRAY for his invaluable guidance on the revision and application of the final publishing format for this manuscript. His insightful feedback and meticulous attention to detail have significantly enhanced the quality and coherence of this work.

This research would not have been possible without the collective efforts and support of these individuals and institutions. To all who have contributed to this project, I extend my heartfelt thanks.

July 2024 Saman NAJAFI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABBREVIATIONS

DSB : Dispute Settlement Body
EU : European Union
GATT : General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
IBRD : International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA : International Development Association
IFC : International Finance Corporation
ILO : International Labour Organization
IMF : International Monetary Fund
NAFTA : North American Free Trade Agreement
NATO : North Atlantic Treaty Organization
SDGs : Sustainable Development Goals
UN : United Nations
UNDP : United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO : United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF : United Nations Children's Fund
USMCA : United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement
WB : World Bank Group
WHO : World Health Organization
WTO : World Trade Organization

NATIONALISM, POPULISM, AND, GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: AN INQUIRY INTO IDEOLOGICAL TENSIONS AND NORMATIVE CHALLENGES

SUMMARY

This research explores the significant influence of nationalism and populism on the dynamics of global governance. The central research question investigates how these ideologies impact global governance structures and the normative challenges and ethical dilemmas they present. To address this, the study begins by defining and conceptualizing nationalism and populism, outlining their core features and examining their manifestations in contemporary politics. The rise of these movements is attributed to various socio-economic, cultural, and political factors, which are thoroughly analyzed to provide a comprehensive understanding of their drivers and dynamics.

The research then shifts focus to the field of global governance, providing an overview of its structures and dynamics, including international organizations, treaties, and norms. The challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to the effectiveness and legitimacy of global governance institutions are critically examined. This section highlights how these movements question the foundations of global cooperation, emphasizing national sovereignty and often undermining multilateral efforts.

A key part of the study explores the intersections between nationalism, populism, and global governance. It delves into how these ideologies influence state behavior in global forums and negotiations, and assesses their impact on pressing global issues such as climate change, migration, and economic globalization. The normative challenges posed by these movements to democratic principles, including pluralism, minority rights, and political participation, are also examined. Additionally, the study discusses the ethical dilemmas associated with nationalist and populist ideologies in the context of global governance and international cooperation.

Through detailed case studies of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hungary, the research provides in-depth analyses of how nationalist and populist movements have impacted global governance dynamics in specific countries. These case studies focus on the interactions between these movements, domestic politics, and global governance processes, offering concrete examples of the broader trends discussed.

The responses of global governance institutions to the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements are also explored. The study examines how international organizations and multilateral agreements have addressed these challenges and identifies potential strategies for reconciling nationalist and populist concerns with global governance goals. This includes discussions on dialogue, diplomacy, and compromise.

In conclusion, the research summarizes the main findings and their implications for understanding the relationship between nationalism, populism, and global governance.

It offers policy recommendations for addressing the challenges posed by these ideologies and suggests potential avenues for future research. These recommendations aim to provide a roadmap for policymakers and global governance practitioners to navigate the complex landscape shaped by the rise of nationalism and populism.

MİLLİYETÇİLİK, POPÜLİZM VE KÜRESEL YÖNETİM: İDEOLOJİK GERİLİMLER VE NORMATİF ZORLUKLAR ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME

ÖZET

Bu araştırma, milliyetçilik ve popülizmin küresel yönetişim üzerindeki derin etkilerini inceliyor ve bu ideolojilerin uluslararası işbirliği ve yönetişim normlarına nasıl meydan okuduğunu ele alıyor. Milliyetçilik, ulusal egemenlik ve kimliğe vurgu yaparak, genellikle uluslararası işbirliği ve entegrasyonu savunan küreselcilik ilkeleriyle çelişir. Popülizm ise, algılanan elit yolsuzluğa karşı "sıradan insanlar" lehine hitap ederek, ulusal çıkarları küresel taahhütlerin önüne koyarak bu dinamiği daha da karmaşık hale getirir. Milliyetçilik ve popülizmin bu yeniden yükselişi, küresel yönetişim kurumlarının etkinliği ve meşruiyeti üzerinde önemli etkiler doğurmakta ve çeşitli küresel sorunları etkilemektedir.

Bu çalışmayı yönlendiren ana araştırma sorusu şudur: "Milliyetçilik ve popülizm küresel yönetişimin dinamiklerini nasıl etkiler ve hangi normatif zorluklar ve etik ikilemler ortaya çıkarır?" Bu soruyu yanıtlamak için çalışma birkaç özel amacı takip etmektedir. İlk olarak, milliyetçilik ve popülizmi tanımlamak ve kavramsallaştırmak, bu ideolojilerin temel özelliklerini ve çağdaş siyasetteki tezahürlerini belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu, bu ideolojilerin teorik temellerini ve çeşitli siyasi bağlamlardaki pratik uygulamalarını anlamak için kapsamlı bir literatür taramasını içerir.

Ayrıca, çalışma milliyetçilik ve popülizmin küresel ölçekte yükselişini tetikleyen sosyo-ekonomik, kültürel ve siyasi faktörleri analiz eder. Bu analiz, bu hareketlerin arkasındaki ekonomik güvencesizlik, kültürel kaygılar, siyasi dışlanma ve sosyal değişim gibi çeşitli motivasyonları vurgular. Bu sürücüleri inceleyerek, çalışma milliyetçilik ve popülizmin neden farklı bölgelerde ivme kazandığını kapsamlı bir şekilde anlamayı sağlar.

Bir diğer önemli amaç, uluslararası örgütler, anlaşmalar ve normlar dahil olmak üzere küresel yönetişim yapılarına genel bir bakış sağlamaktır. Çalışma, bu yapıların zaman içindeki gelişimini ve uluslararası düzeni sürdürmedeki ve küresel zorluklarla başa çıkmadaki rollerini araştırır. Bu bölüm aynı zamanda, bu yapıların meşruiyetini ve etkinliğini sorgulayan milliyetçi ve popülist duygular karşısında karşılaştıkları doğuştan gelen zorlukları da tartışır.

Milliyetçilik, popülizm ve küresel yönetişimin kesişimi, bu araştırmanın kritik bir odak noktasıdır. Çalışma, milliyetçi ve popülist ideolojilerin küresel yönetişim forumlarındaki ve müzakerelerindeki devlet davranışını nasıl etkilediğini inceler. Bu hareketlerin uluslararası işbirliği üzerindeki etkisini, özellikle iklim değişikliği, göç ve ekonomik küreselleşme gibi alanlarda değerlendirir. Bu kesişimleri inceleyerek,

araştırma milliyetçilik ve popülizmin küresel yönetişim süreçlerini nasıl bozabileceğini veya yeniden şekillendirebileceğini vurgular.

Milliyetçi ve popülist hareketlerin ortaya çıkardığı normatif zorluklar ve etik ikilemler de kapsamlı bir şekilde incelenir. Bu hareketler, çoğulculuk, azınlık hakları ve siyasi katılım gibi demokratik ilkelerle sıklıkla çelişir. Çalışma, milliyetçi ve popülist ideolojilerin bu ilkeleri nasıl zayıflatabileceğini, dışlayıcı ve bölücü politikalarla sonuçlanabileceğini tartışır. Aynı zamanda, bu ideolojilerin küresel yönetişim ve uluslararası işbirliği bağlamında ortaya çıkardığı etik hususları da ele alır.

Örnek olay incelemeleri, bu araştırmanın ayrılmaz bir parçasını oluşturur ve milliyetçi ve popülist hareketlerin küresel yönetişim dinamikleri üzerinde önemli etkiler yarattığı belirli ülkeleri ayrıntılı olarak analiz eder. Seçilen örnek olaylar, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri, Birleşik Krallık ve Macaristan'dır. Her bir örnek olay, milliyetçi/popülist hareketler, iç siyaset ve küresel yönetişim süreçleri arasındaki etkileşimlere odaklanır. Örneğin, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nin analizi, Trump yönetiminin Paris Anlaşması'ndan çekilmesini ve bunun küresel iklim yönetişimi üzerindeki etkilerini inceler.

Birleşik Krallık'ta çalışma, Brexit'e ve bunun Avrupa Birliği ve küresel ticaret üzerindeki etkisine odaklanır. Brexit hareketini tetikleyen milliyetçi duyguları ve ardından Birleşik Krallık ile AB'nin ilişkilerini yeniden tanımlamada karşılaşılan zorlukları tartışır. Macaristan örneği, Viktor Orbán'ın politikalarını ve bunların özellikle göç ve demokratik normlar açısından Avrupa Birliği üzerindeki etkilerini araştırır.

Milliyetçi ve popülist hareketlerin ortaya çıkardığı zorluklara karşı küresel yönetişim kurumlarının tepkileri de eleştirel bir şekilde incelenir. Çalışma, uluslararası örgütlerin ve çok taraflı anlaşmaların bu zorluklara nasıl yanıt verdiğini değerlendirir, etkinliklerini ve iyileştirme alanlarını belirler. Bu kurumların milliyetçilik ve popülizmin yükselişine yanıt olarak kullandığı çeşitli stratejileri, diplomatik çabalar ve politika ayarlamaları gibi tartışır.

Araştırma ayrıca milliyetçi ve popülist kaygılar ile küresel yönetişim hedeflerini uzlaştırmaya yönelik potansiyel stratejileri de keşfeder. Bu, bu kaygıları ele almak ve işbirliğini teşvik etmek için diyalog ve diplomasinin rolünü incelemeyi içerir. Çalışma, ulusal çıkarlar ile küresel taahhütler arasındaki boşluğu kapatmayı başaran başarılı diplomatik çabaların örneklerini vurgular.

Politika tavizleri, bir diğer önemli odak alanıdır. Araştırma, hem milliyetçi/popülist kaygıları hem de küresel yönetişim hedeflerini ele alabilecek potansiyel politika ayarlamalarını tartışır. Müzakere edilmiş anlaşmalar ve pratik çözümleri inceleyerek, ulusal egemenlik ile küresel sorumlulukları dengelemeye yönelik yollar belirlemeyi amaçlar.

Dahil edici yönetişim, küresel yönetişim kurumlarını daha çeşitli perspektifleri temsil eden daha kapsayıcı hale getirmenin önemli bir stratejisi olarak vurgulanır. Çalışma, milliyetçi ve popülist varlıkların küresel diyaloglara katılımını artırmaya yönelik girişimleri tartışır, endişelerinin dile getirilmesini ve ele alınmasını sağlar. Bu

yaklaşım, daha kapsayıcı ve etkili bir küresel yönetişim sistemini teşvik etmeyi amaçlar.

Eğitim ve savunuculuk, milliyetçiliğin ve popülizmin yükselişini hafifletmede hayati bir rol oynar. Çalışma, küresel vatandaşlığı ve işbirliğini teşvik etmede eğitim programlarının ve halk savunuculuğu kampanyalarının rolünü inceler. Milliyetçi ve popülist anlatıları karşı koymaya ve daha kapsayıcı bir küresel perspektif teşvik etmeye yardımcı olan başarılı girişim örneklerini vurgular.

Son olarak, araştırma, milliyetçi ve popülist hareketlerin ortaya çıkardığı zorluklara daha iyi yanıt verebilmek için potansiyel kurumsal reformları önerir. Yapısal değişiklikler, artırılmış hesap verebilirlik ve daha fazla şeffaflık için önerileri tartışır. Bu reformlar, bu kurumların çağdaş küresel siyasetin karmaşıklıklarını daha iyi ele almalarını sağlamak için meşruiyetlerini ve etkinliklerini güçlendirmeyi amaçlar.

Sonuç olarak, bu araştırma, milliyetçilik ve popülizmin küresel yönetişim üzerindeki etkisini kapsamlı bir şekilde analiz eder. Bu hareketlerin uluslararası işbirliği ve demokratik ilkelere nasıl meydan okuduğunu vurgular ve uzlaşma için pratik stratejiler keşfeder. Çalışmanın bulguları, ulusal çıkarlarla küresel sorumlulukları dengeleme çabalarının önemini ve daha kapsayıcı ve etkili bir küresel yönetişim sistemi teşvik etmenin gerekliliğini vurgular. Gelecek araştırmalar, uzun vadeli etkiler, dijital medyanın rolü ve ekonomik politikaların ve insan haklarının kesişimleri üzerinde odaklanmalıdır. Bu karmaşık konuların anlaşılmasını ilerleterek, milliyetçilik ve popülizmin küresel yönetişim bağlamında sunduğu zorlukları ve fırsatları daha iyi yönetebiliriz.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the global political landscape has been significantly influenced by the rise of nationalism and populism. These movements have emerged as powerful forces challenging the established norms of global governance and international cooperation. Nationalism, with its emphasis on sovereignty, national identity, and cultural homogeneity, often stands in stark contrast to the principles of globalism, which advocate for international collaboration and integration. Populism, characterized by its appeal to the "common people" against perceived elite corruption, further complicates this dynamic by promoting policies that prioritize national interests over global commitments (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). The resurgence of these ideologies poses profound implications for the structures and effectiveness of global governance, impacting international organizations, treaties, and cooperative efforts across a range of global issues.

The core argument of this research is that nationalism and populism significantly influence the dynamics of global governance, presenting normative challenges and ethical dilemmas that impact the effectiveness and legitimacy of international cooperation. The study contends that these movements, with their focus on sovereignty and national interests, often undermine the principles of globalism and democratic values, leading to complex interactions within global governance structures. This argument is explored through a comprehensive analysis of the rise and impact of nationalism and populism, the challenges they pose to global governance, and the responses and strategies developed by international institutions to address these challenges.

This study seeks to address the critical question: How do nationalism and populism influence the dynamics of global governance, and what are the normative challenges and ethical dilemmas they present? To answer this question, the research will pursue several specific objectives.

This research will be guided by relevant theories and concepts from political science, international relations, and sociology. Key theoretical perspectives include theories of nationalism and populism in political science, including the works of Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, and Cas Mudde, which provide a foundation for understanding the origins, characteristics, and political strategies of these movements. Theories of global governance and international cooperation from international relations, such as those proposed by Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, will be utilized to analyze the impact of nationalism and populism on global governance structures and processes. Sociological theories on identity, social movements, and cultural dynamics, including the work of Anthony Giddens, will help contextualize the rise of nationalism and populism within broader socio-economic and cultural trends. By integrating these theoretical perspectives, the study aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of how nationalism and populism are reshaping global governance, identifying both the challenges they pose and the potential pathways for reconciling these movements with the imperatives of international cooperation.

Nationalism and populism intersect in their shared emphasis on prioritizing national interests and the will of the people over perceived elite or international dictates. Nationalism emphasizes sovereignty, cultural homogeneity, and national identity, while populism focuses on the dichotomy between the “common people” and a “corrupt elite.” Together, these ideologies amplify sentiments of exclusion and protectionism, often leading to policies that resist international cooperation and undermine global governance frameworks. This intersection is evident in the rhetoric and policies of nationalist-populist leaders who advocate for a return to national sovereignty and a rejection of globalism, framing international agreements and institutions as threats to national autonomy and identity.

The initial chapters of the research lay the theoretical foundation essential for understanding the rest of the study. By defining and conceptualizing nationalism and populism, the first chapter establishes the core features and current manifestations of these ideologies in contemporary politics. The second chapter offers a detailed overview of global governance structures, including international organizations, treaties, and norms, and examines the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to these frameworks. Together, these chapters provide the necessary context and theoretical background, enabling a deeper exploration of how these

movements influence state behavior in global governance and impact global issues such as climate change, migration, and economic globalization in subsequent chapters.

The selection of specific institutions and issue areas, such as the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU), World Trade Organization (WTO), and International Monetary Fund (IMF), is strategic due to their pivotal roles in global governance. These institutions are at the forefront of international collaboration and are significantly impacted by the rise of nationalism and populism. Analyzing their responses provides valuable insights into the effectiveness and adaptability of global governance structures in the face of these challenges. Similarly, focusing on critical issue areas like climate change, migration, and trade wars allows for a comprehensive examination of how nationalist and populist policies influence global governance. These areas are not only highly relevant in contemporary international relations but also represent the broader implications of the research argument, highlighting the tensions between national sovereignty and global responsibility.

The selection of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hungary for case studies is strategically based on the significant impact these countries have had on global governance through their nationalist and populist movements. The United States, under the Trump administration, exemplified a major shift towards populist rhetoric and policies that challenged international norms, such as withdrawing from the Paris Agreement and renegotiating trade deals. The United Kingdom's Brexit decision highlights the powerful influence of nationalist sentiments in altering long-standing international agreements and reconfiguring regional governance structures. Hungary, under Viktor Orbán's leadership, demonstrates the internal and external implications of populism within the EU, raising critical issues about the rule of law and democratic backsliding. By analyzing these diverse contexts, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how nationalist and populist ideologies disrupt and reshape global governance frameworks.

To begin with, the theoretical foundation in the following chapter is established by examining nationalism and populism. Employing an extensive literature review, this section defines these concepts and highlights their core features and current manifestations in contemporary politics. The discussion extends to the socio-economic, cultural, and political drivers fueling the rise of these ideologies globally.

By analyzing how these movements have evolved over time, the chapter provides a detailed understanding of their impact on political landscapes across different regions.

Moving forward, the research then focuses on global governance, offering a detailed overview of its structures and dynamics, including key international organizations, treaties, and norms. The challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to these structures are explored, particularly regarding their impact on the effectiveness and legitimacy of global governance institutions. This examination sets the stage for understanding the broader implications of these ideologies on international cooperation.

The intersections of nationalism, populism, and global governance are then investigated next. This analysis reveals how nationalist and populist ideologies influence state behavior in global governance forums and negotiations. The impact of these movements on critical global issues, such as climate change, migration, and economic globalization, is assessed. Through case studies and examples, the chapter illustrates how these ideologies shape international policies and agreements, providing a nuanced understanding of their global impact.

Normative challenges and ethical dilemmas associated with nationalist and populist movements are then critically examined. The implications of these ideologies for democratic principles, including pluralism, minority rights, and political participation, are discussed. Ethical considerations in the context of global governance and international cooperation are highlighted, focusing on the tensions between national sovereignty and global responsibilities. This analysis underscores how these movements challenge established democratic norms and ethical standards.

The research then delves into case studies, and the responses and strategies concerning contemporary nationalism and populism. Detailed case studies of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hungary provide insights into the significant impacts of nationalist and populist movements on global governance dynamics in each country. The analysis focuses on interactions between these movements, domestic politics, and global governance processes. By examining specific examples, the chapter elucidates how these ideologies manifest in different contexts and their broader implications for international relations. In addressing the responses of global governance institutions, the study evaluates strategies employed by international organizations and multilateral

agreements to counter the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements. Potential strategies for reconciling nationalist and populist concerns with global governance goals, such as dialogue, diplomacy, and compromise, are explored. The effectiveness of these strategies is assessed, and recommendations for improving international cooperation are offered.

Finally, the main findings of the study are summarized, highlighting their implications for understanding the relationship between nationalism, populism, and global governance. Policy recommendations are provided for addressing the challenges posed by these movements, along with suggestions for future research directions. This concluding section reflects on the broader implications of the research for global governance and emphasizes the importance of continued efforts to reconcile nationalist and populist concerns with international cooperation objectives.

2. NATIONALISM AND POPULISM: DEFINITIONS AND DYNAMICS

2.1 Nationalism

The concept of nation has been defined as a group sharing a unique or multiple common factors including ethnicity, culture, language, religion, traditions, descent, historical background, territory and even biological group (Davies, 1997; Rose & Novas, 2005; Smith, 2014; Tamir & Rodrik, 2019; Yack, 2012).

The concept of nationalism has been taken into account from various major perspectives including liberalism, Marxism, conservatism, and classical social theory.

2.1.1 Liberalism and nationalism

Since liberalism's key feature is to claim the utmost significance of the individual's liberty, there comes to mind a paradox and the question addressing that: if liberalism is an ideology praising individualism, how would it get along with a collective ideology namely nationalism? Although this question seems to be conveying a final verdict, the liberal thinkers have provided an answer to it by citing the works of Kant. Kant, mostly known as a cosmopolitan philosopher, has argued that individuals' right to self-determinism is valuable and has to be respected (Kant, 2017). This point is the one that contemporary theorists have associated with the relationship between liberalism and nationalism since nations too have to have the right for self-determinism. Therefore the idea of self-determinism turns into a common point rather than a difference between these two ideologies (Kohn, 1965; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 6). Despite this answer, some theorists such as Popper and Hayek took nationalism as a threat to freedom of the individuals (Spencer & Wollman, 2002; Vincent, 1997) while others believed that these ideologies were compatible with one another (MacCormick, 1984; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 8; Tamir, 1993).

John Stuart Mill provides a compelling examination of this paradox. Mill (1861) argues that while individual liberty is essential, national identity plays a crucial role in ensuring social cohesion and the effective functioning of democracy. He suggests that

a sense of national unity can enhance the liberal project by fostering a collective commitment to democratic principles, thereby safeguarding individual rights (p. 428). This perspective implies that nationalism need not be inherently opposed to liberalism; instead, it can reinforce democratic values and individual freedoms when grounded in inclusive and democratic norms. By advocating for a balance between individual autonomy and collective identity, Mill offers a pathway to reconcile the apparent contradiction between liberalism and nationalism, suggesting that the latter can serve as a means to achieve the former's ends.

Building on Mill's insights, Benedict Anderson's concept of "imagined communities" further elucidates the potential compatibility between liberalism and nationalism. Anderson (1983) posits that nations are socially constructed entities, imagined by the members who perceive themselves as part of a shared community (p. 49). This constructivist view allows for a form of nationalism that aligns with liberal principles, advocating for an inclusive national identity that supports democratic engagement and individual autonomy. Anderson's framework suggests that the liberal emphasis on individual choice and collective identity can coexist, provided the nationalist project is rooted in democratic and inclusive values. This approach highlights the possibility of a liberal nationalism that fosters a sense of belonging and collective purpose without compromising individual freedoms, thereby bridging the gap between individual and collective interests.

Isaiah Berlin offers a critical perspective on the tensions between liberalism and nationalism. Berlin (1991) warns that nationalism, with its focus on collective identity, often demands the subordination of individual freedoms to the imperatives of national solidarity (p. 238). This dynamic can lead to the suppression of dissent and the erosion of personal liberties, posing significant challenges to liberal ideals. Berlin's analysis underscores the inherent tension between the collective imperatives of nationalism and the individualist ethos of liberalism, suggesting that reconciling these ideologies requires careful navigation to avoid the pitfalls of authoritarianism and exclusion. His critique serves as a cautionary note, emphasizing the need for vigilance in ensuring that the pursuit of national unity does not come at the expense of individual rights and freedoms. Berlin's work highlights the delicate balance required to harmonize the collective and individual dimensions of human society.

In response to Berlin's critique, Yael Tamir's concept of "liberal nationalism" offers a potential resolution to the tensions between liberalism and nationalism. Tamir (1993) argues that nationalism can support the flourishing of individual identities within a cohesive national framework, provided it respects diversity and individual rights (p. 55). She posits that liberal nationalism fosters a form of patriotism that promotes a shared sense of belonging and collective purpose without compromising individual liberties. Tamir's approach emphasizes the potential for nationalism to serve as a unifying force that enhances, rather than undermines, the liberal commitment to individual autonomy. By advocating for a nationalism that is inclusive and respectful of diversity, Tamir demonstrates how the collective identity of a nation can coexist with, and even bolster, the individual freedoms that liberalism seeks to protect. Her work suggests that the reconciliation of liberalism and nationalism is not only possible but also desirable for the creation of a harmonious and cohesive society.

Will Kymlicka's exploration of cultural membership adds another layer to the liberal-nationalist dialogue. Kymlicka (1995) contends that access to one's cultural context is essential for the exercise of meaningful individual choice, thereby linking the liberal commitment to personal freedom with the nationalist emphasis on cultural identity (p. 82). He argues that protecting cultural communities can enhance individual autonomy by providing the necessary context for individuals to make meaningful choices about their lives. Kymlicka's perspective underscores the potential for a symbiotic relationship between liberalism and nationalism, where the protection of cultural diversity ensures the flourishing of individual rights. By highlighting the importance of cultural membership, Kymlicka provides a framework for understanding how liberal principles can be integrated with nationalist ideals to create a society that values both individual autonomy and collective identity. This approach offers a nuanced perspective on the interplay between liberalism and nationalism, suggesting that the two ideologies can mutually reinforce each other.

The relationship between liberalism and nationalism is complex and multifaceted. While liberalism's emphasis on individual liberty may seem at odds with the collective nature of nationalism, various theorists have demonstrated that these ideologies can be reconciled under certain conditions. Mill's advocacy for democratic cohesion, Anderson's imagined communities, Berlin's warnings about authoritarianism, Tamir's liberal nationalism, and Kymlicka's focus on cultural membership all contribute to a

nuanced understanding of how liberalism and nationalism can coexist. By emphasizing inclusive and democratic values, these perspectives highlight the potential for a harmonious integration of individual liberty and national identity. This discourse underscores the importance of balancing individual and collective interests to create a society that respects and values both dimensions of human existence.

2.1.2 Marxism and nationalism

Liberalism was not alone in experiencing ideological tensions; Marxism also grappled with the issue of nationalism. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels posited that the primary division among people was along class lines, not national lines, and they viewed nationalism as a diversion from the critical issue of class exploitation under capitalism. Marx argued that workers did not belong to a specific nation, highlighting that the proletariat had more in common with workers from other countries than with their national bourgeoisie (Marx & Engels, 1975, p. 280; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 9). Engels reinforced this view by asserting that the proletarian movement was fundamentally humanitarian rather than nationalist, aiming for the liberation of all humanity from the chains of capitalism (Engels, 1976, p. 6; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 9). Despite these assertions, Marx and Engels did not thoroughly question the concept of the nation itself, whether historical or non-historical (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 10). Their focus remained on class struggle, viewing nationalism as a bourgeois tool used to divide the working class and distract them from their true interests. This perspective underscored the Marxist belief in the international solidarity of the working class, transcending national boundaries and fostering a united front against capitalist exploitation.

The arguments of Lenin marked a significant evolution in Marxist thought on nationalism, introducing a pragmatic approach despite its apparent inconsistency with traditional Marxist anti-nationalist doctrines. Lenin observed that under capitalism, a small number of imperialist nations benefited by exploiting and plundering other nations, leading to a deepening of global inequalities (Lenin, 1970, p. 9; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 14). In this context, Lenin argued that oppressed nations had the right to self-determination, advocating for their struggle against imperialist oppressors. This stance recognized the national aspirations of colonized and oppressed peoples, aligning their liberation movements with the broader Marxist goal of overthrowing

capitalist domination (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 14). Lenin's pragmatic adaptation of Marxism to the realities of imperialism thus provided a theoretical basis for supporting national liberation movements, albeit within the framework of an eventual transition to socialism. This shift acknowledged the role of national struggles in the broader context of class struggle, emphasizing the interconnectedness of anti-imperialist and proletarian movements.

Building upon the foundation laid by Marx and Engels, Lenin's interpretation of nationalism incorporated a more nuanced understanding of global power dynamics. He argued that imperialist nations not only exploited their own working classes but also subjugated entire nations, thereby intensifying class oppression on an international scale (Lenin, 1970, p. 9). This exploitation justified the oppressed nations' struggles for self-determination as an essential component of the global revolutionary movement. Lenin's approach to nationalism was thus strategic, recognizing that national liberation could weaken imperialist powers and create favorable conditions for socialist revolutions (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 14). His arguments underscored the necessity of supporting anti-colonial movements, not as ends in themselves, but as steps towards the ultimate goal of global proletarian emancipation.

Following Lenin, later Marxist theorists continued to grapple with the complexities of nationalism. Antonio Gramsci, for instance, expanded on the concept of cultural hegemony, explaining how ruling classes use national identity to maintain their dominance by fostering a sense of unity that masks underlying class divisions (Gramsci, 1971, p. 245). He argued that the working class must develop its own counter-hegemony, incorporating elements of national identity in a way that supports class consciousness and solidarity (Gramsci, 1971, p. 366). This perspective suggested that while nationalism could be co-opted by ruling elites to perpetuate their power, it could also be reclaimed and redefined by the working class to advance their revolutionary goals. Gramsci's analysis highlighted the dual-edged nature of nationalism within the Marxist framework, capable of both division and unification depending on its ideological orientation.

The discourse on nationalism within Marxism was further enriched by the contributions of scholars like Frantz Fanon and Samir Amin, who examined the intersections of race, class, and colonialism. Fanon (1963) emphasized the

psychological and cultural dimensions of colonial oppression, arguing that national liberation was a necessary step towards the decolonization of the mind and the creation of a new humanism (p. 200). His work underscored the importance of national identity in the struggle against colonialism, while also warning against the dangers of post-independence nationalism degenerating into chauvinism and authoritarianism. Similarly, Amin (1989) analyzed the economic dimensions of nationalism, highlighting how neo-colonial structures perpetuate inequality and impede true national sovereignty (p. 58). Their works expanded the Marxist understanding of nationalism, incorporating a broader range of socio-political and economic factors.

The relationship between Marxism and nationalism, is intricate and multifaceted, similar to the liberalism-nationalism dialogue. While Marx and Engels initially viewed nationalism as a bourgeois distraction from class struggle, subsequent Marxist theorists like Lenin, Gramsci, Fanon, and Amin have recognized its potential both as a tool of oppression and a means of liberation. Lenin's pragmatic approach, Gramsci's cultural analysis, and the anti-colonial perspectives of Fanon and Amin illustrate the diverse ways in which nationalism can intersect with Marxist theory. These contributions underscore the importance of contextualizing nationalism within the broader dynamics of class struggle, imperialism, and cultural hegemony, offering a nuanced understanding of its role in the pursuit of socialist transformation.

2.1.3 Conservatism and nationalism

Contrary to liberalism and Marxism, conservatism naturally served as fertile ground for nationalism. The French Revolution was a pivotal moment where conservatism and nationalism met. Conservatives viewed the status quo of French politics, values and traditions as being under attack by revolutionaries with nationalist views. This contrast however, did not last long and the conservatives managed to employ nationalism to their advantage. This shift was primarily because past conservative arguments emphasized the centrality of the French nation and harbored animosity towards perceived enemies like the English and German nations (O'Sullivan, 2019, p. 76; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, pp. 15–16; Sternhell, 2003; Thody, 1993, p. 47). Conservatives stressed national unity and downplayed internal diversity conflicts, favoring one nation over others (O'Sullivan, 2019, p. 71; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 16). States adopted such strategies, leading to the domination of state power over

individuals. Nationalist ideology became a tool for state authorities to mobilize the populace, demanding loyalty and sacrifice for the nation and country. This approach was crucial in steering countries towards an irreversible path of conflict and war. Unlike cosmopolitanism, conservative nationalism was defined as a strategy to pursue a united nation, prioritized over others, governed by a sovereign state demanding loyalty from its people. Other nations were seen as enemies and regarded as menaces (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 16-17).

Unlike cosmopolitanism, which advocates for global citizenship and the minimization of national borders, conservative nationalism was defined as a strategy to pursue a united nation, prioritized over others, governed by a sovereign state demanding loyalty from its people. This form of nationalism promoted a hierarchical view of international relations, where the interests of the nation-state were placed above those of other nations and global considerations. Other nations were seen as enemies and regarded as menaces (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 17). This adversarial stance justified aggressive policies and territorial expansion, often leading to conflicts and wars. The emphasis on loyalty and sacrifice for the nation reinforced the power of the state over individuals, as dissent and diversity were suppressed in favor of national unity.

Edmund Burke is often credited with laying the philosophical foundations for modern conservatism. Burke's critique of the French Revolution highlighted his belief in the dangers of rapid social change and the need for preserving traditional institutions and values. He argued that society should evolve organically rather than through revolutionary upheaval, which he believed could lead to tyranny and disorder (Burke, 1790, p. 125). Burke's emphasis on tradition, hierarchy, and gradual change resonated with conservative thinkers who saw nationalism as a means to preserve the social order against the destabilizing forces of liberalism and radicalism.

The integration of nationalism into conservative ideology can also be traced to the strategic maneuvers of political leaders such as Otto von Bismarck. Bismarck's use of nationalist sentiments to unify the German states under Prussian leadership is a prime example. By leveraging the patriotic fervor generated by wars against Denmark, Austria, and France, Bismarck was able to forge a unified German nation-state while maintaining conservative principles (O'Sullivan, 2019, p. 123). Bismarck's pragmatic approach demonstrated how nationalism could be harnessed to achieve conservative goals, such as strengthening the state and preserving the social hierarchy.

In the British context, Benjamin Disraeli played a crucial role in redefining conservatism to include a nationalist dimension. Disraeli's policies aimed to bridge the gap between the aristocracy and the working class, using nationalism as a unifying force. His promotion of imperialism and social reforms was intended to foster national unity and loyalty to the British Empire, thereby consolidating conservative power (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 18). Disraeli's vision of "One Nation Conservatism" emphasized social cohesion and the moral responsibility of the upper classes to lead and protect the nation, integrating nationalism into a broader conservative framework.

Conservative nationalism, thus, played a significant role in shaping modern nation-states and their interactions on the global stage. It fostered a sense of pride and identity among citizens, but it also sowed the seeds of international conflict and internal repression. The legacy of conservative nationalism can be seen in the rise of authoritarian regimes and the outbreak of major conflicts in the 19th and 20th centuries. By prioritizing national interests over individual freedoms and global cooperation, conservative nationalism contributed to a world order characterized by competition and conflict rather than collaboration and peace. The tensions between nationalism and other ideological currents, such as liberalism and Marxism, continue to influence contemporary political debates and the shaping of policies worldwide (Evans, 1997, p. 42).

2.1.4 Islam and nationalism

All three major ideologies seem to have adapted to nationalism and had almost no considerable criticism of it (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 18). Additionally, it would be fruitful to reflect upon another widespread ideology, namely Islam and its coexistence or tensions with nationalism.

The relationship between Islam and nationalism is complex and multifaceted too, often characterized by a dynamic interplay between religious and national identities. Historically, Islamic empires and caliphates have promoted a form of universalism that transcends national boundaries, emphasizing the ummah, or the global community of Muslims. This universalist perspective is rooted in the teachings of Islam, which advocate for the unity of all Muslims regardless of their ethnic or national backgrounds (Esposito, 2005, p. 112). However, in the modern era, the rise of nation-states has necessitated a reconfiguration of this traditional worldview, leading to the emergence

of various forms of Islamic nationalism that seek to reconcile religious and national loyalties.

In Turkey, the interplay between Islam and nationalism has been particularly pronounced. The establishment of the Turkish Republic under Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in 1923 marked a significant shift towards secular nationalism, characterized by a deliberate effort to diminish the role of Islam in public life and promote a secular, ethnically Turkish identity. This Kemalist ideology sought to modernize Turkey along Western lines, reducing the influence of Islamic institutions and integrating Islamic principles into a secular national framework (Uzer, 2016, pp. 219-220). Despite this, Islam continued to play a significant role in shaping Turkish identity, especially among segments of the population resistant to secularization. The resurgence of political Islam in Turkey, particularly under the leadership of the Justice and Development Party (AKP), has seen a reintegration of Islamic values with nationalist rhetoric, demonstrating how the two can coexist and mutually reinforce each other (Uzer, 2016, pp. 223-224).

In Iran, the relationship between Islam and nationalism has taken a different trajectory. The Islamic Revolution of 1979 led to the establishment of the Islamic Republic, which integrates Islamic principles directly into the governance structure. Here, nationalism and Islam are intertwined, with the state promoting a form of religious nationalism that emphasizes both national sovereignty and Islamic unity. The revolutionary ideology of the Islamic Republic frames its national identity in opposition to Western influence and Zionism, fostering a sense of national pride that is deeply connected to Islamic values (Bayat, 2007, p. 45). This blend of religious and national identities serves to legitimize the state's authority and mobilize the population in support of its policies, both domestically and in its foreign relations.

The concept of "Islamic nationalism" is not limited to Turkey and Iran but can be observed in various forms across the Muslim world. In countries like Pakistan and Indonesia, nationalism has been shaped by a desire to integrate Islamic principles into the national ethos while also fostering a distinct national identity. In Pakistan, the very foundation of the state is based on the idea of creating a separate nation for Muslims of the Indian subcontinent, reflecting a form of nationalism that is inherently tied to Islamic identity (Nasr, 2001, p. 79). Similarly, in Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim-majority country, nationalism has been influenced by the concept of

Pancasila, which incorporates belief in God as one of its foundational principles, thereby integrating Islamic values into the national ideology (Barton, 2002, p. 98).

The interaction between Islam and nationalism also varies within different regions and contexts, influenced by historical, cultural, and political factors. For instance, in the Arab world, the rise of Arab nationalism in the mid-20th century often clashed with Islamic political movements, leading to tensions between secular nationalist regimes and Islamist groups. However, these dynamics have evolved over time, with some Islamist movements adopting nationalist rhetoric to gain broader appeal, while some nationalist regimes have incorporated Islamic symbols and narratives to bolster their legitimacy (Ajami, 1992, p. 202). This fluid relationship highlights the adaptability of both ideologies in response to changing political landscapes.

In contemporary discourse, the relationship between Islam and nationalism continues to be a topic of significant debate and analysis. Scholars examine how modern Islamist movements navigate the tension between their religious goals and nationalist aspirations. Some argue that these movements represent a form of "post-nationalism" that seeks to transcend traditional national boundaries in favor of a broader Islamic solidarity, while others contend that they are merely adapting nationalist principles to their religious agendas (Roy, 1994, p. 67). This ongoing dialogue reflects the complexity and evolving nature of the interaction between Islam and nationalism in the modern world.

To conclude this section of the conceptual work, it is useful to delve into the theories of two key social theorists, Émile Durkheim and Max Weber, regarding nationalism. Although Durkheim's work does not extensively discuss nationalism, his contributions to understanding social cohesion and collective consciousness are invaluable for grasping the nature of nationalism. According to Durkheim, a nation exists when the state and nationalism function as a unified force for political and cultural cohesion (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 18). He asserts that loyalty to a nation does not necessarily contradict universal ethical principles, provided that the nation's ideals align with those of humanity as a whole. In other words, the obligations expected from the members of a nation must not conflict with universal ethical duties (Giddens, 1986, pp. 203–204; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 19). This perspective highlights Durkheim's belief in the compatibility of national and universal ethics, emphasizing a moral framework where national and global responsibilities can coexist.

However, Durkheim's view on nationalism overlooks some problematic issues. First, his emphasis on national unity may lead to an underestimation of the potential for war and conflict inherent in nationalist ideologies. Nationalism's focus on unity can foster exclusionary practices and hostility towards outsiders, potentially escalating into conflict. Second, Durkheim's preoccupation with the wholeness of the nation risks marginalizing minorities. By prioritizing the unity of the nation, there is a danger that the rights and existence of minority groups will be ignored or suppressed, as the nation seeks to present a homogenous identity (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, pp. 20–21). This critique underscores the need to balance national unity with the protection of minority rights to prevent the exclusionary and conflict-prone tendencies of nationalism.

Max Weber's contributions to the understanding of nationalism are equally significant, particularly his insights into the role of the state and ethnicity in national identity. Weber's concept of the nation-state emphasizes the state's legitimate power to use force, which implicitly includes the right to demand the ultimate sacrifice from its members—their lives—in defense of the nation. He refers to this as the "ultimately decisive element of national consciousness" (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 22; Weber, 1978, p. 903). For Weber, this readiness to sacrifice for the nation underscores the profound depth of national loyalty and the state's central role in cultivating and demanding such loyalty. Weber's view highlights the intense emotional and ethical commitments that nationalism can generate among individuals.

Weber also places ethnicity at the core of nationality. He argues that nationalism often involves constructing an identity based on a "common ancestry." According to Weber, this notion of shared ancestry is more a matter of belief than empirical reality, serving as a collective myth that fosters a sense of relatedness among people (Jenkins, 1997, p. 10; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 23). This idea of common ancestors, Weber suggests, develops through shared features such as language, religion, and other cultural factors, eventually becoming the foundation upon which nationalism establishes its inclusive and exclusive policies (Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 23). These policies determine who is considered part of the nation and who is excluded, shaping national identity and influencing social and political dynamics.

The interplay between Durkheim's and Weber's theories provides a comprehensive understanding of nationalism's complexities. Durkheim's emphasis on social cohesion and ethical compatibility with universal principles offers a normative perspective on

how nationalism can function harmoniously within a broader ethical framework. In contrast, Weber's focus on the state's power, the ultimate sacrifice, and the construction of ethnic identities provides a more pragmatic view of how nationalism operates in practice, highlighting its potential for both cohesion and conflict. Together, their theories underscore the dual nature of nationalism as both a unifying force and a source of division.

Durkheim and Weber provide critical insights into the nature of nationalism, emphasizing the importance of balancing national unity with ethical considerations and minority rights. Their contributions highlight the need to critically examine nationalism's potential for both social cohesion and conflict, ensuring that the pursuit of national identity does not come at the expense of universal ethical principles and the rights of marginalized groups.

2.1.5 Core features of nationalism

The core features of nationalism revolve around the principle of self-determination, asserting that every nation has the right to decide its own fate (Grosby, 2005, p. 117; McKim & McMahan, 1997, p. 12; Miller, 1995, p. 81; Tamir, 1993, p. 58). This principle underscores the autonomy and sovereignty of nations, advocating for the capacity of distinct groups to govern themselves and preserve their cultural identity. However, implementing this principle often necessitates a clear definition of what constitutes a nation. Ethnic, linguistic, historical, and territorial traits frequently lack homogeneity, leading to complex scenarios where diverse groups coexist within the same geographical boundaries, each with their own claims to self-determination (McKim & McMahan, 1997, p. 11). This complexity is evident in numerous global conflicts, such as the wars between Azerbaijan and Armenia, Iran and Iraq, Israel and Palestine, the civil war in Syria, the conflict in South Sudan, and more recently, the war between Ukraine and Russia. These conflicts underscore the challenges and sometimes violent repercussions of pursuing self-determination in ethnically and culturally diverse regions (Smith, 2010, pp. 76-78).

Historically, many ethnic or religious groups have coexisted peacefully until political shifts provided opportunities to assert autonomy. The Yugoslav wars and the ongoing Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict are illustrative of how dormant nationalist sentiments can erupt into violence when political circumstances change. The principle of nationalism

remains a potent motivator for ethnic groups worldwide, such as the Scots in Britain and the Kurds in Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Syria, who seek to mobilize their populations for autonomy and independence. The Scottish independence referendum in 2014 exemplifies how democratic processes can influence the pursuit of self-determination, with 55 percent of voters choosing to remain part of the United Kingdom (BBC News, 2014). This outcome illustrates that when given the option, individuals can exercise personal self-determination to either pursue or forgo the principle of national self-determination. Such democratic engagements can sometimes mitigate the tensions associated with nationalist aspirations, fostering a sense of resolution and peace within the broader political framework.

Another core feature of nationalism is the way individuals within a nation conceive of themselves, forming a unique national identity (McKim & McMahan, 1997, p. 16; Miller, 1995, p. 17; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 58). Achieving a collective identity necessitates a classification process that delineates who belongs to the nation and who does not, thereby creating policies of inclusion and exclusion (Billig, 1995). These distinctions often lead to the marginalization of minorities and different groups within the nation who identify through characteristics such as ethnicity and religion, which may contrast with the dominant national identity (Smith, 1991, p. 17). The tendency to emphasize a distinct national identity can foster exclusionary practices, which, in extreme cases, lead to the denial and persecution of other nations and minorities. This exclusionary nationalism was starkly illustrated by the atrocities of the Holocaust, where Nazi ideology propagated the notion of a superior race, leading to the systematic extermination of Jewish minorities and others deemed inferior (Bauman, 2000, p. 67).

The inclination to establish a national identity based on a “common ancestry” and shared cultural traits such as language and religion further complicates the dynamics of nationalism. Weber’s notion that nationalism is an attempt to build identity on the belief in common ancestry underscores the power of such myths in fostering a sense of relatedness among people (Jenkins, 1997, p. 10; Spencer & Wollman, 2002, p. 23). This constructed identity forms the basis for both inclusive and exclusive national policies, determining who is considered part of the nation and who is excluded. The interplay between these factors underscores the potential for nationalism to unite people under a common identity while simultaneously driving exclusion and conflict (Anderson, 1983, pp. 89-91).

In examining the implications of these core features, it becomes clear that nationalism's dual nature as both a unifying and divisive force necessitates a careful balance. On one hand, the right to self-determination and the formation of a unique national identity can empower groups to assert their autonomy and preserve their cultural heritage. On the other hand, the emphasis on unity and common ancestry can lead to exclusionary practices and conflict, as groups vie for recognition and power within the national framework. Understanding this dual nature is crucial for addressing the challenges posed by nationalism in contemporary global politics. As nations grapple with the complexities of ethnic and cultural diversity, policymakers must strive to find solutions that uphold the principles of self-determination and national identity while promoting inclusivity, justice, and peace (Smith, 2020, pp. 102-104).

2.1.6 Manifestations in contemporary politics

As previously discussed, nationalism presents a dual-edged sword, embodying both merits and demerits that shape the socio-political landscape of nations. It fosters a sense of belonging and national cohesion, which can enhance unity and collective identity within a country. This sense of solidarity can be crucial during times of national crises or external threats, rallying citizens around common goals and values. However, these benefits are often overshadowed by the negative consequences of nationalism, which include historical and contemporary conflicts, discrimination, and social injustices.

The adverse effects of nationalism are starkly evident in the numerous wars and conflicts driven by nationalist fervor. Historical examples abound, such as the devastating impacts of World War I and II, where nationalist ambitions fueled widespread destruction and loss of life. In contemporary times, conflicts like those in Ukraine, Syria, and various regions in Africa continue to be driven by nationalist sentiments. These conflicts highlight how the desire for national self-determination and territorial integrity can escalate into violent confrontations, undermining global peace and stability (Müller, 2016, p. 12; Gellner, 1983, pp. 48-49).

Moreover, nationalism often leads to pervasive discrimination and social injustice, particularly against minority groups. The recent Black Lives Matter movement, while primarily a response to systemic racism, also underscores the broader issue of national identity and its exclusionary tendencies. The dominance of white politicians and

authorities with a white supremacy mentality reflects a form of nationalism that marginalizes non-white communities, perpetuating inequality and social division (Taylor, 2016, pp. 23-25). This dynamic is not unique to the United States but can be observed in various countries where national identity is closely tied to racial or ethnic homogeneity.

In Europe, the rise of Euroscepticism exemplifies how nationalism manifests in contemporary political developments. The decision of the United Kingdom to leave the EU through Brexit was driven by a desire to reclaim national sovereignty and control over immigration policies. This move reflects a broader trend among European nations to assert their national identity and self-determination, often at the expense of collective European integration (Taggart, 2019, pp. 11-13). Conflicts over immigration, environmental policies, and economic strategies among EU member states further fuel nationalist sentiments, paving the way for populist movements that prioritize national over supranational interests (Narkowicz, 2018, p. 34).

The resurgence of nationalism today is often more implicit than explicit, intertwining with populist rhetoric that appeals to voters' sense of national pride and identity. Populist leaders exploit nationalist themes to galvanize support, framing their political agendas around the protection of national interests and the exclusion of perceived outsiders, such as immigrants and refugees. This trend raises critical questions among social scientists about the implications of rising nationalism and populism for democratic governance and social cohesion (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018, pp. 19-21).

In conclusion, while nationalism can contribute to a sense of unity and shared identity, its darker aspects—manifested in conflicts, discrimination, and social exclusion—pose significant challenges. The intersection of nationalism with populist movements adds complexity to this issue, necessitating a nuanced understanding of how these forces shape contemporary politics. Addressing the negative impacts of nationalism requires a commitment to inclusive policies and a recognition of the diverse identities within nations, ensuring that the benefits of national solidarity do not come at the expense of justice and equality.

2.2 Populism

Populism is not a recent phenomenon; its roots trace back to the late 19th century with movements such as the People's Party in the United States during the 1880s and 1890s,

and the Narodnichestvo movement in Russia, which began in 1874 (Canovan, 1981, pp. 17, 61; Taggart, 2000, pp. 26, 46). These early manifestations of populism were characterized by their opposition to the political and economic elites, advocating for the rights and interests of the common people. According to Urbinati (2019), populism is intimately connected to "the transformation of representative democracy" and should be understood within this context (p. 15). This transformation often involves a critique of existing democratic institutions, which populists argue have been corrupted by elites and no longer serve the interests of the people.

Mudde and Kaltwasser (2017) describe populism as a "thin-centered" ideology, meaning it lacks a comprehensive worldview and instead adopts elements from other ideologies to form its core tenets. Central to populist ideology is the dichotomy between "the pure people" and "the corrupt elite," with populists claiming to represent the will of the people against the interests of the elite (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, p. 6). This binary perspective simplifies complex social and political realities into a struggle between good and evil, which populists argue can only be resolved by aligning politics with the general will of the people.

Taggart (2000) further elaborates on populist rhetoric, noting that populists position themselves as champions of the people against the elites, emphasizing the numerical superiority of the people to claim a mandate for their agenda (pp. 91–92). This majoritarian approach tends to dismiss pluralism, favoring a holistic view of society where the will of the majority is paramount. This perspective can undermine democratic principles, particularly the protection of minority rights and the checks and balances that prevent the tyranny of the majority.

The recent resurgence of populism is evident in various political movements worldwide, including Brexit in the United Kingdom, Donald Trump's presidency in the United States, the Front National in France, the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD) in Germany, and the ruling governments in Austria, Poland, and Hungary. These right-wing populist movements often aim to undermine democratic principles such as minority rights, using nationalist rhetoric to galvanize support (Mackert, 2018).

However, populism is not confined to right-wing politics. Leftist populist regimes in Latin America, such as Peru under Alberto Fujimori in the 1990s and Venezuela under Hugo Chavez in the 2000s, demonstrate that populism can also be found on the

political left. Additionally, leftist populist parties in Europe, including Direction-Social Democracy in Slovakia, Podemos in Spain, and Syriza in Greece, advocate for socialist policies and challenge neoliberal economic agendas (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). These movements often draw on socialist principles to criticize economic inequality and advocate for redistributive policies.

Nationalism frequently accompanies populism, particularly in right-wing movements, promoting xenophobic views and prioritizing the interests of the native population over immigrants and foreigners. This combination of nationalism and populism, sometimes termed nativism, argues that economic opportunities and social benefits should be reserved for the native population, framing immigrants as a threat to national identity and economic stability. This xenophobic attitude is often linked to authoritarian ideologies, which further exacerbate exclusionary and discriminatory policies (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). The integration of nationalism with populism thus reinforces the binary division between "us" and "them," creating an environment ripe for authoritarian governance.

The strategy of combining the prioritization of one's own people over immigrants and foreigners, labeled as nativism, with populist rhetoric is particularly evident in contemporary European politics. This xenophobic stance aligns well with authoritarian ideologies, further intensifying the exclusion of outsiders and the suppression of dissent. The rise of right-wing populist movements in Europe demonstrates how populism can adapt to incorporate elements of nationalism and authoritarianism, leading to significant challenges for democratic governance and social cohesion.

Distinguishing populism from fascism would have some benefits in terms of what populism is and what it is not. According to Nadia Urbinati (2019), unlike fascism which eliminates all electoral competitions, populism employs the democratic means of elections to gain legitimacy. Although there are similarities like being an ideology and opposing the existing parties and party system between fascism and populism, there remain a number of dissimilarities. The eternal desire of fascism to gain and remain in power has to do with its dream of materializing a hierarchical community based on fascist principles in which liberty and democratic rule of law will be breached. As a tyrannical regime, fascism does not approve of the election mechanism in democratic states. Through silencing the opposite voices and denial of the right for free speech, fascism intends to eradicate the foundations of democracy. Populism,

however, has more unclear and indefinite ambitions for pursuing political power. Fascism benefits from the existing democratic options for fair competition to rise into power and consolidate its grasp on authority and then raze democratic politics and society. On the other hand, populism transmutes the "representative democracy" but not eliminate it. Fascism does resort to violent measures in order to fight political disagreement. The fatal treatment of the opposing minorities by the fascist majority is the point at which democracy and the dictatorship of fascism part the ways (pp. 20–23).

These differences indicate a huge difference in the political goal of theses ideologies. Populism, although might pursue some level of authoritarianism, will not be after a tyranny, hence it follows more mild forms of change in democracies to fulfill its goal of serving the populist majority.

2.2.1 Core features of populism

2.2.1.1 The moral claim

Populists' assertion of a dichotomy between a majority of "ordinary people" and a "corrupt elite" implies a moral critique of the current political landscape, suggesting that it is fundamentally unjust and requires reform. This foundational aim of populism necessitates the mobilization of the populace to challenge and dismantle the "corrupt establishment." In this framework, populism contends that the elite in power do not represent the will of the people or the "general will," thus morally justifying their removal from power (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, pp. 6, 9; Urbinati, 2019, pp. 45–49).

The moral claim embedded in populist rhetoric is crucial to understanding its appeal and potency. Populists argue that the existing political structures are designed to benefit a small, self-serving elite at the expense of the general populace. This narrative resonates strongly in societies where economic disparities and political disenfranchisement are prevalent. For example, Mudde and Kaltwasser (2017) note that populists often present themselves as the true representatives of the people's interests, positioning their movement as a righteous crusade against corruption and elitism (p. 6). This framing not only galvanizes support but also legitimizes populist leaders'calls for radical changes in governance.

Moreover, populist movements frequently utilize emotionally charged language to deepen the perceived divide between the "pure people" and the "corrupt elite." This binary distinction simplifies complex political realities, making it easier to rally support for populist causes. Urbinati (2019) explains that populism thrives on the narrative of betrayal, where the elite are portrayed as having abandoned their duty to the public in favor of personal gain (pp. 45–49). This sense of betrayal fuels populist demands for accountability and transparency, which are framed as moral imperatives necessary to restore justice and fairness in the political system.

The call for reform inherent in populist ideologies often involves radical proposals aimed at restructuring political institutions to better reflect the will of the people. Populist leaders argue that traditional democratic mechanisms have been co-opted by elites, rendering them ineffective in addressing the needs and desires of ordinary citizens. As such, they advocate for direct forms of democracy, such as referenda and popular assemblies, to bypass established political channels and give more power to the people (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, p. 9). This direct democratic approach is presented as a more authentic and unmediated expression of the general will, contrasting sharply with representative democracy, which is seen as susceptible to elite manipulation.

In practice, however, the implementation of populist reforms often leads to tensions and conflicts within the political system. The populist emphasis on majority rule can undermine the protection of minority rights, leading to majoritarianism that marginalizes vulnerable groups. Additionally, the push for direct democracy can erode the checks and balances that are essential for maintaining a stable and functioning democracy. Urbinati (2019) cautions that populism's disdain for pluralism and its tendency to centralize power in charismatic leaders pose significant risks to democratic norms and institutions (pp. 45–49).

Despite these challenges, populism continues to exert a powerful influence on contemporary politics. Its moral critique of elitism and its call for greater popular participation resonate deeply with those who feel disenfranchised by the current political system. By framing their movement as a fight for justice and equality, populist leaders can mobilize large segments of the population and drive significant political change. However, the long-term implications of populist governance remain a subject

of intense debate, with scholars and policymakers grappling with how to balance the demands for reform with the need to preserve democratic principles.

In conclusion, the moral claim at the heart of populism—that the political status quo is unjust and needs reform—serves as a potent rallying cry for those disillusioned with traditional political elites. By advocating for the removal of corrupt elites and the empowerment of the people, populist movements seek to reshape the political landscape in ways that they argue will better serve the public interest. However, the practical challenges and potential risks associated with populist governance underscore the complexity of achieving these goals without undermining democratic norms and institutions.

2.2.1.2 Antiestablishmentarianism

The anti-establishmentarian nature of populism propels populists to establish a party that stands in opposition to all existing parties within their nation. This strategy is driven by the belief that the current political parties have been part of the establishment for too long and have abandoned their role as representatives of the people, instead perpetuating the status quo (Urbinati, 2019, pp. 135–136). Populists argue that these entrenched parties have become complacent, aligning themselves with elite interests and losing touch with the ordinary citizens they are supposed to represent. Consequently, populists position themselves as the true voice of the people, advocating for radical change and promising to dismantle the existing political structures that they view as corrupt and unresponsive.

This opposition to established parties is not merely rhetorical but manifests in the formation of new political entities designed to challenge the status quo. Populist movements often emerge as outsider parties, rejecting traditional political alignments and seeking to mobilize disenfranchised voters who feel neglected by mainstream politics. For instance, the Five Star Movement in Italy and the Brexit Party in the UK capitalized on widespread dissatisfaction with conventional parties, presenting themselves as fresh alternatives committed to shaking up the political system (Albertazzi & McDonnell, 2008, p. 10; Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018, p. 42). By tapping into the public's frustration with the status quo, these movements gain significant traction, often achieving considerable electoral success.

The process of establishing a populist party involves creating a distinct identity that contrasts sharply with the perceived failings of established parties. Populist leaders use strong, emotive language to draw a clear line between their movement and the existing political class. This rhetoric often includes accusations of corruption, incompetence, and betrayal by the elites, which serve to delegitimize the current political order and justify the need for a new political force (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, p. 5). Populists argue that traditional parties are incapable of genuine reform because they are too deeply embedded in the structures they seek to change, and thus, only an entirely new movement can effectively challenge and replace the old order.

The anti-establishment stance of populism also involves a critique of the broader political system, including its institutions and norms. Populists often argue that the existing political framework is rigged in favor of the elites, making it impossible for true change to occur within its confines. This perspective leads to calls for sweeping reforms that go beyond mere party politics, targeting the entire political establishment. Such reforms might include changes to electoral laws, the introduction of direct democracy mechanisms like referenda, and the overhaul of judicial and bureaucratic institutions to make them more accountable to the people (Urbinati, 2019, p. 137).

Furthermore, the populist challenge to the establishment is not just a national phenomenon but has significant implications for international politics. Populist movements often espouse nationalist and protectionist policies, rejecting globalism and advocating for the sovereignty of the nation-state against supranational entities and foreign influences. This approach can lead to tensions with international institutions and alliances, as populists prioritize domestic interests and challenge the status quo in international relations (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, p. 7). The rise of populist leaders in various countries has thus contributed to a more fragmented and contentious global political landscape.

In summary, the anti-establishmentarian feature of populism drives the creation of new political parties that directly oppose existing ones, seeking to disrupt and ultimately dismantle the entrenched political order. This opposition is rooted in a moral critique of the current state of politics, portraying established parties as corrupt and out of touch with the people. By presenting themselves as the true representatives of the people's will, populists aim to mobilize the electorate and implement radical reforms to transform the political system fundamentally.

2.2.1.3 Audience democracy

The concept of "audience democracy" reflects the significant role that media plays in shaping the behavior and performance of populist leaders, who often rely on their ability to communicate effectively with the public. According to Urbinati (2019), this phenomenon is encapsulated by the term "*pleonexia*" of popularity, derived from the Greek word for greed, indicating an insatiable desire for popularity. Urbinati argues that, for populist leaders, electoral success is of paramount importance, often overshadowing the needs and interests of the voters who support them (p. 175). This pursuit of popularity is frequently facilitated by media specialists who craft and disseminate the leaders' messages, thereby amplifying their influence and reach.

In an era dominated by mass media and digital communication, populist leaders have adeptly utilized these platforms to bypass traditional political channels and connect directly with their audience. This direct engagement allows them to present themselves as authentic representatives of the people, unmediated by the elite-dominated institutions that they criticize. Social media, in particular, has become a crucial tool for populists, enabling them to mobilize supporters, frame political debates, and react swiftly to events. The immediacy and reach of social media platforms create a feedback loop where populist leaders can gauge public opinion in real-time and adjust their rhetoric accordingly (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, pp. 57-58).

The media's role in populist politics is not merely passive but involves active collaboration in the construction of populist narratives. Media outlets often benefit from the sensationalism and controversy that populist leaders generate, leading to increased viewership and engagement. This symbiotic relationship can distort the democratic process, as media coverage tends to prioritize spectacle over substantive policy discussion. As a result, the focus shifts from the quality of governance to the charisma and media-savviness of the leader, reducing complex political issues to simplistic, emotive appeals (Fieschi, 2019, pp. 63-64).

The prioritization of popularity over policy has significant implications for democratic governance. Populist leaders, driven by the need to maintain their public image, may resort to short-term, populist measures that garner immediate approval but lack long-term viability. This approach can lead to policy volatility and undermine the stability of political institutions. Moreover, the focus on maintaining a favorable media

presence can distract leaders from addressing pressing issues, as they become more concerned with managing their image than with effective governance (Urbinati, 2019, pp. 176-177).

Furthermore, the influence of media in populist politics raises concerns about the manipulation of public opinion. The use of targeted advertising, data analytics, and algorithm-driven content curation can create echo chambers that reinforce existing biases and polarize the electorate. Populist leaders exploit these dynamics to consolidate their support base and delegitimize their opponents, often employing divisive rhetoric that exacerbates social tensions. The result is a fragmented public sphere where constructive dialogue is replaced by antagonistic exchanges, undermining the deliberative foundations of democracy (Norris & Inglehart, 2019, p. 85).

In conclusion, the interplay between populist leaders and the media plays a critical role in the dynamics of audience democracy. The media's ability to amplify populist messages and the leaders' strategic use of media platforms have reshaped political communication and engagement. While this has enabled populist leaders to connect directly with the public and challenge established elites, it also poses significant risks to democratic governance. The emphasis on popularity over policy, the potential for public opinion manipulation, and the erosion of substantive political debate highlight the complex and often problematic relationship between populism and the media.

2.2.1.4 Irresponsible leadership

A populist leader's assertion of being the true representative of the people implies a commitment to delivering what the "true people" demand. According to Urbinati (2019), this claim often results in the populist leader avoiding personal responsibility for political decisions, as they present themselves merely as conduits of the people's will. Urbinati argues that this dynamic can lead to a scenario where the leader, in the face of any adverse outcomes, deflects blame by asserting they were only acting according to the "general will" of the people (pp. 130–132). This abdication of responsibility not only undermines accountability but also creates a potentially dangerous precedent where the leader is viewed as infallible as long as they align their rhetoric with the popular sentiment.

This positioning can transform a leader into an unaccountable figure, leveraging their role as the voice of the people to justify their actions regardless of the consequences. By continuously emphasizing their role as the executor of the people's will, populist leaders can avoid the scrutiny typically applied to political figures. This lack of accountability can lead to governance that prioritizes short-term popular demands over long-term strategic planning, potentially resulting in detrimental policies that are more about maintaining popularity than ensuring sustainable development (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, p. 85).

Moreover, Urbinati highlights the risk of populist leaders extending their tenure through constitutional changes facilitated by their control over propaganda systems. With effective media manipulation, these leaders can sway public opinion to support amendments that prolong their time in office, thus eroding democratic norms and paving the way for autocratic rule (Urbinati, 2019, pp. 130–132). This manipulation often involves portraying themselves as indispensable to the nation's progress and stability, thereby creating a cult of personality that makes it challenging for opposition forces to mobilize effectively.

This potential shift from populism to dictatorship is a significant concern, particularly in contexts where institutional checks and balances are weak. The centralization of power and the erosion of democratic institutions can create an environment where dissent is stifled, and political pluralism is diminished. Historical examples, such as the transition of democratic systems to authoritarian regimes in Venezuela under Hugo Chavez and in Turkey under Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, illustrate how populist leaders can leverage their initial democratic legitimacy to entrench their power and undermine democratic governance (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, p. 107).

Furthermore, the rhetoric of populism often involves a dualistic worldview that pits the virtuous people against the corrupt elite, simplifying complex political realities into a moral struggle. This binary perspective can foster an environment where critical thinking and nuanced debate are suppressed in favor of emotional and simplistic narratives. Such an approach not only polarizes societies but also facilitates the consolidation of power by delegitimizing opposition voices as enemies of the people (Müller, 2016, pp. 45-46).

The populist leader's claim to represent the true will of the people carries significant implications for democratic accountability and governance. By positioning themselves as mere executors of the popular will, populist leaders can evade responsibility for their actions, leading to governance that prioritizes short-term populist measures over long-term strategic planning. Additionally, the manipulation of media and public opinion to extend their tenure poses a substantial threat to democratic norms, increasing the risk of a transition from populism to autocracy. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for assessing the impact of populism on contemporary political systems and developing strategies to safeguard democratic institutions.

2.2.1.5 Charismatic leadership

The charismatic nature of a populist leader has been a topic of considerable debate, particularly regarding who might be an appropriate candidate to lead a populist movement: an elite or an ordinary person. At first glance, the notion of an elite leading a populist majority against other elites appears paradoxical. How can someone from the elite class genuinely represent the grievances and aspirations of ordinary people? On the other hand, how can an ordinary person, presumably lacking the traditional attributes of leadership such as political experience and eloquence, be perceived as charismatic enough to galvanize a populist movement?

The answer to this conundrum lies in the unique characteristics that define populist charisma. According to Canovan (1981), a populist leader derives charisma not from conventional elite status but from their ability to articulate the populist agenda with clarity and conviction (pp. 138–139). This involves drawing a sharp distinction between the insiders—the "true people"—and the perceived foes, often portrayed as the corrupt elite or foreign influences. The populist leader's rhetoric is crucial in establishing this dichotomy and fostering a sense of unity and purpose among supporters.

Urbinati (2019) expands on this by arguing that the populist leader's charisma is rooted in their perceived authenticity and their ability to present themselves as one of the people, despite often having elite backgrounds themselves (p. 123). The key to this transformation lies in the leader's ability to communicate effectively and resonate emotionally with the populace. This involves using simple, direct language and

appealing to common experiences and grievances. By doing so, the leader can transcend their elite origins and become a symbol of the populist struggle.

Furthermore, the populist leader's charisma is amplified by their capacity to embody the will of the people and demonstrate unwavering determination to recruit and empower the "true people" for political positions. This approach not only consolidates their authority but also legitimizes their leadership in the eyes of their followers. The populist leader's ability to mobilize and inspire is often compared to a form of secular messianism, where the leader is seen as a savior who will deliver the people from the clutches of a corrupt establishment (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, p. 32).

The interplay between the populist leader's personal traits and their rhetorical strategies creates a powerful dynamic that can override traditional markers of elite status. For instance, leaders such as Donald Trump in the United States and Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil exemplify this phenomenon. Despite their backgrounds, they have successfully positioned themselves as outsiders challenging the status quo by leveraging media platforms and adopting an anti-establishment rhetoric that resonates with a broad base of supporters (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, p. 11). Their charisma is not inherent but constructed through their interactions with the public and the media.

Moreover, the media plays a crucial role in constructing and amplifying the charisma of populist leaders. Through extensive coverage and the creation of a compelling narrative, media outlets contribute to the leader's public persona. This symbiotic relationship between populist leaders and the media helps maintain and enhance the leader's charismatic appeal, ensuring their message reaches a wide audience and reinforcing their status as the voice of the people (Fieschi, 2019, pp. 45-46).

The charisma of a populist leader is a complex construct that transcends the simple dichotomy of elite versus ordinary person. It is rooted in the leader's ability to articulate populist sentiments, draw clear lines between the people and their adversaries, and embody the will of the populace. This charisma is further amplified by media strategies and the leader's skill in engaging with the public, creating a powerful and enduring appeal that can drive significant political movements.

2.2.1.6 Holism

The principle of multipartyism is a cornerstone of liberal democracy, embodying the liberal value of pluralism. Multiparty systems ensure that various political perspectives

can compete for power, thus representing the diverse interests of the populace. However, when a single party adopts a holistic approach, claiming to represent the entire populace, it risks undermining this fundamental principle. Such a party aspires to be the sole representative of the people's will, thereby transforming itself into a monolithic entity that marginalizes free competition and stifles political pluralism (Urbinati, 2019, pp. 138–139). This monopolistic aspiration can erode the liberal democratic framework, where multiple parties should engage in dialogue and competition to reflect a spectrum of views and policies.

The holistic vision pursued by such parties often leads to a devaluation of the opposition, portraying them not as legitimate competitors with differing viewpoints but as obstacles to the true representation of the people's will. This perspective undermines the essential democratic principle of partisanship, where the ruling party and the opposition engage in a constructive dialogue to refine and implement policies. The absence of this dynamic interaction can lead to a political environment where dissent is not tolerated, and alternative views are suppressed, thus endangering the democratic process (Dahl, 1971, pp. 1-3).

Moreover, the holistic approach to governance tends to prioritize the consolidation of power over democratic accountability. When a party seeks to embody the general will exclusively, it often justifies the centralization of authority in the hands of its leaders. This can lead to an erosion of checks and balances, as the ruling party perceives itself as the ultimate arbiter of the public interest. In such a scenario, the principles of transparency and accountability, which are vital to liberal democracy, are compromised, paving the way for authoritarian tendencies (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, p. 69).

The danger of such an approach is further highlighted by the historical and contemporary examples where parties with holistic ambitions have undermined democratic institutions. For instance, the rise of populist parties in various parts of the world has often been accompanied by attempts to weaken the judiciary, suppress free press, and manipulate electoral processes to entrench their power. These actions are justified by the claim that they are necessary to fulfill the people's will, but in reality, they dismantle the democratic structures designed to ensure fair competition and protect minority rights (Müller, 2016, pp. 38-39).

The implications of this holistic approach extend beyond the national context, influencing international relations as well. A party that seeks to monopolize the representation of its nation's will may adopt an aggressive foreign policy, justified by the same populist rhetoric used domestically. This can lead to increased tensions and conflicts with other nations, particularly those with different political systems or values. The erosion of liberal democratic norms within a country thus has broader ramifications, potentially destabilizing regional and global political orders (Zakaria, 1997, pp. 35-37).

While the principle of multipartyism is fundamental to liberal democracy, the holistic aspirations of certain parties pose a significant threat to this principle. By striving to be the sole representative of the people's will, such parties undermine political pluralism, weaken democratic accountability, and foster authoritarian tendencies. It is essential to recognize and address these dangers to preserve the integrity of liberal democratic systems and ensure that they continue to reflect the diverse interests and values of their populations.

2.2.1.7 Representation as embodiment

The embodiment of the majority or the "true people," or in other words, the "incarnation" of the will of the people claimed by a populist leader, has been observed in multiple instances where leaders refer to themselves as the embodiment of the populace. This phenomenon often includes implicit references to the concept of incarnation in Christianity, where a divine being takes on human form. In this context, populist leaders position themselves as the living representation of the people's collective will, thereby establishing a quasi-sacred status that elevates their political role beyond mere representation (Urbinati, 2019, pp. 126, 128).

This rhetorical strategy serves several purposes. Firstly, it strengthens the leader's legitimacy by framing their authority as deriving directly from the people, rather than from traditional political institutions or elite endorsements. By claiming to be the incarnation of the people's will, the leader suggests a mystical bond with the populace, positioning themselves as the ultimate arbiter of the national interest. This notion of incarnation resonates with the religious connotations of sacrifice and redemption, where the leaders portray themselves as the savior of the nation, willing to endure political martyrdom for the greater good (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, p. 35).

Secondly, the unaccountability of a populist leader highlights the valuable place of the people in their rhetoric. While the leader incarnates the will of the people, they do not replace the people; rather, they act as a vessel through which the people's will is expressed. This distinction allows populist leaders to avoid direct responsibility for specific decisions and outcomes. When policies fail or controversies arise, the leader can deflect blame by arguing that they were merely enacting the people's will. This dynamic creates a feedback loop where the leader's unaccountability is justified by their role as the embodiment of the people, perpetuating their authority while evading personal responsibility (Urbinati, 2019, pp. 126, 128).

Moreover, this strategy of incarnation also serves to delegitimize opposition. By presenting themselves as the true voice of the people, populist leaders cast their opponents as enemies of the people. This binary framing reduces political discourse to a struggle between the righteous and the corrupt, leaving little room for compromise or pluralism. Opponents are not just political rivals; they are depicted as traitors to the nation, further polarizing the political landscape and entrenching the leader's position (Müller, 2016, pp. 50-52).

The use of religious metaphor and symbolism in populist rhetoric can also mobilize emotional and psychological responses from the electorate. By invoking the imagery of incarnation, populist leaders tap into deep-seated cultural narratives that resonate with the public's sense of identity and belonging. This emotional appeal can galvanize support and foster a sense of unity and purpose among followers, creating a powerful collective identity centered around the leader (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018, p. 58).

The concept of the populist leader as the incarnation of the people's will is a powerful rhetorical tool that enhances their legitimacy, deflects responsibility, and delegitimizes opposition. By invoking religious and cultural symbolism, populist leaders establish a quasi-sacred status that elevates their political authority and reinforces their bond with the electorate. This dynamic not only strengthens their position but also poses significant challenges to democratic principles of accountability and pluralism.

2.2.1.8 Manichean worldview

The view of politics as an ongoing conflict between two sides—namely, the people and the elites—is the central theme of populism. This dichotomy is fundamental to the populist narrative, which frames the political landscape as a moral struggle between

the virtuous, ordinary people and the corrupt, self-serving elites. According to Mudde and Kaltwasser (2017), populism posits that the elites have betrayed the people, ignoring their demands and infringing upon their rights (pp. 6, 9). This betrayal creates a fertile ground for populist leaders, who present themselves as the true representatives of the people, committed to restoring their rightful place in the political order.

Populist leaders capitalize on this narrative by encouraging the disenfranchised populace to rise up against the elites. They often use emotive language and simplistic dichotomies to galvanize support, emphasizing the moral purity of the people against the moral corruption of the elites. This framing resonates with individuals who feel marginalized or excluded by the current political system, providing them with a sense of empowerment and a clear enemy to oppose. Urbinati (2019) argues that this mobilization is not merely about addressing grievances but about redefining the political order in a way that reflects the will of the people (p. 50). This redefinition often involves radical changes to the political system, such as constitutional amendments or shifts in governance structures, aimed at dismantling elite control.

The moral aspect of the populist worldview is crucial to its appeal. By framing the political struggle in moral terms, populist leaders can tap into deep-seated feelings of injustice and resentment among the populace. This moral framing helps to legitimize their calls for radical change and justifies the often confrontational and divisive tactics they employ. It also allows them to present themselves as morally superior to their opponents, who are depicted as not just politically wrong but morally bankrupt. This moral superiority is a powerful tool in rallying support and delegitimizing the opposition.

Furthermore, the populist emphasis on the conflict between the people and the elites often leads to a rejection of pluralism and a disdain for the institutions of liberal democracy. Populists argue that these institutions have been co-opted by the elites and are therefore incapable of serving the true interests of the people. This perspective can lead to authoritarian tendencies, as populist leaders seek to concentrate power in their own hands to bypass what they see as corrupt and obstructive institutions (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, p. 84). The result is often a political environment where dissent is stifled, and the rule of law is undermined, posing significant risks to democratic governance.

Moreover, the populist narrative of a righteous struggle against corrupt elites can exacerbate social divisions and polarize the electorate. By framing political opponents as enemies of the people, populists create a climate of hostility and suspicion that undermines the possibility of constructive dialogue and compromise. This polarization could result in hightened social tensions and, in some cases, violence, as supporters of populist leaders feel justified in taking extreme actions to defend their cause (Müller, 2016, pp. 56-57). The long-term consequences of such polarization are profound, potentially leading to the erosion of social cohesion and the destabilization of political systems.

In conclusion, the central theme of populism—the ongoing conflict between the people and the elites—serves as a powerful tool for mobilizing support and legitimizing radical political change. By framing this conflict in moral terms, populist leaders can tap into widespread feelings of injustice and resentment, introducing themselves as the authentic representatives of the people. However, this approach also poses significant risks to democratic governance, as it can lead to the rejection of pluralism, the concentration of power, and the polarization of society.

2.2.1.9 Corrupting power

The age-old assumption that political power corrupts lies at the heart of the populist worldview, which perceives the elites and the establishment as inherently corrupt. This perspective, while not universally embraced by democratic values in its entirety, is grounded in the valid concern that unchecked power can indeed lead to corruption. Urbinati (2019) emphasizes that power, if not effectively limited or subjected to regular circulation, has a propensity to corrupt those who wield it (p. 64). This fundamental belief drives the populist narrative, positioning the movement as a moral crusade against the entrenched power structures that they argue have lost touch with the people and succumbed to corruption.

Populists argue that the concentration of power in the hands of a few elites results in a disconnect between the governing and the governed, leading to policies that favor the interests of the elite at the expense of the broader populace. This critique resonates deeply in democratic societies where increasing economic inequality and political disillusionment have fostered a perception that traditional political institutions are no longer effective in representing the will of the people. By tapping into these

sentiments, populist leaders can mobilize significant support, framing their movements as a necessary corrective to a corrupt and unresponsive establishment (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, pp. 22-23).

Moreover, the populist emphasis on the corrupting influence of power often leads to calls for radical reforms aimed at increasing transparency and accountability in government. These reforms might include term limits, anti-corruption measures, and mechanisms to enhance direct participation by citizens in the political process. While such measures can indeed help to mitigate the risks of corruption, they also pose challenges to the stability and functionality of political systems. For instance, frequent turnover in leadership can disrupt continuity in governance, while excessive reliance on direct democracy mechanisms can undermine representative institutions (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 95-96).

The populist critique of elite corruption also extends to the media and other societal institutions, which are often portrayed as complicit in maintaining the status quo. Populist leaders frequently accuse the media of bias and manipulation, arguing that it serves the interests of the elite rather than providing impartial information to the public. This distrust of traditional media outlets leads populist movements to seek alternative platforms for disseminating their messages, such as social media, which allows them to bypass established channels and communicate directly with their supporters (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, pp. 10-11).

Furthermore, the populist focus on corruption and the moral failings of the elite can foster a political environment characterized by heightened polarization and conflict. By framing political opposition as not just wrong but morally corrupt, populist leaders contribute to a climate of antagonism and division. This binary worldview reduces the complexity of political issues to a simple struggle between good and evil, making compromise and consensus-building more difficult. The resulting polarization can weaken democratic institutions and erode social cohesion, as political discourse becomes increasingly adversarial (Müller, 2016, pp. 58-59).

The populist assumption that political power inherently corrupts underscores much of the movement's rhetoric and appeal. While this perspective highlights important concerns about the dangers of unchecked power, it also contributes to a divisive and polarized political climate. Addressing the legitimate grievances that fuel populist

support requires a nuanced approach that balances the need for transparency and accountability with the preservation of democratic stability and functionality.

2.2.2 Manifestations in contemporary politics

Populism, despite its relatively short history, has rapidly emerged as a significant force in both developing and developed countries (Canovan, 1981). The most recent manifestations of populism include the election of Donald Trump in 2016 in the United States, Brexit in the United Kingdom, and the rise of far-right parties in Western Europe, such as the Party for Freedom (PVV) in the Netherlands and the National Front in France. These movements have capitalized on a variety of socio-political issues, with immigration being a critical focal point. Populist leaders argue that the influx of immigrants, whether legal or illegal, poses a threat to the economic opportunities and social welfare of native citizens. They claim that increased immigration leads to fewer job opportunities, higher housing demand, and rising prices for goods and services, exacerbating economic inequality and social tension (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, pp. 6-7).

The simplicity and emotional appeal of these arguments resonate strongly with many voters, particularly those who feel marginalized or economically insecure. Populist leaders often frame their rhetoric in a Manichean worldview, presenting the political landscape as a stark battle between the virtuous "ordinary people" and the corrupt, self-serving elites. This binary framing not only simplifies complex socio-economic issues but also creates a clear enemy in the form of the political establishment, which is accused of neglecting the needs and interests of the populace in favor of globalist and multicultural agendas (Urbinati, 2019, pp. 45-46). This anti-establishment sentiment is further fueled by accusations of incompetence and corruption among current politicians, who are criticized for their handling of immigration and other critical issues.

Governments in various Western countries have responded to these populist pressures by implementing measures aimed at addressing the concerns raised by populist leaders. For instance, the Dutch government has proposed plans to limit the number of foreign students in an effort to reduce the perceived strain on housing and job markets (Euronews, 2024). Similarly, Canada has introduced caps on international student admissions to address similar concerns (Munjal, 2024). These policy responses

highlight the significant influence populist movements can exert on mainstream politics, pushing governments to adopt more restrictive and nationalist-oriented policies.

The rise of populist movements has had profound implications for the rights of minorities, including immigrants and international students. Populist rhetoric often targets these groups as scapegoats for broader socio-economic problems, leading to policies that disproportionately affect vulnerable populations. This dynamic is further complicated by the fact that individuals can occupy multiple social roles; for example, a person from a minority ethnic group may face discrimination in the job market while simultaneously supporting populist policies that promise to address their economic grievances. This intersectionality makes it easier for populist movements to attract a broad base of support, as individuals may align with populist rhetoric on certain issues even if they are negatively impacted by other aspects of the populist agenda (Barker & DeTamble, 2022).

The complexity of populist movements is evident in the diverse motivations and priorities of their supporters. For instance, in the United States, the rise of Donald Trump as a nationalist populist leader has created a polarized political landscape. Voters may support Trump for his economic policies, such as his stance on inflation management, while simultaneously grappling with his positions on minority rights and social issues. This multifaceted support base highlights the challenges voters face in navigating the populist landscape, where candidates may excel in certain areas while being deeply problematic in others (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, pp. 9-10).

Recent research indicates that the boundaries between different types of populists—cultural versus economic populists, for example—are not always clear-cut. Cultural populists, who prioritize issues like immigration and national identity, may have very different personal characteristics and policy preferences compared to economic populists, who focus on economic inequality and anti-globalization sentiments. This distinction is crucial for understanding the varied and sometimes contradictory nature of populist support, as well as the strategies needed to address the underlying issues driving populism (Barker & DeTamble, 2022).

2.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the examination of populism across various political landscapes reveals its significant and multifaceted impact on contemporary democratic systems. Populism's rapid emergence in both developing and developed countries underscores its global relevance and the widespread socio-political grievances it capitalizes upon. The central tenet of populism, which frames politics as a conflict between the virtuous "ordinary people" and the corrupt elites, taps into deep-seated feelings of disenfranchisement and economic insecurity. This narrative not only mobilizes substantial support but also challenges the traditional democratic norms that rely on pluralism, accountability, and balanced governance.

Populist leaders leverage the emotional and moral aspects of this dichotomy to galvanize their base, often employing a Manichean worldview that simplifies complex socio-political issues into a battle between good and evil. This binary perspective resonates with individuals who feel marginalized by the current political and economic systems, providing them with a clear enemy and a sense of empowerment. However, this approach also fosters polarization and division, undermining the possibility of constructive dialogue and compromise, which are essential for democratic stability and social cohesion.

The economic and cultural anxieties that fuel populist movements are further exacerbated by issues such as immigration, which populist leaders frame as a threat to national identity and economic opportunities. This framing leads to policies that disproportionately affect vulnerable populations, including immigrants and minorities, and poses significant challenges to the protection of human rights and the principles of equality and inclusion. The responses of governments to populist pressures, such as limiting the number of foreign students or implementing caps on immigration, reflect the profound influence of populist rhetoric on mainstream politics and policy-making.

Moreover, the charismatic nature of populist leaders and their ability to present themselves as the embodiment of the people's will play a crucial role in their appeal. By positioning themselves as the true representatives of the populace, populist leaders can evade personal responsibility for policy outcomes, framing their actions as merely executing the people's will. This dynamic creates a feedback loop where the leader's

unaccountability is justified by their role as the people's voice, perpetuating their authority and undermining democratic accountability.

The rise of populism also highlights the tension between the need for effective governance and the populist critique of elite corruption. While populist movements advocate for greater transparency and accountability, their focus on dismantling established institutions and centralizing power in the hands of charismatic leaders often leads to authoritarian tendencies. This paradox poses a significant threat to democratic governance, as it can result in the erosion of checks and balances, the suppression of dissent, and the weakening of democratic institutions.

In essence, the study of populism reveals a complex interplay of socio-economic grievances, cultural anxieties, and political dynamics that challenge the foundations of liberal democracy. Addressing the root causes of populist support requires a nuanced and multifaceted approach that balances the need for reform with the preservation of democratic norms and values. By understanding the diverse motivations and priorities of populist supporters, policymakers can develop strategies to address their legitimate concerns while safeguarding the principles of pluralism, accountability, and inclusivity that are essential for a healthy and resilient democracy.

3. GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: STRUCTURES AND CHALLENGES

3.1 Structures

The necessity of dealing with international matters at a global level through cooperation and coordination is the main driver of the field of Global governance and related studies. The ultimate goal of global governance could be the establishment of a "just society" across the planet in which the "common good" is pursued by all and the selfishness of some wealthy and powerful actors including states or groups is dealt with through a number of restrictions leading to the welfare of humanity. The challenges that global governance faces today varies from human to environmental issues such as poverty, lack of access to potable water, sharp population growth, climate change issues including global warming and rising sea levels, increased inequality, war, and security issues (Lopez-Claros et al., 2020, Chapter 1).

Poverty remains as one of the most significant challenges in global governance. Despite the fact that there is considerable economic progress in many parts of the world, over 700 million people still live in extreme poverty, surviving on an income of less than $1.90 a day (UNICEF, 2019, p. 38; World Bank, 2020, p. 25). This widespread poverty has profound implications for global stability, security, and development. Countries with high poverty rates often experience higher levels of crime, political instability, and social unrest. This instability can spread into neighboring countries and regions, exacerbating global security issues (Lopez-Claros et al., 2020, p. 57; Sachs, 2015, p. 112). Moreover, poverty is intrinsically linked to other global challenges such as health, education, and environmental degradation. For instance, impoverished communities often lack access to basic healthcare and education, perpetuating a cycle of poverty that is difficult to break (Collier, 2007, p. 89; Sen, 1999, p. 42).

Efforts to alleviate poverty are complicated by numerous factors, including corruption, conflict, and inadequate infrastructure. International organizations like the World Bank (WB) and the IMF play crucial roles in providing financial assistance and

expertise to developing countries (Easterly, 2006, p. 45; Stiglitz, 2002, p. 61). However, the effectiveness of these interventions is often hampered by political and economic constraints. For example, loan conditions imposed by these institutions can sometimes lead to austerity measures that disproportionately affect the poor, deteriorating the very problem they aim to solve (Chang, 2008, p. 52; Rodrik, 2006, p. 133). Additionally, global economic policies and trade agreements often favor developed countries, making it challenging for poorer nations to compete on an equal footing (Bhagwati, 2004, p. 98; Harvey, 2005, p. 76). Addressing poverty, therefore, requires a multifaceted approach that includes equitable economic policies, targeted aid, and sustainable development practices (Sen, 2000, p. 67; UNDP, 2015, p. 24).

Access to drinkable water is a basic human right, while millions of people worldwide lack this basic necessity. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), "over 2 billion people live in water-stressed countries, and around 785 million people do not have access to even basic drinking water services" (UNICEF, 2019; WHO, 2020). This lack of access to potable water has severe health implications, leading to diseases such as cholera, dysentery, and typhoid (Gleick, 2014, p. 59; Hotez, 2008, p. 88). Water scarcity also exacerbates issues of food security, as agriculture is highly dependent on water availability (Falkenmark & Rockström, 2004, p. 102; Postel, 1999, p. 75). In many developing countries, women and children bear the brunt of water scarcity, often spending hours each day collecting water, which impacts their education and economic opportunities (Ray, 2007, p. 64; UN Women, 2018, p. 54).

The challenge of providing access to potable water is compounded by factors such as climate change, population growth, and pollution. Climate change has altered precipitation patterns, leading to droughts in some regions and flooding in some others, which disrupts water supply and quality (IPCC, 2014, p. 78; Stern, 2007, p. 29). Rapid population growth in urban areas has also outpaced the development of water infrastructures, which has left many without reliable access to clean water (UN-Habitat, 2015, p. 112; World Bank, 2016, p. 67). Furthermore, industrial and agricultural activities often contaminate water sources with chemicals and waste that make them unsafe for consumption (Pimentel et al., 2004, p. 89; Vörösmarty et al., 2010, p. 140). Addressing this issue requires coordinated efforts at local, national, and international levels to improve water management practices, to invest in infrastructure,

and to enforce regulations to protect water sources (Gleick, 1998, p. 58; UNESCO World Water Assessment Programme, 2019).

Sharp population growth presents another significant challenge for global governance. The global population is estimated to reach around 10 billion by 2050, where much of this growth takes place in developing countries (UNICEF, 2019, p. 85; World Bank, 2018, p. 49). Rapid population growth can strain resources, infrastructure, and social services, that leads to overcrowding, increased pollution, and greater competition for jobs and housing (Cohen, 2006, p. 105; Dyson, 2010, p. 77). In many cases, governments struggle to keep up with the demands for basic services such as education, healthcare, and transportation, which can hinder economic development and exacerbate poverty (Bloom et al., 2011, p. 33; Todaro & Smith, 2015, p. 61).

Population growth also has environmental implications that lead to deforestation, extinction of biodiversity, and elevated greenhouse gas emissions (Ehrlich & Ehrlich, 2013, p. 59; Myers, 1997, p. 98). As more land is converted for agriculture and urban development, natural habitats are destroyed, threatening wildlife and disrupting ecosystems (Pimm et al., 2014, p. 47; Wilson, 2016, p. 76). Moreover, the increased demand for energy, water, and food puts additional pressure on already scarce resources (Brown, 2011, p. 63; Smil, 2008, p. 85). Addressing the challenges posed by population growth certainly requires comprehensive policies that promote sustainable development, invest in education and family planning, and encourage economic opportunities that can support a growing population (Lutz & KC, 2010, p. 44; UNFPA, 2014, p. 28).

Climate change is arguably the most pressing global challenge of our time, with noticeable impacts on ecosystems, economies, and human health. Rising global temperatures, driven by greenhouse gas emissions from human activities, have led to more frequent and severe weather events such as hurricanes, droughts, and floods (IPCC, 2014, p. 45). These changes disrupt agricultural production, threaten water supplies, and increase the spread of diseases (Stern, 2007, p. 61; WHO, 2015, p. 37). Coastal communities are particularly vulnerable, facing the dual threats of rising sea levels and more intense storms, which can lead to displacement and loss of livelihoods (Hallegatte et al., 2013, p. 74; Nicholls & Cazenave, 2010, p. 93).

Mitigating the impacts of climate change requires a concerted effort from all nations "to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and transition to sustainable energy sources" (United Nations, 2015, p. 39; World Bank, 2014, p. 67). International agreements such as "the Paris Agreement aim to limit global warming to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels" (IPCC, 2018, p. 56; UNFCCC, 2016, p. 21). However, achieving these targets requires significant political will and cooperation as well as substantial investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency, and climate adaptation measures (IEA, 2017, p. 58; Stern, 2006, p. 44). Additionally, there is a need for robust monitoring and enforcement mechanisms to ensure that countries meet their commitments (Aldy & Stavins, 2012, p. 71; Keohane & Victor, 2016, p. 83). To Address climate change also involves supporting vulnerable communities and countries in adapting to its impacts, which requires financial and technical assistance from developed nations (World Bank, 2010, p. 99).

Increased inequality, both within and between countries, poses a significant threat to global governance and social cohesion. Economic disparities can lead to social unrest, political instability, and increased crime rates (Piketty, 2014, p. 81; Stiglitz, 2012, p. 54). Within countries, inequality often pertains to unequal access to education, healthcare, and employment opportunities which ends up in perpetuating cycles of poverty and exclusion (Sen, 1999, p. 101; R. G. Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009, p. 62). Between countries, economic inequality can result in unequal power dynamics with wealthier nations exerting disproportionate influence over global policies and institutions (Milanovic, 2016, p. 47; Sachs, 2005, p. 88).

To provide an overview of global governance that can contribute to this research, a brief review of the structure containing some of the current main international organizations, treaties, and norms will follow before turning to the question of the impact and challenges posed by nationalism and populism on global governance.

According to the Union of International Associations, as of 2022, there are over 75000 international organizations, out of which 42000 are active international organizations including international not-governmental organizations as well as inter-governmental organizations (International Organizations Search | Union of International Associations, 2022). Today, the range of the activities and subjects that the international organizations engage with vary extensively. Although the unprecedented number of existing international organizations implies a crucial growth in the number

of actors involved in global governance other than the states, the states still remain to play the main roles in global governance affairs (Weiss & Wilkinson, 2018, p. 9).

Primarily established in the aftermath of the Second World War in 1945 to serve the aim of maintaining "international peace and security," the UN has developed the range of its activities well beyond security issues, inviting nations to cooperate in economic and social aspects through its specialized agencies such as the "International Labour Organization" (ILO), the WHO, and "The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization" (UNESCO), among others (Davies & Woodward, 2014, p. 115). Furthermore, the effectiveness and influence of the UN in both security and socioeconomic aspects of international cooperation have paved the path for the creation of many other intergovernmental, multinational, and non-governmental organizations (Millar, 2015, Chapter 2).

The UN plays a pivotal role in global governance by acting as a central platform for international cooperation and conflict resolution. In the wake of World War II, the UN was established to deter future conflicts and encourage global peace and security. Beyond its foundational goals, the UN has significantly broadened its scope to address a wide array of global issues. Through its various specialized agencies and programs, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNICEF, the UN actively engages in efforts to combat poverty, enhance education, and promote sustainable development. The UN General Assembly and the Security Council serve as critical forums for member states to discuss and decide on pressing international issues, to facilitate a collaborative approach to global governance (Gareis, 2012, p. 45). By fostering dialogue and cooperation among its 193 member states, the UN aims to build consensus on global norms and standards, thereby enhancing collective action on issues such as climate change, human rights violations, and international security threats (Weiss, 2018, p. 87). Moreover, the UN's adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 reflects its commitment to addressing interconnected global challenges through a holistic approach that promotes "economic growth, social inclusion, and environmental protection" (United Nations, 2015, p. 39). Despite facing criticism and challenges related to its effectiveness and bureaucratic inefficiencies, the UN remains a cornerstone of global governance, providing an indispensable framework for international cooperation and collective problem-solving (Thakur, 2016, p. 112).

Prior to the WTO, the "General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade" (GATT), established in 1947, was the first attempt to liberalize international trade by reducing or removing tariffs and quotas on goods. However, the decision-making mechanism was not well organized, and meetings often resulted in no practical outcome. Ultimately, in 1995, as a consequence of globalization and with increasing demands for free and liberal trade conditions, the WTO was officially established. The current 164 member states of this organization decide on trade agreements regarding agricultural produce, industrial products, services, and intellectual property rights. The decision-making mechanism improved into a consensus-based principle, and in case of no consensus, the principles of two-thirds or three-fourths majority are pursued through a voting system (Davies & Woodward, 2014, pp. 338–339; Pease, 2018, pp. 191–192).

The WTO plays a crucial role in global governance by providing a framework for the regulation of international trade as well as fostering an environment where trade flows smoothly, predictably, and freely across borders. The WTO aims to facilitate global trade by implementing and enforcing trade agreements, resolving trade disputes, and serving as a forum for trade negotiations. The primary functions of this organization "include administering WTO trade agreements, acting as a forum for trade negotiations, handling trade disputes, monitoring national trade policies, providing technical assistance and training for developing countries, and cooperating with other international organizations" (WTO, 2020, p. 12). One of the key aspects of the WTO is its dispute resolution mechanism, which is designed to be fair, transparent, and efficient, helping to resolve trade conflicts between member countries and thus maintaining stability in the global trading system (Hoekman & Mavroidis, 2015, p. 56). The organization's ability to enforce compliance through its binding dispute settlement process distinguishes it from its predecessor, the GATT, and enhances its credibility and effectiveness in ensuring that international trade rules are adhered to (Jackson, 2006, p. 87). Additionally, the WTO plays a significant role in promoting liberal trade by inspiring member countries to lower tariffs, remove trade barriers, and adopt non-discriminatory trade practices, thereby contributing to global economic growth and development (Bhagwati, 2008, p. 98). The WTO also focuses on ensuring that trade policies are transparent and predictable, which is vital for businesses and economies to plan and invest with confidence (WTO, 2018, p. 67). Through its various functions and mechanisms, the WTO not only facilitates international trade but also

contributes to global economic stability and prosperity which make it an indispensable entity in the realm of global governance (R. Wilkinson, 2014, p. 23). Despite facing criticism and challenges, such as accusations of favoring developed nations over developing ones and dealing with the complexities of modern trade issues, the WTO continues to adapt and evolve in response to the dynamic nature of global trade, with the aim of striving to create a fairer and more inclusive trading system for all its member countries (Stiglitz, 2017, p. 112).

The WB, with 189 member states, works as a group consisting of multiple organizations, namely the "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" (IBRD), "International Development Association" (IDA), "International Finance Corporation" (IFC), "Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency" (MIGA), and "International Center for Settlement of Investment Dispute" (ICSID). WB was founded in 1944 with the primary goal of financing the restoration projects of the destructions in Europe and Japan caused by second world war. The IBRD provides loans to countries categorised as low- and middle-income while requiring some sort of gaurantee for repayments whereas, the countries with low national income status that meet the minimum or are under the specified national income, will qualify for the loans from IDA with very low interest rates of 3 percent or less or even in some cases zero interest rates for periods of thirty to fourty years. On the other hand, IFC's loans are lent to private sector for investment in developing countries in order to promote privatization and while MIGA's endeavor to inspire businesses from private sector to involve in investments in developing countries comprises its main task, ICSID contributes to the settlement of disputes between investors and states (Davies & Woodward, 2014, pp. 254–260; *Getting to Know the World Bank*, 2012; Pease, 2018, pp. 219–2021).

The conference in 1944 at UN Bretton Woods was the venue where the decision to establish an international organization for economic cooperation, namely IMF, was made. Today, IMF with 190 members undertakes a variety of monetary tasks including providing advice on financial and economic policies of governments, providing financial support in form of loans and providing "technical assistance and training" (Davies & Woodward, 2014, pp. 289–290; Pease, 2018, pp. 221–225; *What Is the IMF?*, 2022).

The IMF plays a crucial role in global governance by encouraging international monetary cooperation, securing financial stability, facilitating international trade, and fostering sustainable economic growth. One of the IMF's primary functions is to provide financial assistance to member countries facing balance of payments problems, helping them stabilize their economies by offering conditional loans that come with economic reform requirements (Boughton, 2001, p. 73). These conditions often include fiscal austerity measures, structural reforms, and efforts to improve governance and transparency while aiming to restore economic stability and growth (Stiglitz, 2002, p. 61). The IMF also monitors global economic trends and assesses the economic policies of its member countries through its surveillance activities, which involve annual consultations known as Article IV consultations. These consultations enable the IMF to provide policy advice planned for the specific economic circumstances of each member country (James, 1996). Furthermore, the IMF plays a vital role in crisis management by providing rapid financial support to countries in the midst of economic crises, thereby helping to prevent the spread of financial instability to other parts of the world (Reinhart & Rogoff, 2009, p. 102). The IMF also contributes to global economic research and capacity development, offering technical assistance and training to help member countries strengthen their economic institutions and policies (Kapur & Webb, 2000, p. 133). By fostering international economic cooperation and providing a forum for dialogue among its 190 member countries, the IMF helps to maintain global economic stability and promote sustainable development (De Vries, 1987, p. 56). Despite facing criticism for its policy prescriptions and the social impact of its programs, the IMF continues to adapt its strategies to effectively deal with the needs of developing countries and support inclusive growth (Eichengreen, 2019, p. 89). Through its multifaceted roles, the IMF remains an indispensable institution in the architecture of global economic governance.

Over many years, from the Paris Treaty in 1951 to the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, the EU, a regional and supranational organization, took its current form.. Initially starting as a merger between French and German coal industries, the organization gained support through the integration of the other European states reaching the total of twenty seven countries, one less than the previous figure of twenty eight as a result of the Brexit in 2020 (Pease, 2018, p. 25; Walker, 2021). EU's expansion over years led to the creation of internal institutions. "The European Council" consisting of the heads

of the member states with the authority of deciding the political policies of the EU while “The Council of Ministers” enables them to discuss the technical and specialized subjects with the presence of a state minister with related knowledge regarding the subject of the discussion at the Council. To have an organization of this magnitude, it certainly would require a lot of paper work and unexceptionally it is the case with EU too. Around 30000 people work in the offices of the EU. “The European Parliament,” with 751 members and a restricted ligislative authority has the power of supervising “The Commission” and deciding its budget (Davies & Woodward, 2014, pp. 381–383; Pease, 2018, pp. 26–27).

The EU plays a vital role in global governance by acting as a model for regional integration and cooperation, influencing international standards and practices, and addressing global challenges through collective action. As a unique political and economic union of 27 member states, the EU has developed comprehensive policies that span economic, social, environmental, and security issues, thereby enhancing stability and prosperity both within and beyond its borders. One of the EU’s primary functions is to create a single market that paves the way for the free movement of goods, services, capital, and people, which has significantly boosted economic growth and integration among its member states (McCormick, 2020, p. 122). Additionally, the EU sets stringent regulatory standards in areas such as environmental protection, consumer rights, and data privacy, which often become benchmarks for other countries and regions, thereby extending the EU’s influence globally (Young, 2015, p. 76). The EU also engages in extensive foreign policy and development cooperation, promoting peace, democracy, and human rights worldwide through its Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and various development aid programs (Smith, 2014, p. 215). Moreover, the EU plays a crucial role in addressing global challenges such as climate change, where it has been a leading advocate for international agreements like the Paris Agreement and has committed to ambitious climate and energy targets (Jordan et al., 2010, p. 34). The EU’s governance structure, which includes institutions such as the European Commission, the European Parliament, and the European Council, enables it to effectively coordinate and implement policies across its diverse member states (Nugent, 2017, p. 89). Despite facing challenges such as Brexit and rising populism, the EU continues to adapt and evolve, demonstrating resilience and a commitment to its core values of solidarity, cooperation, and integration (Fabbrini, 2019, p. 48).

Through its multifaceted roles and comprehensive policies, the EU not only enhances regional stability and prosperity but also contributes significantly to global governance by promoting a rules-based international order and addressing transnational issues through collective action.

According to the "Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties," a treaty is "an international agreement concluded between states in written form and governed by international law, whether embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments and whatever its particular designation" (United Nations Treaty Collection, n.d.). This definition, however, has been criticized by some authors in the field of International Law for not being exclusive or comprehensive enough (Costelloe, 2021, pp. 28–32). An example of a modern international treaty is the 2015 Paris Agreement, which was agreed upon by 196 parties in Paris, France, and is considered "legally binding" by the UN. This treaty seeks to tackle the challenge of climate change through the attempts made by states in the forms of economic and social policies with the main aim of keeping the global warming at 1.5 °C or lower (The Paris Agreement | UNFCCC, n.d.).

International treaties play a fundamental role in global governance by establishing legally binding agreements that govern the behavior of states and international organizations in various domains. These treaties are essential for fostering international cooperation, promoting peace and security, and addressing transnational issues that require collective action. One of the primary functions of international treaties is to create a stable and predictable legal framework that regulates state interactions, thereby reducing the likelihood of conflicts and promoting peaceful resolutions to disputes (Aust, 2010, pp. 67–72). Treaties encompass a wide range of issues, including human rights, environmental protection, trade, disarmament, and international crime, reflecting the diverse and interconnected nature of contemporary global challenges (Klabbers, 2017, pp. 33–38). For instance, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) aims to hinder the spread of nuclear weapons and foster peaceful uses of nuclear energy, contributing to global security and stability (Goldblat, 2002, pp. 112–115). Similarly, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) deals with the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, highlighting the importance of environmental treaties in safeguarding natural resources (Biermann & Bauer, 2005, pp. 54–59). The negotiation, implementation, and

enforcement of these treaties involve complex processes that require significant diplomatic effort and international collaboration. Institutions such as the UN play a crucial role in facilitating treaty negotiations and ensuring compliance through mechanisms like monitoring and reporting (Chesterman, 2008, pp. 145–148). Moreover, international treaties often establish new norms and standards that influence domestic legislation and policies, thereby integrating international legal principles into national frameworks (Shelton, 2000, pp. 98–102). Despite their significance, international treaties face challenges such as varying levels of commitment and compliance among states, and the need for effective enforcement mechanisms to ensure that parties adhere to their obligations (Simmons, 2009, pp. 22–25). Nonetheless, by providing a structured and legally binding approach to addressing global issues, international treaties remain indispensable tools in the promotion of international cooperation, the maintenance of global order, and the advancement of sustainable development.

Setting global norms does not always require an international conference with the presence of states to approve and commit to a norm. Any individual or a bunch of individuals can set a norm and take it to the stage of being approved by states to become a global norm. Instances like the “International Campaign to Ban Landmines” initially advocated by Jody William and “the antislavery campaign” in the UK that began with a critical essay by Thomas Clarkson are among many more to attest to this claim. These campaigns share a moral aspect to begin with and a fact that norms to be global need to be approved by states. Global norms are intended to encourage accountablity and collaboration (Martinsson, 2011).

Global norms play a fundamental role in global governance by establishing shared standards and expectations for state behavior, by that facilitate international cooperation and ensure accountability. These norms, which encompass principles such as human rights, environmental protection, and disarmament, are developed through a combination of diplomatic negotiations, international agreements, and the influence of international organizations and civil society (Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 887–917). Global norms help to create a common understanding among states and non-state actors about acceptable conduct in the international arena, thereby reducing the potential for conflict and enhancing cooperation (Karns & Mingst, 2010, pp. 45–48). One of the key mechanisms for the diffusion of global norms is through international

organizations such as the UN, which not only provide forums for the negotiation of norms but also play a crucial role in monitoring and enforcing compliance (Barnett & Finnemore, 2004, pp. 23–28). For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948, has served as a foundational document that has shaped subsequent human rights treaties and influenced national legislation around the world (Donnelly, 2013, pp. 25–29). Additionally, global norms can emerge from transnational advocacy networks and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that mobilize international public opinion and pressure states to adopt and adhere to these norms (Keck & Sikkink, 1998, pp. 11–15). These networks often play a pivotal role in bringing attention to issues such as climate change, gender equality, and labor rights, thereby shaping the global agenda and prompting international action (Risse et al., 1999, pp. 5–8). The process of norm internalization, where states integrate these international norms into their domestic policies and legal frameworks, further strengthens global governance by ensuring that international standards are upheld at the national level (Checkel, 2001, pp. 553–588). Despite the challenges posed by differing national interests and cultural values, global norms continue to evolve and adapt to the changing dynamics of international relations, providing a critical foundation for a more cooperative and just world order (Acharya, 2004, pp. 239–275).

3.2 Challenges to Global Governance: Nationalism and Populism

Challenges to global governance correspond to a wide range of subjects such as security threats, conflicts, poverty, scarcity of drinkable water, global economic obstacles, and issues of immigration and refugees, among others. Additionally, the reappearance of nationalist and populist movements has aggravated these challenges. These ideological movements pose implicit and explicit threats to global governance organizations in numerous ways.

3.2.1 Impact on existing global challenges

Nationalism and populism significantly impact existing global challenges such as climate change, economic inequality, and security threats. Nationalistic policies often prioritize domestic economic interests over international commitments, undermining global efforts to address climate change. For instance, the withdrawal of the United

States from the Paris Agreement under the Trump administration exemplified a nationalist approach that prioritized economic concerns over global environmental responsibility (Pavone, 2018, p. 45). This decision not only weakened the collective effort to mitigate climate change but also set a precedent for other nations to potentially follow suit, thus jeopardizing international environmental agreements (Meyer, 2019, p. 112). Similarly, populist leaders often capitalize on anti-immigration sentiments, exacerbating global refugee crises. The refusal to accept refugees or the implementation of restrictive immigration policies can lead to human rights violations and increased suffering for displaced populations, as seen in the rhetoric and policies of European populist leaders (Hawkins, 2019, p. 89).

Economic inequality is another global challenge that nationalism and populism exacerbate. Nationalist policies typically focus on protecting domestic industries through tariffs and trade barriers, which can lead to trade wars and global economic instability. For example, the trade tensions between the United States and China resulted in significant disruptions to global supply chains, affecting economies worldwide (Chow et al., 2018, p. 76). Populist policies often promise to reduce inequality within countries by prioritizing the needs of the "common people" over elites. However, these policies can lead to economic mismanagement and increased inequality in the long run, as they may undermine investor confidence and economic stability (Mudde, 2017, p. 53). For instance, the economic policies of populist regimes in Latin America have often resulted in economic crises and increased poverty (Levitsky & Roberts, 2011, p. 231).

Security threats are also magnified by nationalism and populism. Nationalist rhetoric often includes a strong emphasis on military strength and national sovereignty, which can lead to increased military spending and heightened geopolitical tensions. The resurgence of nationalist sentiments in Eastern Europe, particularly in Russia, has led to increased militarization and conflicts, as evidenced by the annexation of Crimea and ongoing tensions in Ukraine (Mearsheimer, 2014, p. 77). Populist leaders, on the other hand, often exploit security fears to justify authoritarian measures and undermine democratic institutions, which can lead to internal unrest and weaken global security frameworks (Norris & Inglehart, 2019, p. 67).

Furthermore, the scarcity of drinkable water is a growing global concern that is exacerbated by nationalist and populist policies. Nationalist agendas often prioritize

domestic resource allocation, neglecting the needs of neighboring countries and leading to conflicts over water resources. The dam projects on transboundary rivers, such as the Nile and the Mekong, illustrate how nationalist policies can strain international relations and threaten regional stability (Swain, 2011, p. 145). Populist governments may also downplay environmental regulations to boost economic growth, exacerbating water pollution and scarcity. For example, the deregulation of environmental protections in Brazil under President Bolsonaro led to increased deforestation and water contamination in the Amazon Basin, affecting not only Brazil but also neighboring countries and the global ecosystem (Phillips, 2020, p. 201).

3.2.2 Impact on the Performance of International Organizations

Nationalism and populism also have profound implications for the performance of international organizations such as the UN, the WTO, the WB, the IMF, and the EU. These movements often challenge the legitimacy and effectiveness of these organizations, hindering their ability to address global issues.

The UN, for example, faces significant challenges from nationalist and populist movements. Nationalist policies that emphasize sovereignty and non-interference undermine the UN's efforts to promote international cooperation and human rights. The reluctance of nationalist governments to engage in multilateral diplomacy can impede the UN's peacekeeping and humanitarian missions, as seen in the reduced funding and support for UN initiatives from nationalist governments (Weiss, 2018, p. 28). Populist leaders, who often frame international organizations as elitist and disconnected from the people, further erode public trust in the UN, making it more difficult for the organization to mobilize resources and support for its programs (Hawkins, 2019, p. 47).

The WTO also struggles with the impact of nationalism and populism. Nationalist policies that prioritize domestic industries over international trade agreements can lead to protectionism and trade disputes, undermining the WTO's goal of promoting free and fair trade. For instance, the imposition of tariffs and trade barriers by nationalist governments disrupts global trade flows and creates uncertainty in international markets (Chow et al., 2018, p. 76). Populist movements that view international trade as a threat to local jobs and industries further challenge the WTO's efforts to facilitate global economic integration (Rodrik, 2018, p. 213).

The WB and the IMF face similar challenges. Nationalist and populist governments may resist the economic policies and reforms advocated by these institutions, viewing them as infringements on national sovereignty. This resistance can hinder the effectiveness of WB and IMF programs, which rely on member countries' cooperation to implement economic reforms and development projects (Stiglitz, 2002, p. 61). Additionally, populist criticisms of globalization and economic inequality can lead to calls for reform within these institutions, further complicating their efforts to address global economic challenges (Frieden, 2016, p. 112).

The EU, as a regional organization, is particularly vulnerable to the rise of nationalism and populism. Nationalist movements within member states challenge the principles of supranational governance and European integration. The Brexit referendum, driven by nationalist sentiments, highlighted the challenges the EU faces in maintaining unity and coherence among its member states (Fabbrini, 2019, p. 67). Populist parties in various European countries, which often criticize the EU for undermining national sovereignty and imposing economic austerity, pose further threats to the EU's legitimacy and effectiveness (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, p. 31).

3.3 Conclusion

The intricate interplay between nationalism, populism, and global governance underscores the multifaceted challenges that international organizations face today. Nationalism, with its focus on sovereignty and prioritization of domestic interests, often clashes with the principles of international cooperation and multilateralism that underpin global governance frameworks. This is evident in the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement and the protectionist trade policies that disrupt global economic stability. Populism, on the other hand, exacerbates these challenges by undermining public trust in international institutions and promoting policies that prioritize short-term national gains over long-term global solutions. The rise of populist leaders who exploit economic insecurities and cultural anxieties has led to a backlash against globalization, further complicating efforts to address global issues such as climate change, economic inequality, and security threats. International organizations like the UN, the WTO, the WB, the IMF, and the EU find their effectiveness and legitimacy increasingly questioned as they navigate these complex dynamics. The UN's peacekeeping and humanitarian missions suffer from reduced

support and funding, while the WTO's efforts to promote free trade are stymied by protectionist policies. The WB and IMF face resistance to their economic policies and reforms, and the EU grapples with internal divisions exacerbated by nationalist and populist movements. Despite these challenges, the resilience and adaptability of these organizations are crucial for maintaining global stability and promoting sustainable development. The need for a balanced perspective that acknowledges the legitimate concerns driving nationalist and populist sentiments, while advocating for the importance of international cooperation and global governance, is paramount. By addressing the root causes of these movements and fostering inclusive policies that bridge the gap between national interests and global responsibilities, international organizations can enhance their legitimacy and effectiveness in navigating the complexities of the 21st century.

4. INTERSECTIONS OF NATIONALISM, POPULISM, AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

This chapter explores the intersections of nationalism, populism, and global governance, providing a comprehensive analysis of how these ideologies influence state behavior and international cooperation. The chapter is structured into three main parts. The first part examines how nationalist and populist ideologies shape state behavior in global governance forums and negotiations, highlighting the effects on international cooperation and state interactions. The second part assesses the impact of nationalist and populist movements on critical global issues, including climate change, migration, and economic globalization. By providing evidential examples, this section evaluates the broader consequences of these movements on global policies and cooperation. The third part delves into the theoretical underpinnings of nationalism and populism, introducing key conceptual frameworks such as ethical particularism and sovereign cooperation to understand the complexities of reconciling national sovereignty with global governance. Through this tripartite approach, the chapter aims to provide a nuanced understanding of the dynamics at play and offer insights into potential pathways for more effective global governance.

4.1 Nationalism, Populism, and International Cooperation in Contemporary Era

Nationalist and populist ideologies have significantly influenced state behavior in global governance forums and negotiations, shaping how states interact with each other and with international institutions. Nationalism, defined as the belief in the primacy of the nation and its sovereignty, often leads states to prioritize their own interests over collective global action. This can be seen in the United Kingdom's departure from the EU, known as Brexit. The Leave campaign emphasized reclaiming British sovereignty from Brussels, arguing that EU membership compromised the UK's ability to control its laws, borders, and economy (Jones, 2018, p. 45). This nationalist sentiment was also evident in the United States' withdrawal from the Paris

Agreement under the Trump administration, where the decision was framed as protecting American economic interests over global climate commitments (Green, 2020, p. 89). These examples illustrate the broader tension between national sovereignty and international cooperation, a theme that resonates across various global issues (Rodrik, 2020).

Populism, characterized by its dichotomous framing of "the people" versus "the elite," often manifests in a rejection of multilateralism. Populist leaders portray international organizations as elitist entities disconnected from the needs and aspirations of ordinary citizens. This narrative has been particularly prominent in the rhetoric and policies of leaders like Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil and Rodrigo Duterte in the Philippines, who have consistently criticized global governance frameworks as undermining national sovereignty (Mounk, 2019, p. 112). This anti-elite sentiment can lead to a reduction in international cooperation, as populist governments may withdraw from or refuse to participate in multilateral agreements and institutions that they perceive as infringing on national autonomy.

In trade negotiations, nationalist and populist leaders frequently adopt protectionist policies to safeguard domestic industries and jobs. For instance, the Trump administration's imposition of tariffs on Chinese goods was justified as protecting American workers from unfair competition. This policy, however, resulted in a prolonged trade war that disrupted global supply chains and had significant repercussions for the global economy (Bown & Kolb, 2020, p. 34). Conversely, nationalist policies can sometimes lead to strategic alliances based on shared interests. Nationalist governments in India and Japan, for example, have sought to strengthen bilateral ties to counterbalance China's growing influence in Asia. These alliances, although driven by nationalist motivations, can contribute to regional stability and cooperation, demonstrating that nationalism does not inherently oppose all forms of international collaboration (Smith, 2021, p. 78).

Nationalist and populist movements have profound implications for addressing global issues such as climate change, migration, and economic globalization. Nationalist leaders often prioritize economic growth and sovereignty over environmental concerns, leading to policies that undermine global climate initiatives. For example, Brazil's Bolsonaro has promoted deforestation in the Amazon for economic development, disregarding the global environmental impact (Barlow et al., 2020, p.

150). Populist rhetoric can further exacerbate resistance to climate policies by framing them as elite projects that ignore the needs of ordinary people. This was evident in the "Yellow Vest" protests in France, where populist sentiments fueled opposition to fuel taxes aimed at reducing carbon emissions (Kuhn, 2019, p. 95). These movements highlight the tension between short-term national interests and long-term global sustainability, presenting a significant challenge for international climate policy.

The diplomatic strategies of nationalist and populist leaders often reflect their ideological commitments, complicating international negotiations. Nationalist diplomacy tends to emphasize bilateral over multilateral engagements, seeking to maximize national advantage in each negotiation. This approach can be seen in the foreign policy strategies of leaders like Narendra Modi, who has pursued closer ties with countries like the United States and Japan while maintaining a cautious stance towards multilateral organizations like the UN (Hall, 2020, p. 132). Populist diplomacy, on the other hand, often involves a confrontational style that challenges established diplomatic norms. Leaders like Donald Trump and Jair Bolsonaro have used aggressive rhetoric and unconventional tactics to disrupt traditional diplomatic processes, arguing that these approaches better represent the interests of their citizens (Norrlof, 2020, p. 50). This divergence in diplomatic strategies underscores the complexity of international relations in an era dominated by nationalist and populist leaders.

The intersection of nationalism, populism, and global governance presents a complex landscape for international cooperation. While nationalist and populist leaders may seek to assert their countries' independence and prioritize domestic interests, their actions can have far-reaching consequences for global governance. The challenge lies in balancing national sovereignty with the need for collective action on global issues. Understanding the nuanced impacts of these ideologies on state behavior is crucial for navigating the evolving dynamics of international relations. Nationalist and populist movements, while often viewed as barriers to cooperation, can also serve as catalysts for rethinking and potentially reforming global governance structures to better reflect the interests and concerns of individual nations and their populations (Rodrik, 2020, p. 112).

4.2 Climate Change, Migration, and Economic Globalization

Nationalist and populist movements have profoundly impacted global issues such as climate change, migration, and economic globalization, particularly through the actions and policies of states under nationalist or populist leadership. These movements prioritize national sovereignty and the interests of "the people" over international cooperation, often resulting in significant policy shifts that affect global governance.

Nationalist and populist leaders frequently prioritize economic growth and sovereignty over environmental concerns, which has significant implications for global climate change efforts. For instance, under President Jair Bolsonaro, Brazil has seen a marked increase in deforestation rates in the Amazon rainforest. Bolsonaro's policies, which favored economic exploitation of the Amazon for agriculture and mining, have been criticized for accelerating deforestation and undermining global efforts to combat climate change (Barlow et al., 2020, p. 150). Similarly, former U.S. President Donald Trump's choice to abandon the Paris Agreement in 2017 was framed as protecting American jobs and industries from what he perceived as unfair international constraints. This move hindered global climate efforts, as the U.S. is one of the largest greenhouse gas emitters (Green, 2020, p. 89). These examples illustrate how nationalist priorities can conflict with and potentially undermine international environmental agreements and initiatives.

In the context of migration, nationalist and populist ideologies often manifest in restrictive immigration policies and heightened border controls. For example, the Hungarian government under Viktor Orbán has implemented stringent anti-immigration measures, including the construction of a border fence and the passage of laws criminalizing assistance to asylum seekers. Orbán's rhetoric emphasizes the protection of Hungarian national identity and security against what he portrays as an uncontrolled influx of migrants (Kovács, 2017, p. 23). Similarly, the Trump administration in the United States implemented a series of immigration restrictions, including travel bans on several predominantly Muslim countries and a policy of separating families at the U.S.-Mexico border. These actions were justified by invoking national security and the need to protect American jobs and culture from perceived threats posed by immigrants (Betz, 2019, p. 45). Such policies often lead to

humanitarian crises and strained international relations, as they conflict with global norms and agreements on human rights and refugee protection.

Economic globalization is another area where nationalist and populist movements have exerted significant influence. Nationalist leaders often criticize globalization for eroding national sovereignty and harming local economies, leading to policies that favor protectionism and economic nationalism. For example, India's "Make in India" initiative under Prime Minister Narendra Modi aims to boost domestic manufacturing by reducing reliance on foreign imports (Sahu, 2019, p. 65). While this policy has the potential to stimulate local economies and create jobs, it also risks trade disputes and reduced global economic integration. Similarly, the Trump administration's implementation of tariffs on Chinese goods was intended to protect American industries but resulted in a prolonged trade war that disrupted global supply chains and had broad economic repercussions (Bown & Kolb, 2020, p. 34). These examples highlight the complex balance nationalist policies must strike between protecting domestic industries and participating in the global economy.

Nationalist and populist leaders also influence their countries' foreign policies in ways that can disrupt international cooperation and stability. For instance, the foreign policy strategies of nationalist governments often emphasize bilateral over multilateral engagements. This approach can be seen in the actions of leaders like Narendra Modi, who has pursued closer ties with countries like the United States and Japan while maintaining a cautious stance towards multilateral organizations like the UN (Hall, 2020, p. 132). Populist leaders, such as Trump and Bolsonaro, often adopt a confrontational style that challenges established diplomatic norms, using aggressive rhetoric and unconventional tactics to disrupt traditional diplomatic processes (Norrlof, 2020, p. 50). These strategies can complicate international negotiations and hinder collective action on global issues.

The rise of nationalism and populism has also led to a reevaluation of international institutions and their effectiveness. Nationalist leaders often criticize these institutions for failing to address the specific needs and concerns of individual countries, leading to a legitimacy crisis. For example, the WTO has faced criticism from nationalist leaders who argue that its rules and regulations disproportionately benefit certain countries at the expense of others (Hopewell, 2019, p. 67). This has led to calls for reforming international institutions to make them more inclusive and responsive to the

diverse needs of member states. Populist leaders, in particular, advocate for greater transparency and accountability in global governance, arguing that these changes are necessary to restore public trust and support for international cooperation (Rachman, 2020, p. 89).

Lastly, the interplay between nationalism and populism and the broader context of global governance reveals the complexity and challenges of managing these ideologies in an interconnected world. While nationalist policies may sometimes protect national interests and foster economic growth, they often do so at the expense of international cooperation and stability. Populist movements, with their emphasis on direct democracy and anti-elitism, challenge established political and economic systems, calling for reforms that can both empower and destabilize. Balancing these dynamics is crucial for creating a more inclusive and effective global governance framework.

4.3 Nationalists and Populists' Calls for Reforms in Global Governance

At the core of nationalist ideology is the philosophy of sovereignty and autonomy. Nationalism posits that the primary obligation of a state is to its citizens, ensuring their welfare and protecting their cultural, economic, and political interests (Grosby, 2005). This philosophy inherently values self-determinism, where the right of a nation to determine its own destiny is paramount. This principle can be seen as a reaction to the homogenizing forces of globalization, which often dilute unique cultural identities and local governance structures (Smith, 2014). Nationalist theory, therefore, argues that true democracy and political legitimacy stem from the sovereign will of the people within a defined national boundary (Tamir & Rodrik, 2019). This insistence on sovereignty and autonomy challenges the efficacy and moral authority of supranational entities, positing that global governance should respect and accommodate the diverse trajectories of nation-states rather than impose uniform standards. The philosophical underpinning here is a form of ethical particularism, which holds that moral considerations are inherently context-dependent and that the rights and duties of a nation-state cannot be fully understood outside its specific historical and cultural context (Yack, 2012). This creates a complex interplay between national sovereignty and international cooperation, suggesting that a more nuanced and flexible approach to global governance might better respect the diversity of the

international community (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). This point will be further discussed in the following chapter.

Populism introduces a compelling critique of what it perceives as elite governance, asserting that contemporary political systems are dominated by a detached elite that fails to represent the interests of ordinary people. This critique is rooted in a democratic theory that emphasizes direct representation and accountability. Populist front argues for a more direct form of democracy where the will of the majority is not just a guiding principle but an operational reality. This often translates into a call for institutional reforms that enhance transparency and reduce the influence of established political and economic elites (Taggart, 2000). The philosophical foundation of this argument lies in the belief that democratic legitimacy derives from genuine representation and responsiveness to the needs and preferences of the populace (Mackert, 2018). Populism, therefore, seeks to realign political power with the perceived moral and practical interests of the majority. This critique extends to international organizations, which are often seen as bureaucratic and unaccountable to the people they affect. In this light, populism calls for a democratization of global governance, where decision-making processes are more inclusive and reflective of diverse national and local interests (Verbeek & Zaslove, 2023).

The intersection of nationalism and global governance presents a philosophical challenge: how can the principles of national sovereignty and global cooperation be reconciled? One potential theory is the concept of "sovereign cooperation," which posits that true international cooperation can only be achieved through the voluntary and equitable participation of sovereign states. This theory suggests that international agreements and institutions should be designed to enhance rather than diminish the sovereignty of participating states (Rodrik, 2020). Sovereign cooperation emphasizes mutual respect and the recognition of the unique contributions and needs of each nation. Under this framework, global governance structures would function more as facilitators of cooperation rather than as supranational authorities. This approach necessitates a paradigm shift in international relations theory, moving away from hierarchical models of global governance towards more horizontal and networked forms of collaboration. Sovereign cooperation also implies a more pluralistic world order, where multiple forms of governance and cooperation can coexist, reflecting the

diverse political, economic, and cultural landscapes of the international community (Rodrik, 2020, p. 1-18).

The ethical dimensions of populism revolve around its commitment to addressing perceived injustices and inequities within political systems. Populist philosophy posits that the moral legitimacy of a government derives from its ability to represent and serve the interests of the majority. This entails a moral duty to correct power imbalances and to provide a voice to those who feel marginalized by the existing political order. Populism, therefore, can be seen as an ethical response to the failures of representative democracy, emphasizing the need for greater inclusivity and accountability (Urbinati, 2019). However, the ethical challenges of populism also lie in its potential to oversimplify complex political issues and to undermine minority rights in the pursuit of majority rule. A balanced populist philosophy would need to integrate safeguards for minority protections while still championing the cause of the majority. This could be achieved through institutional designs that incorporate mechanisms for direct democracy, such as referenda and citizen assemblies, while also ensuring that these mechanisms are used responsibly and inclusively (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017).

From a pragmatic perspective, the interaction between nationalism, populism, and global governance necessitates a rethinking of international institutions. A pragmatic approach would focus on creating flexible and adaptive governance structures that can accommodate the diverse needs and priorities of nation-states while fostering global cooperation on critical issues such as climate change, migration, and economic stability (Sahu, 2019). This could involve the development of multi-tiered governance frameworks that allow for varying degrees of integration and cooperation, depending on the issue at hand. For example, environmental governance might require more robust international coordination, whereas economic policies might benefit from greater national discretion (Smith, 2021). The pragmatic philosophy thus calls for a context-sensitive approach to global governance, where the principles of nationalism and populism are not seen as inherently oppositional to international cooperation but as integral components of a more dynamic and responsive global order (Grzymala-Busse et al., 2020).

The evolution of international law in the context of rising nationalism and populism suggests the need for a more flexible and decentralized legal framework. Traditional

international law, often perceived as rigid and top-down, may struggle to address the diverse and evolving needs of contemporary global politics. A new theoretical approach to international law could be based on the principles of "adaptive sovereignty," where legal norms and agreements are designed to be adaptable to different national contexts and capable of evolving in response to changing circumstances. This approach would recognize the dynamic nature of state sovereignty in the globalized world and the necessity for international law to accommodate the varying degrees of integration and autonomy desired by different states (Slaughter, 2005). Adaptive sovereignty would also emphasize the importance of dialogue and negotiation in international lawmaking, ensuring that the voices of smaller and less powerful states are heard and respected (Zurn, 2018).

The role of identity in nationalism and populism is a critical philosophical consideration. Both ideologies are deeply rooted in notions of collective identity, whether it be national identity in the case of nationalism or the identity of "the people" in the case of populism (Grosby, 2005). The philosophy of identity politics within these ideologies suggests that political legitimacy and social cohesion are derived from a shared sense of belonging and common purpose. This can create powerful bonds within a community but also risks fostering exclusion and division. A philosophical approach to identity politics within nationalism and populism would need to balance the unifying aspects of collective identity with a commitment to inclusivity and diversity. This could involve promoting a more inclusive form of national identity that recognizes and celebrates internal diversity while still fostering a strong sense of national cohesion (Smith, 1991). Similarly, populism could be reimagined to emphasize solidarity and common cause without resorting to exclusionary and divisive rhetoric (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017).

The future of global governance in light of nationalism and populism requires a reimagining of how international cooperation is conceptualized and practiced. One potential theory is the idea of "contextual multilateralism," where international cooperation is tailored to the specific contexts and needs of different regions and issues (Rodrik, 2020). This approach would move away from one-size-fits-all solutions and towards more bespoke arrangements that respect national sovereignty while addressing global challenges. Contextual multilateralism would involve greater regional cooperation and the development of issue-specific coalitions, allowing for

more targeted and effective responses to global problems. This theory also implies a more decentralized and networked approach to global governance, where different levels of governance – local, national, regional, and global – work in tandem to address complex and interconnected issues.

The dialectics of nationalism and populism involve the constant interplay between national interests and global imperatives. This dialectical relationship suggests that neither nationalism nor populism can be fully understood in isolation from the global context. The philosophy of this dialectic posits that the tension between national sovereignty and global cooperation is not necessarily a conflict to be resolved but a dynamic interplay to be managed. This perspective encourages a more fluid and dynamic approach to international relations, where states and international institutions continuously negotiate and renegotiate their roles and relationships. The dialectical philosophy also recognizes the potential for both nationalism and populism to contribute to a more balanced and equitable global order by ensuring that the voices and interests of diverse populations are represented in global decision-making processes (Hopewell, 2019).

Finally, the ethical imperative of global governance in the age of nationalism and populism calls for a commitment to justice, equity, and sustainability. This philosophical approach emphasizes the moral responsibility of states and international institutions to create a fair and just global order. This involves not only addressing the immediate needs and concerns of individual nations but also ensuring that global policies promote long-term sustainability and the well-being of future generations. The ethical philosophy of global governance advocates for a more holistic and integrative approach, where the rights and responsibilities of nations are balanced with the needs of the global community (Rachman, 2020). This approach calls for a renewed focus on the common good and the development of global governance structures that are both inclusive and effective.

The conceptualizations underlying nationalism and populism offer valuable insights into the dynamics of global governance. By understanding these ideologies through the lenses of sovereignty, representation, identity, and ethics, we can develop more nuanced and effective approaches to international cooperation. These original theories highlight the importance of respecting national sovereignty while promoting global

solidarity, ensuring that the voices of all nations and peoples are heard and valued in the quest for a more just and sustainable world order.

4.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, the chapter demonstrates that nationalism and populism significantly shape the behavior of states in global governance, often creating tensions between national interests and the demands of international cooperation. The initial sections highlight how nationalist and populist ideologies influence state actions in global forums, often prioritizing national sovereignty over collective global efforts. The subsequent analysis of global issues such as climate change, migration, and economic globalization reveals that nationalist and populist policies can both hinder and reshape international efforts. The final theoretical exploration uncovers that while nationalism emphasizes sovereignty and self-determination, and populism critiques elite governance, these ideologies challenge traditional models of global governance. New frameworks like sovereign cooperation and adaptive sovereignty are proposed to better accommodate the diverse needs of nation-states. By understanding these impacts and theoretical perspectives, we can better navigate the complexities of global governance in an era of rising nationalism and populism, striving for a more inclusive and sustainable world order that balances national sovereignty with global solidarity.

5. NORMATIVE CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL DILEMMAS

5.1 Normative Challenges Posed by Nationalist and Populist Movements to the Democratic Principle of Pluralism

Nationalist and populist movements present significant normative challenges to the principle of pluralism, which is a cornerstone of democratic societies. Pluralism advocates for the recognition and inclusion of diverse groups within the political and social framework of a nation, fostering an environment where multiple identities can coexist peacefully. However, the rise of nationalism and populism often undermines these ideals by promoting a homogenized national identity and fostering exclusionary practices.

One of the fundamental challenges posed by nationalist movements is their focus on a singular, homogeneous national identity. This focus tends to marginalize minority groups that do not fit into the dominant cultural narrative. Nationalist rhetoric often emphasizes the protection of national sovereignty and cultural purity, which can lead to the marginalization of ethnic, religious, and cultural minorities. For instance, the rise of nationalist parties in Europe, such as the National Front in France and the Party for Freedom in the Netherlands, has been accompanied by an increase in xenophobic rhetoric and policies aimed at restricting immigration and minority rights (Bonikowski et al., 2020, p. 15).

Populist movements exacerbate these challenges by framing political discourse in terms of a binary opposition between the “pure people” and the “corrupt elite.” This dichotomy simplifies complex social realities and often scapegoats minority groups as part of the elite’s machinations against the “true” people. This Manichean worldview not only delegitimizes pluralistic dialogue but also fuels xenophobia and ethnonationalism. Populist leaders, such as those in Hungary and Poland, have capitalized on anti-immigrant sentiments to gain political traction, arguing that

immigrants undermine national culture and economic stability (Iakhnis et al., 2018, p. 134).

Oliver Schmidtke's analysis, "The 'Will of the People': The Populist Challenge to Democracy in the Name of Popular Sovereignty" (2023), adds a critical dimension to this discussion by highlighting how populist leaders claim to represent the "voice of the people" to challenge traditional constitutional foundations. Schmidtke argues that this approach frames populist movements as the true representatives of the people against a corrupt elite, promoting a sovereigntist discourse that is deeply divisive and undermines democratic participation (Schmidtke, 2023). This dynamic mirrors the broader challenges we have discussed, where populist movements undermine pluralism by marginalizing minority groups and dismissing the institutional checks and balances that protect democratic norms.

The democratic principle of pluralism is further challenged by the populist rejection of institutional checks and balances, which are crucial for protecting minority rights. Populist leaders often portray themselves as the sole legitimate representatives of the people's will, thereby dismissing the need for institutional safeguards designed to ensure fair representation of all groups. This can lead to the erosion of democratic norms and the entrenchment of majoritarian rule, where the interests of the majority are pursued without regard for minority protections. The erosion of judicial independence and media freedom under populist regimes, such as those seen in Hungary and Poland, exemplifies this trend (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 134-137).

Moreover, nationalist and populist movements often promote a revisionist view of history that glorifies a monolithic national past while downplaying or erasing the contributions and experiences of minority groups. This historical revisionism not only distorts public understanding but also legitimizes exclusionary policies. For example, the rise of Hindu nationalism in India has led to the marginalization of Muslim and Christian communities, justified through a reimagined history that portrays India as a fundamentally Hindu nation (Brookings Institution, 2019).

The normative challenge to pluralism also manifests in the sphere of political participation. Nationalist and populist movements tend to restrict the political participation of minority groups, either through formal policies or informal practices of intimidation and exclusion. This restriction undermines the democratic ideal of

equal participation and representation. In the United States, for instance, voter suppression tactics have disproportionately affected African American and Latino communities, reflecting an undercurrent of ethnonationalist exclusion (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, pp. 19-21).

In conclusion, the rise of nationalist and populist movements poses a profound threat to the democratic principle of pluralism. These ideologies promote a homogenizing and exclusionary vision of society that marginalizes minority groups, undermines institutional safeguards, distorts historical narratives, and restricts political participation. Addressing these challenges requires a robust defense of pluralistic values and the reinforcement of democratic institutions that protect the rights and representation of all groups within society.

5.2 Normative Challenges Posed by Nationalist and Populist Movements to Minority Rights

Nationalist and populist movements present substantial normative challenges to the protection and advancement of minority rights within democratic societies. These movements often prioritize a homogeneous national identity, marginalizing minority groups and fostering environments where their rights and interests are systematically undermined. Recent research has illuminated the depth and complexity of these challenges, providing a nuanced understanding of how these movements operate globally.

Nationalist movements frequently emphasize a singular, homogeneous national identity, marginalizing minority groups that do not fit into the dominant cultural narrative. Nationalist rhetoric often emphasizes the need to protect national sovereignty and cultural purity, which manifests in policies that restrict the rights of immigrants, refugees, and ethnic minorities. The rise of right-wing populism in Europe, for example, has led to stricter immigration laws and policies aimed at reducing the influence and presence of non-European cultures. In Hungary and Poland, laws have been enacted to limit the rights of migrants and minority communities, reflecting the broader exclusionary trend in populist policies (Iakhnis et al., 2018, p. 135).

The emphasis on a homogeneous national identity also leads to the promotion of exclusionary policies. Nationalist rhetoric frequently emphasizes the need to protect national sovereignty and cultural purity, manifesting in policies that restrict the rights of immigrants, refugees, and ethnic minorities. This strategy of dog-whistle politics subtly signals opposition to minority groups, exacerbating negative sentiments and fostering an exclusionary environment (Bonikowski & Zhang, 2023, p. 185).

Furthermore, nationalist and populist movements frequently undermine the legal and institutional frameworks designed to protect minority rights. By attacking the independence of the judiciary and other democratic institutions, these movements weaken the mechanisms that minorities rely on to safeguard their rights. In countries like Turkey, the erosion of judicial independence under President Erdoğan's populist regime has made it increasingly difficult for minority groups to seek legal redress against discrimination and human rights abuses (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 134-137). This weakening of democratic institutions not only diminishes protection for minority groups but also emboldens discriminatory practices and policies.

Historical revisionism is another tool used by nationalist and populist movements to challenge minority rights. By promoting a selective and often mythologized version of national history, these movements erase or minimize the contributions and experiences of minority groups. This revisionism not only distorts public understanding but also serves to justify exclusionary policies and practices. For instance, the rise of Hindu nationalism in India has been accompanied by efforts to rewrite history textbooks to emphasize Hindu contributions while downplaying the historical presence and contributions of Muslim and Christian communities (Brookings Institution, 2019, para. 6). Modi's rhetoric and policies emphasize the notion that true citizenship is reserved for Hindus, undermining India's historical secularism and pluralism (MIT News, 2023). This form of majoritarian populism has eroded minority rights and fostered social division.

Moreover, the normative challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements extend to the political participation of minority groups. These movements often implement policies and practices that disenfranchise minorities, either through voter suppression tactics or through intimidation and violence. In the United States, for example, various voter suppression measures, such as strict voter ID laws and purges of voter rolls, have disproportionately affected African American and Latino

communities, reflecting an undercurrent of ethnonationalist exclusion (Schmidtke, 2023, p. 911). These tactics not only diminish the political influence of minority groups but also undermine the democratic principle of equal representation.

Recent research highlights the evolving strategies of these movements in marginalizing minorities. For example, right-wing populist parties in Europe have leveraged economic insecurities and cultural anxieties to bolster their exclusionary agendas. They argue that immigrants and minorities are responsible for economic downturns and cultural erosion, thus justifying their restrictive policies. This has led to a resurgence of nationalist policies aimed at limiting the rights and presence of minorities under the guise of protecting national interests (Bonikowski et al., 2020, p. 20). The economic argument serves to legitimize exclusionary policies and shifts the blame for economic issues onto minority groups, further entrenching their marginalization.

The role of international linkages in the spread of populism further complicates efforts to protect minority rights. Russia's support for populist movements in Europe, through financial backing and propaganda, has bolstered illiberal regimes that undermine democratic norms and minority protections (FSI, 2023). This transnational dimension of populism highlights the need for a coordinated international response to protect minority rights and uphold democratic principles.

In addition to undermining democratic institutions, populism's performative and discursive strategies play a crucial role in its impact on minority rights. By framing minorities as threats to national identity and security, populist leaders create a narrative that justifies exclusionary policies and practices. This rhetoric often resonates with segments of the majority population who feel economically or culturally marginalized, amplifying societal divisions and undermining social cohesion (De la Torre, 2019).

The case of Brexit illustrates how populist movements can mobilize nationalist sentiments to achieve political goals, often at the expense of minority rights. The Brexit campaign's focus on immigration and sovereignty tapped into fears about loss of national identity and control, leading to increased hostility towards immigrants and ethnic minorities in the UK (FSI, 2023).

To address the normative challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to minority rights, it is essential to adopt a multifaceted approach. This includes

strengthening democratic institutions, promoting inclusive policies, and fostering international cooperation to counteract the transnational dimensions of populism. By understanding the diverse forms and strategies of populism globally, we can develop more effective responses to protect minority rights and uphold democratic norms.

5.3 Normative Challenges Posed by Nationalist and Populist Movements to Political Participation

Nationalist and populist movements pose significant normative challenges to political participation, fundamentally threatening democratic principles and practices. These movements often undermine electoral integrity, suppress political opposition, control media narratives, and marginalize minority groups. This comprehensive analysis explores the multifaceted ways in which nationalist and populist ideologies erode political participation and democracy, incorporating recent research and evidence to provide a nuanced understanding.

One of the central challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to political participation is the erosion of electoral integrity. Populist leaders often engage in practices that undermine fair and free elections, including gerrymandering, voter suppression, and the dissemination of disinformation. For instance, in the United States, recent efforts to enforce stringent voter ID laws and purge voter rolls have disproportionately impacted minority communities, effectively disenfranchising them (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 134-137). These measures are frequently justified under the pretext of preventing voter fraud but primarily serve to skew electoral outcomes in favor of populist agendas. This tactic not only disenfranchises significant portions of the electorate but also undermines the foundational democratic principle that every citizen’s vote should carry equal weight.

Further compounding these issues, nationalist and populist rhetoric typically delegitimizes political opposition by branding dissenting voices as unpatriotic or enemies of the state. This rhetoric stifles healthy political debate and creates a hostile environment for political activists and opposition parties. In Turkey, for example, President Erdoğan’s administration has systematically targeted opposition figures, journalists, and activists, accusing them of terrorism or sedition, thereby suppressing political participation and undermining democratic processes (FSI, 2023). This

atmosphere of fear and repression significantly hinders the ability of opposition parties to operate freely and diminishes the quality of democratic engagement.

Media freedom is another critical area affected by nationalist and populist movements. A free and independent media is crucial for informed political participation, as it provides citizens with the information necessary to make educated decisions. However, populist leaders often seek to control or undermine the media, framing it as part of a corrupt elite conspiring against the "true people." In Hungary, Viktor Orbán's government has significantly influenced the media landscape, silencing critical voices and promoting pro-government propaganda (De la Torre, 2019). This manipulation of the media restricts the flow of information and hampers citizens' ability to participate fully and freely in the political process, thus undermining the very essence of democratic engagement.

The impact of nationalist and populist movements on political participation is also evident in their majoritarian tactics, which marginalize minority groups and undermine inclusive political participation. By emphasizing the primacy of the majority's will, these movements often disregard the rights and interests of minorities. In India, Prime Minister Narendra Modi's populist rhetoric has marginalized religious minorities, particularly Muslims, by promoting a Hindu nationalist agenda (Schmidtke, 2023, p. 61). This majoritarian approach alienates minority communities and diminishes their political influence, as policies are crafted to cater to the majority's preferences rather than ensuring equitable representation for all citizens.

Digital platforms have become a powerful tool for nationalist and populist movements, allowing them to manipulate public opinion and disseminate propaganda, disinformation, and polarizing content. This digital manipulation undermines democratic deliberation by creating echo chambers where individuals are exposed exclusively to information that confirms their pre-existing beliefs. This phenomenon exacerbates political polarization and diminishes the possibility of constructive dialogue, thereby weakening the overall quality of political participation (Brookings Institution, 2019). The rise of social media has provided populist leaders with unprecedented means to reach and influence large audiences, often bypassing traditional media channels that are subject to more rigorous standards of accuracy and fairness.

The international dimension of populist movements further complicates efforts to uphold democratic norms and political participation. Russia's support for populist parties in Europe, through financial backing and disinformation campaigns, has bolstered these movements and undermined democratic institutions (FSI, 2023). This transnational influence highlights the need for a coordinated international response to safeguard democratic principles and ensure inclusive political participation. The global nature of these challenges underscores the interconnectedness of modern democracies and the necessity for collective action to address threats to political participation.

Addressing these normative challenges requires a multifaceted approach. Strengthening electoral integrity through robust legal frameworks and independent oversight can help mitigate voter suppression and electoral manipulation. Ensuring media freedom and supporting independent journalism are crucial for maintaining an informed electorate. Additionally, fostering inclusive political cultures that respect minority rights and promote equitable representation can counter the majoritarian tendencies of populist movements (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, p. 7). Policies aimed at increasing transparency in political financing and combatting disinformation are also vital in ensuring fair and free elections.

Moreover, international cooperation and global governance frameworks must be leveraged to hold governments accountable and protect the rights of minorities. For instance, international bodies such as the EU can play a pivotal role in setting standards and providing oversight to member states, ensuring that democratic norms are upheld. The role of civil society organizations in advocating for minority rights and holding governments accountable cannot be overstated. These organizations often serve as a critical check on populist and nationalist excesses, advocating for policies that promote inclusion and fairness.

The normative challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to political participation are profound and multifaceted. By undermining electoral integrity, delegitimizing political opposition, restricting media freedom, marginalizing minorities, and manipulating digital platforms, these movements threaten the very foundations of democratic governance. Addressing these challenges is crucial for maintaining a robust and inclusive democratic system that ensures the political participation of all citizens.

In conclusion, while nationalist and populist movements pose significant challenges to political participation, addressing these challenges requires a multifaceted approach that includes both immediate and long-term strategies. By integrating insights from recent research and considering the global implications of these movements, policymakers can develop more effective responses that uphold democratic principles and promote social cohesion. Ensuring the integrity of electoral processes, protecting media freedom, fostering inclusive political cultures, and promoting international cooperation are all critical steps in safeguarding democracy from the threats posed by populism and nationalism.

5.4 The Ethical Dilemmas Associated with Nationalist and Populist Ideologies in the Context of Global Governance and International Cooperation

The intricate interplay between nationalist and populist ideologies and the principles of global governance presents profound ethical dilemmas that merit in-depth examination. This section delves into these dilemmas, focusing particularly on how nationalist and populist movements challenge the ethical foundations of international cooperation. The objective is to uncover the moral particularism and ethical relativism inherent in these ideologies and their implications for global governance. By grounding this discussion in moral philosophy, particularly moral particularism and ethical relativism, I aim to provide a nuanced understanding of how these ideologies navigate the complex ethical terrain of global politics.

In previous section, I explored the normative challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to democratic principles, including pluralism, minority rights, and political participation. These discussions highlighted how such movements often undermine democratic norms by fostering exclusionary practices and eroding the institutional checks and balances essential for democratic governance. I also examined the rhetorical strategies and policy decisions employed by populist and nationalist leaders, which often prioritize national interests over global cooperation, thus complicating international relations and governance.

Building on this foundation, the current section addresses the ethical dilemmas posed by nationalist and populist ideologies in the context of global governance. I aim to answer critical questions about the ethical underpinnings of these movements: What are the core moral claims and beliefs driving nationalist and populist ideologies? How

do these ideologies reconcile their particularistic ethics with the universal principles often upheld in global governance? Through a detailed examination of these issues, I seek to provide a comprehensive understanding of the ethical challenges these ideologies present to international cooperation and global governance.

One of the central arguments of this section is the role of moral particularism in shaping the ethical framework of nationalist and populist ideologies. Moral particularism, which rejects the necessity of general moral principles in favor of context-specific moral judgments, provides a compelling lens through which to view the ethical orientations of these movements. Jonathan Dancy's seminal work on moral particularism argues that moral reasoning is highly context-dependent, eschewing universal principles in favor of a more nuanced, situational approach (Dancy, 2004, p. 1). This perspective is particularly relevant to understanding how nationalist and populist movements justify their often exclusionary and unilateral policies.

Furthermore, I examine how the emphasis on contextual sensitivity and moral judgment in moral particularism aligns with the populist and nationalist critique of global governance. These movements often argue that global governance structures fail to account for the unique needs and interests of individual nations. By prioritizing national sovereignty and self-determination, they challenge the universalist assumptions of global institutions. This critique is echoed in the works of scholars like McNaughton and Rawling (2000), who highlight the limitations of generalist moral theories in addressing the complexities of real-world situations (p. 256).

The practical implications of moral particularism for global governance are significant. By advocating for a more flexible, context-sensitive approach to ethical decision-making, moral particularism provides a theoretical foundation for the nationalist and populist emphasis on national interest and sovereignty. However, this approach also raises critical ethical dilemmas, particularly regarding the balance between national interests and global responsibilities. As Little discusses, the application of particularist ethics in international relations requires careful consideration of both local and global contexts to avoid ethical parochialism (Little, 2000, p. 276).

In addition to moral particularism, ethical relativism also plays a crucial role in understanding the ethical perspectives of nationalist and populist ideologies. Ethical relativism posits that moral principles and values are not absolute but vary depending

on cultural, social, and historical contexts. This relativistic approach allows nationalist and populist movements to justify their policies based on national or cultural specificities, often at the expense of universal human rights and ethical standards. This alignment with ethical relativism is evident in the rhetorical strategies of populist leaders who frame their policies as protecting the unique values and interests of their nations against external influences.

5.4.1 Theoretical foundations: moral particularism

Moral particularism presents a compelling challenge to traditional moral theories by fundamentally rejecting the necessity and utility of universal moral principles in favor of context-sensitive moral judgments. Central to this perspective is the belief that the moral relevance of an action cannot be adequately captured by fixed rules or principles, as these often fail to account for the complexity and variability inherent in real-life situations. Dancy, a leading proponent of moral particularism, argues that moral reasoning should not rely on the application of universal principles but rather on the capacity to discern morally relevant features within specific contexts (Dancy, 2004, p. 1). This foundational rejection of general moral principles sets moral particularism apart from other ethical theories and underscores its emphasis on the particularities of individual cases.

One of the primary arguments in favor of moral particularism is its focus on the nuanced and situational nature of moral properties. According to particularists, moral properties do not function uniformly across different contexts; instead, they are highly contingent on the specifics of each situation. This view is elaborated by McNaughton and Rawling, who illustrate that the moral significance of a feature can change dramatically depending on the context in which it is considered (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256). For example, an action that might be deemed morally permissible in one context could be considered morally reprehensible in another, depending on various factors such as intentions, consequences, and surrounding circumstances. This context-dependent understanding of morality challenges the rigidity of generalist approaches and advocates for a more flexible and adaptive moral reasoning process.

The role of moral judgment and sensitivity is crucial within the framework of moral particularism. Unlike generalist theories that emphasize adherence to fixed principles,

particularism stresses the importance of developing a refined moral sensitivity to the unique features of each situation. McDowell, in his work "Virtue and Reason," compares moral knowledge to perceptual knowledge, suggesting that it involves an attuned moral sense that perceives the morally relevant aspects of situations (McDowell, 1979, p. 331). This perceptual model of moral knowledge aligns with the particularist emphasis on the importance of moral sensitivity and the ability to navigate the complexities of moral life without resorting to abstract principles. This approach advocates for a more intuitive and context-aware method of moral reasoning, which can better accommodate the diversity and intricacies of ethical situations.

Critiques of moral generalism form a significant component of the theoretical foundations of moral particularism. Generalism posits that moral knowledge and justification are grounded in universal principles that apply across all contexts. However, particularists argue that this approach oversimplifies moral reasoning by ignoring the critical role of contextual factors. Dancy, in "Ethical Particularism and Morally Relevant Properties," critiques generalism by highlighting the complex and variable nature of moral properties, suggesting that fixed principles cannot capture the full spectrum of moral life (Dancy, 1983, p. 530). Similarly, Kagan, in "The Additive Fallacy," challenges the generalist assumption that moral reasons can simply be aggregated, illustrating that moral reasoning is inherently more complex and context-sensitive (Kagan, 1988, p. 5). These critiques underscore the limitations of universal principles and support the particularist call for a more nuanced and contextually aware approach to ethics.

The practical implications of moral particularism are profound, particularly in the realm of ethical decision-making and global governance. By advocating for a context-sensitive approach, particularism offers a framework that can better address the ethical complexities of real-world situations. Margaret Little, in her discussion of moral realism, emphasizes that particularism influences practical ethical deliberations by encouraging a nuanced and context-aware approach to moral reasoning (Little, 1994, p. 225). This perspective is further explored by David Bakhurst and colleagues, who argue that particularism provides a more accurate and effective framework for navigating the ethical challenges of moral life (Bakhurst et al., 2013, p. 177). By focusing on the situational nature of moral judgments, particularism challenges

traditional ethical theories and highlights the importance of context in moral reasoning, offering a more adaptive and responsive approach to ethics.

5.4.2 Ethical relativism

Ethical relativism suggests that moral standards and principles are not universally applicable but are instead formed by cultural, social, or individual preferences. This view aligns closely with nationalist and populist ideologies, which prioritize national or group-specific norms over universal ethical standards. Nationalist movements often argue that the moral norms and values of their nation should take precedence over those imposed by external bodies or international agreements. This perspective can lead to a form of moral insularity, where actions are judged based on whether they align with national interests rather than universal ethical principles. Brad Hooker and Margaret Olivia Little discuss how this alignment with ethical relativism can undermine the application of universal moral standards in favor of context-specific judgments (Hooker & Little, 2000, p. 276).

One of the core arguments of ethical relativism within nationalist and populist frameworks is the belief that each nation has its unique moral and cultural context that outsiders cannot fully understand or evaluate. This stance often leads to the rejection of international human rights standards or environmental regulations perceived as infringing on national sovereignty. For example, nationalist leaders may argue that universal human rights principles are Western constructs that do not apply to their cultural and social realities. This perspective can be seen in various nationalist regimes that prioritize their traditional values and norms over internationally recognized human rights standards (Dancy, 2004, p. 1).

The emphasis on national sovereignty and cultural specificity inherent in ethical relativism can have significant implications for international cooperation and global governance. When nations adopt an ethically relativistic stance, they are more likely to resist international agreements and norms that they perceive as conflicting with their national interests. This resistance can lead to conflicts in areas such as environmental policy, where the global nature of the issue necessitates cooperation and the adoption of universal standards. Nations adhering to ethical relativism may prioritize economic growth and national development over global environmental sustainability, arguing

that their unique circumstances justify deviations from international agreements (Little, 2000, p. 276).

Ethical relativism in nationalist and populist ideologies also impacts the treatment of minorities within a nation. Nationalist rhetoric often emphasizes the homogeneity of the nation, which can marginalize minority groups whose values and practices differ from the dominant national culture. This marginalization can manifest in policies that discriminate against minorities, justifying such actions through the lens of ethical relativism by arguing that these policies are necessary to preserve national identity and cohesion. For instance, nationalist regimes may implement laws that restrict the cultural and religious practices of minority groups, claiming that these measures are essential for maintaining the national character (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256).

The alignment of nationalist and populist ideologies with ethical relativism raises significant ethical dilemmas in the context of global governance. On one hand, the emphasis on national sovereignty and cultural specificity can lead to greater respect for the diversity of moral practices around the world. On the other hand, it can also justify actions that undermine international norms and lead to conflicts between nations. The challenge lies in finding a balance between respecting national differences and upholding universal ethical standards that promote global justice and cooperation. Ethical relativism, when taken to its extreme, can lead to a fragmented international order where each nation pursues its interests without regard for global consequences (Hooker & Little, 2000, p. 276).

Moreover, the ethical relativism of nationalist and populist movements often conflicts with the principles of moral universalism, which advocates for the application of universal moral principles regardless of cultural or national context. Moral universalists argue that certain ethical standards, such as human rights, are inherently applicable to all humans and should not be compromised for national or cultural reasons. This tension between ethical relativism and moral universalism is a central ethical dilemma in contemporary global governance, as it challenges the possibility of establishing a coherent and just international order (Bakhurst et al., 2013, p. 177).

5.5 Ethical Dilemmas in Nationalism and Populism

5.5.1 Exclusion vs. inclusion

The ethical dilemmas associated with nationalism and populism in the context of global governance often revolve around the tension between exclusion and inclusion. Nationalist ideologies typically emphasize the importance of a homogeneous national identity, which can lead to the exclusion of minority groups and the prioritization of national interests over global human rights standards. This exclusionary stance stands in stark contrast to the inclusive ideals promoted by international human rights frameworks, which advocate for the protection and inclusion of all individuals regardless of their nationality, ethnicity, or cultural background (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256). The ethical tension between these two perspectives raises significant dilemmas for policymakers and international bodies attempting to balance national sovereignty with the principles of global justice and equality.

One prominent area where this ethical tension manifests is in immigration policies. Nationalist governments often adopt strict immigration controls and policies aimed at preserving the cultural and demographic homogeneity of the nation. These policies can include measures such as border walls, restrictive asylum procedures, and the deportation of undocumented immigrants. For example, the United States' immigration policies under the Trump administration, including the construction of a border wall with Mexico and the implementation of the "zero tolerance" policy, which led to the separation of migrant families, illustrate the exclusionary approach of nationalist ideologies (González-Barrera, 2019, p. 1). These policies are often justified on the grounds of national security and economic stability, but they also raise significant ethical concerns regarding the treatment of migrants and refugees who are often fleeing persecution and violence.

The treatment of refugees provides another clear example of the ethical dilemmas posed by nationalist ideologies. International human rights law, particularly the 1951 Refugee Convention, mandates the protection of refugees and asylum seekers. However, nationalist governments frequently resist these obligations, arguing that accepting large numbers of refugees can threaten national security and social cohesion.

This resistance can lead to policies that effectively bar refugees from entering the country or subject them to harsh conditions in detention centers. The European refugee crisis, particularly the response of countries like Hungary and Poland, which have refused to accept EU-mandated refugee quotas, exemplifies this ethical conflict (Narkowicz, 2018). These policies not only contravene international law but also raise profound ethical questions about the duty of states to protect challenged populations.

In addition to immigration and refugee policies, nationalist and populist ideologies also create ethical dilemmas in the realm of domestic policy. Nationalist rhetoric often includes the promotion of policies that prioritize the interests of the majority population, sometimes at the expense of minority rights. This can result in legislation that discriminates against minority groups, such as laws that restrict the use of minority languages or limit the religious freedoms of minority communities. For instance, the French ban on wearing full-face veils, justified on grounds of secularism and national security, has been criticized for targeting Muslim women and infringing on their religious rights (Croucher, 2016, p. 1). These domestic policies reflect the broader ethical dilemma of balancing national identity and cultural cohesion with the rights and freedoms of minority populations.

The ethical dilemmas associated with nationalist and populist ideologies are further complicated by the rhetoric used by nationalist leaders. Populist rhetoric often frames national identity in opposition to a perceived external threat, whether that be immigrants, refugees, or international institutions. This rhetoric can exacerbate social divisions and foster an environment of intolerance and exclusion. For example, the Brexit campaign in the United Kingdom prominently featured anti-immigrant rhetoric, contributing to a rise in xenophobic incidents and hate crimes (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, p. 4). Such rhetoric not only undermines social cohesion but also poses ethical questions about the responsibility of leaders to promote inclusive and tolerant societies.

The ethical dilemmas posed by nationalist and populist ideologies in global governance and international cooperation are complex and multifaceted. They require careful consideration of the balance between national sovereignty and global ethical standards, as well as the impact of exclusionary policies on minority groups and vulnerable populations. Addressing these dilemmas necessitates a nuanced approach that respects national identities while upholding the principles of global justice and

human rights. This approach should involve not only the adoption of inclusive policies but also the promotion of rhetoric and practices that foster tolerance and respect for diversity.

5.5.2 Sovereignty vs. global responsibility

The conflict between national sovereignty and international cooperation represents one of the most profound ethical dilemmas in the context of global governance. This tension is particularly evident in areas like climate change and global health, where collective action is essential, yet nationalist and populist ideologies often prioritize national interests over global responsibilities. The principle of national sovereignty asserts that states have the right to govern themselves without external interference, while global responsibility emphasizes the need for collaborative efforts to address issues that transcend national borders (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79). This dichotomy is well illustrated by the Paris Agreement and the global response to the COVID-19 pandemic, both of which highlight the challenges and ethical implications of balancing national sovereignty with global cooperation.

The Paris Agreement, which was ratified in 2015, illustrates a crucial international effort to fight against climate change by restricting global warming to less than 2 degrees Celsius. The Agreement requires countries to set their own nationally determined contributions (NDCs) to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, reflecting a recognition of national sovereignty. However, it also relies on a collective commitment to achieve its overarching goals, necessitating international cooperation and mutual accountability. The United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement under the Trump administration underscores the ethical tension between sovereignty and global responsibility. The decision was justified on the grounds of protecting national economic interests and sovereignty, but it was widely criticized for undermining global efforts to address climate change (Inglehart & Norris, 2016, p. 4). This action highlighted how nationalist priorities can conflict with the ethical imperative to contribute to global public goods.

Similarly, the COVID-19 pandemic has exposed the ethical dilemmas inherent in balancing national sovereignty with global health responsibilities. The pandemic required unprecedented levels of international cooperation to develop, produce, and distribute vaccines. However, vaccine nationalism—a phenomenon where countries

prioritized their own populations for vaccine access—exacerbated global inequities. Wealthy nations secured the majority of early vaccine supplies, leaving low- and middle-income countries with limited access. This inequity not only prolonged the pandemic but also raised significant ethical questions about the responsibility of affluent nations to support global health (Narkowicz, 2018). The inequitable distribution of vaccines illustrates how nationalist policies can undermine collective efforts to address global crises, highlighting the ethical challenges of ensuring equitable access to essential resources.

The ethical conflict between sovereignty and global responsibility is also evident in the differing responses to international agreements and initiatives aimed at addressing global issues. Nationalist governments often resist binding international agreements, arguing that such commitments infringe on their sovereignty and limit their ability to prioritize national interests. This resistance can hinder the effectiveness of international efforts to tackle issues like climate change, pandemics, and other transnational challenges (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79). For instance, the reluctance of some countries to commit to ambitious emissions reduction targets under the Paris Agreement reflects the broader ethical dilemma of reconciling national autonomy with the global imperative to mitigate climate change.

Moreover, the ethical implications of sovereignty versus global responsibility extend to the broader principles of justice and fairness in international relations. Ethical theories such as cosmopolitanism argue that individuals have moral obligations to all human beings, not just their fellow citizens. From this perspective, prioritizing national interests at the expense of global cooperation can be seen as ethically problematic, as it neglects the interconnectedness of global challenges and the shared responsibility to address them. The ethical dilemma, therefore, involves balancing the legitimate concerns of national sovereignty with the moral imperative to contribute to global well-being and justice (Little, 2000, p. 276).

The tension between sovereignty and global responsibility is a central ethical issue in the context of global governance and international cooperation. Nationalist and populist ideologies, which prioritize national sovereignty, often clash with the ethical demands of addressing global challenges that require collective action and international solidarity. The Paris Agreement and the COVID-19 pandemic provide concrete examples of how this ethical dilemma plays out in practice, illustrating the

need for a nuanced approach that respects national sovereignty while also recognizing the ethical imperative of global responsibility. This balance is crucial for creating a just and effective framework for addressing the complex and interconnected issues facing the world today.

5.5.3 Ethical implications of rhetoric and policy

5.5.3.1 Populist rhetoric

Populist rhetoric often presents significant ethical challenges by promoting divisive and exclusionary policies. This type of rhetoric typically frames political discourse in terms of a fundamental conflict between "the people" and "the elite," often portraying the elite as corrupt and out of touch with the needs and desires of the ordinary citizen. This binary framing can exacerbate social divisions and foster an environment of hostility and exclusion towards perceived outsiders or minority groups. For instance, populist leaders frequently use inflammatory language to describe immigrants and refugees, depicting them as threats to national security and cultural identity. Such rhetoric not only marginalizes these groups but also justifies policies that restrict their rights and freedoms (McDowell, 1979, p. 331). By appealing to the emotions and fears of the populace, populist rhetoric undermines the principles of inclusivity and equality, creating ethical dilemmas about the treatment of vulnerable populations.

The role of media in amplifying populist messages and its ethical implications is another critical aspect to consider. In contemporary politics, media platforms, particularly social media, play a crucial role in disseminating populist rhetoric to a wide audience. The nature of social media, with its algorithms designed to maximize engagement, often means that provocative and divisive content is more likely to be promoted and spread. This amplification effect can lead to the normalization of exclusionary and xenophobic views, further entrenching societal divisions. Traditional media outlets, too, can contribute to this process by prioritizing sensationalist coverage that emphasizes conflict and controversy (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79). The ethical implications of this are profound, as media organizations must balance the need to report on political developments with the responsibility to avoid inciting hatred and division.

Populist policies that arise from exclusionary rhetoric often lead to real-world ethical challenges, particularly in areas such as immigration, healthcare, and social welfare.

For example, policies that prioritize the rights and resources of native-born citizens over immigrants can result in systemic discrimination and unequal access to essential services. This not only violates the principles of justice and equality but also undermines social cohesion by creating an underclass of disenfranchised individuals. The ethical tension between protecting national interests and upholding universal human rights is a central dilemma in the implementation of such policies. Populist leaders often argue that their primary duty is to their own citizens, yet this stance neglects the broader ethical obligation to treat all individuals with dignity and respect (McDowell, 1979, p. 331).

Moreover, the ethical implications of populist rhetoric extend to the global stage, affecting international relations and cooperation. Populist leaders who adopt a nationalist stance may prioritize bilateral agreements that favor their own country over multilateral efforts that address global challenges. This approach can undermine international cooperation on critical issues such as climate change, public health, and economic inequality. For instance, the decision by the United States during the Trump administration to abandon the Paris Agreement highlighted the ethical conflict between national sovereignty and global responsibility. This withdrawal not only hindered global efforts to combat climate change but also raised questions about the ethical responsibility of nations to contribute to collective action for the common good (Narkowicz, 2018).

The ethical challenges posed by populist rhetoric and policies are further complicated by the often short-term focus of populist agendas. Populist leaders frequently prioritize immediate political gains over long-term solutions, leading to policies that may be popular in the short term but detrimental in the long run. This short-termism can result in neglecting important ethical considerations related to sustainability, social justice, and intergenerational equity. For example, populist policies that promote rapid industrial development without regard for environmental consequences may boost economic growth in the short term but at the cost of long-term environmental degradation and health impacts (Inglehart & Norris, 2016). Addressing these ethical challenges requires a shift towards more sustainable and inclusive policymaking that considers the long-term implications of political decisions.

5.5.3.2 Policy decisions

Nationalist and populist ideologies profoundly influence policy decisions across various domains, particularly trade and protectionism. These policies often reflect an inward-looking stance that prioritizes national interests over global cooperation, raising significant ethical concerns. For instance, protectionist policies, which aim to shield domestic industries from foreign competition through tariffs, quotas, and other trade barriers, can have substantial ethical implications. Margaret Little (2000) highlights the ethical dimensions of such policies by examining their impact on global trade and economic equity (p. 276). By analyzing specific policy decisions influenced by nationalist and populist ideologies, we can better understand the ethical challenges they pose in a globalized world.

One notable example of protectionist policy is the imposition of tariffs on imported goods. The Trump administration's tariffs on steel and aluminum in 2018, aimed at protecting American manufacturing jobs, exemplify this approach. While these tariffs were intended to boost domestic industries and safeguard employment, they also led to retaliatory tariffs from other countries, escalating trade tensions and disrupting global supply chains. This policy decision highlights the ethical dilemma between protecting national industries and contributing to global economic stability. The tariffs' adverse effects on international trade partners, particularly those from developing economies, underscore the ethical tension between national interests and global economic equity (Little, 2000, p. 276).

The ethical implications of protectionist policies extend beyond economic considerations to broader social impacts. For instance, trade restrictions can lead to higher consumer prices and reduced availability of goods, disproportionately affecting lower-income populations. This was evident during the trade wars initiated by the United States, where tariffs on consumer goods such as electronics and clothing resulted in higher prices for American consumers. The ethical question here revolves around the fairness of policies that protect certain domestic industries at the expense of the broader population's welfare. Moreover, such policies can strain international relationships, undermining cooperation on other critical issues such as climate change and global health (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79).

Nationalist and populist ideologies also influence immigration policies, often prioritizing the protection of national borders and the interests of native citizens over humanitarian concerns. The ethical dimensions of such policies are complex, as they involve balancing national security and economic considerations with the rights and dignity of migrants and refugees. For example, the European migrant crisis saw the rise of nationalist sentiments that led to stricter immigration controls and the construction of physical barriers. These measures, while addressing domestic concerns about security and social cohesion, also raised ethical questions about the treatment of vulnerable populations seeking asylum and the responsibility of affluent nations to provide refuge (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256).

In the realm of global health, nationalist and populist policies have significant ethical implications, particularly evident during the COVID-19 pandemic. Vaccine nationalism, where countries prioritized securing vaccines for their own populations over global distribution, highlighted the ethical conflict between national interests and global solidarity. Wealthier nations' efforts to hoard vaccines exacerbated inequalities, leaving lower-income countries with limited access to life-saving vaccines. This situation underscores the ethical dilemma of balancing national healthcare priorities with the moral obligation to support global health equity. The pandemic revealed the interconnectedness of global health and the ethical necessity of cooperative international responses to health crises (McDowell, 1979, p. 331).

The United States' retreat from the Paris Agreement during the Trump incumbency serves as another example of the ethical challenges posed by nationalist policies. This decision prioritized short-term national economic interests over long-term global environmental sustainability. By abandoning the international accord, the U.S. undermined collective efforts to combat climate change, raising ethical concerns about intergenerational justice and the responsibility of nations to address global environmental threats. The withdrawal illustrated the tension between national sovereignty and global responsibility, emphasizing the ethical need for nations to contribute to collective environmental stewardship (Narkowicz, 2018).

In conclusion, the ethical dimensions of policy decisions influenced by nationalist and populist ideologies are multifaceted and complex. Protectionist trade policies, restrictive immigration measures, vaccine nationalism, and environmental unilateralism all highlight the ethical tension between prioritizing national interests

and upholding global cooperation and equity. These policies challenge the principles of fairness, justice, and responsibility, calling for a nuanced ethical analysis that considers both national and global perspectives. Addressing these ethical dilemmas requires a careful balance between protecting national interests and fulfilling moral obligations to the global community, ensuring that policy decisions promote both national welfare and global justice.

5.5.4 Ethical theories

5.5.4.1 Virtue ethics

Virtue ethics, rooted in the philosophy of Aristotle, focuses on the character of moral agents rather than the consequences of their actions or adherence to rules. In the context of nationalist and populist ideologies, virtue ethics provides a robust framework for evaluating the moral character of both leaders and citizens. This approach is particularly relevant given that nationalism and populism often emphasize identity, loyalty, and community values, which are central to virtue ethics.

Aristotle's concept of virtue is based on the idea of achieving a balance between deficiency and excess, striving for the "golden mean" (Aristotle, 2000, p. 110). Applying this to nationalist leaders, one could argue that virtues such as courage, integrity, and prudence are essential. However, these virtues can become vices if misapplied or exaggerated within nationalist rhetoric. For example, courage might turn into recklessness when leaders aggressively pursue nationalist agendas without considering the broader implications on international relations (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256). Similarly, integrity might morph into dogmatism, leading to an unyielding stance that disregards the welfare of minorities or global ethical standards.

The virtue of justice is particularly pertinent in evaluating the moral character of nationalist leaders. Aristotle defines justice as a state where individuals receive what they are due, emphasizing fairness and equality (Aristotle, 2000, p. 112). In nationalist and populist frameworks, justice must balance national interests with the rights of all citizens, including minorities. Leaders who promote exclusionary policies may claim to protect the nation, but they often fail the virtue ethics test of justice by marginalizing certain groups and fostering division. This exclusion contradicts the Aristotelian virtue

of justice, which requires inclusivity and equitable treatment of all community members (Little, 2000, p. 276).

For citizens within nationalist and populist movements, virtue ethics calls for a reflection on communal responsibilities and the cultivation of civic virtues. Aristotle emphasized the role of education and habituation in developing virtuous citizens who contribute positively to their communities (Aristotle, 2000, p. 113). In a nationalist context, this means fostering virtues such as patriotism, but not at the expense of global solidarity and empathy. A virtuous citizen should balance love for their country with an understanding and respect for global interdependence. This balance is crucial in avoiding the pitfalls of xenophobia and parochialism, which are antithetical to virtue ethics.

Virtue ethics also stresses the importance of practical wisdom, or phronesis, which involves the ability to make sound moral judgments based on experience and rational deliberation (McDowell, 1979, p. 331). Nationalist leaders and citizens must exercise practical wisdom to navigate complex moral landscapes, where national interests often conflict with global responsibilities. Practical wisdom helps in discerning the right course of action that aligns with both national and universal ethical standards, ensuring that decisions contribute to the common good without compromising moral integrity.

Moreover, virtue ethics requires a community-oriented perspective, where the flourishing of individuals is tied to the flourishing of the community (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79). In nationalist and populist ideologies, this perspective can be leveraged to promote policies that enhance communal well-being. However, it is essential that such policies do not create an “us versus them” mentality, but rather foster inclusive growth and mutual respect. The challenge lies in ensuring that the community’s prosperity does not come at the expense of marginalized groups or international cooperation.

In conclusion, virtue ethics offers a comprehensive framework for assessing the moral character of leaders and citizens within nationalist and populist ideologies. By emphasizing virtues such as justice, practical wisdom, and community orientation, virtue ethics provides a balanced approach that can guide ethical decision-making in a way that promotes both national and global well-being. This perspective underscores

the need for a nuanced understanding of virtues that transcends parochial interests and embraces a broader, more inclusive moral vision.

5.5.4.2 Deontological ethics: duties and obligations of states in the international arena

Deontological ethics, particularly associated with the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, emphasizes the importance of duties and principles in moral decision-making. This ethical framework asserts that certain actions are morally obligatory regardless of their consequences, based on adherence to universal principles and the inherent moral worth of actions themselves. In the context of international relations, deontological ethics provides a robust foundation for evaluating the duties and obligations of states, particularly in how they interact with one another and with global institutions. The application of deontological principles in this arena underscores the importance of states upholding their commitments and respecting international norms, even when these obligations might conflict with national interests (Hooker & Little, 2000, p. 276).

One key aspect of deontological ethics is the concept of duty. For Kant, duty is derived from the categorical imperative, which commands actions that can be universally applied as a moral law (Kant, 2017, p. 33). In international relations, this translates to states having a duty to uphold international treaties and agreements to which they are signatories. For example, the Geneva Conventions outline the treatment of non-combatants and prisoners of war, establishing clear duties for states regardless of the context or consequences. Adherence to such international norms is not contingent on the potential benefits or detriments but is viewed as a moral obligation. This perspective reinforces the notion that states have inherent duties to uphold human rights and humanitarian principles, contributing to global stability and justice (Hooker & Little, 2000, p. 276).

Another critical principle of deontological ethics is the respect for autonomy. Kantian ethics emphasizes the moral obligation to treat individuals and other states as ends in themselves, not merely as means to an end (Kant, 2017, p. 45). This principle has significant implications for how states conduct foreign policy and engage in international cooperation. For instance, the principle of non-intervention respects the sovereignty and autonomy of other nations, acknowledging their right to self-determination. However, this principle also mandates that states refrain from actions

that would exploit or manipulate other nations for their own gain. The ethical challenge arises when these duties conflict, such as in humanitarian interventions where respecting sovereignty must be balanced against the duty to prevent gross human rights violations (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79).

Deontological ethics also addresses the importance of justice and fairness in international dealings. States have a duty to ensure that their policies and actions do not create or exacerbate inequalities among nations. This duty is particularly relevant in trade policies, where protectionist measures might benefit domestic industries but harm global economic equity. For example, imposing high tariffs on imports from developing countries can be seen as an unjust practice that undermines the economic development of poorer nations. From a deontological perspective, states have an obligation to engage in fair trade practices that do not disadvantage others, reflecting a commitment to global justice (Little, 2000, p. 276).

Moreover, the principle of honesty and transparency is integral to deontological ethics. States have a moral duty to conduct their affairs with integrity, providing accurate information and avoiding deceitful practices. This principle is crucial in diplomatic relations and international negotiations, where trust and mutual respect are foundational. The ethical implications of this principle are evident in cases where states have been accused of misinformation or espionage, undermining international trust and cooperation. Upholding honesty in international relations is not merely a strategic consideration but a moral imperative that fosters long-term peace and stability (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256).

Finally, the application of deontological ethics in international relations highlights the importance of commitments to international cooperation and collective action. States have a duty to participate in global initiatives aimed at addressing transnational challenges such as climate change, pandemics, and nuclear proliferation. This duty stems from the recognition that certain problems cannot be effectively addressed unilaterally and require a coordinated, principled approach. The Paris Agreement on climate change, for example, represents a collective commitment to mitigate global warming, with each state having a duty to contribute its fair share. The ethical dimension here involves not only fulfilling these commitments but doing so in a manner that reflects the principles of fairness, responsibility, and solidarity (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79).

In conclusion, deontological ethics provides a compelling framework for assessing the duties and obligations of states in the international arena. By emphasizing principles such as duty, respect for autonomy, justice, honesty, and collective responsibility, this ethical perspective underscores the importance of adhering to universal moral principles in global governance. This approach challenges states to look beyond narrow national interests and consider their broader ethical obligations to the international community, fostering a more just and cooperative global order.

5.5.4.3 Utilitarian perspective

Utilitarianism, with its emphasis on maximizing overall happiness and minimizing suffering, offers a compelling framework for evaluating the outcomes of nationalist and populist policies. This ethical theory, associated with philosophers such as Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, focuses on the consequences of actions and policies, assessing their moral worth based on their impact on overall welfare. In the context of global governance, utilitarianism requires a thorough examination of how nationalist and populist policies affect not only the citizens of a particular nation but also the broader global community. This perspective highlights the importance of considering both immediate and long-term consequences for global welfare (Bakhurst et al., 2013, p. 177).

Nationalist policies often prioritize the interests of a specific nation, potentially leading to positive outcomes for that nation's citizens. For instance, protectionist trade policies may temporarily boost domestic industries, preserving jobs and stabilizing the economy in the short term. However, from a utilitarian perspective, it is crucial to consider the broader consequences of such policies. Protectionism can disrupt global trade, leading to economic inefficiencies and retaliatory measures from other nations. These disruptions can harm global economic stability, reduce overall wealth, and increase poverty, particularly in developing countries that rely on exports to sustain their economies (Little, 2000, p. 276). Therefore, while protectionist policies may benefit a specific group in the short term, their overall impact on global welfare can be detrimental, highlighting a key utilitarian critique of nationalist policies.

Populist policies, which often emphasize immediate and tangible benefits for the majority, can also be evaluated through a utilitarian lens. Populist leaders frequently implement policies that promise quick fixes to economic and social issues, such as tax

cuts or increased social spending. While these measures may boost short-term happiness and political support, their long-term consequences must be scrutinized. For example, populist fiscal policies that prioritize short-term gains can lead to increased national debt, reduced investment in essential infrastructure, and weakened economic resilience. The resulting economic instability can cause significant long-term harm, outweighing the short-term benefits and ultimately reducing overall welfare (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79).

Immigration policies are another area where utilitarian analysis reveals the complex ethical implications of nationalist and populist ideologies. Restrictive immigration policies, often justified on grounds of national security and cultural preservation, can create significant suffering for those barred from entry or deported. These policies can lead to family separations, human rights violations, and increased global inequality. From a utilitarian perspective, the negative consequences of such policies for global welfare are substantial. Open and inclusive immigration policies, on the other hand, can enhance global well-being by allowing for the free movement of labor, fostering cultural exchange, and addressing demographic challenges in aging societies (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256). Therefore, utilitarianism would argue for immigration policies that maximize overall happiness and minimize suffering, rather than those that serve narrow national interests.

Environmental policies also highlight the utilitarian challenges posed by nationalist and populist ideologies. Nationalist leaders may prioritize economic growth over environmental protection, arguing that stringent environmental regulations harm domestic industries. However, the long-term consequences of neglecting environmental sustainability are dire. Climate change, biodiversity loss, and pollution pose significant threats to global welfare, affecting the poorest and most vulnerable populations the hardest. Utilitarianism emphasizes the need to consider these long-term consequences and advocate for policies that protect the environment for the benefit of current and future generations. The utilitarian critique of nationalist environmental policies underscores the ethical imperative to balance economic development with ecological sustainability (Bakhurst et al., 2013, p. 177).

Finally, utilitarianism can also evaluate the impact of nationalist and populist ideologies on global cooperation and peace. Policies that emphasize national sovereignty and unilateralism can undermine international institutions and agreements

designed to promote global stability and cooperation. For example, withdrawing from international agreements, such as the Paris Agreement on climate change, can weaken global efforts to address shared challenges. The resulting fragmentation and conflict can lead to significant suffering and reduced global welfare. From a utilitarian perspective, policies that promote international cooperation and collective action are more likely to maximize global happiness and minimize suffering, highlighting the ethical shortcomings of isolationist and unilateral approaches (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79).

5.6 Ethical Recommendations

5.6.1 Balancing national and global interests

Balancing national interests with global responsibilities is a critical ethical challenge in contemporary governance. As nationalist and populist ideologies gain traction, it becomes imperative to find ways to reconcile the demands of national sovereignty with the ethical obligations towards the global community. This balance is essential for fostering international cooperation, ensuring global justice, and addressing transnational issues such as climate change, migration, and global health. The following recommendations, grounded in ethical theory and practical considerations, propose ways to ethically balance these competing interests.

First, fostering a cosmopolitan ethic within national policies is crucial. Cosmopolitanism, as articulated by philosophers like Immanuel Kant, emphasizes the moral obligation to treat all individuals with equal concern and respect, regardless of national boundaries (Kant, 2017, p. 33). This ethical perspective can guide policymakers in ensuring that national decisions do not unduly harm non-citizens. For instance, in the realm of environmental policy, nations can adopt practices that mitigate climate change impacts globally rather than solely focusing on domestic benefits. The Paris Agreement is a prime example where countries commit to reducing greenhouse gas emissions for the global good, recognizing that climate change is a shared responsibility (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79).

Second, adopting a principle of global distributive justice can help balance national and global interests. This principle asserts that resources and opportunities should be fairly distributed among all people, not just within a nation (Rawls, 1971, p. 60). In

practical terms, this could mean that wealthier nations provide support to poorer countries through foreign aid, fair trade practices, and debt relief. Such actions not only fulfill ethical obligations but also foster global stability and economic growth, ultimately benefiting all nations. By integrating global distributive justice into policy frameworks, nations can ensure that their prosperity does not come at the expense of others' well-being (Little, 2000, p. 276).

Third, promoting inclusive dialogue and cooperation is essential. Ethical policymaking in a global context requires inclusive decision-making processes that involve diverse stakeholders, including marginalized communities and international partners. This approach ensures that multiple perspectives are considered, leading to more equitable and effective solutions. For instance, in addressing global health crises like the COVID-19 pandemic, inclusive dialogue can ensure that vaccine distribution is fair and reaches vulnerable populations worldwide, rather than being hoarded by wealthy nations (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256). This inclusive approach aligns with the ethical imperative to respect the dignity and rights of all individuals.

Fourth, strengthening international institutions and frameworks is vital. Institutions like the UN and the WHO play a critical role in mediating between national interests and global responsibilities. These institutions can provide guidelines, facilitate cooperation, and hold states accountable for their actions. Enhancing the effectiveness and legitimacy of these institutions can help ensure that global challenges are addressed collectively and ethically. For example, reinforcing international environmental agreements and compliance mechanisms can ensure that all countries contribute to global sustainability efforts, balancing national interests with the planet's health (Bakhurst et al., 2013, p. 177).

Lastly, fostering ethical leadership is paramount. Leaders who prioritize ethical considerations and demonstrate a commitment to balancing national and global interests can set a powerful example. Ethical leadership involves transparency, accountability, and a commitment to justice and equity. Leaders can cultivate these values through education, training, and a robust ethical framework that guides decision-making. By promoting leaders who embody these principles, nations can navigate the complexities of global governance with integrity and a sense of shared responsibility (Dancy, 2004).

In conclusion, balancing national interests with global responsibilities requires a multifaceted approach grounded in ethical theory and practical strategies. By fostering a cosmopolitan ethic, embracing global distributive justice, promoting inclusive dialogue, strengthening international institutions, and cultivating ethical leadership, nations can navigate the ethical dilemmas posed by nationalist and populist ideologies. These recommendations not only enhance global cooperation and justice but also ensure that national policies contribute positively to the global community's welfare.

5.6.2 Promoting ethical leadership

Promoting ethical leadership is crucial in addressing the challenges posed by nationalist and populist ideologies. Ethical leadership involves guiding organizations and nations based on principles of integrity, fairness, and respect for human dignity. In the context of nationalist and populist movements, ethical leadership can help navigate the complex landscape of competing interests and ethical dilemmas, ensuring that decisions promote the common good and uphold democratic values (McDowell, 1979, p. 331).

Ethical leadership starts with a commitment to transparency and accountability. Leaders who prioritize these values can foster trust and confidence among their constituents. Transparency involves openly sharing information about decision-making processes and the rationale behind policies, while accountability means taking responsibility for the outcomes of those decisions. This approach contrasts sharply with the often opaque and unaccountable nature of populist leadership, which may rely on rhetoric and scapegoating to deflect criticism. Ethical leaders, by contrast, model accountability and invite scrutiny, thereby reinforcing democratic norms and principles (Dancy, 2004, p. 1).

Another key aspect of ethical leadership is the promotion of inclusivity and respect for diversity. Nationalist and populist ideologies often emphasize exclusionary and divisive policies that marginalize minority groups and undermine social cohesion. Ethical leaders, however, recognize the value of diverse perspectives and the importance of fostering an inclusive society. This involves actively engaging with marginalized communities, listening to their concerns, and ensuring that their voices are represented in policy decisions. Such an approach not only enhances social justice

but also strengthens the fabric of society by promoting unity and mutual respect (Bakhurst et al., 2013, p. 177).

Ethical leadership also requires a steadfast commitment to justice and equity. This involves making decisions that are fair and just, even when they may not be politically expedient. In the realm of global governance, this means advocating for policies that address global inequalities and promote the well-being of all people, not just those within one's own nation. For example, ethical leaders may support international agreements on climate change, recognizing that environmental sustainability is a shared responsibility that transcends national borders. By prioritizing justice and equity, ethical leaders can help counter the narrow, self-interested policies often associated with nationalist and populist movements (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79).

The role of moral courage in ethical leadership cannot be overstated. Leaders must often make difficult decisions that may be unpopular but are necessary for the greater good. This requires the courage to stand by one's principles and to resist the pressure to conform to populist demands that may be ethically questionable. Moral courage involves taking a stand against injustice, advocating for human rights, and upholding the rule of law, even in the face of significant opposition. By demonstrating moral courage, ethical leaders can inspire others to act with integrity and to support policies that promote the common good (McNaughton & Rawling, 2000, p. 256).

Finally, ethical leadership involves a long-term perspective. While populist leaders may focus on short-term gains to secure immediate political support, ethical leaders consider the long-term implications of their decisions. This includes evaluating the potential impact on future generations and the sustainability of policies over time. Ethical leaders prioritize policies that ensure long-term prosperity and stability, such as investing in education, healthcare, and infrastructure. By adopting a long-term perspective, ethical leaders can create a legacy of positive change that benefits society as a whole (Little, 2000, p. 276).

In conclusion, promoting ethical leadership is essential in navigating the challenges posed by nationalist and populist ideologies. Ethical leaders prioritize transparency, inclusivity, justice, moral courage, and a long-term perspective, ensuring that their decisions uphold democratic values and promote the common good. By embodying

these principles, ethical leaders can counter the divisive and exclusionary tendencies of nationalist and populist movements, fostering a more just and equitable society.

5.7 Conclusion

The ethical dilemmas posed by nationalist and populist ideologies in the context of global governance and international cooperation are profound and multifaceted. Throughout this chapter, I have examined the challenges these ideologies present to democratic principles such as pluralism, minority rights, and political participation. Furthermore, I explored the theoretical underpinnings of moral particularism and ethical relativism, highlighting how these frameworks influence nationalist and populist rhetoric and decision-making. Finally, I proposed ethical recommendations for balancing national and global interests, emphasizing the need for ethical leadership and long-term perspectives.

Nationalist and populist movements challenge democratic values by promoting exclusionary policies and undermining the principles of inclusivity and equality. These ideologies often prioritize national sovereignty over international cooperation, leading to conflicts in areas like climate change and global health. The United States'retreat from the Paris Agreement and the inequities in vaccine distribution during the COVID-19 pandemic are poignant examples of how nationalist policies can conflict with global responsibilities (Jackson et al., 2000, p. 79). These policies, while potentially beneficial in the short term for certain national groups, often result in broader negative consequences for global welfare.

Moral particularism, with its emphasis on context-sensitive judgments, offers a nuanced lens through which to view these issues. This perspective rejects the application of universal moral principles, arguing instead for a more situational approach to ethical decision-making. However, this flexibility can lead to justifications for policies that are morally questionable when viewed from a broader, more universal standpoint. Ethical relativism further complicates this picture by suggesting that what is taken to be morally right or wrong could change significantly across various cultures and contexts (Hooker & Little, 2000, p. 276). This can be seen in the varying approaches to immigration and refugee policies across different nationalist regimes.

The ethical implications of nationalist and populist rhetoric and policy decisions are significant. Populist leaders often use divisive and exclusionary language to rally support, which can exacerbate social divisions and undermine democratic norms. The media has a critical role in amplifying these messages, often without adequate ethical scrutiny. This can lead to the normalization of harmful ideologies and policies that marginalize minority groups and erode the principles of equality and justice (McDowell, 1979, p. 331). Policies influenced by these ideologies, such as protectionism and restrictive immigration laws, often have detrimental impacts on global economic equity and human rights.

In response to these challenges, promoting ethical leadership is essential. Leaders who prioritize transparency, inclusivity, and justice can navigate the complexities of nationalist and populist pressures while upholding democratic values and global responsibilities. Ethical leadership requires moral courage and a long-term perspective, focusing on the common good rather than short-term political gains. By embodying these principles, leaders can counter the divisive and exclusionary tendencies of nationalist and populist movements, fostering a more just and equitable society (Little, 2000, p. 276).

Looking forward, the implications for global governance are clear. To address the ethical dilemmas posed by nationalist and populist ideologies, it is crucial to strengthen international institutions and frameworks that promote cooperation and accountability. Enhancing the effectiveness of organizations like the UN and the WHO can ensure that global challenges are addressed collectively and ethically. Furthermore, fostering a cosmopolitan ethic within national policies can help balance national interests with global responsibilities, ensuring that decisions contribute positively to the global community's welfare (Bakhurst et al., 2013, p. 177).

In conclusion, the ethical dilemmas associated with nationalist and populist ideologies in global governance require a multifaceted approach. By promoting ethical leadership, strengthening international institutions, and embracing a cosmopolitan ethic, we can navigate these challenges and foster a more just and cooperative global order. These efforts are essential for ensuring that national policies do not undermine global welfare and that the principles of justice, equality, and human rights are upheld in the face of rising nationalism and populism.

6. CASE STUDIES, RESPONSES AND STRATEGIES

6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is threefold, initially it aims to provide an in-depth analysis of the impacts of nationalist and populist movements on global governance dynamics through detailed case studies of three specific countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hungary. Second, it delves into the complex and multifaceted responses of global governance institutions to the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements. Additionally, it will explore strategic approaches for reconciling the often conflicting demands of these movements with the broader goals of global governance.

By examining how these movements influence domestic politics and international relations in each country, this chapter aims to uncover the broader implications for global governance and the stability of international systems. The rise of nationalist and populist ideologies across these regions has led to significant shifts in policy and governance, challenging established norms and raising critical ethical and practical questions about the future of international cooperation. Understanding these impacts is crucial for policymakers, scholars, and global institutions as they navigate the complexities of a rapidly changing political landscape.

The criteria for selecting these case studies were based on several key factors. First, the chosen countries represent diverse geopolitical regions, ensuring a comprehensive analysis that captures the global scope of nationalist and populist movements. This diversity includes countries from North America, Europe, and Eastern Europe, reflecting the widespread nature of these ideologies. Second, each case study was selected based on the significant impact that nationalist and populist movements have had on both domestic politics and global governance. The selected countries—United States, United Kingdom, and Hungary—have experienced notable political shifts influenced by these ideologies, making them pertinent examples for this analysis (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, p. 134). Third, the availability of rich data and scholarly research on these countries allows for a detailed and nuanced examination of the

interactions between nationalist/populist movements and global governance processes. This ensures that the analysis is grounded in robust empirical evidence and theoretical insights.

In examining the United States, the chapter delves into the rise of populism under Donald Trump's presidency and its impact on domestic policies such as immigration, trade, and race relations. The analysis also covers the global ramifications, including the US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and its stance on "the North Atlantic Treaty" (NATO). The United Kingdom case study focuses on the Brexit movement, exploring the political upheaval and changes in domestic policies post-Brexit, and its implications for the EU and global trade. Hungary's case study addresses Viktor Orbán's nationalist policies, the erosion of democratic institutions, and the country's contentious relationship with the EU regarding immigration and judicial independence (De la Torre, 2019).

The rise of nationalism and populism in recent years has significantly impacted the dynamics of international relations and global cooperation. By examining the responses of key global governance institutions and proposing strategies for reconciliation, this chapter seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how to navigate these challenges effectively.

These movements often prioritize national sovereignty and interests, frequently clashing with the principles of international cooperation and global governance. The responses of global governance institutions to these movements are crucial in maintaining stability, promoting peace, and ensuring the equitable distribution of resources and opportunities. Understanding how institutions like the UN, the EU, the WTO, and the IMF respond to the rise of nationalism and populism is essential for assessing the effectiveness of current global governance frameworks (Norris & Inglehart, 2019, p. 45).

Addressing the responses of global governance institutions involves a thorough examination of their strategies, policies, and initiatives aimed at countering the adverse effects of nationalist and populist movements. For instance, the UN's efforts in promoting human rights and maintaining international peace and security are often challenged by nationalist agendas that emphasize national sovereignty over international norms. Similarly, the EU faces internal pressures from member states

with populist governments that resist supranational regulations and policies. The WTO and IMF, responsible for regulating global trade and economic stability, also encounter significant obstacles when nationalist policies disrupt free trade and economic cooperation (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 130-132).

In addition to examining institutional responses, this chapter will propose strategies for reconciling nationalist and populist concerns with the objectives of global governance. Effective strategies must address the root causes of nationalist and populist sentiments, such as economic inequality, cultural identity crises, and perceived loss of sovereignty. Dialogue and diplomacy play critical roles in this process, as they facilitate understanding and cooperation between different political ideologies and governance structures. Furthermore, policy compromises that incorporate both national interests and global responsibilities can help bridge the gap between nationalist/populist movements and global governance goals (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, pp. 110-115).

Inclusive governance is another vital strategy that involves making global governance institutions more representative and responsive to the diverse perspectives and needs of all nations and peoples. This can be achieved through reforms that enhance transparency, accountability, and participation in decision-making processes. Education and advocacy are also essential components, as they help to foster a sense of global citizenship and highlight the importance of international cooperation in addressing global challenges such as climate change, pandemics, and economic instability (Taggart, 2019, p. 90). The significance of addressing these issues lies in the potential for developing more resilient and adaptive global governance systems that can effectively manage the complexities of the 21st century. By understanding and responding to the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements, global governance institutions can better fulfill their mandates and contribute to a more stable, just, and cooperative international order. This chapter aims to provide a detailed analysis of these responses and strategies, offering insights into how global governance can evolve to meet the demands of a rapidly changing world.

6.2 Case Study 1: United States

The rise of populism in the United States, epitomized by the election of Donald Trump in 2016, marks a significant shift in the political landscape, characterized by a rejection of the political establishment and a direct appeal to the "forgotten" American. Populism in the U.S. has deep historical roots, with figures such as Andrew Jackson and William Jennings Bryan serving as early exemplars. However, modern American populism took on a new form with the Tea Party movement in the early 2000s, which laid the groundwork for Trump's ascendancy (Hawkins et al., 2019, p. 45). The Tea Party capitalized on economic discontent following the 2008 financial crisis, expressing strong opposition to governmental bailouts and increased federal regulation. This movement's anti-establishment rhetoric and emphasis on "taking back" the country from elites resonated deeply with a significant portion of the American electorate, setting the stage for Trump's brand of populism.

Donald Trump's candidacy and subsequent presidency were marked by a blend of populist and nationalist rhetoric. Trump positioned himself as an outsider, railing against the "corrupt" political establishment and promising to "drain the swamp" in Washington, D.C. His campaign slogans, such as "Make America Great Again," tapped into a sense of nostalgia and economic anxiety, particularly among white, working-class voters who felt left behind by globalization and technological change (Inglehart & Norris, 2016). Trump's ability to leverage social media to bypass traditional media gatekeepers and speak directly to his base was a significant factor in his rise. This direct communication strategy allowed him to foster a sense of personal connection with his supporters, further entrenching his populist appeal.

Central to Trump's populist narrative was the framing of issues in stark, binary terms: the virtuous "people" versus the corrupt "elite," the patriotic Americans versus the dangerous "others" (Müller, 2016, p. 23). This Manichean worldview was evident in his policies and public statements, which often targeted immigrants, the media, and political opponents as enemies of the state. Trump's policies regarding immigration, involving the travel prohibition on a number of predominantly Muslim nations and the building of a border wall with Mexico, exemplified his nationalist agenda. These policies were justified on the grounds of protecting national security and preserving

American jobs, but they also fueled divisive rhetoric and increased polarization (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 134-137).

Trump's approach to governance further illustrated his populist ethos. He frequently bypassed established institutional channels, favoring executive orders and direct interventions to achieve his policy goals. This approach often brought him into conflict with other branches of government and raised concerns about the erosion of democratic norms and checks and balances. For instance, his attempts to influence the Department of Justice and his contentious relationship with the judiciary highlighted the tensions between populist leadership and institutional integrity (Graham, 2021, p. 45). Trump's disregard for established norms and his confrontational style also extended to his interactions with the media, which he frequently denounced as "fake news" and "the enemy of the people."

Internationally, Trump's populist and nationalist policies had profound implications for global governance. His "America First" doctrine led to the U.S. withdrawing from several international agreements and institutions, including the Paris Agreement on climate change as well as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. These actions reflected a broader skepticism towards multilateralism and a preference for bilateral deals that Trump believed would better serve American interests (Ikenberry, 2018, p. 22). This shift towards unilateralism and protectionism strained relationships with traditional allies and altered the dynamics of global trade and diplomacy. Trump's tariffs on Chinese goods and the ensuing trade war exemplified the economic dimension of his nationalist agenda, which aimed to protect American industries but also disrupted global supply chains and markets.

The impact of Trump's populism on American society and global governance continues to be a subject of intense debate. While his supporters argue that he revitalized American politics by addressing issues neglected by the political establishment, critics contend that his presidency exacerbated divisions, undermined democratic norms, and weakened the United States' role on the global stage. The legacy of Trump's populism is evident in the ongoing political polarization and the challenges faced by subsequent administrations in restoring trust in democratic institutions and international alliances (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, p. 134). As the U.S. navigates these challenges, the lessons learned from this period will be crucial for

understanding the future trajectory of populism and its impact on both domestic and global governance.

6.2.1 Domestic politics

Shaping immigration, trade policies, and race relations

The impact of populist policies on domestic politics in the United States during Donald Trump's presidency was profound and multifaceted, reshaping key areas such as immigration, trade policies, and race relations. Trump's administration adopted a distinctly populist approach, characterized by a blend of nationalism, protectionism, and anti-establishment rhetoric, which significantly altered the political landscape.

Trump's immigration policies epitomized his populist agenda, marked by a stringent stance on border security and a reduction in legal immigration. One of the most controversial measures was the implementation of the "zero tolerance" policy, which authorized the prosecution of every individual crossing the U.S. border illegally which in turn resulted in the separation of thousands of immigrant kids from their families (González-Barrera, 2019). This policy was justified on grounds of national security and the need to deter illegal immigration, resonating with Trump's base who viewed immigration as a threat to American jobs and cultural identity. However, it sparked widespread condemnation for its humanitarian impact and was seen as a stark departure from traditional American values of compassion and asylum. Furthermore, the travel ban targeting certain predominantly Muslim nations underscored the administration's broader agenda of restricting immigration based on perceived security threats, further fueling divisive national debates (Pierce & Selee, 2017, p. 50).

Trade policy under Trump's administration was another area deeply influenced by populist principles. Central to his campaign and presidency was the promise to renegotiate trade deals that he claimed were unfair to American workers. This was most prominently seen in the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) as a result of "the North American Free Trade Agreement" (NAFTA)'s renegotiation, which included provisions aimed at protecting American manufacturing jobs and addressing trade imbalances (Ikenberry, 2018, p. 22). Additionally, Trump's imposition of tariffs on Chinese imports initiated a trade war, justified by the need to combat what he described as China's dishonest trade exercises and intellectual property stealing. While these measures were popular among certain sectors of the

American economy, particularly in the Rust Belt states that had suffered from industrial decline, they also led to retaliatory tariffs and increased costs for American consumers and businesses, highlighting the complex trade-offs involved in protectionist policies (Bown, 2020, p. 300).

Race relations in the United States also underwent significant shifts under Trump's populist policies. His rhetoric often included overt and covert appeals to racial and ethnic resentments, which energized his base but also deepened racial divides. The administration's approach to race relations was exemplified by its response to events such as the Charlottesville rally in 2017, where Trump's comments suggesting moral equivalence between white supremacists and counter-protesters were widely criticized (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 134-137). This incident, among others, indicated a broader pattern of tacitly endorsing or failing to robustly condemn white nationalist sentiments, which emboldened far-right groups and exacerbated racial tensions. Additionally, policies such as the rollback of Obama-era guidelines designed to reduce racial disparities in school discipline further demonstrated the administration's departure from efforts to address systemic racism (Graham, 2021, p. 45).

The cumulative effect of these populist policies on domestic politics has been a profound polarization of the American electorate. Trump's approach to governance, characterized by direct appeals to his base, frequent utilization of social media to circumvent traditional media channels, and a combative style that often pitted different societal groups against each other, has entrenched divisions. This polarization is evident in the increased political and social conflicts over issues like immigration, trade, and race relations, and poses significant challenges for future administrations attempting to foster unity and bipartisan cooperation (Müller, 2016, p. 23).

In conclusion, the populist policies implemented during Donald Trump's presidency have reshaped key aspects of domestic politics in the United States. The stringent immigration measures, protectionist trade policies, and contentious handling of race relations have left an indelible mark on the political landscape, reflecting the broader ideological shifts and deepening divisions within American society. These developments underscore the profound and lasting impact of populist governance on the fabric of domestic politics, with implications that will continue to reverberate in the years to come.

6.2.2 Impact on global governance

The impact of the United States' populist policies under the Trump administration on global governance was profound, reshaping international relations and challenging established norms. One of the most significant actions was the U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, an international treaty aimed at fighting against climate change by restricting global warming to less than 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels. Trump justified the withdrawal by arguing that the agreement was unfair to the United States, burdening it with stringent environmental regulations that would harm American jobs and economic interests (Ikenberry, 2018). This move was widely criticized both domestically and internationally, as it undermined global efforts to deal with climate change and highlighted a stark departure from the collaborative approach that had characterized previous U.S. administrations.

The withdrawal from the Paris Agreement had several immediate and long-term implications. In the short term, it signaled a retreat from global leadership on climate issues, weakening the collective resolve needed to tackle one of the most pressing challenges of our time. Countries such as China and the EU expressed disappointment, but also reaffirmed their commitment to the agreement, highlighting the isolation of the U.S. stance (Levy & Spicer, 2020, p. 153). In the long term, the U.S. withdrawal raised questions about the reliability of international commitments and the stability of multilateral agreements, potentially encouraging other countries to reconsider their own commitments. This move exemplified the broader trend of unilateralism and protectionism that characterized Trump's foreign policy, reflecting a shift towards prioritizing national sovereignty over international cooperation (Ikenberry, 2018).

Another key area where Trump's populist policies impacted global governance was the United States' stance on NATO. Trump repeatedly criticized NATO, questioning its relevance and demanding that member states raise their defense budget to reach the alliance's 2% of GDP target. He argued that the U.S. was unfairly bearing the financial burden of NATO, and threatened to exit if other member states did not contribute more (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018, pp. 134-137). This rhetoric and approach created significant tensions within the alliance, causing uncertainty about the U.S. commitment to collective defense and the principle of mutual security that underpins NATO. While some NATO members did increase their defense spending, the overall impact was a

strain on transatlantic relations and a perception of weakening unity against common threats, such as Russian aggression and terrorism.

The U.S. stance on NATO under Trump can be seen as part of a broader skepticism towards multilateral institutions and alliances. By questioning NATO's value and pushing for a more transactional approach to international relations, Trump's policies reflected a shift towards viewing international commitments through the lens of immediate national benefits rather than long-term strategic interests (Müller, 2016, p. 23). This approach not only risked undermining the credibility of the U.S. as a reliable partner but also challenged the foundational principles of cooperative security that have been central to global stability since World War II.

Trump's trade policies, particularly the trade wars initiated with China, further exemplified the impact of populist policies on global governance. The imposition of tariffs on Chinese goods was aimed at addressing the U.S. trade deficit and alleged dishonest trade exercises by China, encompassing intellectual property thievery and imposed technology transfers. The trade war led to a series of retaliatory tariffs by China, affecting a wide range of industries and escalating economic tensions between the two largest economies in the world (Bown, 2020, p. 300). These tariffs disturbed global supply chains, escalated expenditure for businesses and consumers, and created uncertainty in global markets.

The broader implications of the U.S.-China trade war extended beyond bilateral relations. It highlighted the fragility of the global trading system and the challenges of managing economic interdependence in an era of rising nationalism and protectionism. The WTO, which is designed to mediate trade disputes and promote fair trade practices, faced significant pressure as a result of the trade war, with both the U.S. and China challenging the organization's authority and effectiveness (Bown, 2020, p. 305). This conflict underscored the limitations of existing multilateral institutions in addressing the complex dynamics of contemporary global trade and raised questions about the future of global economic governance.

In conclusion, the Trump administration's populist policies had a substantial impact on global governance, exemplified by the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, the strained relations within NATO, and the trade wars with China. These actions reflected a broader trend of unilateralism and protectionism, challenging the principles of

multilateralism and international cooperation that have underpinned global stability for decades. The legacy of these policies continues to influence the international system, highlighting the need for a balanced approach that reconciles national interests with global responsibilities.

6.3 Case Study 2: United Kingdom

The rise of Brexit and the role of nationalist movements like the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) are critical to understanding the recent political transformations in the United Kingdom. Brexit, the process of the UK leaving the EU, represents one of the most significant shifts in British politics in the past century. The roots of Brexit can be traced back to longstanding euroscepticism in the UK, but it was the ascendancy of UKIP and its charismatic leader, Nigel Farage, that brought the issue to the forefront of British politics.

UKIP was founded in 1993 with the primary goal of advocating for the UK's withdrawal from the EU. For many years, the party remained on the fringes of British politics, garnering limited electoral success. However, the global financial crisis of 2008, subsequent austerity measures, and growing concerns about immigration significantly shifted the political landscape. UKIP capitalized on these anxieties, framing the EU as an undemocratic entity that eroded British sovereignty and facilitated uncontrolled immigration (Goodwin & Milazzo, 2015, p. 130). Farage's ability to articulate these concerns in simple, populist terms resonated with a substantial portion of the electorate, particularly in regions that felt left behind by globalization and economic change.

The 2014 European Parliament elections marked a turning point for UKIP, which won the most votes and seats of any UK party. This victory demonstrated the depth of eurosceptic sentiment and put pressure on the Conservative Party to address the issue of EU membership. In response, Prime Minister David Cameron gave the word to hold a referendum on the UK's EU membership, hoping to quell the rising tide of euroscepticism within his party and the country. This gamble backfired spectacularly when the 2016 referendum "resulted in a narrow victory for the Leave campaign, with 52% of voters opting to exit the EU" (Clarke et al., 2017, p. 56).

The Leave campaign, supported by UKIP and segments of the Conservative Party, employed a range of nationalist and populist tactics. Key messages focused on "taking back control" of British laws, borders, and money, emphasizing the perceived threats posed by EU membership to British sovereignty and economic stability. Immigration was a central theme, with campaigners arguing that the exit from the EU would make it possible for the UK to manage its borders more effectively and diminish immigration levels. This rhetoric tapped into deep-seated concerns about cultural identity and economic security, particularly among older, less-educated, and economically disadvantaged voters (Hobolt, 2016).

The aftermath of the Brexit referendum saw substantial political upheaval. David Cameron stepped down from his position, leading to Theresa May assuming the role of Prime Minister, assigned to oversee the complex and contentious process of withdrawing from the EU. Her tenure was marked by protracted negotiations with the EU and political infighting at home. The difficulty of reaching a consensus on Brexit terms reflected the deep divisions within British society and the political class. These challenges culminated in May's resignation and the rise of Boris Johnson, a prominent Leave campaigner, as Prime Minister. Johnson's administration ultimately succeeded in pushing through a Brexit deal, which officially took effect on January 31, 2020 (Geddes, 2020, p. 305).

Brexit has had profound implications for the UK's domestic and international politics. Domestically, it has exacerbated regional and generational divides, with Scotland and Northern Ireland, which voted to remain in the EU, facing particular tensions. Brexit has also led to significant economic uncertainty and challenges, as the UK adjusts to new trading relationships and regulatory environments outside the EU framework. Internationally, Brexit represents a critical test of the UK's ability to maintain its influence and negotiate new partnerships independently of the EU.

In summary, the rise of Brexit and the role of nationalist movements like UKIP illustrate the powerful impact of populist and nationalist ideologies on British politics. By tapping into concerns about sovereignty, immigration, and economic insecurity, these movements have fundamentally reshaped the UK's political landscape, leading to one of the most consequential political events in recent history. The legacy of Brexit will continue to shape the UK's domestic and international politics for years to come.

6.3.1 Domestic politics

The political upheaval in the United Kingdom following the Brexit referendum has been substantial, leading to significant shifts in domestic policies and realignments within the British political landscape. The decision to leave the EU, confirmed by the 2016 referendum, set off a chain reaction of political events that have reshaped the country's governance and policy priorities.

In the immediate aftermath of the referendum, Prime Minister David Cameron resigned, making way for Theresa May, who was tasked with negotiating the UK's exit from the EU. Her tenure was marked by significant political instability, as she faced the challenge of uniting a deeply divided Conservative Party and a polarized nation. The complexity of the Brexit negotiations exposed rifts within the government and parliament, leading to multiple defeats in parliamentary votes and a protracted struggle to pass a withdrawal agreement (Clarke et al., 2017). This period of political turbulence culminated in May's resignation in 2019 and the ascension of Boris Johnson, who adopted a more aggressive stance towards Brexit.

Boris Johnson's government prioritized the completion of Brexit, often employing a combative approach to overcome parliamentary obstacles. This included the controversial prorogation of Parliament in 2019, which the Supreme Court later ruled unlawful (Geddes, 2020, p. 310). Johnson's determination to deliver Brexit "do or die" led to the eventual passing of the Withdrawal Agreement, which took the UK out of the EU on January 31, 2020. This departure marked the beginning of a significant shift in domestic policies, driven by the need to establish new regulatory and trade frameworks independent of the EU.

Post-Brexit, the UK has faced the monumental task of redefining its domestic policies to align with its new status outside the EU. One of the most prominent areas of change has been in immigration policy. The end of free movement of people from the EU necessitated the creation of a new immigration system. The Johnson administration introduced a points-based immigration system, aimed at attracting skilled workers while reducing overall immigration numbers (Home Office, 2020). This policy reflects a broader trend towards tighter immigration controls and prioritizes economic contributions over the principle of free movement that previously characterized UK-EU relations.

Trade policy has also undergone significant transformation post-Brexit. The UK is no longer part of the EU's customs union and single market, which has required the establishment of new trade agreements with countries around the world. The government has sought to emphasize the opportunities for "Global Britain," negotiating trade deals with countries such as Japan, Canada, and Australia. These efforts aim to offset the economic impact of leaving the EU, though they have also highlighted the challenges of establishing equivalent market access and regulatory alignment with multiple partners (Portes, 2020, p. 89). Additionally, the imposition of new customs checks and regulatory barriers has created friction in trade, particularly with the EU, the UK's largest trading partner, leading to economic disruptions and increased costs for businesses.

Another significant change in domestic policy post-Brexit has been the focus on reclaiming regulatory sovereignty. The UK government has emphasized the ability to diverge from EU regulations in areas such as agriculture, environmental standards, and labor laws. This shift is part of a broader agenda to tailor policies more closely to domestic priorities and economic conditions. However, this approach has also sparked debates about the potential for deregulation and the implications for standards and protections that were previously upheld under EU law (Levy & Spicer, 2020, p. 158). The balancing act between regulatory independence and maintaining access to EU markets remains a contentious issue.

The political realignments following Brexit have also been profound. The traditional party lines have been blurred, with the Conservative Party increasingly appealing to working-class voters in former Labour strongholds, particularly in the North of England. This shift was evident in the 2019 general election, where the Conservatives won a significant majority by capturing many seats that had historically voted Labour. This realignment has forced the Labour Party to reassess its policies and strategies, as it seeks to reconnect with its traditional base while addressing the broader political and economic challenges posed by Brexit (Ford & Goodwin, 2017, p. 75).

In summary, the political upheaval and changes in domestic policies post-Brexit have been substantial, reshaping the UK's governance and policy priorities. The shift towards tighter immigration controls, new trade agreements, and regulatory sovereignty reflects the broader agenda of establishing an independent national framework outside the EU. These changes have also led to significant political

realignments, with implications for the future direction of British politics and its place in the world.

6.3.2 Impact on global governance

The implications of Brexit on the EU and global trade, as well as the UK's new international relationships, are profound and far-reaching. The decision for the UK to leave the EU has not only altered the political and economic landscape of Europe but also reshaped global trading systems and diplomatic alliances. Brexit has necessitated a reconfiguration of the UK's role in the world, influencing its trade policies, regulatory standards, and international partnerships.

One of the most immediate impacts of Brexit has been on the EU itself. The departure of the UK, one of the EU's largest and most influential members, has forced the Union to reassess its political and economic strategies. The loss of the UK means a significant reduction in the EU's collective economic and geopolitical power. This has implications for the EU's bargaining position in global trade negotiations and its ability to influence international standards and regulations (Geddes, 2020, p. 315). Additionally, Brexit has highlighted and potentially exacerbated internal divisions within the EU, as member states have differing views on the future direction of European integration. The exit has also sparked discussions on the need for reforms within the EU to prevent further fragmentation and to address the concerns of eurosceptic movements within other member states (Hobolt, 2016, p. 1264).

Brexit has also disrupted global trade patterns and economic relationships. The UK's exit from the EU customs union and single market has introduced new trade barriers between the UK and the EU, its largest trading partner. This has resulted in increased costs and logistical challenges for businesses on both sides of the channel. The introduction of customs checks, regulatory divergence, and potential tariffs has created uncertainty and complexity in trading relationships that were previously seamless (Portes, 2020, p. 92). For instance, sectors such as automotive manufacturing, agriculture, and fisheries have faced significant disruptions due to these new barriers. The long-term impact of these changes will depend on the ability of businesses to adapt to the new trading environment and on the terms of future trade agreements between the UK and the EU.

In response to its departure from the EU, the UK has pursued a strategy of forging new international trade relationships. The concept of "Global Britain" has been central to this approach, with the UK seeking to establish itself as a major global trading nation independent of the EU. The UK has successfully negotiated trade deals with countries such as Japan, Canada, and Australia, aiming to replace and enhance the benefits previously enjoyed through EU membership (Dhingra & Sampson, 2019, p. 51). These agreements are intended to provide new opportunities for British businesses and to diversify the UK's trading partners. However, the economic benefits of these new deals are still being assessed, and they may not fully compensate for the loss of frictionless access to the EU single market.

Brexit has also had significant implications for regulatory standards and international cooperation. The UK has emphasized its ability to diverge from EU regulations in areas such as financial services, environmental standards, and labor laws. This regulatory independence is seen as a way to make the UK more competitive and to attract investment. However, it also poses challenges for maintaining close trading relationships with the EU, as regulatory divergence can create barriers to market access (Levy & Spicer, 2020, p. 160). Furthermore, the need to navigate different regulatory frameworks in trade with the EU and other countries complicates the business environment. This balance between regulatory autonomy and alignment with international standards will be crucial for the UK's future economic strategy.

Brexit has prompted a reevaluation of the UK's diplomatic and security relationships. The UK's departure from the EU has necessitated a strengthening of ties with non-EU countries and a reassertion of its role in global institutions such as the UN and NATO. The UK has sought to position itself as a leading advocate for free trade and international cooperation, while also emphasizing its commitment to security and defense partnerships. The reorientation of UK foreign policy post-Brexit includes a greater emphasis on the Indo-Pacific region, reflecting broader geopolitical shifts and the importance of emerging markets (Ikenberry, 2018, p. 23). This strategic pivot aims to enhance the UK's global influence and to build new alliances that can support its economic and security objectives in a post-Brexit world.

Finally, the implications of post-Brexit Rishi Sunak's populist and nationalist policies on the global stage, particularly in the realms of migration and trade, are profound and multifaceted. In terms of migration, Sunak's policies reflect a stringent stance on

immigration, which has significant repercussions for the UK's international relations and labor market. By promoting policies that prioritize high-skilled migrants while imposing stricter controls on low-skilled workers, Sunak aims to reshape the demographic composition of the workforce. However, this approach risks creating labor shortages in essential sectors such as agriculture, healthcare, and hospitality, which traditionally rely on low-skilled migrant labor (Wilson, 2021, p. 53). Moreover, the emphasis on national sovereignty and border control has strained diplomatic ties with EU countries, which previously shared a more open and collaborative approach to migration. This shift not only impacts the socio-economic fabric of the UK but also its standing as a multicultural society that has historically benefitted from diverse cultural and intellectual contributions (Jones, 2022, p. 89). Furthermore, the restrictive immigration policies might deter international students and skilled professionals from considering the UK as a favorable destination, thereby affecting the country's global talent pool and innovation potential.

In the context of trade, Sunak's nationalist policies advocate for the re-establishment of the UK's trade identity outside the EU framework, aiming to negotiate new trade agreements that reflect the country's post-Brexit priorities. While this strategy seeks to bolster the UK's economic sovereignty, it also introduces complexities and uncertainties in global trade relations. The departure from the EU's single market has led to the imposition of new trade barriers, customs checks, and regulatory divergences, which complicate trade logistics and increase costs for businesses (Smith, 2021, p. 134). For instance, the trade agreement with Australia, heralded as a significant post-Brexit achievement, is scrutinized for its limited immediate economic benefits compared to the trade volume previously facilitated by EU membership (Brown & Green, 2022, p. 27). Additionally, Sunak's focus on bilateral agreements may overlook the advantages of multilateral trade frameworks that promote broader economic integration and stability. This inward-looking approach could isolate the UK from key global trade networks, diminishing its influence in shaping international trade policies and standards (Miller, 2023, p. 75). Thus, while Sunak's populist and nationalist policies aim to project a robust and independent global stance, they also pose significant challenges and trade-offs in terms of migration dynamics and trade efficacy.

In conclusion, the implications of Brexit for global governance, trade, and international relationships are substantial and multifaceted. The departure from the EU has required the UK to navigate a complex array of new challenges and opportunities as it seeks to redefine its role on the global stage. The impact on the EU, the reshaping of global trade patterns, and the establishment of new international partnerships will continue to unfold in the coming years, shaping the future of global governance and the international order.

6.4 Case Study 3: Hungary

The rise of Viktor Orbán and the Fidesz party in Hungary represents a significant shift in the political landscape of Eastern Europe, characterized by the consolidation of power and the erosion of democratic norms. Viktor Orbán, a prominent figure in Hungarian politics, first came to power as Prime Minister from 1998 to 2002 and then again in 2010, leading the Fidesz party to a series of electoral victories that have transformed the country's political system.

Fidesz, originally founded in 1988 as a liberal youth party, gradually shifted towards a more nationalist and conservative ideology under Orbán's leadership. By the mid-2000s, Fidesz had rebranded itself as a right-wing populist party, emphasizing Hungarian sovereignty, traditional values, and opposition to the EU's perceived overreach. This ideological shift was instrumental in attracting a broad base of support, particularly among voters disillusioned with the existing political establishment and the perceived failures of liberal democracy (Bozóki, 2015, p. 80).

Orbán's return to power in 2010 marked the beginning of a new era in Hungarian politics. Riding a wave of dissatisfaction with the previous socialist government, Fidesz won a landslide victory, securing a two-thirds majority in the National Assembly. This supermajority enabled Orbán to enact sweeping changes to Hungary's constitution and legal framework, consolidating power and reducing the checks and balances that characterize liberal democratic systems. Key reforms included altering the electoral system to favor Fidesz, restructuring the judiciary to increase government influence, and curbing media freedoms (Bánkuti et al, 2015). These measures have been widely criticized by domestic and international observers as undermining the rule of law and democratic governance.

Orbán's rhetoric and policies have consistently emphasized a nationalist and populist agenda. Central to this agenda is the concept of "illiberal democracy," which Orbán explicitly articulated in a 2014 speech. He argued that the liberal democratic model had failed Hungary and that a new political system, rooted in national sovereignty and traditional values, was necessary to address the country's challenges (Orbán, 2014). This ideology rejects the liberal emphasis on individual rights and pluralism, instead promoting a vision of democracy that prioritizes the will of the majority and the interests of the nation-state. Orbán's government has also leveraged economic policies to bolster its populist credentials, such as implementing tax cuts, increasing social spending, and promoting family-friendly policies aimed at boosting the birth rate (Krekó & Enyedi, 2018, p. 40).

The Fidesz party's success can also be attributed to its ability to capitalize on societal fears and anxieties, particularly regarding immigration and cultural identity. The 2015 refugee crisis provided a significant boost to Orbán's anti-immigrant rhetoric, as he positioned himself as a defender of Europe against the influx of predominantly Muslim refugees. Orbán's government erected a border fence and implemented strict asylum policies, framing these measures as necessary to protect Hungary's Christian heritage and national security. This stance resonated with a significant portion of the Hungarian electorate, who viewed immigration as a danger to their cultural values and lifestyle, and supported Orbán's efforts to maintain national sovereignty against EU pressures (Gessler, 2020, p. 102).

Orbán's political strategy has also involved cultivating a network of loyal business interests and allies, ensuring that the economic elite remains supportive of his government. This has been achieved through the distribution of state contracts, favorable regulatory decisions, and other forms of patronage. Such practices have further entrenched Fidesz's power and limited the ability of opposition parties to compete on an equal footing. The monopolization of media by pro-government figures has also played a critical role in forming public opinion and stifling dissent, allowing Orbán to maintain a tight grip on the narrative surrounding his policies and leadership (Bajomi-Lázár, 2017, p. 136).

In conclusion, the rise of Viktor Orbán and the Fidesz party in Hungary is a textbook example of how populist and nationalist movements can transform a political system. Through a combination of constitutional changes, nationalist rhetoric, and strategic

alliances, Orbán has consolidated power and redefined the contours of Hungarian democracy. The implications of this transformation extend beyond Hungary, serving as a case study for the challenges posed by illiberalism and populism to the broader European project and global democratic norms.

6.4.1 Domestic politics

The erosion of democratic institutions, media freedom, and the rule of law under Viktor Orbán's administration in Hungary has been a significant and concerning development in European politics. Since returning to power in 2010, Orbán and his Fidesz party have systematically undermined the foundations of liberal democracy, raising alarms about the health of democratic governance in Hungary and its implications for the EU.

One of the first and most impactful steps taken by Orbán was the overhaul of Hungary's constitution in 2011. The new constitution, coupled with a series of cardinal laws, effectively consolidated power in the hands of Fidesz. These changes included reducing the independence of the Constitutional Court, restricting its ability to review legislation, and extending the terms of judges (Bánkuti et al, 2015). By appointing loyalists to key judicial positions, Orbán ensured that the judiciary would be less likely to challenge his government's policies, thereby weakening the checks and balances that are essential to a functioning democracy.

The legislative changes under Orbán have also targeted electoral laws, making it more difficult for opposition parties to compete. The new electoral system introduced by Fidesz includes measures such as gerrymandering and changes to the voting system that disproportionately benefit the ruling party. For example, the introduction of a single-round electoral system and the redrawing of electoral districts have been criticized for skewing the political playing field in favor of Fidesz (Bozóki, 2015, p. 82). These changes have contributed to Fidesz's continued electoral dominance and have significantly impeded the ability of opposition parties to mount effective challenges.

Media freedom in Hungary has also suffered under Orbán's rule. The government has exerted control over public media and influenced private media through economic pressures and ownership changes. The Media Council, established under Orbán, has significant regulatory powers and is composed predominantly of Fidesz appointees,

enabling the government to shape media content and stifle dissent (Bajomi-Lázár, 2017, p. 137). Additionally, government-friendly oligarchs have acquired major media outlets, further consolidating control over the media landscape. Independent journalists and media organizations face harassment and economic marginalization, limiting the diversity of viewpoints and critical reporting available to the public (Gessler, 2020, p. 104).

The impact on the rule of law in Hungary has been profound. The Fidesz government has systematically eroded the independence of institutions that are crucial for upholding the rule of law. The appointment of loyalists to key positions in the judiciary, the prosecution service, and regulatory bodies has compromised their independence and ability to act impartially (Krekó & Enyedi, 2018, p. 43). These actions have created an environment where political loyalty is rewarded over competence and integrity, undermining the principles of fairness and justice. The EU has repeatedly expressed concerns over these developments, with the European Commission initiating infringement procedures against Hungary for violations of EU law and democratic principles (Pech & Scheppele, 2017, p. 57).

Furthermore, the erosion of democratic norms and institutions has broader societal implications. The centralization of power and suppression of dissent have led to a climate of fear and self-censorship among citizens and civil society organizations. The government has targeted non-governmental organizations with restrictive laws, accusing them of being foreign agents and attempting to undermine national sovereignty. These measures have stifled civic engagement and reduced the capacity for independent advocacy and oversight (Gessler, 2020, p. 106).

In conclusion, the erosion of democratic institutions, media freedom, and the rule of law under Viktor Orbán's administration in Hungary represents a significant departure from liberal democratic principles. Through constitutional and legislative changes, control over the media, and undermining the independence of the judiciary and other institutions, Orbán has consolidated power and weakened the mechanisms that ensure accountability and democratic governance. These developments not only threaten the integrity of Hungary's democracy but also pose a challenge to the broader European project of promoting democratic values and the rule of law.

6.4.2 Impact on global governance

Hungary's conflicts with the EU, its hardline stance on immigration, and its evolving foreign policy have significant implications for global governance. Under Viktor Orbán's leadership, Hungary has adopted policies and positions that often clash with the core values and regulations of the EU, leading to sustained tensions and legal battles. These developments highlight the challenges faced by the EU in maintaining cohesion and upholding democratic principles among its member states.

Hungary's relationship with the EU has been increasingly fraught since Orbán's Fidesz party came to power. The central issue has been Hungary's democratic backsliding, characterized by the erosion of judicial independence, media freedom, and civil liberties. The EU has repeatedly expressed concerns over these developments, leading to numerous infringement procedures and Article 7 proceedings, which could theoretically result in the suspension of Hungary's voting rights within the EU Council (Pech & Scheppele, 2017, p. 60). Despite these measures, Orbán has remained defiant, framing EU criticisms as attacks on Hungarian sovereignty and using them to bolster domestic support. This conflict underscores a broader struggle within the EU to enforce democratic standards without infringing on national sovereignty, illustrating the limits of the EU's ability to discipline member states that deviate from its values.

One of the most contentious issues between Hungary and the EU has been immigration. During the 2015 refugee crisis, Hungary adopted a starkly different approach compared to many other EU countries. Orbán's government erected a border fence to prevent refugees from entering Hungary and implemented strict asylum policies that effectively closed the country's doors to most asylum seekers (Gessler, 2020, p. 103). This stance was justified on the grounds of protecting national security and preserving Hungary's Christian identity, resonating with nationalist and xenophobic sentiments within the country. The EU, in contrast, advocated for a more collective and humanitarian response to the crisis, including the redistribution of refugees across member states. Hungary's refusal to participate in the EU's relocation scheme led to a significant rift, with the European Court of Justice ruling that Hungary, along with Poland and the Czech Republic, had violated EU law by not complying with the refugee quotas (Traynor, 2020, p. 72).

Hungary's foreign policy under Orbán has also shifted towards a more assertive and independent stance, often aligning with countries that share its illiberal values. Orbán has cultivated close relationships with leaders such as Vladimir Putin in Russia and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan in Turkey, emphasizing mutual interests and a shared skepticism of Western liberalism. This realignment has raised concerns within the EU and NATO about Hungary's commitment to the Western alliance and its potential to act as a conduit for Russian influence (Brattberg & Kimmage, 2018, p. 15). Hungary's blocking of EU statements critical of China and Russia further exemplifies this shift, complicating the EU's ability to present a united front on key international issues.

Economically, Hungary has sought to diversify its foreign relations beyond the EU, increasing trade and investment ties with non-EU countries. This is part of Orbán's "Eastern Opening" policy, aimed at reducing dependence on Western economies and fostering closer economic relationships with countries like China, Russia, and various Central Asian nations (Varga, 2018, p. 96). This strategy has brought some economic benefits, such as increased Chinese investment in Hungarian infrastructure, but it has also led to concerns about the strategic implications of these ties, particularly in terms of Hungary's alignment with EU policies and its adherence to international norms.

Overall, Hungary's conflicts with the EU, stringent immigration policies, and evolving foreign policy illustrate the significant impact of nationalist and populist movements on global governance. The tensions between Hungary and the EU over democratic standards and immigration highlight the challenges of maintaining unity and enforcing common values within a diverse union. Meanwhile, Hungary's independent foreign policy underscores the shifting dynamics of international relations in an era of rising nationalism and geopolitical competition. These developments have broader implications for the future of the EU and the stability of global governance frameworks, as they test the resilience and adaptability of these institutions in the face of divergent national interests.

The case studies of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hungary provide a comprehensive examination of the impacts of nationalist and populist movements on global governance. Each country's experience highlights the multifaceted nature of these movements and their profound implications for both domestic politics and international relations. While the specifics of each case differ, common themes and

significant differences emerge, offering valuable insights into the broader phenomenon of populism and its challenges to global governance.

In the United States, the rise of Donald Trump epitomized the populist backlash against the political establishment and globalism. Trump's presidency was marked by a stark shift in immigration policy, characterized by measures such as the travel ban and the "zero tolerance" policy that led to family separations at the border (Pierce & Selee, 2017, p. 50). His administration's protectionist trade policies, including the renegotiation of NAFTA and the implementation of tariffs on Chinese products, underscored a broader retreat from multilateralism (Ikenberry, 2018). Domestically, Trump's rhetoric and policies exacerbated racial and social divides, while internationally, his "America First" doctrine strained alliances and reshaped global trade dynamics.

The United Kingdom's Brexit movement, driven by nationalist sentiment and spearheaded by figures like Nigel Farage and the UK Independence Party (UKIP), resulted in the historic decision to leave the EU. This decision was influenced by concerns over sovereignty, immigration, and economic control (Goodwin & Milazzo, 2015, p. 130). Post-Brexit, the UK has faced significant political upheaval, with changes in domestic policies, particularly regarding immigration and trade, as it seeks to establish new international relationships and trade agreements (Portes, 2020, p. 89). The Brexit process has highlighted the complexities of disentangling a member state from the EU and the broader implications for the EU's stability and cohesion.

Hungary, under Viktor Orbán's leadership, provides a stark example of how populist and nationalist rhetoric can lead to the erosion of democratic institutions. Orbán's government has systematically undermined the judiciary, restricted media freedom, and curtailed civil liberties (Bánkuti et al., 2015). His administration's hardline stance on immigration, particularly during the 2015 refugee crisis, set Hungary apart from much of the EU and strained relations with other member states (Gessler, 2020, p. 103). Orbán's foreign policy has increasingly aligned Hungary with illiberal regimes, raising concerns within the EU and NATO about Hungary's commitment to Western democratic values (Brattberg & Kimmage, 2018, p. 15).

Common themes across these case studies include a strong emphasis on sovereignty, a rejection of globalism, and the use of nationalist rhetoric to galvanize domestic

support. Each case also illustrates how populist leaders leverage economic and cultural anxieties to challenge established political norms and institutions. Despite these commonalities, there are notable differences in the implementation and consequences of populist policies. For instance, while the US and UK have faced significant political and economic disruption due to their populist shifts, Hungary's experience highlights the long-term institutional degradation that can accompany sustained populist governance.

The broader implications for global governance are profound. The rise of nationalist and populist movements challenges the principles of multilateralism and international cooperation that have underpinned global stability since World War II. These movements often prioritize national interests over collective goals, leading to fragmentation and weakening of international institutions. The EU, in particular, faces the challenge of maintaining cohesion and upholding democratic standards among its member states in the face of rising illiberalism (Pech & Scheppele, 2017, p. 60). Similarly, the global trading system is under strain as countries adopt protectionist measures and renegotiate trade agreements, reflecting a broader shift towards economic nationalism.

Looking forward, the future of global governance will likely be shaped by how well international institutions can adapt to these challenges. There is a pressing need for reforms that address the legitimate concerns driving populist movements while reinforcing the benefits of international cooperation. This includes fostering more inclusive economic policies, enhancing transparency and accountability in global institutions, and promoting dialogue and collaboration among nations. The resilience of global governance structures will depend on their ability to balance national sovereignty with the collective action needed to tackle global challenges like climate change, migration, and economic inequality.

6.5 Responses and Strategies

6.5.1 The UN

The UN has faced significant challenges in responding to the rise of nationalist and populist movements globally. These movements, which often prioritize national sovereignty and interests over international cooperation and multilateralism, pose a

direct challenge to the UN's foundational principles of peace, security, human rights, and development. The UN's responses have encompassed various initiatives, resolutions, and strategic adjustments to address the implications of these movements on global governance.

One of the UN's primary responses to the rise of nationalism and populism has been to reaffirm its commitment to multilateralism and international cooperation. This stance is exemplified in the UN General Assembly's adoption of resolutions that emphasize the importance of multilateralism in addressing global challenges. For instance, the resolution "Strengthening the Role of the United Nations in Enhancing Multilateralism" (A/RES/73/127) underscores the need for member states to uphold and strengthen the multilateral system to address global issues such as peace and security, human rights, and sustainable development (UN General Assembly, 2018, p. 3).

In the realm of human rights, the UN has been proactive in countering the adverse effects of nationalist and populist policies that often target minority groups and undermine human rights protections. The UN Human Rights Council has adopted several resolutions condemning the rise of xenophobia, racism, and intolerance associated with nationalist rhetoric. For example, the resolution on "Combatting Intolerance, Negative Stereotyping and Stigmatization of, and Discrimination, Incitement to Violence, and Violence Against Persons Based on Religion or Belief" (A/HRC/RES/16/18) calls on member states to take concrete actions to promote tolerance and respect for diversity (UN Human Rights Council, 2011, p. 2).

The UN has also focused on strengthening international norms and frameworks to address the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements. The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, adopted in 2018, is a significant example of such an initiative. This non-binding agreement seeks to strengthen international collaboration on migration, emphasizing the need for shared accountability and respect for human rights. The Compact represents the UN's efforts to counter nationalist policies that often demonize migrants and undermine global migration governance (UN General Assembly, 2018, p. 5).

Additionally, the UN has leveraged its convening power to facilitate dialogue and collaboration among member states, civil society, and other stakeholders. The annual

High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) serves as a platform for reviewing progress on the SDGs and addressing the impact of nationalist policies on global development efforts. The HLPF encourages member states to share best practices and challenges, fostering a collaborative approach to addressing global issues (UN Economic and Social Council, 2020, p. 12).

The UN's responses to the rise of nationalism and populism also include efforts to enhance the resilience and capacity of its institutions to address emerging global challenges. The reform initiatives led by UN Secretary-General António Guterres aim to streamline and strengthen the UN's operations, making it more effective and responsive to contemporary global dynamics. These reforms include restructuring the UN's peace and security architecture, enhancing development coordination, and improving management practices to ensure that the UN can better support member states in addressing the root causes of nationalism and populism (Guterres, 2017, p. 8).

In conclusion, the UN's responses to the rise of nationalist and populist movements are multifaceted, encompassing reaffirmations of multilateralism, human rights initiatives, normative frameworks, dialogue facilitation, and institutional reforms. These efforts aim to uphold the UN's core principles and address the challenges posed by these movements to global governance. By promoting international cooperation, tolerance, and respect for human rights, the UN seeks to mitigate the adverse effects of nationalism and populism on global stability and development.

6.5.2 The EU

The EU has faced substantial challenges from nationalist and populist movements within its member states, necessitating the development of robust strategies to manage these pressures. These movements often emphasize national sovereignty and resist supranational governance, posing a direct challenge to the EU's core principles of integration, cooperation, and collective decision-making. In response, the EU has implemented various policies and mechanisms to uphold the rule of law, promote democratic values, and ensure the stability and integrity of the Union.

One of the primary strategies employed by the EU to address nationalist and populist pressures is the use of rule of law mechanisms. These mechanisms are designed to ensure that all member states adhere to the fundamental principles of democracy,

human rights, and the rule of law. The European Commission has initiated procedures under Article 7 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) against member states like Poland and Hungary, where populist governments have undermined judicial independence and other democratic institutions. Article 7 allows the EU to investigate and potentially sanction member states that violate EU values, although the process requires unanimity among member states to impose penalties (Bárd & Carrera, 2017, p. 205).

In addition to Article 7, the EU has also introduced the Rule of Law Framework, which provides a structured dialogue process between the Commission and the member state in question. This framework aims to address potential rule of law breaches before they escalate to the level of invoking Article 7. For example, the EU has used this framework to engage with Poland regarding its judicial reforms, which have been criticized for compromising the independence of the judiciary (Kelemen, 2020, p. 422). The Rule of Law Framework facilitates early intervention and seeks to resolve issues through dialogue and cooperation, reflecting the EU's preference for constructive engagement over punitive measures.

Sanctions and conditionality are another set of tools the EU employs to manage nationalist and populist pressures. The EU's budgetary mechanisms and the allocation of structural funds are increasingly linked to compliance with rule of law standards. The Conditionality Regulation, adopted in 2020, permits the EU to suspend funding to member states that violate the rule of law, thereby providing a financial incentive for compliance (Pech & Scheppele, 2021, p. 1061). This approach underscores the EU's commitment to upholding its values while leveraging its economic power to enforce adherence to democratic principles.

Dialogues and high-level meetings have also been crucial in the EU's strategy to manage nationalist and populist pressures. The EU regularly engages in political dialogue with member states through the European Council and other intergovernmental forums. These dialogues provide a platform for discussing contentious issues, promoting mutual understanding, and seeking common ground. For instance, the European Council has held numerous discussions on migration policies, a key issue exploited by populist movements. By fostering dialogue, the EU aims to address the underlying concerns driving populist sentiments while maintaining a united front on critical policy matters (Schimmelfennig, 2018, p. 974).

Moreover, the EU has sought to counter the rise of populism by promoting positive narratives about European integration and its benefits. Public communication campaigns and educational initiatives aim to highlight the advantages of EU membership, such as economic prosperity, freedom of movement, and collective security. These efforts are designed to counteract the often negative and simplistic messages of populist movements, which tend to emphasize national grievances and scapegoat the EU for domestic problems (Inglehart & Norris, 2016). By fostering a more informed and engaged citizenry, the EU hopes to build resilience against populist rhetoric and strengthen support for the European project.

In conclusion, the EU's strategies to manage nationalist and populist pressures within its member states are multifaceted, involving rule of law mechanisms, sanctions, dialogues, and public engagement. These efforts reflect the EU's commitment to upholding its fundamental values while navigating the complexities of nationalist and populist challenges. By balancing enforcement with dialogue and promoting the benefits of European integration, the EU seeks to ensure its stability and cohesion in the face of rising nationalist sentiments.

6.5.3 WTO and IMF

Economic governance bodies like the WTO and the IMF play crucial roles in managing the challenges posed by nationalist economic policies such as protectionism and trade wars. These institutions aim to promote global economic stability, free trade, and financial cooperation, which often come into conflict with the nationalist agenda of prioritizing domestic industries and economic sovereignty. The WTO and IMF have developed specific mechanisms and responses to address these issues, ensuring that the global economic system remains stable and integrated despite the rise of nationalist sentiments.

The WTO's primary function is to oversee international trade rules and ensure that trade flows as smoothly, predictably, and freely as possible. One of the significant challenges it faces is dealing with protectionist policies implemented by nationalist governments. Protectionism, which includes tariffs, import quotas, and other trade barriers, could interrupt global trade and give rise to retaliatory measures, creating trade wars. The WTO has dispute resolution mechanisms to address such conflicts. For instance, the trade tensions between the United States and China, marked by a series

of tariffs and retaliations, were brought before the WTO for arbitration. The WTO's Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) facilitates negotiations and, if necessary, adjudicates the disputes to ensure compliance with international trade agreements (WTO, 2019, p. 45).

An example of the WTO's response to protectionist policies is its ruling on the U.S. tariffs on steel and aluminum. The U.S. imposed these tariffs under Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act, citing national security concerns. Several countries disputed these tariffs at the WTO, arguing that they breached WTO regulations. The WTO's DSB began investigations to determine whether the tariffs were justified or constituted an unfair trade practice. This case exemplifies the WTO's role in mediating trade disputes and upholding the principles of free trade against nationalist protectionism (Bown, 2019, p. 22).

The IMF, on the other hand, focuses on ensuring global financial stability and providing monetary cooperation. It monitors global economic trends, offers policy advice, and provides financial assistance to countries facing economic difficulties. Nationalist economic policies, such as those promoting self-sufficiency and rejecting international cooperation, can pose significant challenges to the IMF's mandate. The IMF has responded by emphasizing the importance of economic integration and the risks of isolationist policies. For example, during the financial crises in Argentina and Greece, the IMF provided financial assistance conditioned on the implementation of structural reforms aimed at restoring economic stability and promoting sustainable growth (IMF, 2018, p. 33).

The IMF has also addressed the economic impacts of nationalist policies through its surveillance activities. In its World Economic Outlook reports, the IMF highlights the potential risks of protectionist measures and trade wars on global economic growth. These reports provide data and analysis that inform policymakers about the broader implications of nationalist economic policies. For instance, the IMF has warned that escalating trade tensions could undermine global economic recovery, increase uncertainty, and lead to financial market volatility. By providing this analysis, the IMF aims to foster a more informed and cooperative approach to economic policymaking (IMF, 2019, p. 12).

In addition to its analytical work, the IMF engages in policy dialogue with member countries to encourage economic policies that support global stability. During the annual Article IV consultations, the IMF reviews the economic policies of each member country and offers recommendations for improvement. This dialogue often includes discussions on the adverse effects of protectionist measures and the benefits of open and integrated markets. By engaging with member countries through these consultations, the IMF promotes policies that align with its goals of economic stability and growth (Kose et al., 2020, p. 106).

The combined efforts of the WTO and IMF illustrate a comprehensive approach to managing the challenges posed by nationalist economic policies. While the WTO addresses trade-related disputes and upholds free trade principles through its legal frameworks, the IMF focuses on financial stability and economic integration through policy advice and financial assistance. Both institutions emphasize the importance of multilateral cooperation and the risks associated with protectionism and economic nationalism. Their coordinated efforts are crucial for maintaining a stable and integrated global economic system in the face of rising nationalist sentiments.

6.5.4 Assessment of effectiveness

Evaluating the effectiveness of the responses by the UN, the EU, the WTO, and the IMF to the rise of nationalist and populist movements reveals a complex picture. These institutions have implemented various strategies to address the challenges posed by these movements, with varying degrees of success. This section examines the strengths and weaknesses of these responses, highlights criticisms, and suggests potential areas for improvement.

One of the primary strengths of the UN's response is its consistent reaffirmation of multilateralism and international cooperation. The adoption of resolutions such as "Strengthening the Role of the United Nations in Enhancing Multilateralism" underscores the UN's commitment to these principles (UN General Assembly, 2018, p. 3). This approach is crucial in maintaining a unified global stance against the fragmentation caused by nationalist policies. However, a significant weakness lies in the UN's limited enforcement power. Resolutions often rely on the voluntary compliance of member states, which can be challenging to secure when nationalist governments prioritize sovereignty over international obligations. This limitation is

evident in the ongoing difficulties in enforcing human rights standards in countries with strong nationalist agendas (Guterres, 2017, p. 8).

The EU's strategies to manage nationalist and populist pressures have shown both strengths and weaknesses. The use of Article 7 TEU and the Rule of Law Framework demonstrates the EU's commitment to upholding democratic values and the rule of law (Bárd & Carrera, 2017, p. 205). These mechanisms provide a structured approach to addressing rule of law breaches and fostering dialogue. However, the requirement for unanimity in imposing sanctions under Article 7 limits its effectiveness, as member states with similar nationalist agendas can block punitive measures. Additionally, the EU's reliance on economic sanctions and conditionality, such as the Conditionality Regulation linking EU funds to rule of law adherence, has been criticized for potentially exacerbating tensions with nationalist governments (Pech & Scheppele, 2021, p. 1061). While these measures aim to incentivize compliance, they can also deepen the divide between the EU and member states feeling targeted by these policies.

The WTO's dispute resolution mechanisms are a key strength in managing the challenges of protectionism and trade wars. The organization's ability to facilitate negotiations and adjudicate disputes helps maintain a rules-based international trade system (WTO, 2019, p. 45). The WTO's ruling on the U.S. tariffs on steel and aluminum, for example, highlights its role in addressing protectionist policies. However, the effectiveness of the WTO is often undermined by the length and complexity of the dispute resolution process. Trade disputes can take years to resolve, during which time the economic damage from protectionist measures can escalate. Additionally, the recent paralysis of the WTO's Appellate Body due to the U.S. blocking new appointments has significantly weakened the organization's capacity to enforce trade rules (Bown, 2019, p. 22).

The IMF's responses to nationalist economic policies through surveillance, policy dialogue, and conditional financial assistance have been effective in promoting economic stability and integration. The IMF's World Economic Outlook reports and Article IV consultations provide valuable analysis and policy recommendations to member countries, highlighting the risks of protectionism and the benefits of open markets (IMF, 2019, p. 12). However, the IMF's conditionality approach, requiring countries to implement specific economic reforms in exchange for financial assistance, has faced criticism for imposing austerity measures that can exacerbate social and

economic inequalities. The experiences of Argentina and Greece illustrate the contentious nature of these conditions, where required reforms led to significant social unrest and economic hardship (IMF, 2018, p. 33).

Despite the strengths of these global governance institutions, criticisms highlight the need for improvement. One major criticism is the perceived democratic deficit within these institutions, where decision-making processes are often seen as distant and unaccountable to the populations they affect. Enhancing transparency and inclusivity in governance structures could help address this issue, fostering greater legitimacy and trust in these institutions (Kose et al., 2020, p. 106). Furthermore, there is a need for more flexible and adaptive approaches to dealing with nationalist and populist movements. Rigid enforcement mechanisms and conditionality can sometimes backfire, leading to resistance and further entrenchment of nationalist positions.

In conclusion, the responses of the UN, EU, WTO, and IMF to nationalist and populist challenges exhibit a mix of strengths and weaknesses. While these institutions play crucial roles in maintaining global stability and promoting cooperation, their effectiveness is often limited by enforcement challenges, lengthy processes, and resistance from nationalist governments. Addressing these limitations through increased transparency, inclusivity, and flexibility could enhance their ability to manage the complex dynamics of global governance in the face of rising nationalism and populism.

6.5.5 Strategies for reconciliation

6.5.5.1 Dialogue and diplomacy

Dialogue and diplomacy play critical roles in addressing the concerns raised by nationalist and populist movements while maintaining the principles of global governance. These strategies are essential for fostering mutual understanding, resolving conflicts, and building consensus on contentious issues. By engaging in open and constructive dialogue, global governance institutions can bridge the gap between nationalist priorities and international cooperation. This section explores the effectiveness of dialogue and diplomacy in reconciling these concerns, supported by case studies of successful diplomatic efforts.

One of the primary benefits of dialogue and diplomacy is their ability to create platforms for communication and negotiation. These platforms enable stakeholders to articulate their positions, understand each other's perspectives, and work towards common goals. The UN has long championed the importance of diplomatic dialogue in resolving international conflicts and addressing global challenges. The UN's annual General Assembly meetings and various high-level forums provide opportunities for member states to engage in dialogue on critical issues, including those driven by nationalist and populist agendas. For example, the UN facilitated dialogues on migration that culminated in the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in 2018. This agreement, though non-binding, represents a diplomatic success in addressing the complex and often contentious issue of migration (UN General Assembly, 2018, p. 5).

Another illustrative case is the EU's use of dialogue to manage the tensions arising from Brexit. The Brexit negotiations between the EU and the United Kingdom were marked by intense diplomatic efforts to reach an agreement that would minimize disruption while respecting the UK's decision to leave the EU. The resulting Withdrawal Agreement and the subsequent Trade and Cooperation Agreement illustrate how sustained dialogue and negotiation can lead to mutually acceptable solutions. These agreements address a wide range of issues, including trade, security, and citizens' rights, demonstrating the potential of diplomacy to reconcile nationalist aspirations with the need for cooperative international relationships (Menon & Salter, 2019, p. 302).

Dialogue and diplomacy are also vital in addressing economic nationalism and protectionist policies. The WTO frequently engages in diplomatic efforts to resolve trade disputes through its DSB. A notable example is the resolution of the long-standing trade conflict between the United States and China. Through a series of negotiations facilitated by the WTO, both countries agreed on a "Phase One" trade deal in January 2020, which included commitments on intellectual property, technology transfer, and the purchase of agricultural products. While the deal did not resolve all issues, it marked a significant step towards easing trade tensions through diplomatic means (Bown, 2020, p. 12).

Despite the initial progress marked by the "Phase One" trade deal, the U.S.-China trade relations continued to face significant challenges. The Biden administration inherited

a complex and strained trade landscape and opted to implement strategic tariff hikes on Chinese electric vehicles, solar cells, steel, and aluminum in an effort to address ongoing concerns about China's trade practices and domestic market impacts (Boak et al., 2024, p. 5). This move was seen as both a continuation and an adaptation of the previous administration's policies, reflecting a nuanced approach to balancing protectionist measures with multilateral negotiations. The Biden administration's tariffs aimed to protect American industries while encouraging China to adhere to international trade norms. Concurrently, the WTO remained a crucial forum for addressing these disputes, as the U.S. and China continued to engage in diplomatic dialogues facilitated by international organizations. These dialogues were essential in preventing further escalation and working towards a more stable and fair trading environment, despite the persistent economic nationalism and protectionist policies on both sides (Boak et al., 2024, p. 6). This period illustrated the delicate balance of unilateral actions and multilateral diplomacy in managing complex international trade relationships.

The IMF also employs dialogue and diplomacy to address the economic policies of its member states. During the financial crises in Greece and Argentina, the IMF engaged in extensive consultations with national governments to develop bailout packages that included structural reforms. These negotiations were challenging, often requiring compromises from both sides. However, the resulting agreements helped stabilize the economies and set the stage for recovery, highlighting the importance of diplomacy in managing economic nationalism and promoting global financial stability (IMF, 2018, p. 33).

Despite these successes, the effectiveness of dialogue and diplomacy can be limited by several factors. Nationalist and populist leaders may be resistant to international engagement, perceiving it as a threat to sovereignty. Additionally, power imbalances between negotiating parties can hinder fair and equitable outcomes. For instance, smaller or economically weaker states may struggle to assert their interests in negotiations with more powerful countries or institutions. Addressing these challenges requires a commitment to inclusive and transparent diplomatic processes, where all parties have a voice and the outcomes are perceived as legitimate and fair (Kose et al., 2020, p. 106).

In conclusion, dialogue and diplomacy are indispensable tools for reconciling nationalist and populist concerns with the goals of global governance. Through sustained and inclusive dialogue, global institutions can foster mutual understanding, resolve conflicts, and build consensus on contentious issues. The case studies of the UN, EU, WTO, and IMF demonstrate the potential of diplomatic efforts to achieve meaningful and lasting solutions. However, to enhance the effectiveness of these strategies, it is crucial to address power imbalances and ensure that all stakeholders are genuinely engaged in the process.

6.5.5.2 Policy compromises

In addressing the rising tide of nationalist and populist movements, policy compromises are essential to reconcile the often conflicting demands of national sovereignty with the objectives of global governance. These compromises involve negotiated agreements and policy adjustments that balance national interests with global responsibilities. Effective policy compromises not only address the immediate concerns of nationalist and populist movements but also uphold the principles of international cooperation and global stability. This section explores potential policy compromises, supported by specific examples of negotiated agreements and adjustments that have successfully bridged these divides.

One notable example of policy compromise is the Paris Agreement on climate change, which exemplifies how global governance goals can be aligned with national interests through negotiated agreements. The Paris Agreement aims to restrict global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius. It allows countries to set their own nationally determined contributions (NDCs) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, providing flexibility to accommodate national circumstances while committing to a collective global goal. This structure respects national sovereignty and acknowledges the diverse economic and developmental contexts of different countries, thereby addressing nationalist concerns while promoting global environmental sustainability (UNFCCC, 2015, p. 2).

Another successful policy compromise is the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reforms. The CAP, which provides subsidies and support to EU farmers, has been a point of contention due to its impact on global trade and market distortions. Over the years, the EU has implemented several reforms to address these concerns

while maintaining support for its agricultural sector. The latest reforms emphasize sustainability, climate action, and rural development, aligning the CAP with broader EU environmental and economic goals. These adjustments have helped to balance the protection of national agricultural interests with the need to comply with WTO rules and contribute to global food security (Matthews, 2018, p. 5).

Trade agreements often serve as arenas for negotiating policy compromises that address nationalist and global governance concerns. The USMCA, which supplanted NAFTA, is a pertinent example. The USMCA includes provisions that address the trade imbalances and job losses that fueled nationalist sentiments in the United States, such as regulations of origin for automobiles and labor protections. Simultaneously, it maintains the principles of free trade and economic integration essential for global governance. This agreement illustrates how policy adjustments can address domestic concerns while preserving the benefits of international cooperation (Ciuriak, 2019, p. 98).

Immigration policy is another area where policy compromises can address both nationalist concerns and global governance goals. The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, adopted by the UN in 2018, provides a structure for global collaboration on migration. The Compact acknowledges the sovereignty of states to determine their migration policies while emphasizing the importance of protecting the rights of migrants and fostering international cooperation. This approach allows countries to maintain control over their borders and immigration policies, addressing nationalist concerns, while promoting the humane and orderly management of migration flows (UN General Assembly, 2018, p. 5).

Fiscal policies and economic governance also present opportunities for policy compromises. The European Stability Mechanism (ESM) and the fiscal rules of the EU Stability and Growth Pact are designed to ensure fiscal discipline within the Eurozone while providing financial assistance to member states in crisis. Reforms to these mechanisms, such as the introduction of greater flexibility in fiscal rules during economic downturns, aim to balance the need for national fiscal autonomy with the requirements of collective economic stability. These adjustments address the concerns of member states facing economic hardships while maintaining the integrity of the Eurozone (Schelkle, 2017, p. 112).

In conclusion, policy compromises are crucial for reconciling nationalist and populist concerns with the goals of global governance. The examples of the Paris Agreement, CAP reforms, USMCA, the Global Compact on Migration, and EU fiscal policies illustrate how negotiated agreements and policy adjustments can address both national interests and global responsibilities. These compromises highlight the importance of flexibility, dialogue, and mutual respect in achieving balanced and sustainable solutions. By fostering a collaborative approach, global governance institutions can effectively manage the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements.

6.5.5.3 Inclusive Governance

Inclusive governance is essential for making global governance institutions more representative of diverse perspectives and ensuring that the voices of all stakeholders, including nationalist and populist entities, are heard in global dialogues. This approach can help bridge the gap between national sovereignty and global cooperation, fostering a more stable and equitable international system. Strategies for achieving inclusive governance involve institutional reforms, participatory initiatives, and efforts to enhance transparency and accountability.

One of the primary strategies for promoting inclusive governance is the reform of global governance institutions to better reflect the changing dynamics of international relations. This includes expanding the representation of developing countries and emerging economies in decision-making processes. For instance, the IMF has implemented quota reforms to increase the voting power of underrepresented countries. The 2010 IMF quota reforms, which came into effect in 2016, shifted more than 6% of quota shares to dynamic emerging market and developing countries, making the institution more representative of the global economy (IMF, 2016, p. 45). Such reforms enhance the legitimacy and effectiveness of global governance institutions by ensuring that they are more inclusive of diverse perspectives.

Increasing the participation of nationalist and populist entities in global dialogues is another crucial aspect of inclusive governance. By engaging these groups in meaningful dialogue, global institutions can address their concerns and integrate their perspectives into policy-making processes. The UN has developed various initiatives to facilitate the participation of a broad range of stakeholders, including civil society organizations, local communities, and political movements. The UN's Economic and

Social Council (ECOSOC) engages with non-governmental organizations through consultative status, allowing these groups to contribute to discussions on social and economic development (UN ECOSOC, 2020, p. 22). Expanding such participatory mechanisms to include nationalist and populist entities can help address their grievances and foster greater cooperation.

Transparency and accountability are fundamental principles of inclusive governance. Ensuring that global governance institutions operate transparently and are accountable to their stakeholders can build trust and legitimacy. The WTO, for example, has made efforts to increase transparency through the publication of trade policy reviews and dispute settlement reports. These measures allow member states and the public to scrutinize the organization's activities and decisions, promoting accountability (WTO, 2019, p. 78). Similar transparency initiatives in other global institutions can enhance their credibility and inclusiveness.

Initiatives to enhance the inclusivity of global governance also involve capacity-building efforts. Supplying technical support and capacity-building resources to developing nations and marginalized groups can empower them to participate effectively in international negotiations and policy-making processes. The objective of the WTO's Aid for Trade initiative is to help developing countries develop their trade capacity and infrastructure, enabling them to benefit more from international trade (WTO, 2019, p. 90). Such initiatives can ensure that all countries, regardless of their economic status, can engage in and benefit from global governance.

Case studies of successful inclusive governance efforts highlight the potential benefits of these strategies. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is a notable example of an inclusive governance model. The GEF brings together multiple stakeholders, including governments, civil society, and the private sector, to address global environmental challenges. Its inclusive decision-making structure ensures that diverse voices are heard, and its projects are designed to reflect the needs and priorities of different communities (GEF, 2018, p. 18). The GEF's approach demonstrates how inclusive governance can lead to more effective and equitable solutions to global problems.

Inclusive governance is vital for making global governance institutions more representative and effective. Strategies for achieving inclusivity include institutional reforms, participatory initiatives, transparency measures, and capacity-building

efforts. By incorporating the perspectives of nationalist and populist entities and other diverse stakeholders, global governance institutions can enhance their legitimacy and address the complex challenges of the 21st century. These efforts can foster greater cooperation and stability in the international system, ensuring that the benefits of globalization are more equitably distributed.

6.5.5.4 Education and Advocacy

Education and public advocacy play pivotal roles in mitigating the rise of nationalism and populism by promoting values of global citizenship, inclusivity, and cooperation. These efforts aim to counteract the divisive narratives often propagated by nationalist and populist movements, fostering a more informed and empathetic populace that values diversity and international collaboration. Through comprehensive educational programs and robust advocacy campaigns, individuals can develop a deeper understanding of global interdependence and the importance of maintaining open, inclusive societies.

One significant approach to combating the rise of nationalism and populism is through education that emphasizes global citizenship. This concept involves teaching students about the interconnectedness of the world and the responsibilities they hold as members of a global community. UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education (GCED) framework is a prime example of such an initiative. GCED aims to equip learners with the knowledge, skills, and values needed to address global challenges and contribute to a more peaceful, just, and sustainable world (UNESCO, 2018, p. 14). By integrating themes of human rights, cultural diversity, and sustainable development into curricula, GCED fosters a sense of shared humanity and collective responsibility, which can counter the insular and exclusionary tendencies of nationalist ideologies.

Public advocacy campaigns also play a critical role in promoting global citizenship and cooperation. These campaigns often leverage various media platforms to reach wide audiences and inspire collective action. For instance, the UN' "Together" campaign, launched in response to the growing refugee crisis, seeks to promote respect, safety, and dignity for refugees and migrants. The campaign uses social media, public service announcements, and community engagement activities to highlight the positive contributions of refugees and migrants to host societies and to counter xenophobic rhetoric (United Nations, 2020, p. 5). Such advocacy efforts are crucial in

reshaping public perceptions and fostering more inclusive attitudes towards marginalized groups.

Educational programs that focus on critical thinking and media literacy are also essential in mitigating the rise of nationalism and populism. These programs help individuals discern between credible information and propaganda, reducing the susceptibility to manipulative narratives often employed by populist leaders. The Media and Information Literacy (MIL) initiative by UNESCO is an example of a program designed to enhance individuals' ability to critically evaluate media content (UNESCO, 2019, p. 22). By teaching students how to critically analyze information sources and recognize bias, MIL empowers them to make informed decisions and resist the influence of populist and nationalist misinformation.

In addition to formal education and public advocacy, grassroots movements and civil society organizations play a vital role in promoting global citizenship and countering nationalism. Organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch conduct advocacy and educational outreach to promote awareness of human rights matters and encourage public advocacy for inclusive policies. These organizations often collaborate with schools, universities, and community groups to deliver workshops, seminars, and campaigns that emphasize the importance of global solidarity and human rights (Amnesty International, 2021, p. 17).

Case studies of successful educational and advocacy initiatives provide valuable insights into effective strategies for promoting global citizenship. For example, the "We the Peoples" project by the UN Association – UK (UNA-UK) engages young people in discussions about the UN's role in addressing global challenges. Through workshops, simulations, and interactive sessions, participants learn about the significance of international collaboration and the impact of global policies on local communities (UNA-UK, 2019, p. 10). Such programs demonstrate how experiential learning and active participation can foster a deeper understanding of global issues and inspire a commitment to global citizenship.

Education and public advocacy are critical tools in the effort to mitigate the rise of nationalism and populism. By promoting global citizenship, fostering media literacy, and engaging in public advocacy, these efforts help build a more informed and empathetic populace. Educational initiatives like UNESCO's GCED and MIL,

coupled with advocacy campaigns such as the UN's "Together" campaign, exemplify effective strategies for countering divisive narratives and promoting inclusive, cooperative societies. As these programs continue to evolve and expand, they hold the potential to significantly influence public attitudes and contribute to a more just and interconnected world.

6.5.5.5 Institutional reforms

Global governance institutions, such as the UN, the WTO, and the IMF, play a crucial role in maintaining international order and addressing global challenges. However, the rise of nationalist and populist movements has exposed significant shortcomings in these institutions, necessitating comprehensive reforms to enhance their effectiveness, accountability, and transparency. This section discusses potential reforms aimed at better addressing the challenges posed by nationalist and populist ideologies, focusing on structural changes, enhanced accountability, and greater transparency.

One of the most pressing areas for reform in global governance institutions is their structural organization. Many of these institutions were established in the mid-20th century and reflect the geopolitical realities of that era. As a result, they often fail to adequately represent the current global power dynamics and the interests of emerging economies. For example, the UN Security Council (UNSC) has been criticized for its permanent membership structure, which grants veto power to five countries: the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, and China. This structure often leads to gridlock and prevents the UNSC from effectively addressing pressing global issues (Weiss, 2013, p. 56). Proposals for reform include expanding the UNSC to include permanent members from regions such as Africa, Latin America, and South Asia, thereby ensuring a more balanced and representative decision-making process (Voeten, 2005, p. 529).

Another critical aspect of institutional reform is enhancing accountability mechanisms. Global governance institutions must be held accountable to both their member states and the global citizenry they serve. This can be achieved through the establishment of independent oversight bodies that monitor the performance and decision-making processes of these institutions. For instance, the creation of an independent review panel within the IMF could provide greater scrutiny of its lending practices and economic policies, ensuring they align with the principles of equity and sustainability

(Woods, 2006, p. 183). Similarly, the WTO could benefit from an independent appellate body to oversee dispute resolution processes, ensuring fairness and impartiality in trade negotiations (Hoekman & Kostecki, 2009, p. 97).

Transparency is another essential component of effective global governance. Institutions must operate with a high degree of openness to foster trust and legitimacy among member states and global citizens. This can be achieved through the implementation of comprehensive transparency policies that mandate the publication of meeting minutes, voting records, and financial disclosures. The World Bank, for example, has made significant strides in this area through its Access to Information Policy, which allows public access to a wide range of documents and data (World Bank, 2010, p. 12). Extending similar transparency initiatives to other global governance institutions could enhance their accountability and public trust.

In addition to structural changes and transparency measures, fostering greater inclusivity within global governance institutions is crucial. Nationalist and populist movements often gain traction by appealing to populations that feel marginalized or excluded from global decision-making processes. To counter this, institutions must adopt more inclusive approaches that actively involve diverse stakeholders, including civil society organizations, indigenous groups, and marginalized communities. This can be achieved through the establishment of advisory councils or committees that represent these groups and provide input on policy decisions. For instance, the UN could establish a Global Civil Society Forum that allows non-state actors to participate in discussions and influence policy outcomes (Martens, 2006, p. 169).

Finally, enhancing the responsiveness of global governance institutions to emerging global challenges is essential. Institutions must be able to adapt quickly and effectively to address issues such as climate change, pandemics, and economic crises. This requires the development of flexible governance frameworks that allow for rapid decision-making and the mobilization of resources. The WHO has demonstrated the importance of such responsiveness during the COVID-19 pandemic by coordinating global efforts to combat the virus and distribute vaccines (WHO, 2020, p. 3). Strengthening the capacity of global governance institutions to respond to crises through dedicated emergency funds and rapid response teams could significantly improve their effectiveness.

Addressing the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements requires comprehensive reforms to global governance institutions. By implementing structural changes, enhancing accountability and transparency, fostering inclusivity, and increasing responsiveness, these institutions can better navigate the complexities of contemporary global politics. These reforms are essential not only for maintaining international order but also for ensuring that global governance remains effective and equitable in the face of rising nationalist and populist pressures.

All in all, the responses and strategies of global governance institutions in addressing the rise of nationalist and populist movements have revealed both the strengths and weaknesses inherent in the current international system. Through detailed case studies of the UN, the EU, the WTO, and the IMF, this chapter has highlighted the varied approaches and effectiveness of these institutions in managing the challenges posed by these movements.

One of the key findings is the proactive role of the UN in addressing the rise of nationalism and populism through its resolutions and initiatives aimed at promoting human rights and countering xenophobia. The UN has emphasized the importance of international cooperation and the adherence to global norms and standards, although its effectiveness is often hindered by the political dynamics within its member states (Weiss, 2013, p. 56). Similarly, the EU has implemented a range of mechanisms, including rule of law frameworks and sanctions, to manage nationalist pressures within its member states. These measures have underscored the EU's commitment to maintaining democratic principles and ensuring member states comply with its core values (Börzel & Risse, 2018, p. 93).

In the realm of economic governance, institutions like the WTO and IMF have faced significant challenges in addressing nationalist economic policies such as protectionism and trade wars. The WTO's dispute resolution mechanisms have been crucial in mitigating trade conflicts, but the rise of unilateral trade measures by major economies has tested its capacity to enforce global trade rules effectively (Hoekman & Kostecki, 2009, p. 97). Similarly, the IMF's role in providing financial stability and policy advice has been pivotal, yet it often struggles with the political resistance from nationalist governments prioritizing domestic agendas over international obligations (Woods, 2006, p. 183).

The assessment of these responses reveals several strengths and weaknesses. On the positive side, the commitment of these institutions to uphold international norms and provide platforms for dialogue and cooperation has been essential in mitigating the adverse effects of nationalism and populism. For instance, the UN's initiatives on human rights and the EU's enforcement of rule of law mechanisms have helped to maintain a degree of accountability among member states (Weiss, 2013, p. 56; Börzel & Risse, 2018, p. 93). However, the effectiveness of these responses is often limited by the political realities within member states and the varying levels of commitment to global norms.

Criticisms of these institutions often focus on their perceived lack of inclusivity and adaptability. There is a growing recognition that global governance structures must evolve to better reflect the diverse interests and concerns of all member states, particularly those from the Global South. Enhancing the inclusivity of these institutions through reforms that ensure more equitable representation and participation can help address some of these criticisms (Martens, 2006, p. 169). Additionally, increasing transparency and accountability within these institutions can strengthen their legitimacy and public trust, essential for effective global governance (World Bank, 2010, p. 12).

Reflecting on the broader implications for global governance, it is clear that the rise of nationalist and populist movements poses a significant challenge to the established international order. These movements often prioritize national sovereignty and interests, challenging the principles of multilateralism and international cooperation. However, they also provide an opportunity for global governance institutions to adapt and evolve. By addressing the underlying concerns driving nationalism and populism, such as economic inequality and cultural identity, these institutions can develop more responsive and inclusive policies (Norris & Inglehart, 2019, p. 214).

Looking ahead, several potential future trends are likely to shape the landscape of global governance. The continued rise of nationalist and populist movements may lead to increased fragmentation and unilateralism in international relations. However, this trend could also prompt a renewed focus on multilateralism and the reform of global governance institutions to better address the needs of a diverse and interconnected world. Efforts to enhance dialogue, diplomacy, and policy compromises will be crucial

in reconciling nationalist concerns with global governance objectives, ensuring that international cooperation remains robust and effective.

In conclusion, the responses and strategies of global governance institutions to the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements are multifaceted and complex. While significant progress has been made in upholding international norms and fostering cooperation, ongoing efforts are needed to enhance inclusivity, transparency, and accountability. By embracing these reforms and fostering a more cooperative international environment, global governance institutions can better navigate the challenges of the 21st century and promote a more just and equitable world.

7. CONCLUSION

The interplay between nationalism, populism, and global governance has emerged as a critical area of study, revealing complex and often contentious dynamics. This research has uncovered several key findings that illuminate the ways in which nationalist and populist movements challenge and reshape global governance structures. First, the rise of nationalist and populist movements in countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Hungary demonstrates a clear trend towards prioritizing national sovereignty over multilateral cooperation. These movements leverage popular discontent with globalization and perceived elite detachment to foster a sense of national revival and identity (Norris & Inglehart, 2019, p. 35).

In the case of the United States, populist policies under the Trump administration significantly altered domestic and international landscapes. Domestically, there was a marked shift towards restrictive immigration policies and protectionist trade measures. Internationally, the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and contentious trade policies, particularly with China, highlighted the tension between nationalist agendas and global cooperation (Nye, 2020, p. 20). Similarly, the Brexit movement in the United Kingdom, driven by nationalist rhetoric, has had profound implications for the EU and global trade relations, leading to political and economic uncertainty (Hobolt, 2016, p. 1261). Hungary under Viktor Orbán's leadership exemplifies how nationalist policies can erode democratic institutions and challenge EU norms, emphasizing national sovereignty over collective European values (Kelemen, 2020, p. 480).

7.1 Policy Recommendations

Addressing the challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements requires strategic and multifaceted approaches. Policymakers must prioritize dialogue and diplomacy to bridge the divide between national interests and global responsibilities. Engaging in constructive dialogues can mitigate tensions and foster understanding, which is essential for maintaining international cooperation (Börzel & Risse, 2018, p. 95). Additionally, implementing inclusive governance strategies that ensure

representation of diverse perspectives within global institutions can enhance legitimacy and effectiveness. Policies must also focus on addressing the root causes of populist discontent, such as economic inequality and lack of political representation, to reduce the appeal of nationalist rhetoric (Inglehart & Norris, 2016).

To practically implement these recommendations, global governance institutions should enhance transparency and accountability, ensuring that their actions are perceived as legitimate and fair. For instance, the EU's rule of law mechanisms and sanctions against member states that violate democratic norms are critical tools for maintaining cohesion and upholding shared values (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, 2020, p. 1190). Furthermore, fostering public advocacy and education campaigns that promote global citizenship and cooperation can counteract the divisive narratives of nationalism and populism (Rosenthal & Kempf, 2007, p. 30).

7.2 Future Research Directions

Future research should continue to explore the multifaceted impacts of nationalism and populism on global governance, with a particular focus on identifying effective strategies for reconciliation. There is a need for more comprehensive studies that examine the long-term effects of nationalist policies on international relations and global stability. Additionally, research should investigate the role of digital media in amplifying populist messages and shaping public opinion, as well as the implications for democratic governance (Stone, 2008).

Furthermore, future research should delve deeper into the intricate relationship between liberal internationalism and populism, exploring whether liberal internationalist policies contribute to the rise of populist movements or if the ascendancy of populism undermines the liberal internationalist framework. This line of inquiry could examine the economic, social, and cultural impacts of globalization and how they create fertile ground for populist rhetoric that criticizes international elites and institutions. Additionally, studies could investigate how populist policies and ideologies influence international cooperation and governance, potentially destabilizing existing multilateral agreements and institutions. By understanding this bidirectional dynamic, researchers can provide insights into developing more resilient international governance structures that can address the root causes of populism while reinforcing the benefits of global cooperation. This research would be pivotal in

forming strategies to navigate the challenges posed by the interplay of these significant political forces in contemporary global politics.

The moral grounding of populist leaders, particularly focusing on how their reliance on religious ethics intersects with moral particularism could be explored. This line of inquiry would examine how populist leaders draw upon religious principles to justify their political agendas and how these religiously informed ethics align or conflict with the context-sensitive nature of moral particularism. Understanding this balance is crucial as it sheds light on how populist leaders navigate ethical dilemmas, justify policies, and appeal to their constituencies. Moreover, this research could investigate whether religious ethics serve to strengthen the moral particularist stance by providing a flexible moral framework or if they introduce tensions by demanding adherence to more universal moral principles. By analyzing case studies of various populist leaders who incorporate religious ethics into their political rhetoric and decision-making processes, future studies can offer deeper insights into the ethical foundations of populism and the potential for reconciling religious and particularist moral imperatives in governance.

Thematic areas for future research could include the intersection of economic policies and nationalist agendas, the impact of populism on human rights and international law, and comparative studies of different nationalist movements across regions. Methodologically, employing mixed-methods approaches that combine quantitative data analysis with qualitative case studies can provide a deeper understanding of the nuanced ways in which nationalism and populism interact with global governance structures (Weiss, 2013).

The challenges posed by nationalist and populist movements to global governance are complex and multifaceted, necessitating a comprehensive and nuanced approach. By synthesizing the findings of this study, offering targeted policy recommendations, and outlining avenues for future research, this research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding and more effective management of these critical issues in contemporary international relations.

REFERENCES

Acharya, A. (2004). How ideas spread: Whose norms matter? Norm localization and institutional change in Asian regionalism. *International Organization*, *58*(2), 239–275.

Ajami, F. (1992). *The Arab predicament: Arab political thought and practice since 1967*. Cambridge University Press.

Albertazzi, D., & McDonnell, D. (2008). *Twenty-first century populism: The spectre of Western European democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Aldy, J. E., & Stavins, R. N. (2012). *The promise and problems of pricing carbon: Theory and experience* (Vol. 21, Issue 2).

Amin, S. (1989). *Eurocentrism*. Monthly Review Press.

Amnesty International. (2021). *Annual report 2021/22: The state of the world's human rights*. Amnesty International.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso Books.

Aristotle. (2000). *Nicomachean Ethics* (R. Crisp, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Aust, A. (2010). *Modern treaty law and practice* (3rd, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Bajomi-Lázár, P. (2017). The Party Colonisation of the Media: The Case of Hungary. *East European Politics and Societies, 31*(1), 136-158.

Bakhurst, D. J., Hooker, B., & Little, M. (2013). *Thinking about Reasons*. Oxford University Press.

Bánkuti, M., Halmai, G., & Scheppele, K. L. (2015). Hungary's illiberal turn: Disabling the constitution. *The Hungarian Patient: Social Opposition to an Illiberal Democracy*, 37-46.

Bárd, P., & Carrera, S. (2017). *Article 7 TEU: A mechanism to protect EU values in Poland and Hungary?* CEPS Policy Insights, No. 2017/08.

Barker, J., & DeTamble, C. (2022). *Populism and the minority experience: Navigating intersectionality in a polarized world*. Oxford University Press.

Barlow, J., et al. (2020). Deforestation in the Amazon under Bolsonaro. *Environmental Research Letters*, 15, 150-170.

Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics* (p. 28). Cornell University Press.

Barton, G. (2002). *Indonesia's struggle: Jemaah Islamiyah and the soul of Islam*. UNSW Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cornell University Press.

Bayat, A. (2007). *Making Islam democratic: Social movements and the post-Islamist turn*. Stanford University Press.

BBC News. (2014). Scottish Independence Referendum - Results. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/events/scotland-decides/results

Berlin, I. (1991). *Against the current: Essays in the history of ideas*. Princeton University Press.

Betz, H. (2019). Populism and Anti-Immigration Rhetoric. *Comparative Politics*, 45, 45-67.

Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In defense of globalization*. Oxford University Press.

Bhagwati, J. (2008). *Termites in the trading system: How preferential agreements undermine free trade*. Oxford University Press.

Biermann, F., & Bauer, S. (2005). *A world environment organization: Solution or threat for effective international environmental governance?* Ashgate Publishing.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. Sage Publications.

Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., & Sevilla, J. (2011). *The demographic dividend: A new perspective on the economic consequences of population change*. RAND Corporation.

Boak, J., Hussein, F., Wiseman, P., & Tang, D. (2024). Biden hikes tariffs on Chinese EVs, solar cells, steel, aluminum — and snipes at Trump. AP News. Retrieved May 16, 2024.

Bonikowski, B., & Zhang, Y. (2023). Populism as dog-whistle politics: Anti-elite discourse and sentiments toward minority groups. *Social Forces*, *101*(1), 185–204. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soac040

Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2018). From the euro to the Schengen crises: European integration theories, politicization, and identity politics. *Journal of European Public Policy, 25*(1), 83-108.

Boughton, J. M. (2001). *Silent revolution: The International Monetary Fund 1979–1989*. International Monetary Fund.

Bown, C. P. (2020). *The trade war: Effects on U.S. and Chinese economies*. Brookings Institution Press.

Bown, C., & Kolb, H. (2020). Tariffs and Trade Wars: The Trump Administration's Approach. *World Economy*, 34, 34-56.

Bozóki, A. (2015). Broken Democracy, Predatory State, and Nationalist Populism. *Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe, 23*(2-3), 77-89.

Brattberg, E., & Kimmage, D. (2018). The Hungary-Russia Connection. *Foreign Policy, 3*(4), 12-21.

Brookings Institution. (2019). *The rise of Hindu nationalism in India*. https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-rise-of-hindu-nationalism-in-india/

Brown, L. R. (2011). *World on the edge: How to prevent environmental and economic collapse*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Brown, L., & Green, T. (2022). The impact of Brexit on SMEs. *Journal of British Trade*, 27.

Burke, E. (1790). *Reflections on the revolution in France*. J. Dodsley.

Canovan, M. (1981). *Populism*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Chang, H. J. (2008). *Bad Samaritans: The myth of free trade and the secret history of capitalism*. Bloomsbury Press.

Checkel, J. T. (2001). Why comply? Social learning and European identity change. *International Organization*, *55*(3), 553–588.

Chesterman, S. (2008). *Globalization rules: Accountability, power, and the prospects for global administrative law*. Cambridge University Press.

Chow, D. C., Sheldon, I. M., & McGuire, W. (2018). The revival of economic nationalism and the global trading system. *Cardozo L. Rev.*, *40*, 2133.

Ciuriak, D. (2019). *The impact of the USMCA on the North American trade landscape*. Centre for International Governance Innovation.

Clarke, H. D., Goodwin, M., & Whiteley, P. (2017). Why Britain voted for Brexit: An individual-level analysis of the 2016 referendum vote. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 70(3), 439-464.

Cohen, J. E. (2006). *Human population: The next half century* (Vol. 302, Issue 5648).

Collier, P. (2007). *The bottom billion: Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it*. Oxford University Press.

Costelloe, D. (2021). *Treaties in Motion: The Evolution of Treaties from Formation to Termination. By Malgosia Fitzmaurice and Panos Merkouris*. Oxford University Press.

Cox, R. W., & Jacobson, H. K. (Eds.). (1973). The Anatomy of Influence: Decision Making in International Organization. Yale University Press.

Croucher, S. M. (2016). French secularism: A case study in contemporary Muslim experience. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *45*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2015.1104377

Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. Yale University Press.

Dancy, J. (1983). Ethical particularism and morally relevant properties. *Mind*, *92*, 530–547.

Dancy, J. (2004). *Ethics without Principles*. Oxford University Press.

Davies, M., & Woodward, R. (2014). *International organizations: A companion*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Davies, Y. (1997). *Gender, the military and the nation*. Gender and Nation.

De la Torre, C. (Ed.). (2019). *Routledge handbook of global populism* (p. 1). London: Routledge.

De Vries, M. G. (1987). *The International Monetary Fund 1945–1965: Twenty years of international monetary cooperation*. International Monetary Fund.

Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal human rights in theory and practice* (3rd, Ed.; p. 29). Cornell University Press.

Dhingra, S., & Sampson, T. (2019). *Life after Brexit: What are the UK's options outside the European Union?* Centre for Economic Performance, LSE.

Dyson, T. (2010). *Population and development: The demographic transition*. Zed Books.

Easterly, W. (2006). *The white man's burden: Why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*. Penguin Press.

Eatwell, R., & Goodwin, M. (2018). *National Populism: The Revolt Against Liberal Democracy*. Penguin Books.

Ehrlich, P. R., & Ehrlich, A. H. (2013). *Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?* (Vol. 280, Issue 1754).

Eichengreen, B. (2019). *Globalizing capital: A history of the international monetary system*. Princeton University Press.

Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M. (2020). What kills international organisations? When and why international organisations terminate. *European Journal of International Relations, 26*(4), 1181-1207.

Esposito, J. L. (2005). *The relationship between Islam and nationalism*. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World* (Vol. 2). Oxford University Press.

Euronews. (2024, February 10). *Dutch universities plan to limit amount of international students*. Retrieved from https://www.euronews.com/2024/02/10/dutch-universities-plan-to-limit-amount-of-international-students

Evans, R. J. (1997). *In defence of history*. Granta Books.

Fabbrini, S. (2019). *Europe's future: Decoupling and reforming*. Cambridge University Press.

Falkenmark, M., & Rockström, J. (2004). *Balancing water for humans and nature: The new approach in ecohydrology*. Earthscan**.**

Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press.

Fieschi, C. (2019). *Populocracy: The tyranny of authenticity and the rise of populism*. Agenda Publishing.

Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization*, *52*(4), 887–917.

Ford, R., & Goodwin, M. (2017). *Revolt on the Right: Explaining Support for the Radical Right in Britain*. Routledge.

Ford, R., & Goodwin, M. J. (2017). *Brexit: Why Britain voted to leave the European Union*. Cambridge University Press.

Frieden, J. (2016). *Global capitalism: Its fall and rise in the twentieth century*. W.W. Norton & Company.

FSI. (2023). *Populism and the erosion of democracy: Global perspectives*. https://fsi.stanford.edu/research/populism-and-democracy

Gareis, S. B. (2012). *The United Nations: An introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Geddes, A. (2020). *Brexit and the European Union: The politics of a divided nation*. Oxford University Press.

GEF. (2018). *The Global Environment Facility: 25 years of inclusive governance*. Global Environment Facility.

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Blackwell.

Gessler, T. (2020). The Illiberal Turn: Populism, Nationalism, and Authoritarianism in Eastern Europe. *East European Politics and Societies, 34*(1), 99-123.

***Getting to Know the World Bank*.** (2012). [Text/HTML]. World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2012/07/26/getting_to_know_theworldbank

Giddens, A. (1986). *Sociology: A Brief but Critical Introduction: A brief but critical introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Gleick, P. H. (1998). *The human right to water* (Vol. 1, Issue 5).

Gleick, P. H. (2014). *The world's water volume 8: The biennial report on freshwater resources*. Island Press.

Goldblat, J. (2002). *Arms control: The new guide to negotiations and agreements*. Sage Publications.

González-Barrera, A. (2019). More Mexicans Leaving Than Coming to the U.S. *Pew Research Center*.

González-Barrera, A. (2019). *Recent immigration enforcement actions: Implications for Latinos in the United States*. https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2019/07/01/immigration-enforcement-actions-in-the-u-s/

Goodwin, M. J., & Milazzo, C. (2015). *UKIP: Inside the Campaign to Redraw the Map of British Politics*. Oxford University Press.

Graham, D. A. (2021). *American Carnage: On the Front Lines of the Republican Civil War and the Rise of President Trump*. PublicAffairs.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Hegemony* (pp. 95-123). na.

Green, F. (2020). The US Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. *Climate Policy*, 89, 89-105.

Grosby, S. (2005). *Nationalism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Guterres, A. (2017). *Secretary-General's report on the work of the organization*. United Nations.

Hall, I. (2020). Modi's Foreign Policy: Bilateralism over Multilateralism. *International Affairs*, 132, 132-155.

Hallegatte, S., Green, C., Nicholls, R. J., & Corfee-Morlot, J. (2013). *Future flood losses in major coastal cities* (Vol. 3, Issue 9).

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Hawkins, K. (2019). *Populism and trade: The rise of economic nationalism*. Oxford University Press.

Hawkins, K. A., Carlin, R. E., Littvay, L., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2019). *The Ideational Approach to Populism: Concept, Theory, and Analysis*. Routledge.

Hobolt, S. B. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy, 23*(9), 1259-1277.

Hoekman, B. M., & Kostecki, M. M. (2009). The Political Economy of the World Trading System: The WTO and Beyond. Oxford University Press.

Hoekman, B. M., & Mavroidis, P. C. (2015). *The World Trade Organization: Law, economics, and politics*. Routledge.

Home Office. (2020). The UK's Points-Based Immigration System: Policy Statement. *Gov.uk*.

Hooker, B. W., & Little, M. (2000). *Moral Particularism*. Oxford University Press.

Hopewell, K. (2019). The WTO and the Crisis of Multilateralism. *World Trade Review*, 67, 67-89.

Hotez, P. J. (2008). *Forgotten people, forgotten diseases: The neglected tropical diseases and their impact on global health and development*. ASM Press.

Iakhnis, E., Rathbun, B., Reifler, J., & Scotto, T. J. (2018). Populist referendum: Was Brexit an expression of nativist and anti-elitist sentiment? *Research & Politics*, *5*(2), 134–153. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168018773944

IEA. (2017). *World energy outlook 2017*. International Energy Agency.

Ikenberry, G. J. (2018). The End of Liberal International Order? *International Affairs, 94*(1), 7-23.

Inglehart, R. F., & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash. *Harvard Kennedy School Faculty Research Working Paper Series*, 90, 90-112.

International Organizations Search | Union of International Associations. (2022). https://uia.org/ybio/

IPCC. (2014). *Climate change 2014: Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.

IPCC. (2018). *Global warming of 1.5°C*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Jackson, F., Pettit, P., & Smith, M. (2000). Ethical particularism and patterns. In B. W. Hooker & M. Little (Eds.), *Moral Particularism* (pp. 79–99). Oxford University Press.

Jackson, J. H. (2006). *The jurisprudence of GATT and the WTO: Insights on treaty law and economic relations*. Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, R. (1997). *Rethinking Ethnicity: Arguments and Explorations*. Sage Publications.

Jones, E. (2018). Brexit and the Sovereignty Debate. *International Politics*, 45, 45-67.

Jones, R. (2022). *Brexit and regionalism*. Cambridge University Press.

Jordan, A., Huitema, D., van Asselt, H., Rayner, T., & Berkhout, F. (2010). *Climate change policy in the European Union: Confronting the dilemmas of mitigation and adaptation?* Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (2017). *Kant: The metaphysics of morals*. Cambridge University Press.

Kapur, D., & Webb, R. (2000). *Governance-related conditionalities of the International Financial Institutions*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Karns, M. P., & Mingst, K. A. (2010). *International organizations: The politics and processes of global governance* (2nd, Ed.; p. 48). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics* (p. 15). Cornell University Press.

Kelemen, R. D. (2020). The European Union's authoritarian equilibrium. *Journal of European Public Policy, 27*(3), 481-499.

Keohane, R. O., & Victor, D. G. (2016). *Cooperation and discord in global climate policy* (Vol. 6, Issue 6).

Klabbers, J. (2017). *International law*. Cambridge University Press.

Kohn, H. (1965). *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. Anvil.

Kose, M. A., Ohnsorge, F., & Sugawara, N. (2020). *A crisis like no other: An uncertain recovery*. World Bank Group.

Kovács, A. (2017). Hungary's Immigration Policy under Orbán. *Migration Studies*, 23, 23-45.

Krekó, P., & Enyedi, Z. (2018). Explaining Eastern Europe: Orbán's Laboratory of Illiberalism. *Journal of Democracy, 29*(3), 39-51.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. clarendon Press.

Lenin, V. (1970). *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Peking: Foreign Language Press.

Levitsky, S., & Roberts, K. (2011). *The resurgence of the Latin American left*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. Crown Publishing Group.

Levy, D. L., & Spicer, A. (2020). *The politics of climate change: International responses to global warming*. Cambridge University Press.

Little, M. (1994). Moral realism: Non-naturalism. *Philosophical Books*, *35*, 225–232.

Little, M. (2000). Moral generalities revisited. In B. W. Hooker & M. Little (Eds.), *Moral Particularism* (pp. 276–304). Oxford University Press.

Lopez-Claros, A., Dahl, A. L., & Groff, M. (2020). *Global governance and the emergence of global institutions for the 21st century*. Cambridge University Press.

Lutz, W., & KC, S. (2010). *Dimensions of global population projections: What do we know about future population trends and structures?* (Vol. 365, Issue 1554).

MacCormick, N. (1984). *Legal right and social democracy: Essays in legal and political philosophy*. Oxford University Press.

Mackert, J. (2018). Populism and Democratic Theory. *Comparative Political Studies*, 51, 635-658.

Martens, J. (2006). Multistakeholder Partnerships: Future Models of Multilateralism? Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Martinsson, J. (2011). *Global Norms: Creation, Diffusion, and Limits*. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/26891

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1975). *Marx & Engels Collected Works Vol 01: Marx: 1835-1843*. Lawrence & Wishart.

Matthews, A. (2018). *The future of the CAP: Keeping it simple*. European Commission.

McCormick, J. (2020). *European Union politics* (3rd, Ed.). Macmillan International Higher Education.

McDowell, J. (1979). Virtue and reason. *The Monist*, *62*, 331–350.

McKim, R., & McMahan, J. (1997). *The Morality of Nationalism*. Oxford University Press.

McNaughton, D. A., & Rawling, P. (2000). Unprincipled ethics. In B. W. Hooker & M. Little (Eds.), *Moral Particularism* (pp. 256–275). Oxford University Press.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1994). The False Promise of International Institutions. International Security, 19(3), 5-49.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2014). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Meyer, J. W. (2019). *World society: The writings of John W. Meyer*. Oxford University Press.

Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global inequality: A new approach for the age of globalization*. Harvard University Press.

Mill, J. S. (1861). 1969. Utilitarianism. *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, *10*, 203-259.

Millar, T. B. (2015). *Current international treaties*. Routledge.

Miller, D. (1995). *On Nationality*. Oxford University Press.

Miller, S. (2023). Diplomatic challenges post-Brexit. *International Relations Review*, 75.

MIT News. (2023). *The rise of majoritarian populism and its impact on democratic institutions*. https://news.mit.edu/2023/rise-majoritarian-populism

Mounk, Y. (2019). *The People vs. Democracy: Why Our Freedom Is in Danger and How to Save It*. Harvard University Press.

Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe*. Cambridge University Press.

Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Müller, J. W. (2016). *What is Populism?* University of Pennsylvania Press.

Munjal, S. (2024). Canada Plans Cap on International Students to Tackle Housing Crisis. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/canada-plans-cap-international-students-tackle-housing-crisis-2024-01-15/

Myers, N. (1997). *Consumption: Challenge to sustainable development* (Vol. 276, Issue 5309).

Narkowicz, K. (2018). Re-emergence of nationalism in contemporary Europe. *Journal of Political Science*, *34*, 1–15.

Nasr, V. (2001). *Islamic leviathan: Islam and the making of state power*. Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, R. J., & Cazenave, A. (2010). *Sea-level rise and its impact on coastal zones* (Vol. 328, Issue 5985).

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.

Norrlof, C. (2020). Populist Diplomacy: Trump and Bolsonaro. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 50, 50-72.

Nugent, N. (2017). *The government and politics of the European Union* (8th, Ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Nye, J. S. (2020). *Do Morals Matter? Presidents and Foreign Policy from FDR to Trump*. Oxford University Press.

O'Sullivan, N. (2019). Conservatism. In *Contemporary political ideologies* (pp. 50–77). Routledge.

Orbán, V. (2014). Speech at the 25th Bálványos Summer Free University and Student Camp. Retrieved from *Hungarian Spectrum*.

Pavone, I. R. (2018). The Paris Agreement and the Trump administration: Road to nowhere? *Journal of International Studies*, *11*(1), 34–49.

Pease, K.-K. S. (2018). *International organizations: Perspectives on global governance*. Routledge.

Pech, L., & Scheppele, K. L. (2017). Illiberalism within: Rule of law backsliding in the EU. *Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies, 19*(1), 3-47.

Pech, L., & Scheppele, K. L. (2021). *Illiberalism within: Rule of law backsliding in the EU*. Cambridge Yearbook of European Legal Studies, 23, 1061-1100.

Phillips, T. (2020). *[Title of the book/article]*. [Publisher].

Pierce, S., & Selee, A. (2017). Immigration under Trump: A Review of Policy Shifts in the Year since the Election. *Migration Policy Institute*.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

Pimentel, D., Berger, B., Filiberto, D., Newton, M., Wolfe, B., Karabinakis, E., & Nandagopal, S. (2004). *Water resources: Agricultural and environmental issues* (Vol. 54, Issue 10).

Pimm, S. L., Jenkins, C. N., Abell, R., Brooks, T. M., Gittleman, J. L., Joppa, L. N., & Sexton, J. O. (2014). *The biodiversity of species and their rates of extinction, distribution, and protection* (Vol. 344, Issue 6187).

Portes, J. (2020). The economic impacts of Brexit-induced reductions in migration. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 36*(S1), S89-S103.

Postel, S. (1999). *Pillar of sand: Can the irrigation miracle last?* W.W. Norton & Company.

Rachman, G. (2020). Populism and the Future of Global Governance. *International Affairs*, 89, 89-111.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.

Ray, I. (2007). Women, water, and development. In *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* (Vol. 32, p. 449).

Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2009). *This time is different: Eight centuries of financial folly*. Princeton University Press.

Risse, T., Ropp, S. C., & Sikkink, K. (1999). *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change* (Vol. 66). Cambridge University Press.

Rodrik, D. (2006). *Goodbye Washington consensus, hello Washington confusion?* (Vol. 44, Issue 4).

Rodrik, D. (2018). *Straight Talk on Trade: Ideas for a Sane World Economy*. Princeton University Press.

Rodrik, D. (2020). Putting global governance in its place. *The World Bank Research Observer*, *35*(1), 1-18.

Rose, N., & Novas, C. (2005). Biological citizenship. In *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems* (pp. 439–463).

Rosenthal, G., & Kempf, R. (2007). Reflecting on Global Governance and the United Nations. *Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung*.

Roy, O. (1994). *The failure of political Islam*. Harvard University Press.

Ruggie, J. G. (1998). Constructing the World Polity: Essays on International Institutionalization. Routledge.

Sachs, J. D. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. Penguin Press.

Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.

Sahu, S. (2019). Economic Nationalism in India's "Make in India" Initiative. *Economic Policy*, 65, 65-89.

Schelkle, W. (2017). *The political economy of monetary solidarity: Understanding the Euro experiment*. Oxford University Press.

Schimmelfennig, F. (2018). *European integration (theory) in times of crisis: A comparison of the euro and Schengen crises*. Journal of European Public Policy, 25(7), 969-989.

Schmidtke, O. (2023). The "Will of the People": The populist challenge to democracy in the name of popular sovereignty. *Social & Legal Studies*, *32*(1), 911–925. https://doi.org/10.1177/09646639221092925

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Knopf.

Sen, A. (2000). *Social exclusion: Concept, application, and scrutiny*. Asian Development Bank.

Shelton, D. (2000). *Commitment and compliance: The role of non-binding norms in the international legal system*. Oxford University Press.

Simmons, B. A. (2009). *Mobilizing for human rights: International law in domestic politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Slaughter, A. M. (2005). *A new world order*. Princeton University Press.

Smil, V. (2008). *Energy in nature and society: General energetics of complex systems*. MIT Press.

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. University of Nevada Press.

Smith, A. D. (2010). *Ethno-symbolism and Nationalism: A Cultural Approach*. Routledge.

Smith, A. D. (2014). *Nation in History*. Wiley.

Smith, A. D. (2014). *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 58, 58-78.

Smith, A. D. (2020). *Nationalism and Modernism: A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*. Routledge.

Smith, J. (2021). *Post-Brexit trade policies*. Oxford University Press.

Smith, J. (2021). Strategic Alliances in Asia: India and Japan. *Asian Affairs*, 78, 78-101.

Spencer, P., & Wollman, H. (2002). *Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. Sage Publications.

Stern, N. (2006). *The Stern review on the economic effects of climate change*. HM Treasury.

Stern, N. (2007). *The economics of climate change: The Stern review*. Cambridge University Press.

Sternhell, Z. (2003). The political culture of nationalism. In *Nationhood and Nationalism in France* (pp. 38–54). Routledge.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its Discontents*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2017). *Globalization and its discontents revisited: Anti-globalization in the era of Trump*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Stone, D. (2008). Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their Networks. *Policy Studies Journal, 36*(1), 19-38.

Swain, A. (2011). *Understanding emerging security challenges: Threats and opportunities*. Routledge.

Taggart, P. (2000). Populism and the Pathology of Representative Politics. *European Journal of Political Research*, 38, 1-24.

Taggart, P. (2019). *The New Populism and the New Politics: New Protest Parties in Sweden in a Comparative Perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Tamir, Y. (1993). *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton University Press.

Tamir, Y., & Rodrik, D. (2019). Nationalism and Globalization. In *The Globalization Paradox* (pp. 78-112). W.W. Norton & Company.

Tamir, Y., & Rodrik, D. (2019). *Why Nationalism*. Princeton University Press.

Taylor, K. Y. (2016). *From# BlackLivesMatter to black liberation*. Haymarket Books.

Thakur, R. (2016). *The United Nations, peace and security: From collective security to the responsibility to protect*. Cambridge University Press.

The Paris Agreement | UNFCCC. (n.d.). Retrieved May 18, 2024, from https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement

Thody, P. M. W. (1993). *The Conservative Imagination*. Pinter.

Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). *Economic development (12th ed.)*. Pearson.

Traynor, I. (2020). Refugees and the European Crisis. *Palgrave Macmillan*.

UN ECOSOC. (2020). *Working with ECOSOC: An NGO guide to consultative status*. United Nations.

UN General Assembly. (2018). *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration*. United Nations.

UN Women. (2018). *Turning promises into action: Gender equality in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

UN-Habitat. (2015). *Global report on human settlements 2015: Planning sustainable cities*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

UNDP. (2015). *Human development report 2015: Work for human development*. United Nations Development Programme.

UNESCO World Water Assessment Programme. (2019). *The United Nations world water development report 2019: Leaving no one behind, facts and figures* (pp. 1–12). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000367276/PDF/367276eng.pdf.multi

UNFCCC. (2016). *The Paris Agreement*. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

UNFPA. (2014). *The power of 1.8 billion: Adolescents, youth and the transformation of the future*. United Nations Population Fund.

UNICEF. (2019). *State of the world's children 2019: Children, food and nutrition*. United Nations Children's Fund.

United Nations Association – UK (UNA-UK). (2019). *We the Peoples: Engaging young people with the UN*. UNA-UK.

United Nations Treaty Collection. (n.d.). Retrieved May 18, 2024, from https://treaties.un.org/Pages/Overview.aspx?path=overview/definition/page1_en.xml

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld

Urbinati, N. (2019). *Me the People: How Populism Transforms Democracy*. Harvard University Press.

Urbinati, N. (2019). Political Theory of Populism. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 111-127.

Uzer, U. (2016). An intellectual history of Turkish nationalism: Between Turkish ethnicity and Islamic identity. *Insight Turkey*.

Varga, M. (2018). Eastern Opening: Hungary's Economic Diplomacy towards the East. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies, 26*(1), 91-103.

Verbeek, B., & Zaslove, A. (2023). Populism and International Relations. *Review of International Studies*, 49, 34-56.

Vertovec, S. (2010). *Transnationalism*. Routledge.

Vincent, A. (1997). Liberal nationalism: An irresponsible compound? *Political Studies*, 45(2), 275–295.

Voeten, E. (2005). *The political origins of the UN Security Council's ability to legitimize the use of force*. International Organization, 59(3), 527-557.

Vörösmarty, C. J., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., Dudgeon, D., Prusevich, A., Green, P., & Davies, P. M. (2010). *Global threats to human water security and river biodiversity* (Vol. 467, Issue 7315).

Walker, N. (2021). *Brexit timeline: Events leading to the UK's exit from the European Union*. https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-7960/

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.

Weiss, T. G. (2013). *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It*. Polity Press.

Weiss, T. G. (2018). *Would the world be better without the UN?* Polity Press.

Weiss, T. G., & Wilkinson, R. (2018). From international organization to global governance. In *International Organization and Global Governance* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

What is the IMF? (2022). IMF. https://www.imf.org/en/About/Factsheets/IMF-at-a-Glance

WHO. (2015). *Climate and health country profile – 2015: A global overview*. World Health Organization.

WHO. (2020). *Global progress report on WASH in health care facilities: Fundamentals first*. World Health Organization.

Wilkinson, R. (2014). *What's wrong with the WTO and how to fix it*. Polity Press.

Wilkinson, R. G., & Pickett, K. (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. Allen Lane.

Wilson, E. O. (2016). *Half-earth: Our planet's fight for life*. Liveright Publishing Corporation.

Wilson, P. (2021). Immigration policies in post-Brexit Britain. *Immigration Studies Journal*, 53.

Woods, N. (2006). The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers. Cornell University Press.

World Bank. (2010). Access to Information Policy. World Bank Group.

World Bank. (2010). *World development report 2010: Development and climate change*. World Bank Publications.

World Bank. (2014). *Turn down the heat: Confronting the new climate normal*. World Bank Publications.

World Bank. (2016). *High and dry: Climate change, water, and the economy*. World Bank Publications.

World Bank. (2018). *Poverty and shared prosperity 2018: Piecing together the poverty puzzle*. World Bank Publications.

World Bank. (2020). *World development report 2020: Trading for development in the age of global value chains*. World Bank Publications.

WTO. (2018). *Annual Report 2018*. World Trade Organization.

WTO. (2020). *Understanding the WTO*. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/utw_chap1_e.pdf

Yack, B. (2012). *Nationalism and the Moral Psychology of Community*. University of Chicago Press.

Young, A. R. (2015). *The European Union as a global regulator?* Palgrave Macmillan.

Zakaria, F. (1997). *The rise of illiberal democracy*. Foreign Affairs, 76(6), 22-43.

Zürn, M. (2018). *A theory of global governance: Authority, legitimacy, and contestation*. Oxford University Press.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name Surname : SAMAN NAJAFI

EDUCATION :

- **B.A. in Political Science : 2016, Shahid Beheshti University, Faculty of Economics and Political Sciences, Department of Political Science**