



The Dialectics of Globalization and the Rise of Populism: Issues in Perspective

Oluwatobi O. Aje^{1*}, Yildom Dunse²; Felix Chidozie³

^{1,2,3} Department of Political Science and International Relations, College of Leadership
Development Studies, Covenant University, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria

Received: 18 March 2017 ; Accepted: 20 Jan 2018

Abstract:

The paper examines the dialectical nature of globalization and the rise of populism in contemporary world politics. Unequivocally, the world has become a global village and the subject of globalization has become one of the preponderant issues of the 21st century. But this interconnectedness and interdependence have not been innocent of challenges; rising inequality, migrant crisis, environmental degradation, poverty, diseases and international terrorism. Using library research methods, the paper scrutinizes the inherent contradictions in the globalized world vis a vis the resurgence of populism in the developed world. It discovers that, the unprecedented backlashes of globalization have been used by populist individuals and groups as a tangible claim to justify their anti-global aspirations in appealing to the people against established global agents and institutions. The paper posits that the reactionary resentment to global agenda by the developed world that at one time propagated the imperatives of globalization is in itself contradictory. It concludes that although the backlash of globalization has been used by ambitious populist who promises quick fix and better socio-economic and political lot, populism may not be the holistic answer to the challenges facing current international system. It therefore recommends that the short comings of globalization be collectively confronted using the sustainable development goals as a reasonable point of departure.

Keywords: Dialectics, Globalization, Populism, Brexit, Trumpism

Introduction

Contemporary international system bears the stamp of a global village, in which socio-cultural and political-economic affairs in one part of the globe reverberate and influence happenings at another end of the world. The

variegated units of the global system have thus become inexorably linked and firmly knotted with each other. The clamour for a global village was predicated upon the fact that it will accelerate development, increase literacy level, reduce poverty, and promote

*Corresponding Author's Email: ajeoluwatobi@gmail.com

the unification of the distinct units of the international system. Globalization envisages fostering connectivity and interdependence in every facet of life (Jones, 2010). Indeed, with the advancement of science and technology, the process of globalization was fast tracked by increasing cross-border division of labour, migration, and the flow of capital (Kalb, 2000). Consequently, globalization has become one of the preponderate issues in current time, resonating differently among scholars and practitioners as representing political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental vicissitudes.

Although, there are debates as to the historical antecedent of globalization among extant literature, it's arguable that the modern form of globalization which hinges on neo-liberal ideologies and values is inextricably tied to the demise of communism and the setting in of the Americanization process.

Tellingly, the emergence of globalization at the end of the cold war era can be linked to America's mission to instill a new world order culminating in the Americanization of the world as postulated by Fukuyama (1992) in his End of history thesis; with the global triumph of political and economic liberalism, democracy and capitalism thus become the defining moments in history. Hence, the contemporary global structure characterized by neo-liberal values and orientations was architected by the advanced capitalist world with the resourcefulness of the United States.

However, recent incidence reveals a contradiction in which, the master minders and architects of contemporary global order have begun to doubt the sustainability of the unrestrained and interconnected world. The fore-runners of the project are now towing the pathway of systemic withdrawal from the

global project. This is in part due to the growing and unprecedented backlash of the interpenetration project and the enormous challenges which the borderless mission presents and which in a way threatens the sustainability of the socio-economic and political development of these States.

If globalization is the process in which markets of different countries are intergated to exchange goods, technology, capital and service which are not restricted to local economies alone- why the new wave of protectionism and the systemic withdrawal by the same bloc that espouse the idea and who constitute the architect of the global village? Against this evident contradictions, the paper attempts to examine the dialectics of globalization and the rise of populism by interrogating if the recent happening in global politics is another end of history, clash of civilizations or clash of globalizations using the case of Brexit and Trumpism as major point of departure. Following the introduction, the second section dwells on conceptualization and review of extant literature. The third examines the dialectical nature of globalization. The fourth amplifies the cases of Brexit and Trumpism as evident dialectics of globalization, while the fifth section concludes the study.

Literature review

Globalization

Globalization is a concept that has always been contentious. This was corroborated by Dicken (2007:3) when he regards the term as 'one of the most used, but also one of the most misused...and most confused words' in today's world. Jan Aart Scholte noted that 'globalization stands out for quite a large public spread across the world as one of the

defining terms of late twentieth-century social consciousness' (Scholte: 1995). On a larger scale, the term is sometimes used to depict 'increased integration, interpenetration, and interconnectedness' of the world system in socio-political, economic and security areas of human endeavour (Chidozie & Aje, 2017).

The World Bank defines globalization as 'the global circulation of goods, services and capital but also of information, ideas and people' (World Bank, 2000: 3). This implies that the world has no boundaries and geography has become irrelevant. People now move freely across different countries in search of better livelihood, activities and happenings around the globe are scrutinized and commented on as they are happening, ideas are shared to finding solutions to global changes. Castells (1996: 92) see globalization as 'an economy with the capacity to work as a unit in real time on a planetary scale'. It is an instrument that harmonizes the world-beyond borders. Relating the political, economic, social and even cultural aspects of different countries into one as network that stretches across national borders.

Globalization signifies modernity, this was the perspective suggested by Giddens when he defined it 'as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring miles away and vice versa' (Giddens, 1990: 64). To him globalization cannot be understood outside the context of modernity. Linking globalization to the process of modernity, he argues that globalizing is inherent in modernity and 'is evident in some of the basic characteristics of modern institution, particularly their disembeddedness and reflexivity' (Giddens, 1990: 63). He further asserts that modernity is the transformative form of social life.

Some scholars see globalization as a concept that relates to anything outside the economic domain. These scholars try to provide a holistic definition of the term. Held et.al (1999:2) provide an ambiguous concept of the term globalization as 'the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, from the cultural to the criminal, financial to the spiritual'. This definition does not see the term as restricted to a particular aspect of life but the whole. Dicken (2007: 8) noted that globalization is 'not a single unified phenomenon, but a syndrome of processes and activities'. These processes and activities must be seen and understood as spatial, intertwined and woven together whereby the global and local intermeshed.

Globalization is a change and movement that represents a new international system from a dividing era in the cold war into a system that captures integration as its central attribute and is seen as an ongoing process that leads to the inevitable integration of markets (Friedman, 1999). Globalization has brought about arguments as to the pros and cons but it is believed that 'globalization has the potential to bring enormous benefits to those in both the developing and developed world,...it has failed to live up to its potential' (Stiglitz, 2006: 4).

Globalization debate

The concept of globalization has supplanted a line of division between its critics and supporters. Moreover, the debate seeks to explain the dividing lines as to how globalization affects nations and lives of billions of people in the world. The origin of these debates is not well documented but arguments about the concept seem to have flourished rather suddenly in the early 1990s (Bisley,

2007, p. 11). Bisley further gave an example as follows; to the phases of the debate on globalization

Table 1.
Evolution of globalization debate

| Phase of debate | Characteristics | Examples |
|--------------------|---|---|
| Late 1980s | Globalization identified as a process driving radical change in the social realm | Giddens (1990), Harvey (1989), Featherstone (1990), Luard (1990) |
| Early to mid-1990s | Claims about globalization amplified, they become increasable mainstream and key lines of contestation emerge | Ohmae (1995), Giddens (1994), Camileri and Falk (1992), Albrow (1996), Scholte (1993) |
| Late 1990s | Central claims about globalization are theoretically, empirically and politically challenged | Weiss (1998), Garrett (1998), Hirst and Thompson (1996), Rodrik (1997), Hoogvelt (1997) |
| Early 2000s | Consolidation of globalization through parameter setting studies and as a site of political contestation | Held et al (1999), Schotle (2000), Castells (1996, 1997, 1998), Klein (2000), Stiglitz (2002) |
| Mid 2000s | Merits of globalization overtly defended in the face of the critics | Bhagwati (2004), Wolf (2004), Legrain (2002), Friedman (2005) |

Source: (Bisley, 2007: 11)

The debate about globalization has three major dividing lines or schools of thought which are;

Globalist or hyper globalizes

This school of thought has scholars such as Kenichi Ohmea (1995), Manuel Castells (2006), Peter Dicken (1992), and Thomas Friedman (1999). The arguments advance by this school of thought is that globalization is a power transformative force in human existence and history. They recommended a world without borders where an economic activity is denationalized, hence nation-state has diminishing role with multinational corporations as the main carriers of economic activity Ohmea (1995: XIV)

As private sector managers and government policymakers are discovering, it makes no sense in so borderless a world to think, say, of countries like 'Italy' or 'China' as discrete

economic entities. Their internal variations are too great, and their external linkages are too expensive for such slipshod generalizations to be useful as guides to action. Equally important, the sheer speed of business-related migration through the digital network now vastly outpaces the ability of governments—both leaders and institutions—to adapt and respond. Left to their own devices, governments simply cannot move quickly enough to build prosperity for their people.

For globalists 'the process of globalization slices through the political authority of nation-states. Indifferent to national borders, globalization transforms not only economic mechanism but also political power and cultural patterns' (Lemert, Elliott, Chaffee, & Hsu, 2010: 205).

Anti-globalist or sceptics

Commentators like Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson (1999), Naomi Klein (2004), Robert Gilpin (2000), Barry Jones (1995) constitute this school of thought. They argue that globalization promised a lot of things, but still remained a fallacy. Hirst and Thompson argue that globalization is a necessary myth which does amount to the internationalization of the world economy. Anti-globalist questions the supposed benefit of globalization and demand evidences to show that the world has actually become more integrated than it used to be. Arguing further, Hirst and Thompson (1999: 2-3) note that;

- i. Genuinely transnational companies appear to be relatively rare whereas most companies are based nationally and trade multinationally on the strength of major national location of assets, production and sales.
- ii. Capital mobility is not producing a massive shift of investment and employment from the advanced to the developing economies instead foreign direct investment is highly concentrated among advanced industrial economies and the developing world remains marginal in both investment and trade.
- iii. The world economy is far from being genuinely global rather trade, investment and financial flows are all concentrated in the triad of Europe, Japan and North America and this dominance set to continue.

- iv. They argued that the three major economic powers (G3) have the capacity to coordinate policy and to exert powerful governance pressures over financial markets and other economic tendencies.
- v. They further argued that the present highly internationalized economy is not unprecedented.

Transformationalist

This school of thought sees globalization as the driving force which accounts for the rapid political, economic and social changes that are currently reshaping modern societies and the world order. This is a middle ground position to the two other schools of thought. The transformationalist viewpoint centers on Giddens submission that globalization is a power transformative force leading to massive shake-up of societies, economies, institutions of governance and world order (Giddens: 1990). They argued differently from the globalist who saw state power as diminishing but rather that the power of states is being reorganized and reconstituted as a result of the complex nature of governance in the world today. Giddens further argued that the globalization is shaped by four forces- the world capitalist economy, world military order, international division of labour and nation-state system. These forces have helped the advanced capitalist states take lead in the world.

Tadi (2006) gave the summary of the central assumption of the globalist and the anti-globalist as follows;

Table 2.
The main points of the globalist and the sceptics Source: (Tadi, 2006: 187).

| Serial Number | | Globalist | | Sceptics |
|---------------|-------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| | | Radical | Moderate | |
| 1 | Conceptualization | A new era | A contingent and contradictory historical process | Nothing new; ideology and myth |
| 2 | Main Causes | Laissez faire capitalism and technology | Combined forces of modernity | Project of the West |
| 3 | Main Consequence | | | |
| 4 | Economical | New global economy | Post-industrial economy | internationalization of economy |
| 5 | Political | The end of state; global government | Reconstruction and restructuring of state power | States are more powerful than ever |
| 6 | Cultural | Homogenization | Hybridization | Fragmentation |
| 7 | Future Prediction | The end of history, global civilization | Indeterminism | Clash of civilizations |

The Concept of Populism

Before we investigate populism in relation to globalization we need to make clear what we are talking about. Populism is a completely fluid term that has specific meaning in specific discourses. Most scholars agree that populist movement are 'of the people but not of the system' (Taggart, 1996: 32). It is always as a resultant change against the established status quo in the name of the people or by the people. It has been conceptualized based on political, social, economic discursive features (Weyland, 2001, p. 1) arising from economic and social crisis. Populist hostility is not targeted at only the political, economic, social and cultural facet but also at the public opinion of the media. This was Canovan (1999: 2) opinion of Populism, understood as 'an appeal to the people' against both the established structure of power and the dominant ideas and values. Gellner and Ionescu (1969: 1) noted that by way of

offering a far-reaching analysis of the word;

There can, at present, be no doubt about the importance of populism. But no one is quite clear just what it is. As a doctrine or as a movement, it is elusive and protean. It bobs up everywhere, but in many and contradictory shapes. Does it have any underlying unity? Or does one name cover a multitude of unconnected tendencies? Cited in (Gidron & Bonikowski, 2013: 3)

Just as globalization cuts across borders, so does populism. The concept can be used to represent opinions, political movement, paradigm shift, social revolutions and leaders across boundaries. In so far, the term can be described as chameleonic. Populism has three main conceptual approaches; populism as an ideology, discursive style and political mobilization.

Populism as an ideology

Cas Mudde defines populism as ‘a thin-centered ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogenous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite,’ and which argues that politics should be an expression of the *volontégénérale* (general will) of the people’ (Mudde, 2004: 543). Populism from this definition is firstly an idea characterized by rivalry between the people and the elites, but advocates politics based on the general consent of the people. As thin-centered ideology populism is reflected in a party's documents, manifestoes, literature and the speeches of political actors which are the primary units of analysis (Mudde: 2004).

Populism as a Discursive Style

Populism is sometimes seen as a pretentious, fine-sounding, and persuasive talk. Kazin (1995) observed that it is a concept of ‘us’ and it explicitly represents majority of the people. He further argues that American populism is always based on the differences between us and them. Deegan-Krause, Kelvin and Haughton (2009: 822) made a distinction

between populism as ideology and style and succinctly put it as political talk instead of the idiosyncrasy of the political actor. Accordingly, it “shifts our assessments from binary opposition—a party is populist or not—to a matter of degree—a party has more populist characteristics or fewer”.

Populism as a political Mobilization

This approach emphasizes populism as a political strategy of mass political mobilization, which aims at nationalization and redistribution of economic wealth. It is anti-elitist, anti-tax and sometimes anti-integration. Jansen defines populist mobilization as ‘any sustained, large-scale political project that mobilizes ordinarily marginalized social sectors into publicly visible and contentious political action, while articulating an anti-elite, nationalist rhetoric that valorises ordinary people’ (2011: 82). It stresses the nationalist aspect, the ‘we feeling’ in the mobilization process and try to connect to the people empathically.

Gidron and Bonikowski (2013) gave the characterization of the three approaches to populism discussed above as the following;

Table 3.
Characteristics of the three approaches to populism Source: (Gidron & Bonikowski, 2013: 17)

| | Definition of populism | Unit of analysis | Relevant methods | Exemplars |
|--------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Political Ideology | A set of interrelated ideas about the nature of politics and society | Parties and party leaders | Qualitative or automated texts analysis, mostly of partisan literature | Mudde (2004, 2007), Kaltwasser and Mudde (2012) |
| Political Style | A way of making claim about politics; characteristics of the discourse. | Text, speeches, public discourse about politics | Interpretive textual analysis | Kazin (1995), Laclau (2005), Panizza (2005) |
| Political Strategy | A form of organization and mobilization | Parties (with a focus on structures), social movements, leaders | Comparative historical analysis, case studies | Roberts (2006), Wayland (2001), Jansen (2011) |

The Dialectical Nature of Globalization

With the ever increasing interconnectedness of the international system, some scholars and observers believe that the globalization trend is inevitable as well as irreversible; that in coming years, the international system would have become an advanced borderless world. However, scholars such as, Harold James, Kevin O'Rourke, Zahra Egal and Andrew Sobel have observed that the evolution of the international system has witnessed several epoch and stages of well integrated international community which however collapsed in itself under the pressure of unexpected or unprecedented events (Egal & Sobel, 2009; O'Rourke, 2009; James, 2002).

In Europe, for instance, the universal Erasmian world of the Renaissance was destroyed by the Reformation and its Catholic counterpart, and separatism, provincialism, and parochialism followed. A more immediate (and perhaps more familiar) precedent is the disintegration of the highly interconnected economic world of the late nineteenth century (James, 2002: 1)

Recognising that no one integrated international community is like other, James posits that unequivocally, no one collapse is precisely like another. But the fact remains that well integrated international communities advanced until there ensued irreconcilable contradictions which nurtured the basis for its disintegration. These contradictions regarding the international community often ascend from the 'patterns of thought and institutional mechanisms that arise in response to a new and unfamiliar international or cosmopolitan world'. For example, the collapse of globalism in the interwar depression which destroyed the financial power of Great Britain the 'dynamic force behind the internationalization of the

economy in the nineteenth century' incited Japan and Nazi Germany to invent 'aggressive and exploitative approaches to a nationalist management of the economy' and they largely rejected the ideas and doctrines of globalism (Sobel, 2009; James, 2002). This form of reactionary resentment against globalism at certain points of the global project remains 'similar over long periods'(James, 2002: 1)

Therefore, the continuous vibration of the international community towards interpenetration, interconnectedness and towards a borderless empire carries within itself the possibility of disintegration as soon as there ensue irreconcilable contradictions. Thus, the globalized world system can be described as a project which contains in itself, the grains of its own destruction. James identified two alternate paths to the 'autodestruction' of the globalized world: the first stems from an 'inherent flaw in the system itself'; the second is the reactions and responses generated by this flaw, 'in this account, fear disrupts globalization'(James, 2002: 2).

The first grain of 'autodestruction' described above is anchored in the flaws and faultlines inherent in the global project. These contradictions stem from, the ills, the negativity and the backlash of the system: unwholesome movement of both human and non-human means of production. This becomes amplified when zoomed against contemporary events in the international system.

Philip Martins dwells extensively on the ripple effects of migration as one of the inextricable faultlines of contemporary globalism. Since globalization advocates interpenetration of both human and non-human resources, since it encourages the

outsourcing of workers from beyond national borders, its resultant effect is the mass migration of people towards advanced political economies attracted by socio-political and economic opportunities accentuated by informational networks of family and friends already established in the advanced capitalist world (Martin, 2009).

Indeed, the migration in the early years of the post-cold war era, aided the management of increasing labour shortage in many of the advanced capitalist economies whose work force stagnated as a result of decreasing birth rates (Martin, 2009). However, relying on history especially of the 19th century, Kevin O'Rourke posits that the process of emigration, offers opportunities for poor countries to enhance their standards of living; that, as people migrate from poorer countries into advanced political economies, real wages tends to rise as labor supply shrinks in those countries (O'Rourke: 2009). This gives the poor countries leverage to catch up with the developed countries and also, on the long run, it could destabilize the hitherto socio-economic opportunities enjoyed in the advanced political system. Essentially because, the emigrants hence compete with the indigenes for jobs and other opportunities which could be limited. This creates tensions and mixed reactions from the citizens of the advanced political economies.

Studying the attitude of elite and masses towards transnational trade, labour outsourcing and migration in the United States, Medina and Sobel (2009) discovered that, the elite tend more to embrace transnational trade, outsourcing and migration, perhaps because of their education, exposure and position in the society, whereas the masses tend to be threatened by transnational trade, labour outsourcing and migration. Thus, while elite

embraces cogent elements of globalization for economic reasons, the general public having a shallow understanding of the economic gains 'from globalization and the substitutability of the movement of labour, goods, and capital across borders... reveal a greater globalization backlash' and hence invoke the 'conception of distinct national identity, us versus them' as a basis for anti-globalism.

Related to this issue is the argument that globalization has made it imperative for States to strive towards creating and sustaining favorable conditions that can ensure lasting growth and win the confidence of investors. Consequently, States are thus gradually compelled to 'function primarily in the interests of global capital, rather than functioning for their citizens' (Schirato & Webb, 2003: 117). Although, in theory, these States advance that they work ultimately for their citizens, but when measured against reality, Bourdieu concludes that the priority of these States is primarily to assure investors interest while skillfully ignoring the interests of the poor and of the working classes (Bourdieu, 1998)

Indeed, in the last several decades, there has been revival of inequality in the advanced capitalist world, when measured in comparison to what obtains in the immediate aftermaths of the war eras (Huber & Stephens, 2009). Unequivocally, the resurgence of inequality in the advanced political economies increases with the acceleration of globalization (Huber & Stephens, 2009).

In the same vein, Jean Baudrillard (1993) believes that the contradictions of globalisation makes terrorism inevitable- it is 'the inevitable outcome of our world system' (Baudrillard, 1993: 128). 'The universalizing of 'us', and the exclusion of

'them'-do not come about without effects; they are tied up with a politics, which, many writers argue, leads inevitably to resistance' and in part gives impetus for terrorism (Schirato & Webb, 2003: 41). In the view of Pierre Bourdieu, modern terrorism is thus anchored 'in the despair of those excluded' cited in (Schirato & Webb, 2003: 41). Although one cannot extensively argue that globalisation directly gives impetus to terrorism, but it is safer to posit that the various components of globalization (advanced communication and technologies as well as free movement of people among others) have been instrumental for the continuous success of terrorism. Terrorist activities in developed economies are thus blamed on the uncontrolled migration from poor/developing states where terrorism finds a safe abode to nurture and envisage its plans on the international system. Thus, the enduring question of terror attacks in advanced political economies is often blamed on the negligence of globalization – the free flow of human, arms and other resources.

In essence, the unprecedented backlash of globalization in current times have equally affected the masterminders, the architects of the global project. This is inevitable given that the major industrial states failed to organize realistic agenda. They overburdened the trade talks with inappropriate demands about environmental and especially labor standards... finally, they appeared to encourage the apocalyptic street scenes in which citizens of mostly rich countries, who might have been expected to see themselves as beneficiaries of globalization, rioted against the new economic order (James, 2002: 2).

Hence, the contradictions and backlash of globalization has thus given rise to populist movement across Europe and America with migration and terrorism as the fore issues. The reactions and responses generated by these flaws, bathed by fear and uncertainty in the emerging trends of globalization, is essentially the second pathway to 'autodestruction' of globalisation advanced by James; that 'fear disrupts globalization' (James, 2002: 2). Thus, within the confines of reactionary resistance towards globalization, by the major advocates of the global project, the dialectical nature of globalization finds expression.

Trumpism and Brexit: Evident dialectics of globalization

With the perceived imperfections and challenges posed by the ever increasing erosion of border barriers, culminating in the international spread of terrorism, the emergence of refugee crisis and the Euro Crisis, populism has become an inescapable reality and also a veritable political tool amongst right-wing radicals in Europe and America and the 'mainstream parties have not been able to develop strategies to effectively counter this populism'(Greven, 2016: 2).

Although, this right-wing populism appearing across the United States and Europe may manifest in different forms, but there exists substantial similarities between them which centers on the 'juxtaposition of a (corrupt) political, class or establishment' and the granting of authentic voice to the people. (Ibid: 1)

The second similarity is based on the definition of the identity and interests of the people as culturally homogenous and distinct

from the identity of others 'usually minorities such as migrants, which are supposedly favoured by the (corrupt) elite' (Ibid)

Fundermentally, the strategy and tactics used by right-wing populists is negative political communication. They invoke supposed 'political correctness' as a major theme in their discourse. Often allowing the 'staging of calculated provocations and scandals, and of the breaking of supposed taboos. As this resonates with the needs of the media in terms of markets demands and the news cycle' (Ibid)

The din for systemic withdrawal from supranational organization, the hostility towards non-indigenes who are supposedly favored by the establishment, find bright expression in Britain aspirations to exit the European Union and also in the political manifesto of Trump Presidency. Thus, the Brexit reality and the election of President Donald Trump represents the latest resurgence of populist aspirations in Europe and America- showcasing a new form of status quo ante. It represents a complex reality whereby the supposed losers from globalization find a fortress among individuals in the mainstream party who can help challenge existing establishment- 'the republicans in the U.S., the Tory party in the U.K.' (Nolte, 2016).

Dionne, Pita and Stelzenmuller (2016), rightly locates the reason for this growing development in America and the United Kingdom in the backlash of globalisation and technological change. Particularly, they argue on how economic grievances and political fragmentation justifies the rise of populism in America and Europe. Judis (2016) explains that populism succeeds in U.S. and Europe when the public perceive that the dominant political norms defended and preserved by existing establishment are inimical to their

hopes, fears and concerns. Populists then ramp up these neglected worries, framing them in a manner that pits the people against an obdurate elite. By doing this, they become spontaneous agents for change. This explains why, majority of their supporters are usually those who are economically challenged, whose jobs and incomes are threatened by 'trade, globalization, migration and technology' (Roubini, 2016). Hence, anti-migration, anti-islam, anti-trade, anti-EU, and anti-establishment are usually the mantra of populists who seek to gather the supposed losers of globalization.

This was essentially the case with the Brexit narrative where populists build upon the adverse effects of migrants on the socio-political and economic advancement of the Nation. These populist groups argue that globalisation and its tool (international organisation- the EU) are just a means of enriching certain states with economic, military and intelligent proceeds from Britain. In view of the vote leave group, a vote to leave the European Union, means an end to Britain's loyalty to the Union, an end to the sending of over £ 350 million every week to Brussels, and instead the funds will be spent on Britain's domestic priorities, the NHS and science research among others (Brown, 2015). Corroborating the Vote Leave Camp, the Leave EU Camp posit that by leaving the European Union, Britain will have more funds for domestic concerns, 'each household could be better off by this amount - through cheaper food bills, no membership fees, with the cost of regulations lifted, too.' (Brown, 2015: 4)

They reject the unification of currency and reiterate the lessons of the Great Recession and are hostile to immigrants because they regard them as seedbeds of crime and ultimately of terrorism. They

conclude that the reality of this is that unemployment rate and insecurity level has increased and the nation has become more vulnerable than ever before. And above all, the nation has lost its main sovereignty and respect among the communities of nations. Thus, the Leave E.U. campaign for the restoration of Britain's sovereignty in order to ward off migrants and border threats. Accordingly, 'Imagine not having our laws dictated to us by Brussels. Instead, MPs would become accountable to the public and we would once again be able to make and decide on our own laws. Imagine how we could then regain control of important issues such as our borders' (Brown, 2015: 4). Therefore, the call to exit the European Union is a call to make Britain and Britons 'great again' - a clarion call to ensure that Britain takes charge of its borders and tackles its security challenges independently without relying on orders from the Union.

Similarly, the campaign manifestoes that ushered in U.S. President Donald Trump built on the supposed negligence of the establishment. The repudiation of immigrants who are perceived to be a threat to national employment, security and development. It was observed that during the campaigns, Trump continually played on racist opposition, and 'exploiting a latent sympathy for fascism among working-class white Americans' (Judis, 2016).

Essentially, he holds the view that, given the growing tensions of international terrorism, the admission of Muslims into the United States should be minimal if not holistically terminated. He believes that the multilateral concerns over climate issues, is not really as serious as often described by national and supranational establishment. To

him, 'climate change is just a weather' and it should not be made so complicated as to disrupt or imperil national and transnational companies (BBC, 2016). Accordingly, the Paris Climate agreement if adhered to, could cost the United States over 2.5 trillion dollars and over 6.5 million jobs, while America's household income will reduce drastically (Varinsky, 2017). Perhaps that was a valid reason for exiting the Paris Climate agreement.

Trump portrayed himself as one who is hostile to free trade, illegal immigrants and the savior of the 'silent majority' (Judis, 2016). Free trade in his view was unfavourable to the United States as other nations tend to gain more from the bilateral and multilateral trade relations. And the illegal immigrants were termed the crime executioners in America, taking away the jobs of the people and constituting potential threats to the nation. Thus his avowal to be politically correct and uncover political mysteries hitherto covered by previous establishment in order to reshape the political defect set in motion by establishment.

Paul Nolte argues that although the establishment and institutions may be largely faulty and could awaken the desire for better administration and institutions, it is instructive to note that current status quo ante signals a dramatic lack of legitimacy for complex institutions beyond the national state, a lack of understanding for the necessary complexity of multilayered institutions in the 21st century; and most of all, a product of ruthless seduction by populist politicians with false claims of returning to a more simple world of order... therefore, the recourse to one's own nation, and a framework of national politics undisturbed by transnational

entanglements and obligations takes center stage: be it in Trump's "make America Great Again", in the anti-EU thrust of the Brexit movement...The utopian society of populists everywhere is a stable society of indigenous citizens, not disturbed by globalization, by mobility and migration(Nolte, 2016).

The above reveals that there is a gradual reduction of legitimacy to the global project by the advanced capitalist world. This points to the central fact that, globalization like every other social reality is subject to the logic of dialectics, as the growing call among great powers to withdraw systematically from the global project contradict their age-long position, when they evangelised the inevitability and indispensability of globalization.

Conclusion

Despite the irrefutable benefits of globalization, there have emerged a repudiation among great powers who at one time publicised the imperative of globalization. The resultant backlash of globalization and the increased ineffectiveness of global institutions have reinforced the claim for a systemic withdrawal from the global project. Simultaneously, this supposed ineffectiveness of global institutions have been used by populist individuals and groups as a tangible claim to justify their anti-global aspirations. Truly, since fear of becoming victims and losers of the global project hampers the blossoming of globalization, populists present themselves as alternative, that can provide quick fix and

redress the fear of the people.

However, it is imperative to note that populism might not be the answer to the challenges presented by the defects of globalization. Populism could perhaps compound the problem that the current international system faces, because, what populism represents is much deeper than mere pointing out the gaps of the establishment and of globalization agents and institutions. Precisely, it is 'the epiphenomenon for a crisis of modernity (Nolte, 2016).

Therefore, the ever increasing vulnerability of the system at large, can not become cured by clinging to national pedigrees as the ultimate solution. Since these challenges are problems without passport, it remains sound and logical to combat them collectively. However, the worries and anxieties of the populist should be taken into consideration in recasting the fate of the global system. Poverty, growing inequalities, insecurity, among others represent the premises upon which populists seek to incite the masses, these concerns and worries should therefore be given serious thoughts. Specifically, the realization of the Sustainable development Goals of the United Nations which envisage to free the world of poverty, restore and protect the sanity of the eco-system and ensure peace and stability could be the right point of departure for national and international bodies in combating the rise of populism in current times.

References

- Baudrillard, J. (1993). *The Transparency of Evil*. New York: Verso.
- BBC. (2016). *Donald Trump: 24 Things the Next President Believes*. Retrieved June 15, 2017, from BBC: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-34903577>, November 9
- Bisley, N. (2007). *Rethinking Globalization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myth of our Time*. (N. Richard, Trans.) London: Polity Press.
- Brown, T. (2015). *Brexit: The Leave Narrative*. Retrieved June 11, 2017, from IIEA: <http://www.iiea.com/ftp/Publications/2015/Brexit-The%20Leave%20Narrative.pdf>
- Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy. *Political Studies*, XLVII, 2-16.
- Chidozie, F., & Aje, O. O. (2017). International Organizations and Global Governance Agenda: SGDS as a Paragon. *Acta Universitatis Danubius*, 10(1), 66-83. Retrieved August 11, 2017, from <http://journals.universityofdanubius.ro/index.php/internationalis/article/view/2379/4114>
- Cuterela, S. (2012). Globalization: Definition, Processes and Concepts. *Romanian Statistical Review*, 137-146.
- Dicken, P. (2007). *Global Shift: Mapping the changing contours of the world Economy*. London: Sage.
- Dionne, E., Pita, A., & Stelzenmuller, C. (2016). *The Rise of the Right: Right-Wing Populism in the U.S. and Europe*. Retrieved June 13, 2017, from Brookings: <https://www.brookings.edu/podcast-episode/the-rise-of-the-right-right-wing-populism-in-the-u-s-and-europe/>, April 13
- Egal, Z., & Sobel, A. (2009). *Capital Mobility and State Social Welfare Provisions in the late 1880s*. New York: Routledge.
- Friedman, T. (1999). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. London: Harper Collins.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gellner, E., & Ionescu, G. (1969). *Populism: Its Meanings and National Characteristics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gidron, N., & Bonikowski, B. (2013). *Varieties of Populism: Literature Review and Research Agenda*. Cambridge: Weatherhead center for International affairs. Retrieved from http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/gidron/_bonikowski_populismreview_2013.pdf
- Greven, T. (2016). *The Rise of Right-Wing Populism in Europe and the United States: A comparative Perspectives*. Retrieved June 26, 2017, from Friedrich Ebert Stiftung: http://www.fesdc.org/fileadmin/user_upload/publications/RightwingPopulism.pdf, May
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.

- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1999). *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity.
- Huber, E., & Stephens, J. (2009). Globalization and inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean. In A. Sobel, *Challenges of Globalization: Immigration, Social Welfare, Global Governance* (pp. 127-153). New York: Routledge.
- James, H. (2002). *The End of Globalization: Lessons from the Great Depression*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Jansen, R. S. (2011). Populist Mobilization: A New Theoretical Approach to Populism. *Sociological Theory*, 29(2), 75-96.
- Jones, A. (2010). *Globalization: Key Thinkers*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Judis, J. (2016). *Us V Them: The Birth of Populism*. Retrieved June 11, 2017, from The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/oct/13/birth-of-populism-donald-trump>, October 13
- Kalb, D. (2000). Localizing Flows: Power, Paths, Institutions, and Networks. In D. Kalb, L. Marco Van Der, S. Richard, V. S. Bart, & W. Nico, *The Ends of Globalization: Bringing Society Back In* (pp. 1-29). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield publishers, Inc.
- Kazin, M. (1995). *The Populist Persuasion: An American History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Krause, D., Kevin, & Haughton, T. (2009). Toward a more useful conceptualization of populism: Types and degrees of populist appeals in the case of Slovakia. *Politics and Policy*, 37(4), 821-841.
- Lemert, C., Elliott, A., Chaffee, D., & Hsu, E. (2010). The Great Globalization Debate, 1989-2010. In C. Lemert, A. Elliott, D. Chaffee, & E. Hsu, *Globalization* (pp. 201-266). London: Routledge.
- Martin, P. (2009). Sustainable Labor Migration Policies in a Globalizing World`. In A. Sobel, *Challenges of Globalization: Immigration, Social Welfare, Global Governance* (pp. 18-42). New York: Routledge.
- Medina, M., & Sobel, A. (2009). Economic Versus Identity. In A. Sobel, *Challenges of Globalization: Immigration, Social Welfare, Global Governance*2. New York: Routledge.
- Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition*, 39(4), 542-563.
- Mulinge, M., & Margaret, M. (2001). Globalisation and Sustainable Development in Africa: putting old wine in a new wineskin. In T. Assefa, S. Rugumamu, & A. G. Ahmed, *Globalisation, Democracy, and Development in Africa: Challenges and Prospects* (pp. 101-119). Addis Ababa: OSSREA.
- Nolte, P. (2016). *The Populist Danger in the U.S. and Europe*. Retrieved June 3, 2017, from Das Progressive Zentrum: <http://www.progressiveszentrum.org/the-populist-danger-in-the-united-states-and-in-europe/>, July 1
- Ohmae, K. (1995). *The Evolving Global Economy: Making Sense of the New World Order*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- O'Rourke, K. (2009). The Era of Free Migration: Lessons for Today. In A. Sobel, *Challenges of Globalization:*

- Immigration, Social Welfare, Global Governance* (pp. 44-58). New York: Routledge.
- Roubini, N. (2016). *The Political Left and Right are Being Unpended by Globalization Politics*. Retrieved June 17, 2017, from Huffington Post: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nouri-el-roubini/globalization-politics_b_11655494.html, August 23
- Schirato, T., & Webb, J. (2003). *Understanding Globalization*. London: Sage Publications.
- Scholte, J. A. (1995). Globalisation and Modernity. (pp. 15-20). San Diego: International Studies Association Convention.
- Sobel, A. (2009). Opportunities and Challenges. In A. Sobel, *Challenges of Globalization: Immigration, Social Welfare, Global Governance* (pp. 1-17). New York: Routledge.
- Stiglitz, J. (2006). *Making Globalization Work*. London: Penguin.
- Tadi, T. (2006). The Globalization Debate: The Sceptics. *Panoeconomicus*, 53(2), 179-190.
- Taggart, P. A. (1996). *The New Populism and the New Politics: New Protest Parties in Sweden in a Comparative Perspective*. London: Macmillan.
- Varinsky, D. (2017). *5 Claims Trump used to Justify Pulling the US Out of the Paris Agreement- and the Reality*. Retrieved June 17, 2017, from Business Insider: , June 2 <http://www.pulse.ng/bi/tech/tech-5-claims-trump-used-to-justify-pulling-the-us-out-of-the-paris-agreement-and-the-reality-id6773413.html>
- Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a Contested Concept: Populism in the Study of Latin American Politics. *Comparative Politics*, 34(1), 1-22.
- World Bank. (2000). *Poverty in an age of Globalization* . Retrieved March 2017, from www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/pb/globalization/povertyglobalization
- Youngs, G. (2003). International Relations as we enter the twenty-first century. In E. Kofman, & G. Youngs, *Globalization: Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-15). London: Continuum.