A Review of Basic Concepts for Understanding the Contemporary State under Globalization

NAKATANI Yoshikazu*

ABSTRACT

This paper is a reconsideration of the state under ongoing globalization, and consists of five sections. The first section indicates the necessity of distinguishing the concepts of state, stateness and statehood in order to apprehend the political (de)rearticulation of the socio-economic relations in the state. The second section focuses on the nation (national) state and nationalism in relation to the formation of the capitalist state. The third section is concerned with the relativization of the state in a growing interdependence across national boundaries, although the state is not hollowing out, but transforming and changing the constellation of social categories. The fourth section reviews theories of global democracy and points out the necessity of introducing the state into its theorization, and in the final section, the paper sums up the aforementioned remarks about the reconsideration of the state.

Keywords: state, state project, nation (national) state, neoliberalism, neopopulism, global democratic theories.

It has been repeatedly said that the state is in the process of erosion under ongoing globalization. Instead of being hollowed out, however, the state is looming large in the shape of the "Competition State" and amidst growing skepticism about the extant conditions of the EU. In addition, nationalism and ethno-regionalism have been enflamed, despite deepening interdependence of socio-economic relations across borders. These contemporary developments urge a reconsideration of the traditional theory of the state. This article focuses on the concept of the state in the context of ongoing globalization. First it is necessary to distinguish conceptually between the state, statehood and stateness. This distinction is important if we want to grasp the present position of the state in the age of globalization and to have some prospect for democracy in the future.

(1) State, Statehood and Stateness

Presentation (*Vorstellung*) is an abstraction of something concrete and represents itself in representatives (signifiant). In this respect, the *state* is an abstract noun that expresses the totality of political and socio-economic relations bounded by a given territory.

* Professor Emeritus, Ritsumeikan University.

Political power is an instrumental component, and denotes the ability to make and implement policy via-à-vis or in defiance of oppositions by a countervailing power. On the other hand, *state power* is organized in the apparatus of the state and has a different attribute from the socio-economic powers in regard to the legitimate enforcement of its decisions by physical force. Thus, the state cannot exist without state power organized by the state apparatus, and its power intentionally articulates social relations into a relational entity.

Statehood (*Statelichkeit*) is a representation that expresses a relational existent which is made known with the concept of the state. Put differently, statehood is an ontological expression of the state as an abstraction. This entity is composed of the political and socio-economic relations and has a particularity or distinctiveness in its own relational formation. It has also internally a relative autonomy in relation with international relations. *Stateness* is an expression of constitutional particularity inherent in statehood. Hence, its nature is prescribed by the forms of articulation between social relations. The word *state* is generally used as an umbrella term which integrates both statehood and stateness. In this respect, both concepts are necessary for understanding the contemporary state.

From the aforementioned point of view, the configuration of socio-economic relations in a nation (or national state) is the result of the intended articulation between them in time and space. The socio-economic contours of statehood have changed shape under internal and external evolutionary pressures, and ongoing globalization demands interdependence between states. But this is not synonymous with the dissolution of the state itself, even if it is appropriate to indicate that the contours of the state are in the process of transformation owing to cross-bordering and the concatenation of socio-economic relations among nations under globalization.

Irrespective of where they live, social ties among individuals are indispensable and unavoidable for human beings because a person is a social being, as Aristotle pointed out in his *Politics*[1]. Social organization is an institutionalized relation which is limited in space and scale. Each space is demarcated with a geographic width and narrowness in scale and is organized for a particular purpose. In this respect, statehood is a space with a certain scale, which is called a territory, bounded by the state. The state is a cohesive element that aggregates socio-economic relations in a territory through state power.

Given the above, the state is an abstraction of a relational entity. Just as any abstracted expression of relations can have an "ideology effect", so too the concept of the state, in spite of its internal contradictions, has cohesive energy as an ideology to integrate society into a community. The identification of the state with a political community is due to this mental effect. Statehood is an ontologically political expression of this entity

---

1) Aristotle equated the polis with the state (a special kind of association), and said as follows. "This most sovereign and inclusive association is the polis, as it is called, or the political association" (*Politics,* ed. trans., by Ernest Barker, Oxford University Press, 1962: 1).

and is organized in a social formation (*Gesellschatsformation*).　The state is, furthermore, sublimated into a supreme being by the "ideology effect" inherent in abstraction.　This means that the state represents itself as a fictitious person in imagination, and that it emerges like a collective capitalist in the capitalist state.　The concept of the state, thus, assumes a multiplicity of abstraction in epistemology and entity in ontology.　This can cause a conceptual confusion, which is comprehensible in the same vein that representation stands for a referent.　For a certain incongruity and equivocality is unavoidable in expressing the mutual relations between them.

　　There is further complexity in conceptualizing the state because it presents itself in a governing apparatus with relative autonomy from socio-economic relations in a given territory.　This is another face of the state.　In other words, governing power speaks for itself under the guise of political community.　This is due to the fact that the state is regarded as a communal society, so long as a coercive element inherent in the given social regimentation is accepted as a common norm to be observed.　Nationalism is a vital element, providing momentum for integration and development of the nation (national) state so long as it is deeply infused in a political community.　In these politico-historical elements and ideological discourse, the concept of the state emotionally conjures up an imagined native country, the image of which overlaps with the state itself.

　　Although the state is a relatively autonomous entity, it is not isolated from external relations beyond itself.　State theory should, therefore, be an approach to the socio-economic and political entity in the context of intra/inter-national relations.　In other words, one of main issues for political theory is to put the state into an *explanandum* by recourse to other political *explanans* and to analyze its particular structure from a relational standpoint.　International relations are not an independent variable, but should be approached as dialectical dynamics of a shifting complex composed of relations among states with particularity in their construction.

　　Politics (*Politik, politique*) is polysemous in etymology and polymorphic in phenomenology.　From an institutional point of view, it may be described as a social technique for organizing individuals in society and for maintaining its cohesiveness.　Policy is another expression of politics and pertains to a sort of strategy to control social relations by political power.　It therefore entails a manipulation of rhetoric and symbols with some rationality and normality.　Statehood is an ensemble of a multilayered social structure and the state is the political designation of statehood as a relational entity in a given territory. It is necessary for a statehood to keep its totality by state power in response to internal contradictions.　Statehood is commonly referred to by the name of the state and becomes commonly known as a political community equipped with a governing apparatus, and the state apparatus is a binding force over the given society as a whole.

＜**Complexity of the state concept**＞

Governmental organizations politically arrange the socio-economic relations and manage them in the given national territorial state. The political power organized in the state apparatus is indispensable for these political functions. State power has also a relative autonomy which originates in the separation of political and socio-economic realms in capitalist society. This separation of the normal capitalist state in institution and function stems fundamentally from a difference in ownership of the means of production, in contrast with that found in a feudal society. Although the formal division between the state and society gives a particular political function to the governing apparatus, it is necessary to have a certain degree of functional correspondence between them, otherwise the governing power would lose legitimacy, which it requires to perform its all-inclusive function of integrating society.

The three elements — territory, nation and sovereignty — are intertwined in the constitution of the state. There emerges, however, a need to explain the interchangeability between government and state, because government appears as the state in spite of a mere governing apparatus of the given territory. This means that government, especially the executive division, represents itself as the state. Although it is a perplexing problem to resolve the complexity inherent in the conception of the state, one can deduce the reason for it from the homological fact that the socio-economic relations are demarcated by the government as a territory, while, at the same time, the government epitomizes these relations in the name of the state. Furthermore, the government steers them in different directions, like a shepherd controlling a herd of sheep. In these contexts, the state is identified with a governing apparatus because the latter is assumed to be a representative of statehood without making a conceptual distinction between the state and its government. The conceptual complexity of the state and its associated terms consequently originates in this sort of homology, even though they are essentially different concepts expressing different functions.

＜**Sovereignty and hegemony**＞

Sovereignty (*Soveraineté*) is a supreme power and pertains to a nation (national) state. Its traditional character is also supposed to be changing as a result of globalization, but sovereignty still retains a critical relevance in the functions of national integration and the nation's independence from other states. This means that like the notion of the state, sovereignty has two aspects, for it refers to national sovereignty internally and state sovereignty externally (we might call this the 'Janus-faced nature of sovereignty'). Sovereignty is an attribute of the state and has a legal significance in internal and external relations. The coercive power of the state power derives its legitimacy from the concept of sovereignty, and it can resort to legal sanction besides physical force as an ultima ratio.

On the other hand, hegemony is an important element of socialization. It is the

intellectual-moral leadership of a society, and originates intrinsically in the given socio-economic relations because the establishment of these relations means nothing other than organization of persons according to some dominant value.　As any relation involves some underlying value and principle of discipline, behavior in this framework appears as an actualization of basic values through the mediation of relations, because socio-economic actors are generally obliged to behave in these relations.　State power intentionally arranges these relations and gives some direction to the interactions of actors by means of hegemonic ideology and institutions.　Therefore, the systemization of socio-economic relations depends not only on the deprivation and indulgence of basic social values, but on an element of consent and persuasion by soft power.　Hegemony is a valence of social relations and is routinized in everyday practice.　Discourse in politics is an intended expression by which rulers appeal to the ruled in order to disseminate the ruler's aims in the given context.　But this power is also embedded in customs rather than always being exercised by coercion.　In addition, hegemonic discourse is institutionalized in given legal arrangements, because legal institution is a device for regulation channels to make a social and economic interaction.　To put it differently, hegemony is a spiritual instrument for making individuals and corporal associations into social actors according to a critical principle of a social formation.　In these ways, hegemony functions as a vital element for integration and cohesion in a society, at least, in a normal state.　In this respect, state power still firmly retains its hegemony in an age of globalization.

　　Putting the concept of hegemony into international relations, it is necessary for hegemons to maintain their superiority in intellectual-moral leadership along with coercion and enforcement. In other words, supremacy in international relations demands hegemonic leadership, otherwise a hegemon would lose its soft power.　Therefore, supremacy in international relations cannot be simply reduced to military power.

＜**The state project and state policy**＞
　　State power organizes socio-economic relations into a concrete-real formation of the state.　These relations, however, inherently involve some contradictions and continually reproduce them in their process of development.　It is, therefore, necessary for the governing apparatus to react to conflicts in the given conditions and path-dependencies, and to set some outline for a future image of the statehood.　The state project is a governing device, able to react to some problems whenever they occur, and to construct some scheme or plan for the future.

　　The state project is a set of policy processes which comprises the planning of policy as well as its performance and evaluation.　Inevitably, original plans will need to be corrected in this process because the given conditions are incessantly under changing pressures from both home and abroad.　In other words, the policy process is a feedback between government and society, and its patterns are conditioned by the historical context.

The state project is the activation and stabilization of a given society. Government faces the question of what socio-economic and ideological policy should be selected to elicit consent from the society. A dysfunction of government can cause a "crisis of crisis management" or "crisis of legitimacy", in response to which government will need to adopt some policy. Some capitalist states faced these situations in the 1970s. This issue will be discussed in more detail later in relation to neoliberal globalization.

＜**Stateness**＞

Perception is the self-consciousness of existents (*Dasein*), although it may entail a false consciousness, and social existents are an artificial result of the realization of ideas via a teleological contemplation in given historical conjunctures. So long as the state formation is a contrivance, it inevitably assumes variegated forms and constructs. This multiformity is recognizable in the taxonomy of political regimes (e.g., discernible in the differences between compound and unitary states, republic and monarchy in state form, presidency and parliamentary system in government system) even if these regimes are comprehended in the capitalist state according to a classification of state type.

Articulation of these relations (or relevant conjunction of heterogeneous relations, although they are in neither unidirectional and nor synchronous) gives a concrete character to the entity called the state. Put differently, differences in the formation of the state are the result of a necessity contingent on history. Consequently, each formation of the state inscribes some particularity in itself. Stateness is an attribute of statehood and is an expression of character inscribed in the structure of the state. It is a manifestation of constellations of social relations and is a reflection of power relationships among social categories. This means that the formation of the state is changeable according to its internal conditions and external impacts from abroad.

Institutional classification of the state in comparative politics is theoretically based on a comparison of the given particularities inherent in stateness. As mentioned earlier, stateness has diversity in time and space. This implies that the state assumes a sort of polymorphism, as the capitalist state shows multifarious forms according to differences of articulation between politico-societal elements. It is necessary, then, to consider the quality of stateness in relation to the nation (or national) state.

(2) Capitalism and The Nation (National) State

Capitalism is a profit-seeking economic system based on the market. This system needs a social regimentation for (re)production of commodities including the socio-economic relations needed for it. This system of production characteristically depends on a fictitious commodities including money, labour force, land, knowledge, and the like. These commodities are mobile in nature, albeit to different degrees, whereas invested

capital such as infrastructure, is immobile by its nature.　This idiosyncrasy essential in the capitalist production gives the state its characteristics in contemporary globalization.

　　Freedom to establish an artificial person (corporation) in an economic system is, inter alia, essential for economic actors to do business with legal guarantees.　Although this production system functions in accordance with the rationality of capitalistic production, it needs to be complemented by the extra-economic intervention for the reproduction of capitalist relations.　Although the domains of political power and socio-economic power in the capitalist state are separated in function and organization, this separation is just a formal division, and the two domains remain interdependent.　At the same time, the relative autonomy assigned to both gives the capitalist state the potentiality to reorganize social formation through a delay and dislocation of rising conflicts in time and space.　For this reason, the relative autonomy organized in the state apparatus, also, contains the possibility of changing the given socio-economic relations through political power.　State apparatus is not just an organ for arbitrating social demands, but an agent that can induce some directions through its relative autonomy.　One of the reasons for the durability of capitalism in defiance of its intrinsic contradictions emanates from political contrivances to ensure adaptability to given needs and in response to conjunctures in history.　This response to a rising or foreseeable conflict by the state apparatus gives a malleability to the capitalist system.

　　The rise and development of capitalism is closely related to the formation of the nation, and the appearance of capitalism has been explained in connection with the transition from feudal-rural communities to modern-urban industrialization, although there emerged a dispute between premordialists and modernists, or between naturalists and constructivists about the origin of nation in the 1970s and 1980s[2].　This dispute hinged on different understandings about the relationship between ethnic-rudimental and civic-artificial elements in the origin of nation.　No further mention is made here to the dispute, but it should at least be noted that the nation is a compound outcome of an ethnic-rudimental element and a civic-legal one which was inspired by the need to reorganize the production system according to capitalist relations within the state.　The ideal type (*Idealtypus*) of the modern state in Western Europe has been traditionally formulated in relation with the nation and nationalism.

＜The nation and nationalism＞

　　As statehood is a politico-social construct in the territory, so nationhood is a personification of it in the given territorial state.　In this context, there inseparably arises a circular identification among the inhabitants: the nation and the ethnic-civic group in

---

2)　E. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780,* Cambridge University Press, 1992; E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 1983, Cornell University Press; Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origin of Nations,* Blackwell, 1986.

consciousness of the state.   A nation is a population sharing a similarity in language and culture beyond generations (family resemblance, *Familienähnlikeit*).   It is also a political entity as it represents itself in a nation state based on the imagination of sharing the same ethnicity and civic culture.   But a nation-state is a fictional concept because it is a heterogeneous composition of a plurality of nations under the control of a dominant nation in the statehood.   Although the nation-state may resemble a container, it can not necessarily enclose the contradictions inherent in a stratified society which consists of diversified social categories.   Socio-economic tensions between nations or tribes in underdeveloped areas are generally a result of colonization and territorialization superimposed by the imperial powers.   On the other hand, any national state in a developed area, especially a compound state, involves a tension between assimilation and dissimilation, or between inclusion and exclusion.   The potentiality of this centrifugal effect becomes more prominent when cultural difference and economic independence are consciously shared in the same nation inside the given statehood.

Nationalism is the ideology of the nation and is inseparably intermingled with a spontaneous affection for the native country.   This mental disposition is closely related to patriotism, and inspires a sense of affinity to the nation state by the manipulation of political symbols because symbols have an identification effect towards some nation.   For example, the national flag awakens a national identity in visibility, the national anthem in audition and national history in intellectual indoctrination.   The intermingled effect of these mental elements cultivates a sense of identification to one particular nation as opposed to others.   This means that a sense of belonging to some nation is a self-confirmation which is associated with an ethnic base and certain political contrivances.   Multicultural policy and the relegation of administrative power to local government signify a necessary response in terms of the integration of a compound state.

Although nationalism is an essential constituent of the nation (national) state, its mindset is qualitatively different for each nation according to the constitution of the state and its position in the world.   This difference is, for example, discernible in the way that both developmental dictatorship and socialist statism (*etatisme*) strive to keep integration by recourse to nationalism or national interest.   In these respects, nationalism is an effective momentum for national integration, although its observable phenomenon has an equivocality and particularity in time and space.

Nationalism is an inter-subjective sense of belonging to the same nation, and its cohesiveness depends on the maintenance of an amalgam of intellectual-institutional and emotional-psychological elements.   Nationalism is a sort of meta-ideology for national integration and does not have a single face, but a multifaceted look as recognizable in the history of nationhood.   The particularity of nationalism is reflected in the building of the nation-state.   In this regard, it is possible to compare Japanese nationalism with the nationalism found in the US.   This comparison helps to clarify the nature of nationalism

to some extent because each country's nationalism has its own representative character.

＜Two exempla of nationalism＞

The beginning of nation-building in the US originated in an emigrant country which declared its separation from the Old World in space and body politics.   This is known by two terms: independence and revolution.   The integral element for Americans is based on a spiritual binder which convinces the population that they are descendants and defenders of fundamental principles exemplified in the Constitution.   Taking these particularities into consideration, American nationalism characteristically depends on a civic element, which is an artificial contrivance to make a common belief as a nation, and one of its essential principles is the concept of freedom.   Liberal nationalism is profoundly imbued among inhabitants as a given national creed or a base value like a red thread running through generations, and takes a deep hold as an ethos that governs habitual practice.   Economic liberalism is an offspring or application of liberalism and has been a strong momentum in allowing the US to become the greatest capitalist state of the world, with complementary intervention in the economic system by the government.   In brief, liberal nationalism is an archetypical principle for national integration in the pluralistic politico-social structure of America and has been a driving force for its economic development.

On the other hand, Japanese nationalism is an amalgam of traditional and modern elements, and characteristically takes on an ethnic inclination in contrast with a civic one. This tenacity occasionally appears as a return to an appeal to traditional culture, especially in times of social transition. Although Japanese nationalism is composed of an intermixture of multifarious ingredients, it is presumably correct to include an emotional project (*Entwurf*) of local patriotism into the national imagination.   Affection for one's native place is naturally settled in the mind as a familiar landscape, and it is psychologically enlarged into an identification with the nation.   This emotional element is a general character of nationalism.   Japanese nationalism is, however, strongly connected with a propensity to imagine a social association in an image of native community.   This tradition is intermingled with a mixture of Buddhism and Shinto in which ancestry worship and religious rituals breed a particular political mythology for national integration in Japan. It is needless to say that analysis of the relation between religion and political culture is an important problem for a religious sociology.

Another aspect of nationalism in Japan was cultivated from above during the imperial Meiji Restoration period and the subsequent era.   The regime during this time of reconstruction was connected with an imperial policy operating under the pseudo-constitutionalism, and imperial education by the government.   Cultivation of nationalism from above entailed a reliance on state power and a weak skepticism towards it in the popular mind.   The defeat in the Second World War, however, brought a drastic regime change and a changed intellectual climate.   Japanese nationalism in the post-war period,

under the current Constitution, involves a momentum to democratize the socio-economic relations. But it has, also, a lingering high propensity to invoke reactionary values in defense of particularities of Japanese culture. The political trajectory of post-war Japan has swung like a pendulum, between such a democratic and anti-democratic movements, in tendency and counter-tendency.

＜**Nationalism and Internationalism**＞

Although socio-economic relations are demarcated in statehood, they are not enclosed within it, but they are related to each other in a different way. The foreign relations of each state oscillate in a cross-border interaction with others, and the mutual interaction between social relations across borders transforms the social structure of each state. This process entails not only resonance and co-evolution, but collisions and repercussions between states. Globalization has the tendency to compel each state to response to such deepening interdependency.

Nationalism is a psychological and ideological element of nationhood, so it requires each person to internalize some basic values of the given nation-state, and interrogates whether its values are observed in everyday practice. In this context, nationalism functions as a touchstone for self-confirmation in contrast to and in relation with others. This means that the concept of nationalism cannot have a meaning without others. Otherwise there would emerge a self-contradiction in that there would be only one nation in the world. Put differently, nationalism and internationalism are two sides of the same coin. From this point of view, there arises a problem concerning the mutual relationship between them.

In order to consider this problem, it is first necessary to explain, even if cursorily, the issue of national interest. National interest is nothing more than a sort of fictitious concept because it appears as a total interest or public goods of the nation. Although it is only the dominant one in the given society, there is certainly a sphere of common goods which are indivisible and un-exclusive, as is exemplified in national security, or in a lighthouse. But these public goods are different in nature. War is, for example, a destructive consumption and is neither natural nor unavoidable. As war is artificial, it is, at least, reducible by the construction of safeguards against war.

As long as interest means a concern about things that are nonmaterial as well as economical, it can also include some prospect for democracy and the reconstruction of a self-interested nationalism into a global democratic order because the socio-economic relations of one nation-state are intertwined with others in a process of interdependency. Even though it is reasonable to envision some form of global democracy, the reorgani-zation of the world order in accordance with the intention of some strong powers should be avoided, and nationalism based on the principle of democracy should be shared beyond borders. In this respect, it is necessary to internalize democracy, which demands the

connection of nationalism with democracy through the democratization of the politico-societal relations of each state.　The right to live in peace is a vital principle that should be shared among nations in defiance of power politics and traditional ideology subservient to the status quo.　Given the above, nationalism could be articulated with internationalism in an incessant transaction between nation-states based on democratic nationalism.　Even though it remains a thought experiment, the theory of the democratization of globalization and the globalization of democracy, emerges in these contexts as a solution to the "tragedy of common goods" and the rampancy of terrorism across and beyond nation-states.

(3)　The Contemporary State under Relativization and Paradox

Growing interdependency in the context of ongoing globalization means that there emerges a relativization of the state and objectification of it because development of mutual relations between countries calls for some reflection on the state.　In these contexts, however, there emerges not only a defense of national interest and an advent of the "competition state" founded on a knowledge-based economy, but also a tendency toward the globalization of national populism.　Furthermore, we observe a rampancy of terrorism across national boundaries along with conflicts between states.　Especially, the Middle East has been a "cradle of conflict" and its deep impact extends to Europe in different ways, including the immigrant and refugee problems.　In addition, the fiscal impasse in Southern Europe which emerged first in Greece, raises skepticism about the EU.　Although it is possible to describe the present age as the time of globalization, we are living in an age of convergence and divergence, as is discernible in these events.　Neoliberalism and neopopulism are related with globalization, as follows.

＜Neoliberal globalization＞

Neoliberalism is a variant of liberalism, and its ideological effect is characterized as a revision of embedded liberalism which formed the socio-economic infrastructure and policy axis of the developed states in the post-war period.　Neoliberal reorganization as a state project necessitates a transition from a demand-side economy to a supply-side one, according to a market-fundamentalism and monetarism.　This policy change brings about a restructuring of redistributive welfare regimes and remarkable disparities in income, owing to the introduction of flexibility in labor markets and the consequent polarization in the socio-economic structure[3].

Neoliberalism was conjured up as a state project to react to the "crisis of crisis management" caused by the fiscal crisis in the early of 1970s.　The idea was also

---

3)　Y. Nakatani, "An Introductory Remarks Concerning the Genealogy of Neoliberalism," *Ritsumeikan Law Review,* No. 32, pp. 55-59, June 2015.

introduced to reconstruct the socio-economic structure and become increasingly embedded in the socio-economic structure in the fourth quarter of the last century. Although the American economy, for a while, enjoyed a boom under neoliberal reconstruction during the 1990s, international finance system has been, however, under an intermittent turbulence by the speculative action and the state has been obliged to give some bailout policies toward it. Then, we can call the turning of the last century to be a period of "neoliberal revolution" and the first phase in the construction of a "neoliberal world order."

The intellectual genealogy of neoliberalism originates in a base value of capitalism and is linked together with the movement toward a profit-seeking market fundamentalism. The neoliberal vision was set out in epistemic communities such as the Mont Pelerin Society (*Société du Mont Pèlerin,* formed in 1947). Neoliberal intellectuals had been trying to reorganize social liberalism under the three principles of rationality in economics (the "3Es": economy, efficiency and effectiveness) and "human capital" theory which reduces human relations into economic ones among *homo economicus.* This brings an "isolation effect" in combination with a "possessive individualism." These trends are exemplified in a transition from the Keynesian-Fordist regime which was prominent during the "golden age" of the post-war era. The coalescence of market fundamentalism and neo-conservatism became mainstream in Anglo-American conservative and liberal conservative governments in conjunction with policy adjustment among the developed countries in the 1970s and 1980s. In these historical contexts, neoliberalism has been a hegemonic ideology for the reconstruction of the capitalist state, and Latin-American countries were required to follow the "Washington Consensus" whose principles are based on neoliberalism and the theory of "authoritarian liberalism" which attaches great importance to an activation of *homo economicus* in refusal of "democratic totalitarianism"[4]. The Middle East was also included in the experiment of neoliberal democratization. Globalization has been inspired by the adjustment policy advocated by the developed states and international organizations whose project is to reconstruct the world order according to neoliberalism. This project to construct a new constitutional world order, however, involves many conflicts and contradictions, in both the internal and external relations of the state.

＜Neopopulism＞

The relation of subject and object in politics emerged as the relation of rulers and subjects (liegeman) in feudal society. This means that subordinates were subjects in the social regimentation of subjection. In other words, the ontological subjectivity of individuals was maintained as a dependent subject in the feudal relations, and subjects

---

4) F. A. von Hayek, *Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Economics,* University of Chicago Press, 1967: 161.

remained isolated in their own enclaves.   The people's (popular) revolution in the 18th century transformed the objective subject into a subjective citizen, and sovereignty passed from monarch to nation, at least in conception.

The concept of "people" is a political term to describe the totality of inhabitants of a given territory, metaphorically as a political person.   This person was introduced as a political fiction to construct the concept of popular sovereignty or a sovereign people, abstractly embodied in the political people as a whole and the total population in the country.   On the other hand, indirect democracy involves necessarily coexistence of a real-concrete representative space and an abstract-conceptual one.   The former constitutes a kernel of political power (*Machtkern*, an actual-substantive state power) in a political contrivance.   Thus, government by the people has to correspond to the government for the people, and the popularity of government is regarded as a necessary requirement for representative democracy.   So indirect democracy intrinsically involves two elements: popularist (or popular) government by representatives and a populistic reflection of the people's will in government.   Such conflicting relations between these elements have also provided a momentum for democratization.   The latent conflicts between them do not appear prominent, so long as the society enjoys relative stability.   But the populistic element arises starkly in times of social transition, because the incumbent government is liable to be unable to respond to the anticipations of its constituents.   From this point of view, the advent of contemporary populism discernible beyond borders is a reflection of the changing contours of socio-economic relations under globalization.   It is necessary to enumerate some of the characteristics of contemporary populism and its rhetoric.

First, neopopulism exhibits the propensity to urge homogeneity in politics with an appeal to a discourse of binary division, as exemplified in the use of "friend-enemy" rhetoric in politics.   This propensity is observable in the anti-pluralism of populism. Although populism casts light on the elitist structure of society in a unity-in-diversity, it ignores a recognition of "otherness" and is likely to lead itself to authoritarianism.   A critical aspect of representative democracy resides in discussion by representatives in parliament, and it is, also, necessary for this political contrivance to be a reflection of agonistic opinions of the pluralistic society in an incessant reconsideration of changing international relations.   The effective concurrence between the representative system and society in the state can pull up the extant democracies to a higher level.

Second, it is possible to discern an "anti-elitist elitism" in neopopulism which is connected with its first feature.   This political stance appears as a strategy to make use of latent antipathy and anxiety among people towards the existing power structure in a thrust for seizure of political power.   This regime is, among others, prominent in a populistic authoritarian monocracy.

Third, neopopulism is an agent for an exclusionist movement against aliens by recourse to an awakening of the notion of "homeland".   Put differently, it appeals to a

sense of identification with the same country. Ethno-nationalism could arouse a psycho-logical energy ("cathexis effect") to affect a sense of belonging to a nation and turn it into a kind of xenophobia. But civic-nationalism, likewise, involves the same propensity to repulse aliens in order to maintain national cohesion based on the same civic culture. This sort of movement, especially emerges in an age of polarization of national opinions caused by a growing consciousness of discrepancies in socio-economic structure and oppositional social attitudes towards policy responses to them.

Given the aforementioned remarks, the advent of neopopulism has been provoked by ongoing globalization because the articulation of socio-economic relations is changing in co-evolution with growing interdependence between states. The rise of global neo-polulism is also another expression of resentment against the establishment and anxiety for the future structural change of the world order. Even though it is unavoidable to intro-duce a representative system in the nation state, it is necessary to make it developmental by the principle of democratic representation in a social autonomy of individuals. On the other hand, some theorists are searching for a democratic world order based on the nation-state, even though still as a "thought experiment".

(4)   Global Democratic Theory and the State

A long time has passed since Habermas indicated the appearance of a post-national constellation in the world order. Beck pointed out the crisis of global society, and Held and others argued for "cosmopolitan governance" in their recognition of the emergence of an overlapping destiny beyond borders[5]. Although their perspectives have a difference in emphasis, advocates of global democracy have generally been referred to as either cosmopolitan democrats or members of the global justice school, according to their axiological or normative point of view.

＜Second structural transition of legitimacy＞

If representative democracy is the first transition of political legitimation in the nation-state, global democratic theory insists on the need to bring about the second one on a global scale. Theorists of contemporary global democracy, however, do not demand the construction of a world state or world government in place of the state. In this respect, Kant also had the same cosmopolitan perspective of a global association based on human rights or justice, and envisioned its realization in an increasing interdependence among

---

5) J. Habermas, *Die postnationale konstellation,* Schurkamp, 1998 (*The Postnational Constellation: political essay,* translated and edited, with an introduction by Max Pensky, Polity, 2001); Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity,* Sage, 1992; D. Held, *Cosmopolitanism: Ideas and Realities,* Polity, 2010; Daniele Archibugi, *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy,* Princeton University Press, 2008.

nations.

Desirability and feasibility are not, of course, one and the same.   But the appearance of global democratic theory signifies a consciousness of the need to change the extant global order.   Although democratization on a global scale is only a dim possibility and still just a "thought experiment," we should not leave unaddressed the many ongoing risks which extend from the threat of war to the destruction of the natural environment.   Global democratic theory needs to be searched for from the perspective of the right to live in peace rather than from the viewpoint of realpolitik or "armed peace" theory (the mutual proliferation of armed forces).   In addition, it is necessary to suppose that one of the causes of terrorism in the Middle East is traceable not only to the coercive enforcement of a given world view (*Weltanschauung*) by violence, but is also caused by abject poverty and income disparity among inhabitants.   Although the vision of global democracy is convincing as a counter-vision to these contemporary situations, it necessarily involves many problems.   One of these is the question of what position the state occupies in global governance.

(5)   Concluding Remarks: The State and Globalization

Globalization, indeed, claims to adopt another point of view different from method- ological nationalism, and theories of global democracy are apt to emphasize on the "hollowing out" of the state in the background of the deterritorialization of socio- economic relations.   But abandonment of the state means to throw off the foothold for democratization in theory and practice.

A cross-bordering of socio-economic relations does not mean the emergence of a global "Empire" or global "quasi-state," because the state is a real existent and nationalism is closely related with it.   It is not convincing to deduce a "hollowing out" of the state from mobility of capital beyond borders[6].   The space of the state, in fact, retains a relative autonomy to make cohesion and to induce a political legitimation in its territory. Neoliberal restructuring is nothing more than rearticulation of relations by the state.   In other words, state apparatus integrates socio-economic relations in the state, and capital invested in social infrastructure cannot be exempt from locality.   Additionally, capital does not have transnational mobility without support and approval by the state.

With regard to global democracy, we should recall the reasonable remarks by Robert A. Dahl.   He pointed out that it is difficult to envisage a "demos" and system to represent it on a global scale[7].   In addition, the plan of "cosmopolitics" under some strong powers

---

6)   Sebnem Oguz, "Rethinking Globalization as Internationalization of Capital: Implications for Understanding State Restructuring, *Science & Society* 79 (3), July 2015: 336-63.

7)   Robert A Dahl, "Can International Organization be Democracy?" in Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón, ed., *Democracy's Edges,* Cambridge University Press, 1999.

of the world is likely to be a fig leaf, concealing formal and informal imperialism, and is contrary to the principles of autonomy and the self-rule of nations.   Moreover, the state is still a fundamental constituent of the world order, and nationalism is looming large with a strong sense of being in defiance of globalization.   Considering these factors, it is necessary to formulate a vision of global democracy in conjunction with the democratization of each state and to extend it in collaboration among nations beyond borders.

＜**Public and private autonomy for democracy**＞

Public autonomy in the state has two related meanings: a political function to integrate the given socio-economic relations in the territory, and independence from intervention by other states.   The modern state was a transformation of the political regime under the feudal system into a republican form of government or constitutional monarchy.   The necessary condition for representative democracy is, in principle, openness in politics including accountability and responsiveness toward constituents so that they can prevent it from changing into a modern autocracy.

On the other hand, public and private autonomy are closely related.   This means the necessity of an autonomous civil society based on the voluntary association of individuals as a "monitory democracy" in order to act as a check on state power.   Although it is obvious that the institutionalized right of freedom is a bulwark against infringements by the arbitrary use of political power, the logic and dynamics of capitalism should not be overlooked because their momentum, embedded in socio-economic relations, has an inherent propensity to ignore individual rights in the name of responsibility for a respect to the publicity or the rights of others.   Given these conditions, the nation-state is, both practically and theoretically, a stronghold for democratization.   But a further development of democracy demands on taking globalization into consideration, because socio-economic relations are in a process of deterritorialization and growing interdependence among them on a cross-border scale.

Although democracy is, indeed, an unaccomplished work that needs to be incessantly rebuilt beyond generations and bounded limits, it is difficult to envision a global democracy without the democratized state.   Global democratic theory is productive only when it tries to seek a vision in relation with the state and its location in global governance.   In brief, the state remains a strong matrix for the integration of the people, and hence, it is necessary to make it a springboard for the further democratization of intra/inter relations of the state in theory and practice.   The spiritual kernel explicit in the Japanese Constitution is founded on the vision that the right to live in peace should be shared beyond boundaries.   Indeed, this declaration implies a realistic vision to open a global gateway for the avoidance of military dilemmas caused by fear and threat.   Its relevance is highly deserving of our attention in view of the conflicts and violence around the contemporary world.