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NCFCA’s 2017-2018 Resolution

“Resolved: Nationalism ought to be valued above globalism.”

This resolution asks us to value nationalism over globalism. Affirmatives will want to take that resolution and control the narrative of the debate by focusing on America and its hegemony. Hegemony made simple is just the world’s popularity contest. When you are winning, you have more influence. You will want to illustrate stories of hard working American businesses, intellectual property rights, crime rates of refugees, and most importantly the reasoning behind protecting the nation from widespread obsession with baked beans on toast.

Sometimes, absolute nationalism prevents the most efficiency and acts as a hindrance the success to the nation itself. Nationalism becomes protectionism and isolationism begins to fester some harms.

To prevent these harms, let’s look at the wording of the resolution. We’ll cover here some minor observations of some of the words in the resolution, a deeper analysis of both “nationalism” and “globalism,” then how debaters can choose to debate between these two.

Some Basic Words

Within the resolution, there is a phrase that holds a significant amount of power. “Ought to be valued” is the portion that sparks the debate. In laymen’s terms, it simply means to have a duty over something. In terms of the resolution it is asking the affirmative to demonstrate why we have a duty to nationalism over globalism and vice versa on the negative. This phrase acts as the call to action for the audience, judge, and most importantly the debaters. How can we determine what belief our duty is to or what each side of the resolution means?

What is Nationalism?

An excellent resource is Patrick Hogan’s paper entitled *Understanding Nationalism*. He discusses the political constructs and psychology behind nationalism and delves into the deeper roots behind it. Hogan focuses particularly on three complex narrative prototypes that are prominent in human thought and action. He argues that our ideas and feelings about what nations are and what they should be are fundamentally organized and oriented by these prototypes. He writes:

“Thus, a patriot is someone committed to a particular society’s culture, institutions, political philosophy. But there are numerous problems with this view. First, no society has a single way of life. Different segments of society have different rights, privileges, obligations, and restrictions. Moreover, patriotism is often affirmed most acutely in times of international conflict, thus in opposition to a national enemy. But the national enemy, too, does not represent a single, invariant way of life. Indeed, in some cases, a patriot for one side may have greater sympathy with certain ideas and practices on the enemy side. However, he or she is, it seems, unlikely to recognize such sympathy if the practices are explicitly associated with the enemy side.” *[[1]](#footnote-1)*

Patrick Hogan is an author who debated for and against values in many of his works. He doesn’t just write without warrant. He discussed evidence behind his claims by writing:

“Consider, for example, the recent conflict between the United States and France over the Iraq war… it was widely considered patriotic to oppose all things French—hence, for example, the spectacle of Americans pouring out bottles of French wine. The crux of this conflict was the French view of the situation in Iraq. However, when Americans were presented with a statement of the French position on Iraq, they largely agreed with it. Or, rather, they largely agreed as long as the position was not identified as French. As this example suggests, the crucial factor for a patriot is not the position or practice of his or her country, nor the position or practice of the enemy. Rather, the crucial factor is the labels, the names attached to those positions and practices. The same point applies to ethnic, religious, and other group loyalties." *[[2]](#footnote-2)*

During this conflict, it became natural to become a patriotic mud slinger with our ally. Hogan is creating the notion that nationalism for a patriot is about protecting the American fighter. That is why nationalism is viewed in such a different perspective by large numbers of people. It is viewed as sometimes overly proud, patriotic, or offensive. If everyone is in it for themselves there will always be individuals caught at the bottom or that become the enemy. Should we be driven by a self-centered desire for success or is there a sustainable alternative?

What is Globalism?

Dr. Jim Eckman is a professor with numerous accolades for his work in the academic sector and does a great job in his article *Globalism vs. Nationalism: The Ideological Struggle of the 21st Century.* He argues that this resolution is the new divide in America. He writes:

“For much of the 20th century, ideological discussions and debates have centered on liberal versus conservative, left versus right. No longer. The ideological divide of the 21st century is emerging as globalism versus nationalism. Since the end of World War II, global integration and technological progress have fueled a new world order centered on free trade, open borders and interdependent economies. Goods, capital and people should be able to move freely across borders, which is actually the meaning of globalization. But Greg Ip of the Wall Street Journal argues that globalism is a “mindset that globalization is natural and good, that global governance should expand as national sovereignty contracts.” The new nationalist surge has startled and shocked the advocates of globalism. This new nationalism is the vital center of Brexit and the election of Donald Trump.”*[[3]](#footnote-3)*

In other words, nationalism is growing and amassing quite the American crowd. Why can’t we get the best of it all? Help people around the world but focus on ourselves? Unfortunately, the world is a place of extremes and infinitely regressive concerning values. Most countries and powers around the world fall more and more into the extreme cases of their beliefs. Globalists believe that it is their duty to have the countries interact for the betterment of the globe. Globalism is the pursuit of a network among all the countries around the world.

Friedman says, “That’s why I define globalization this way: it is the inevitable integration of markets, nation-states and technologies to a degree never witnessed before – in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before and in a way that is enabling the world to reach into individuals, corporations and nation-states farther, faster, and deeper, cheaper than ever before.” *[[4]](#footnote-4)*

When Worlds Collide?

If you are Affirmative your goal is to convince the judge that other countries can’t be trusted to work together or on the behalf of one another. Specifically, planting doubt that true globalism requires blind trust which is risky to the citizens in countries. If Hitler had risen to power with all the nations being interconnected, would he have been stopped? However, on the other hand the globalist says that without helping other nations progress, we are all doomed for cycles of turmoil and war.

The founders realized the importance of interacting with other nations when they asked (basically begged) France for help in the revolutionary war. Growing and nurturing ally relationships is increasing difficult when more time is spent obsessing with self-protection. What if more major countries had taken the United States’ nationalistic approach during WWII and allowed less opposition towards the hostile takeover going on in smaller countries? Eckman explains:

Historically, Great Britain presided over the first era of globalization, from the mid-1800s through 1914. They advocated free trade and the gold standard. That era gave way to an extreme era of nationalism, which produced World War II. But after World War II, “the logic of globalism shifted beyond trade to grand strategy. By ceding modest amounts of sovereignty to international institutions, a country could make the world, and itself, far stronger by pursuing its own narrowly defined interests.” For these globalists, economic and geopolitical self-interest were inseparable. Hence, the 1957 Treaty of Rome led to the formation of the European Union of 28 nations. The assumption? Economic and political integration world make war unthinkable. For the next five decades, trade, industrialization and demographics produced a cycle of rising prosperity. By the 2000s, globalism appeared triumphant. *[[5]](#footnote-5)*

Round #1957 seemed to have named the new fighter, *European Union* as the champion. Another win for globalism.

In Conclusion

Our now new friend Dr. Eckman does a wonderful job summing up his article saying:

“In conclusion, those who have advocated for the ideology of globalism and worldwide economic integration seriously underestimated the risks and potential dangers that would result from large parts of society feeling as if they were left behind due to more open trade with open borders as the world’s economies integrated together. Those sentiments and real feelings explain why the Brexit vote was successful. Such developments also explain the emergence of Trump. Fundamentally, the ideology of nationalism is (temporarily?) providing a meaningful and energized alternative to the ideology of globalism. Will the alternative of nationalism survive? Will it thrive and permeate the other nations of Europe? There are four major elections being held in Europe during 2017. Each one of these elections could potentially result in victories by the nationalists in France, Italy, and the Netherlands, and even in Germany. If the nationalist forces all win in Europe, it could mean the death of the European Union. What exactly Donald Trump will do as he rides the wave of this intense new nationalism is anybody’s guess. But one thing is for certain right now: Globalism in the United States (and the world?) as a governing ideology is on hold. Is it dead? Only time will tell.” *[[6]](#footnote-6)*

Use this knowledge to win debate rounds, frame the perspective as beneficial and negate the benefits of your opponent and you will be able to sway the debate in your favor.
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