

“Globalization and Nationalisms. Historical Perspectives on a Complex Relationship”

Place: digital (Bayreuth und Regensburg)

Organizers: Volker Depkat (Universität Regensburg), Susanne Lachenicht (Universität Bayreuth)

Date: 26.04.2021 – 13.07.2021

By Manuel Benza / Susi Hopp / Alexander Knirim, Universität Bayreuth

Bill Henderson / Anja Kurasov / Annika Pauly, Universität Regensburg

As Volker Depkat (Regensburg) and Susanne Lachenicht (Bayreuth) write in their overview to this lecture series, the growing economic entanglements, supposed "globalization," have not put an end to nations and nation states. The shutdown of borders and the disruption of global supply chains in reaction to the COVID-19 crisis as much as Britain's "Brexit," or former U.S. President Donald Trump's "America First" nationalism illustrate this all too well. Contrary to what liberal theories suggest, market-oriented economies can enter into high-level conflicts, and economic integration has not diminished one of the most powerful historical forces of the so-called modern age: nationalism. In the context of a joint research project addressing related questions, Professors Erdmute Alber (Social Anthropology, University of Bayreuth), Ulf Brunnbauer (Director of the Leibniz Institute for East and Southeast European Studies, University of Regensburg), Volker Depkat (American Studies, Regensburg), Hartmut Egger (Economics, Bayreuth), Gerlinde Groitl (Political Science, Regensburg), and Susanne Lachenicht (Early Modern History, Bayreuth), in cooperation with the Leibniz Science Campus "Europe and America in the Modern World," the Center for International and Transnational Area Studies (CITAS) at Regensburg, and the Institute of African Studies and the Cluster of Excellence "Africa Multiple" at Bayreuth, organized a joint online lecture series to probe the relationship of nationalisms and globalization in a *longue durée* perspective.

SUSANNE LACHENICHT (Bayreuth), opening the series with both her own remarks and those of VOLKER DEPKAT (Regensburg), discussed the ways in which recent developments have highlighted the need to complicate our understanding of nations, nationalisms, nation states, and globalization. Our understanding of these global forces is often reduced to binaries that do not reflect the complexity and the nuances of their interconnectedness. Lachenicht discussed how glimpses of the questions raised by the relationships between such global forces can already be seen in the early modern period. Paradigms for what constituted a nation were beginning to shift. There were also evolving ideas of the relation between the nation and the state. Concurrently, European and other empires were expanding to a degree not seen before. From today's perspective, these and many other related developments raise the question of how to characterize that period, which in turn raises questions relevant to this lecture series. The discussion that followed Lachenicht's remarks highlighted how an interdisciplinary approach can lead productively to the questioning of assumptions, the detailed definition of terms, and the careful delineation of specific temporal and spatial contexts.

In the second session, STEFAN LINK (Hanover, New Hampshire) proposed a mix of meta-historical reflection when it comes to how the history of globalization is viewed. Beginning the lecture with a review of the history of globalization, moving to the Great Depression, and then examining the 1933 World Economic Conference in London, Link wished to question the common "pendulum view" of globalization and propose a different narrative. Through these historical case studies, Link concluded that the common "master narrative" and its pendulum view of globalization is insufficient to describe

the concept to its full extent. He suggested an alternative periodization in which the interwar period of the 1930s is defined as a major rupture point with long-term consequences that remain with us to this day. The events of the 1930s, as illustrated by the case studies, caused a major break within the global economy. This period caused industrialization to emerge on the periphery, as the institutions in those countries shifted their focus towards their own economic development. With these changes, the entire structure of the global economy was massively altered after that period – consequences that have stretched far beyond a simple “swing of the pendulum”.

BARTOLOMÉ YUN CASALILLA focused his lecture on early globalizations and the making of Spain in the 18th century. The intensification of exchange between distant regions of the world contributed to the definition of imagined communities. In the case of Spain, the phenomenon of nation building was led by family networks among the local elites in the Iberian Peninsula and America, creating a Spanish aristocracy beyond Castilla and León. For Yun Casalilla, a sense of “Spanishness” began to emerge especially since 1714, when the Habsburg dynasty was replaced by the Bourbons, who created a tax-based system, expanding the power of the king at the expense of other institutions. In this context, the process of globalization increased military tensions. Consequently, the crown required resources from local elites in exchange for titles for military services, which represented valuable political and social capital. After 1808, the growing sense of identity of the American elites and the lack of protection of the crown led to a weakening “Spanishness” within the colonies and, subsequently, to the processes of American independences. After the lecture, comparisons with the building of other states, different methods to measure globalization, American nationalisms and the exchange between the king and the elites were discussed.

MARY NOLAN (New York) reviewed central issues raised by the study of economic globalization. Its first modern phase (1880-1914) was an age of nationalism but not primarily of nation states. The principal globalizers were formal and informal empires. Imperial consciousness and identities drove globalization; there was no talk of an abstract global economy eroding sovereignty and somehow itself regulating transatlantic exchanges. Turning to more recent developments, Nolan noted that nationalism can be a basis for opening economies, limiting them through protectionism, using threats to improve a state's position in the global economy, retreating to regional blocs, or pursuing import substitution industrialization. Globalization is a political project, with every stage of trade liberalization driven by states altering their policies and processes rather than by private actors somehow forcing change. Finally, Nolan addressed the nebulous term deglobalization. What exactly should be measured, and is it value or volume? How much of a decline is just normal fluctuation? The post-lecture discussion focused on the need to rethink the metaphors used to describe developments (e.g., the simple swinging of a pendulum) and the tendency to ascribe linearity to processes that are in fact non-linear.

In his talk about the transatlantic space, DANIEL S. HAMILTON (Washington, DC) addressed misconceptions about the economic relationships between the United States, the European Union, and China. His first leitmotif: the misconception of trade and commerce. Hamilton clarified that trade and commerce are not the same and goods are only a part of trade. Also, the US and EU are still the two largest and most connected economies globally, due to the significance of goods and services trading. His second leitmotif: the real driver of the transatlantic economy isn't trading but investment flows. The company BMW, for example, illustrates the fact that US and EU companies prefer to invest abroad rather than trade across the ocean. Lastly, despite their closeness, the EU and US have been unable to create a strategic relationship based on their deep economic integration – a continuing political goal of presidential administrations. In their discussion, Gerlinde Groitl (Regensburg) and Hamilton highlighted how the effects of the US-EU relationship go beyond foreign policy. Although people are connecting globally, globalization processes are uneven in their impact. Finally,

deglobalization is misleading because China, the US, and the EU aren't able to unlink due to their interdependency. Politicians are trying to redefine the terms of their dependency.

KONSTANTINOS KATSAKIORIS (Prague) focused on Africa's relations with socialist countries and how those influenced the establishment of economies and nationalisms in the newly independent states. By analyzing various key themes in East-South relations, such as anticolonial nationalism, military and economic ties, educational aid, and the training of elites, as well as cultural exchange, Katsakioris sought to highlight the fact that national aspirations were the driving force behind the formation of said alliances. The Eastern Bloc's and China's communist systems served as major inspirations for African economists and state leaders alike, who debated the various options with which best to structure their newly formed countries. Simultaneously, the socialist states had a considerable effect on the arising African nationalisms, not least through the exchange of ideas and ideologies. As shown through the case of Algeria and its relations to the Soviet Union, educational assistance on academic but also work-related levels (e.g. training specialists for the Algerian oil and gas industries) were significant factors that helped strengthen the nation state. After the lecture, the tension between the rhetoric and the reality of national policy was discussed. Another topic was the socialist globalization promoted through the communist influence on Africa.

ANNALISA URBANO's (Rome) lecture centered on questions of labor, nationalism, citizenship and 'strangers' in relation to the west African diamond industry from the 1920s until the 1970s. After gaining independence, many new governments took measures to assert control over citizenship requirements, as well as to restrict migration and limit access to labor and resources alike. In retrospect, the mass expulsions that followed might be considered as expressions of enforcing nationalist interests. To better understand this phenomenon, we can link it to the diamond industry, which after World War II prompted a series of interregional migrations as it offered a lucrative work field. One such example examined was the diamond mining district "Kono" in Sierra Leone. While still under colonial rule, the tension between workers deployed by the African Consolidated Selection Trust (which held exclusive mining rights at the time) and illegal workers who migrated from other regions was resolved by forced migration and other radical measures. Those had long-term effects, such as reconsideration of who is seen as a stranger and who is granted citizenship, but also of notions of independence and nationalism. The post-lecture discussion considered the concepts of stranger and citizen, the role of slavery and race, and the distinction between nation and nation state.

STEFAN BERGER (Bochum) focused on right-wing strategies in the Ruhr territories in trans-regional comparison. One of the questions raised was how deindustrialization affected the commemorative culture in former industrialized regions, as well as how right-wing organizations used this phenomenon to further their political agendas. Berger applied a memory model, which considers three perspectives: antagonistic, cosmopolitan and agonal. He argued that the typical elite narrative in the Ruhr region is based on a cosmopolitan argument, which in Germany is linked to the concept of "Kulturwandel." The AfD, as a right-wing party, denies this success of the "Kulturwandel" and instead presents itself as the savior of the "common man", a position more often seen in left-wing parties. Similar processes, under different circumstances, could be observed in former industrial regions in England or France. Berger concluded that in recent years the antagonistic memory had a large influence, although there are differences in other countries (e.g., Spain). Respondent Rainer Liedtke commented that he sees a larger variety in this field especially concerning the AfD, highlighting the discussion about immigrants in recent years.

This lecture series' discussions around globalizations and deglobalizations in different periods of time, the problem of periodization, global and transnational economies, state-building, nation-building, the role of empires, colonialism, race, etc., illuminated the relation/tension between the global and the national, highlighting the relevance of interdisciplinarity and the importance of attending to these

phenomena in different moments of history and from different geographic perspectives. They also confirmed the interdependence of both concepts in contexts of integration/disintegration. The analyses of these global forces show that a binary approach is not sufficient to understand these phenomena in their full complexity, and that focusing excessively on expansive forces like empires blurs the role of the peripheries. In addition, the agency of key actors who create networks and senses of identity beyond geographic distance and political borders is also important to understanding the emergence of globalizing or deglobalizing forces. Furthermore, the methods and scales for measuring globalization are also important to the debate, all of whose interdependencies can be better understood through multi- and interdisciplinary approaches. Finally, the transnational flow of ideas, the relation of colonialism, and the emergence of nation-states, with implications for citizenship, labor, migrations, etc., play active roles in the relation of the global and the national.

PROGRAM:

“Globalization and Nationalisms. Historical Perspectives on a Complex Relationship”

Joint Lecture Series of the Universities of Bayreuth (UBT) and Regensburg (UR)

Summer Term 2021

Mondays, 6 to 8 p.m. via Zoom

April 26 Introduction, Volker Depkat (UR)/Susanne Lachenicht (UBT)

May 10 London 1933: The World Economic Conference, the Great Depression, and the History of Globalization, Stefan Link (Modern Economic History, Dartmouth College), Respondent: Ulf Brunnbauer (IOS, Regensburg)

June 7 Early Globalization, Cross-border Social Networks and the Making of Spain: A Methodological Problem and Some Thoughts, Bartolomé Yun Casalilla (Early Modern History, Seville), Respondent: Susanne Lachenicht (Early Modern History, UBT)

June 14 Empires, Nation-States and Globalization in the Long Twentieth Century, Mary Nolan (Modern History, New York University), Respondent: Volker Depkat (American Studies, UR)

June 21 The Transatlantic Economy in a Changing World: Economic Integration - Political Nationalism - De-Globalization?, Dan Hamilton (Political Sciences, Johns Hopkins University), Respondent: Gerlinde Groitl (Political Sciences, UR)

June 28 Nationalism and the Economy through the Prism of Africa's Relations with the Socialist Countries, Konstantinos Katsakioris (History, Charles University, Prague), Respondent: Erdmute Alber (Social Anthropology, UBT)

July 5 Citizens and 'Strangers', Panafricanism, Nationalism, Labour and Diamonds in West Africa (1920-1970), Annalisa Urbano (History, Rome), Respondent: Joël Glasman (History of Africa, UBT)

July 13 (Tuesday) Deindustrialisierung und „der kleine Mann“ – rechtspopulistische Strategien im Ruhrgebiet im transregionalen Vergleich', Stefan Berger (Institute for Social Movements, Ruhruniversität Bochum), Respondent: Rainer Liedtke (19th and 20th-century European History, UR)