

The World from Neo-Liberal Globalization to Neo-Populist Ethno-Nationalism: From the Law of Nature to the Law of Nurture

Sibuh Gebeyaw Tareke*

Department of Political Science and International Studies, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

*Corresponding Author: Sibuh Gebeyaw Tareke, Department of Political Science and International Studies, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

ABSTRACT

Neoliberalism arose from classical liberalism, which was believed in individual liberty, equal opportunity, and private property should administer by individual 'law of nature' while the 'law of state' regarded as a 'necessary evil'. When neoliberalism had emerged in 1970s, it replaced the theories of Keynesianism, which targeted state regulation on the economic policy; towards a more 'monetarist' individual self-regulating and 'market law' approach. This "Individual against all" approach of neoliberalism led the mass to live like slaves in slavery age and peasants in feudalism. Then economic crises aggravated and the 'law of identity' emerged or neoliberalism shifted towards all against all approaches of neo-populism. This paper explores the neoliberal law of the individual over the mass and its practical failure; next it discusses all against all laws of neo-populism and its threats. In the end, it provides the missing laws of both the 'neo-neo' approaches as a solution and a concluding remark.

Keywords: Neo-liberalism; Neo-populism; Law-of-Nature; Law-of-market; Law-of-State; Law-of-Nurture

INTRODUCTION

The private ownership of the means of production was introduced as a distinct movement in the Age of Enlightenment, when liberalism became popular among Western philosophers and economists. Liberalism sought to replace the norms of hereditary privilege, state religion, absolute monarchy, divine right of kings and traditional conservatism with representative democracy and the rule of law. Liberals ended the mercantilist policies of the 15th and 16th century, loyal monopolies and other barriers to trade and as an alternative, it promoted free market economy or economic man, while the law of a state attracted on social and political issues (Kelly, 2005).

This period also known as a belief in which an individual possesses the natural rights of free will and every individual is equally endowed with the God-given right of self-determination and the ability to consent to be governed. In the 20th century, the economic man model of liberalism replaced by modern liberalism, which was recognized intervention of the state in the market economy (Harrison & Harris, 2011).

Following the 1970s economic crises, neoliberalism had emerged from the liberal tradition, as a counter-

revolutionary to modern liberalism-the trend towards big government and state intervention (law of the state) that had characterized much of the twentieth century. Thus, neoliberalism has seen the market as morally and practically superior to government and any form of political control. That is why they recognized the market state (*the law of the market*) instead of the nation state (*the law of the state*) (Hayek, 1944, p. 95; and Friedman, 1962, p.38-50). Moreover, the known ideological guardians of neoliberalism Hayek and Friedman again emphasized on labour and capital mobility, cultural pluralism, and economic inequality clashes with the loyalty most people feel towards different forms of "social capital", where and if, the world follow neoliberalism and market fundamentalism (Ibid).

It meant that the natural rights of every human activity like, social, economic and political aspects have been controlled by individual capitalists through the free market economy. Here the free market law maintains the natural rights of individuals negative freedom only and missed the positive freedoms of individual society. It has also left an important aspect of the law of the state in a vacuum or gives it a facilitative role to entrepreneurs. This state observatory role of neoliberalism, leads individual capitalists to

monopolize the socioeconomic and political activities as the expense of the mass or recognizing an individual man to dominate the market battle against the interests of the mass of society.

Within this context of social cohesion provided by market transactions rather than by political, cultural, or religious agreement or belief, we can however see that there is one political ideology above all which currently stands out as dominant. By promoting the individual and the global free market; it undermines all the social institutions and connections, weakened the sense of national identity, eroded state sovereignty, resulted inequality, high unemployment, socioeconomic and political crises (Anderson, 2015, p.1-12).

The other massive dysfunctional economic sector is “the fossil fuel industry: oil, coal, and gas. This is bit by bit bringing crisis and instability of a different sort, through disrupting the global climate system, which is already having awful and expensive consequences throughout much of the world”. This weakness of neoliberalism stems mainly from its persistent unwillingness to correct its own errors and then generally fails to correct or eliminate these, leading to severe instability for the economic system as a whole (Ibid). As a result, over the past thirty years, neoliberalism has resulted in profound social, cultural, political or economic crisis, particularly in developing countries. This neoliberal pattern of crisis, has resulted in the rise of ‘all are in battle against all’ doctrine known as neo-populism, in 2010 (O'Donnell, 2018, p.2-12).

In doing so, this paper assesses the individual market law oriented doctrine of neoliberalism from alpha to omega. Next determines the conflictual dogma of neo-populism law of identity and its threats. Then it searches the missing *laws* on both neo-neo (laws of the market and the law of identity) as a remedy for our problems. In the end, it provides a concluding remark. The method of the study is mainly depending on the comparative and the documentary qualitative approach. The analyses of documentary sources include semi-systematic literature review and discourse analyses of the previous scholarly work and international organizations statistical reports.

THE CROSS ROAD DEVELOPMENT AND CROSS SECTORIAL CRISIS OF NEOLIBERALISM

The Rhetorical Advent of Neoliberalism and the Market Law

The development of liberal ‘free market economic law’ was traced back to the 19th century classical

liberalism. In the twenty century, classical liberalism was replaced by modern liberalism, which characterized by the dual role of individual liberty to act in free market economy, according to their interests (natural law) and state intervention in the economy (The law of the state). The 21st century marked the period of neoliberalism and globalization, which orchestrated on the dogma of ‘market law’ only over socioeconomic and political aspects through ‘rollout’ the role of the state in these aspects (Heikki, 2014, p.734-38).

In broad-spectrum, since 1945, the Western world had lived with a form of capitalism known as the ‘Keynesian Welfare State’ (KWS). The KWS was favored on the synergy of a market economy and government intervention. The former accepted the natural rights of individuals to act freely in the market economy through the guarantee of the negative freedoms of individuals. The later allowed the government intervention in the form of regional policy development, government ownership- nationalized railways, welfare benefits-unemployment benefit, employment and trade union rights, and universal public services-health and education services to maintain the positive freedom of the society (King, 1987: 9; Anderson, 2015, p.3; Friedman, 1962, p.63).

In line with this logic, the famous economist Frederick Hayek (1944) documented that neoliberalism has been emerged in 1970s, through the rollback of the KWS and then by reviving the classical liberalism in extreme manner. On the one hand, following the crises of KWS when combined with the 1973 multiplying of oil prices and the breakdown of the international system of fixed exchange rates” (Anderson,2015, p.3), neoliberalism had emerged by rejecting the Keynesianism policies of government expenditure on the public sector; and a wish to expand the scope for market forces to operate, including internally within the remaining public sector and internationally in the global finance system (Anderson, 2015, p.2-8; Hayek, 1944, p.94-98).

On the other hand, neoliberalism becomes a hegemonic ideology in 1990s, through a radical revival of classical liberalism. However, neoliberalism did not share all elements of classical liberalism rather it used some of its rhetoric on individual natural rights. That means, classical liberalism believed on the natural rights of individuals. They view human beings as rationally self-interested creatures,

which have a pronounced capacity for self-reliance whereas society is therefore seen to be atomistic, composed of a collection of largely self-sufficient individuals (Conway, 1995). They also believe in negative freedom. The individual is free insofar as he or she is left alone, not interfered with or coerced by others; while the state is regarded as a 'necessary evil' or they believe in a minimal state, which acts, as a 'night watchman' (Gray, 2000; Ramsay, 1997).

This was most clearly expressed in the classical liberal belief in a self-regulating market economy. The market should be 'free' from government interference because it is managed by what Adam Smith referred to as an 'invisible hand'. The 'invisible hand' explains how economic problems such as unemployment, inflation or balance of payments deficits can be removed by the mechanisms of the market (Smith, 1976, p.52). This view articulated as states had the power to maintain the social activities and political decisions, while individuals mandated to regulate the economic activities without government interference.

In doing so, though neoliberalism has taken the free market economic system from classical liberalism, extremely it gives an ultimate power to the operation of market forces, "seeing the market as providing the principal answer for almost every question in politics, economics, environment, and society. It links philosophically back to a view of human life which prioritizes the individual" through neglecting the role of the state and the interests of the general community (Anderson, 2015, p.2).

Glaring evidence shows that, after the collapse of fascism in 1945, and the Soviet-style communism 1991; the cross road development of neoliberalism becomes a dominant ideology in 1990s. This view was most memorably articulated by the US social theorist Francis Fukuyama in his essay 'The End of History'(1989), who proclaimed that "we are witnessing the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government"(p.1-2). It meant that there was an emerging agreement about the desirability of liberal democracy, and market or capitalist economy and an open, competitive political system throughout the world, and the western liberalism, had triumphed over all its rivals.

Empirics and Cross Sectorial Crisis of the Neoliberal Market law

The proponents of neoliberalism argued that, free markets adopted mechanisms are the optimal way of organizing all exchanges of goods and services. It is believed, set free the creative potential and the entrepreneurial spirit which is built into the spontaneous order of any human society, and thereby lead to more individual liberty and well-being, and a more efficient allocation of resources (Hayek, 1973; Friedman, 1962). In this sense, neoliberalism goes beyond the classical economic theory in which the market has been seen to be morally and practically superior to government and any form of political control (Hayek, 1944, p.95).

On the other hand, they argued that, the state interventions in markets must be kept to a bare minimum and it cannot possibly possess enough information to second-guess market prices and beliefs the only legitimate purpose of the state is to safeguard individual, especially commercial, liberty, as well as strong private property rights (Harvey, 2005:2;Nozick 1974, p.23).

Accordingly, when the world states act in this way, they achieve success, their citizens will reap the benefits from competitive global economy, by increasing the flexibility of labour markets could solve the persistently higher unemployment rates, reduce wealth in equality between poor and rich, promotes social capital, and creates socio economic development and political stability and maintains (Lee, and McBride, 2007, p.79).

Furthermore, the neoliberal theorists advocated that, liberalization of the economy, deregulation of markets, and privatization of publicly provided services, lower taxes on income and capital; orchestrated as a central doctrine of the neoliberal policymakers, the belief to expedite greater economic growth (GDP).The overall idea was that the growth would benefit all capitalists, corporations, workers and the economy at large through wage growth and increased mobility. It also promises to labour and capital mobility, cultural pluralism, human development, good governance, economic and social stability with the loyalty most people feel towards different forms of "social capital" (Konczal, 2020, p.2; Anderson, 2015, p.2).

The major driving force behind the advance of neoliberal ideas and structures has been economic globalization. Globalization has

witnessed the incorporation of national economies into an interlocking global economy in which production is internationalized and capital flows freely, and often instantly, between countries. He has argued that this has contributed to the replacement of the nation-state by the 'market state' or the 'law of state' by the 'law of market', to maximize the choices available to individuals over the mass (Lee, and McBride, 2007, p.12-48).

In contrast to the neoliberal theorists, Blomgren (1997) noted, neoliberalism becomes a loose set of ideas of how the relationship between the state and its external environment ought to be organized, and not a complete political philosophy or ideology in which it does not understand as a theory about how political processes ought to be organized at all. Besides, in the holy trinity dogma of neoliberalism such as liberalization, privatization and deregulation policies, the issues of democracy and free exchanges of political ideas were not clearly set as an agenda. Moreover, others critique of the doctrine is predominantly concerned with its inability to deliver growth, its proclivity to exacerbate inequality and its depreciation of cultural values that are contradictory to a growth agenda (Harvey, 2005, p.2-7).

Furthermore, though the neo-liberal emphasis on regulating social and economic questions with the market and quasi market processes, but intervenes systematically on the supply-side in order to maximize efficiency gains, which is a paradox with their dogma. Then, it created a number of tensions or paradoxes on the western states. Their democratic functions of mobilizing civil society in turn fall to the wayside (Lee and McBride, 2007, p.97-103). Beyond a certain level, market imperfections happened and reduce demand for labour, prevent the labour market from clearing. Far from achieving their goals, actually increase unemployment above its natural level (Ibid, p.82).

Konczal (2020) expressed that, the regressive policies of neoliberalism, "including lower tax rates for corporations and the already wealthy, deregulation, and privatization, have resulted in slower growth, greater income inequality, wage stagnation, and decreased labor market mobility" (p,2). All these contradictory policies of neoliberalism have resulted cross continents and sectorial crises. In the post Washington consensus period of neo-liberalism (1990), the Western states were facing slow growth compared with the Bretton Woods era (1945-

1970), in which the Western European unprecedented economic growth (Temin, 2002, p.3-22).

In broad spectrum, the neoliberal agenda of liberalization, privatization and deregulatory system failed to foster economic growth, instead it did grow income inequality. In the West, the leading research show that, the top 1 percent's share of income went from 8 percent of total income in 1979 to 18 percent in 2017 (Piketty, et.al., 2017, p.553-609). Specifically, they documented that, from the 1980s to the late 1990s, this was primarily driven by inequality within labor income, whereas from 2000 to now, this happened along capital income and also the share of income paid to labor fell from 85.3 percent in 1980 to 78.5 percent in 2011.

Besides, as to Anderson, the neoliberal policy in developing countries exacerbated inequality; it resulted in slower growth and inability to deliver growth, stagnant wage growth, and decreased labor market and capital mobility and its depreciation of cultural values that are contradictory to a growth agenda (2015, p.2). Similarly, the growth rates in the developing world, particularly in Africa have been very lower on average in the past two decades of the Washington Consensus, in comparison than they were in the pre Washington Consensus years of the 1960s and 1970s (Lee, and McBride, 2007, p.118).

In fact, the twin policies of economic globalization and neo-liberalization had recorded a devastating effect to all sectors of the society throughout the world. The root problems of neoliberalism were the abstract notion of an individual's gains credibility over the mass. This meant that the law of market promotes the individual against all or one gate at the expense of others. Particularly, an ill-assorted hodge-podge idea of the 'market law' recognized a few Western multilateral corporations and entrepreneurs that had exploited the resources, clashed cultures, and arrested the mental of Africans in order to become their subordinate and then not behaving their activities by their own. In doing so, this policy of neoliberalism has left Africans into Armageddon.

In general, Beck (1999) documented that, many of these problems have steamed from the neoliberal pseudo policies. On the one hand, the individual self-generated 'market law', over the whole social, economic and political aspects of the society. From another vantage point, the significant 'law of the state' had been neglected in socioeconomic and political activities. Then

this socioeconomic inequality and political instability resulted among others, Global warming, overpopulation, pathogens, shortage of resources, weapons of mass destruction, and ethnic nationalism and populism in which the world emerging in the spectrum of “all are at war against all” category based on race, religion, ethnic, and region.

NEO-POPULISM AS THE LAW OF NURTURE AND THE POLITICS OF NONPOLITICIAN

The Rise of Neo-Populism Belief as a Reaction to Neo-Liberalism

The term populism was used in the jargon of the social sciences. However, it was normally applied in the Third World countries as a political integration of the masses under the context of authoritarian regimes for several decades and then it had replaced communism in performing the role of the specter that obsessed the world. Recently, the identification of trends has started with the distinctive pluralist systems in the United States of America (Tarchi, 2016, p.2-3).

In the United States of America, the rise of neo-populist movements have aggravated following the failure of neoliberalism ideology. Since the financial crisis of 2007-2008, neoliberalism had failed to effectively counter socio-economic issues such as growing inequality, social crises and political instability, and then populism as a response has emerged to the crises created by neoliberalism. It also resulted in the flow of the right-wing neo-populism and the election of Donald Trump. If a leftist politics are prevented from collapsing the neoliberal agenda, neo-populist movements on the right will likely continue to gather momentum (O'Donnell, 2018, p.10).

Unlike neoliberalism ‘market law principle’, neo-populism has emerged with its unique principle of the ‘law of nurture’- personality determinants based on the environment (identity, religion, region, etc. based category). According to Taggart (2000), it indicates the wide geographical coverage and its chronological breadth have emphasized the heterogeneity of the phenomenon rather than its common grounds and socio-economic and political aspects.

Moreover, Berlin et al. (1968) has expressed the basic characteristics of populism as the idea of organized society closely related to the organic community; a belief related more to the society than to the state; the interest in bringing the people back to the lost harmony with the natural

order; a tendency towards sentimental emphasis on values linked to ancient times, and the belief that neo-populism speaks in the name of the majority of the population to holed onlythe vested sounds of the society.

It also expressed in terms of movements, regimes, discursive styles and rhetorical strategies, states of mind and psychological behaviours. Therefore, to adapt to a wide variety of contexts and to divide the line between left and right, its ideological orientation has been changing through time. Thus, it is a fictitious entity and that it would be useless to try to capture it (Taguieff, 2002, p. 78). In line with its ineffectiveness, others assumed it “in the confused light of the cumulative forms that it coated in time and in space, rather than through an intellectual synthesis which inevitably tended to be simplistic” (Hermet, 2001, p. 53).

In doing so, neo-populism has emerged with different features with that of neoliberalism. In the former case, the principle of representation is based on the assumption of national sentiment, identity politics, homology, similarity and proximity between representatives and the represented. The later has been emphasized by the so called liberal democratic principles of the autonomy of individuals in the free market economy regardless identity. This difference leads neo-populism to a frontal clash with liberal democracy (Mény, and Surel, 2000).

The Neo-populism Law of Nurture and the Politics of Nonpolitician Ideology

Historically, Populism has not expressed as a homogeneous type of political ideology, rather, it orchestrated in different contents. Internally, it has not a political strategy to achieve the common objectives of the political programs or have not political program that fully shared by all of its members and externally it has not a capacity to view the situations that happenings in the world (Tarchi, 2016, p.2-6).

On the other hand, Zanatta (2002) argued that, it has some attributes of political ideology and its own visible nucleus, a soul, a heart made of elements, recurrent in time and space that make it similar to an ideology (p. 263–264). Indeed, some identified neo-populism in terms of political ideology which stated that the will of the people with justice and morality as such is “supreme over every other standard, over the standards of traditional institutions, over the

autonomy of institutions and over the will of other strata” (Shils, 1956, p. 98).

To dig deeper into social behaviors of neo-populism, Tarchi (2016) expressed it in the sense of movements than political ideology. In line with this logic, it is “neither as an ideology, nor only as a style, but as a mental, connected to a vision of the social order that is based on a belief in the innate virtues of the people, whose primacy is claimed as the source of the legitimacy for government” (p.1). Besides, Dorna articulated neo-populism as a natural intrinsic behavior of an individual rather than ideology. It can be better understood as a feeling, a moral attitude or as the reflection of a pre-existent psychological structure, emotional and cognitive at the same time and recurring mentality appearing in different historical and geographic contexts as the result of a special social situation (1999, p. 8; Ionescu and Gellner, 1969, p.3).

Far from moving towards its behavioral understanding, in the twenty-first century it may be characterized by marginalizing both the natural and democratic rights of the society. Primarily, it has become as a challenge to democracy on its own ground, in the name of pseudo identity the elites manipulate the people that allowed to vote, but without any tangible policies and objectives that serve in the interests of the society. Moreover, the real power is concentrated away from it, towards a more liberal and enlightened elite and in which the popular sovereignty is nothing but a necessary lie, an elaborate ruse backed by false promises (Canovan, 1993, p. 49–50).

For example, Fujimori's discourse was anti-elitist and anti-establishment. Then he began a systematic attack on Peru's political elites and the establishment institutions they controlled, namely, the political parties, Congress, and the judiciary. This antiestablishment orientation was always present in Fujimori's status as a political outsider. “It intensified, however, after he took office, lacking an organized political base of his own and having to confront alternative, independent institutions; and it peaked when the Congress posed more assertive challenges to his economic and security policies in late 1991 and early 1992” .In doing so, neo-populist has been illustrated as the ‘politics of non-politics’ in which a leader attitudes as the embodiment of national unity and the public interest against the dispiriting divisiveness of partisan or particular interests (Roberts, 1995,p.97).

Secondly, Roberts explained that, the populist government had failed to achieve economic development and then organized labor was devastated by a decade of economic crisis that produced widespread factory layoffs, rising underemployment, and an informalization of the workforce (p.97-99). In line with this he more highlights the fact that:-

By 1991 the level of unionization had fallen by one-third to 12 percent of the workforce, while over half of the economically active population in Lima worked in the informal sector and 49 percent of salaried workers in the private sector had temporary contracts. In short, structural changes in the Peruvian economy had fragmented and atomized the workforce, obstructing organizational efforts that relied upon class-based collective interests and identities.

This neo-populist inefficient government in Peru had led the workers in a massive protest movement that undermined military rule in the late 1970s. Consequently, this phenomenon leads Peru into economic collapse and civil war (Ibid).

Moreover, the diseases of neo-populist governments have endowed with weak political institutions, high socioeconomic crisis, leads to a new social disorder, a fragmentation of civil society, a de-structuring of institutional linkages, and an erosion of collective identities that enables personalize leaders to establish vertical, unmediated relationships with atomized masses as it illustrated in the contemporary world, particularly in British, USA, France, Spain , Africa and Latten America (Tullio-Altanm,1989, p. 42–43). In general, the neo-populist national identity and anti-political movements may lead the world society into identity war (all are at war against all), as the same as nationalism was therefore a powerful factor leading to war the world society in both 1914 and 1939.

THE MISSING LAW’S IN THE NEO-NEO POLITICS AS A RESOLUTION

Human society is an association of persons for cooperative action. The cooperative action on the basis of the principle of the division of labor has brought an extra advantage over productivity than the isolated action of individuals. In fact, the cooperative works of human society is not only the sum of what they would have produced by working as a self-sufficient individual, but extensively more. All human civilization is founded on this fact. That is why; man is

distinguished from animals by the virtue of the division of labor (Ralph, 2005, p. 1).

Nevertheless, following the industrial revolution in the 19th century, private ownership as the means of production maintained, the only workable system of human cooperation in a society based on the division of labor (Good in, 2006, p. 17-19). This period also known as classical liberalism, which was recognized only the individual as an economic man and the belief that human beings as rationally self-interested creatures, which have a pronounced capacity for self-reliance. So a market economy governed by an individual self-regulating mechanism in which the market should be 'free' from government interference (Ryan, 1993, p. 293-296).

According to Polanyi, the nineteenth-century self-regulating market system had led to socially disastrous in terms of human sociability and dignity and the moral life of real human beings, natural environment and the turmoil of the twentieth century. Overall, in the mid-nineteenth century, "the effects on the lives of the people were awful beyond description. Indeed, human society would have been annihilated but for protective countermoves which blunted the action of this self-destructive mechanism" (1957, p. 72-76). For this reason, he argued that, the natural rights of an individual that could not manage the market imperfections without the law of state intervention and empowerment for those who had not capacity and awareness (Ibid).

Secondly, the period of the 20th century was the *Modern* liberalism era. Since 1945, The KWS was adopted a market economy system together with government intervention. The individuals act freely in the market economy and also the government intervenes in the form of regional policy development, government ownership-nationalized railways, welfare benefits-unemployment benefit, employment and trade union rights, and universal public services -health services (King, 1987, p. 9). This period was appreciated in fostering socio economic development and political stability in both developed and developing countries than the 21st century policy of neoliberalism. For this reason, Temin argued that, the modern liberalism period was represented a marriage between new and old liberalism, and thus embodies the law of the state (intervention in the economy) and the law of nature (free rights of an individual in the market economy) (2002, p.3-22).

Thirdly, the 21st century period of neoliberalism had emerged as a hegemonic ideology in 1990s, by extremely grants economic, social and political activities in the market law. This radical 'market law' principles have resulted to market imperfections and reduce demand for labour, prevent the labour market from clearing, increase unemployment, aggravates socioeconomic catastrophe throughout the world and then it failed and replaced by other alternatives (Anderson , 2015, p.2). Following the failure of neoliberalism, the study analysis of Lee, Simon and Stephen McBride (2007) show that, even the instrument of neo-liberalism - UNCTAD, IMF and World Bank recommended that, what is now needed is not 'more and better economics' to refine neo-liberalism, but an alternative political economy model, to displace the 'market fundamentalism' of the neo-liberal orthodoxy, has been located in the concept of the public domain - that is a social democratic alternative to the neo-liberalism, based upon the creation of a Global Covenant (p.249-58).

In view of this, I understood that, a historical conception of neoliberalism market law actually distorts genuine equality of human beings and it does not consider the possibility that real universality becomes known to human beings in concretized, social form. It is only a guardian of an individual, but the counter-poison to the mass of the society. I agree with the law of nature in which individuals have the right to do things, whatever they want freely and rule itself democratically. Though, an individual has the right of democracy and liberty given by nature, every activities of an individual will be protected and regulated by government from somebody and market imperfection.

Lastly, the politics of non-political system of neo-populism, attributes personal culm rather than an institution, diminished the core values of political culture, distributive conflicts engendered by entrenched socioeconomic inequalities, "as to the fragility of autonomous political organizing among popular sectors and the weakness of intermediary in situations that aggregate and channel social demands within the political arena"(Roberts, 1995,p.113).

In line with this logic, I agree that the neo-populism 'laws of nurture (environment) disintegrate the bond of society to live through unity with diversity, because the 'hodge-podge' doctrine of neo-populism identity orientation does not bring to light the best possible regime but rather the

narrower non political things—based on ethnic identity, religion, region, or a particular mobilization to take power alone. Therefore, contemporary dogmatic of neo-neo politics are disbelief and irrational because it did not understand the individual cannot live without the community as well as unity with diversity.

Accordingly, to solve the contemporary all round problems, I recommend that the world should return back to rediscover the ‘missing dimension of socioeconomic thinking and the politics of the common ground. The only route to our socioeconomic prosperity is the “role of the state”. That is the missing element is the ‘law of the state’ that balanced the positive and negative freedoms of an individual and the general society as it was designed to work for the poor in 20 centuries.

Moreover, I recommend that, the modern liberal era of social democratic system served as a useful moderate action, solving our contemporary eternal problems of politics, economics and social existence. I believed that, the 21st century doctrines of neo-liberalism and neo-populism exhibit through promoting an ‘individual at the market battle against all’ and ‘all are at war against all’ approach respectively. Whereas, learning from the past, comparatively the modern liberal KWS political ideology should be an adequate solution to these neo-neo problems. In doing so, we return to a broader social wellbeing and understanding system and a permanent return to the politics of modern liberalism, which forward the possibility that it may have hold of the truth.

In general perspective, as I thought I had written this paper to initiate all the world states to reconsider ‘the politics of all opportunities for all human prosperity’ without distinguishing poor and rich and red and yellow color—that is democratic welfare state. Because, we do not live now like ‘*slaves in slavery age*’, ‘*peasants in feudalism*’, ‘*commodity in neoliberalism*’ and ‘*identity in neo-populism*’, rather all human beings are a social creature we live together in cooperation and integration equally from one another. To assure this, the law market should make synergy with the law of the state to guaranty both the interests of the individual and the society at large.

CONCLUSION

The world is characterized by complex, plural, contradictory, differentiated, disjoint but also

coalescing and condensing development and antagonistic struggles. The history of the world is not a liner political ideology that existed as a system of government (Heikki, 2014, p.746). For example, from the time of the 19th century, there were different political ideologies with new powers, structures and mechanisms existed at one time and disappeared at the other time. Among others, classical liberalism, modern liberalism, neoliberalism and neo-populism were adopted since the 19th century and failed and arose one by one with their dogmatic laws of nature, state, market and identity respectively until now.

The nineteenth-century self-regulating market system or economic liberalism was favoured an individual economic man but not seen the society as a human creature. Then this individual self-understanding system had led to the turmoil of the twentieth century. Following this crisis, KWS emerged as an ideology in the mid-20th century. In KWS, the world socioeconomic development was promised through adopting the synergy of both the free market economy and state intervention. Unfortunately, following the 1970s oil crisis, it was replaced by neoliberal radical market law system.

The neoliberal market law approach was promised a radical transformation of the world society, but its outcome is apparent in which it resulted in the current socioeconomic catastrophe and this effect can then help to bring about and shape a process of transition to neo-populism law of identity. Currently, the neo-populist approach has decayed the long living styles of the society regards to unity with diversity. In line with these systems, my argument suggests a rational return back towards global Keynesian systems of governance, which will enabling the world society equal socioeconomic opportunity, increase autonomy and new possibilities as a renew syntheses through which concerning the market/social link or the integration of the law of state with the law of market.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anderson, V. (2015). *The fall of neoliberalism*, (un published Conference paper).
- [2] Beck, U. (1999). *World risk society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [3] Berlin, et al. (1968). To define Populism. *Government and Opposition* 3, (2).
- [4] Beveridge, W. (1944). *Full employment in a free society*. London: Allen & Unwin.

- [5] Canovan, M. (1993). Il populismo come l'ombra della democrazia. *Europa Europa* 2,(2).
- [6] Conway, D. (1995). *Classical liberalism: The Unvanquished Ideal*. Basingstoke: Macmillan and New York: St Martin's Press.
- [7] Dorna, A. (1999). *Le populisme*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- [8] Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [9] Fukuyama, F. (1989). The end of history? *The National Interest*, 16.
- [10] Goodin, R.E. (2006). *The oxford handbooks of political science*. New York: Oxford University Press inc.
- [11] Gray, J. (2000). *Two faces of liberalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [12] Harrison, & Harris. (2011). *American democracy now*. New York City: McGraw Hill.
- [13] Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [14] Hayek, F.A. (1944). *The road to serfdom*. London: Routledge.
- [15] Hayek, F.A. (1973): *Law, legislation and liberty: A new statement of the liberal principles and political economy, 1, rules and order*. London: Routledge.
- [16] Heikki, P. (2014). On the dialectics of global governance in the Twenty-first Century: A Polanyian Double Movement?, *Globalizations*, 11(5),733-750, DOI:10.1080/14747731.2014.981079.
- [17] Hermet, G. (2001). *Les populismes dans le monde. Une histoire sociologique XIXe-XXe siècle*. Paris: Fayard.
- [18] Ionescu, G and Gellner, E. (1969). 'Introduction.' In: *Populism. Its Meanings and National Characteristics*. Eds. Ghiță Ionescu and Ernest Gellner. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 1-4
- [19] Kelly, P. (2005). *Liberalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press. ISBN 0-7456-3291-2.
- [20] King, D (1987), *The new right: Politics, markets and citizenship*. London: Macmillan Education.
- [21] Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state and utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [22] Lee, S and McBride, S. (2007). *Neo-Liberalism, State Power and Global Governance*. United States: New York.
- [23] Mény, Y and Surel, Y. (2000). *Par le peuple, pour le peuple. Le populisme et les démocraties*. Paris: Fayard.
- [24] O'Donnell, A. (2018). Neoliberalism, ambiguity and the rise of populist movements. *International Journal of Social Economics*, DOI: 10.1108/IJSE-05-2017-0202.9.
- [25] Piketty, et al. (2017). Distributional national accounts: Methods and estimates for the United States. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133, (2).
- [26] Polanyi, K. (1957). *The great transform at on*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- [27] Ralph, R., (Ed.) (2005). *Mises, Liberalism: The Classical Tradition*, trans. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- [28] Ramsay, M.(1997). *What's wrong with Liberalism? A radical critique of liberal political philosophy*. London: Leicester University Press.
- [29] Roberts, K.M. (1995). Neoliberalism and the transformation of populism in Latin America: The Peruvian case. *World Politics*, 48 (1).
- [30] Ryan, A. (1993). Liberalism; pp. 291-311, in Robert E. Good in and Philip Pettit (eds.). *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [31] Shils, E. (1956). *The Torment of secrecy. The background and the consequences of American Security Policies*. Glencoe: Free Press.
- [32] Smith, A. (1976). *An enquiry into the nature and causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Chicago, Ill :University of Chicago Press.
- [33] Taggart, P. (2000). *Populism*. Buckingham PA: Open University Press.
- [34] Taguieff, P-A. (2002). *L'illusion populiste*. Paris: Berg International.
- [35] Tarchi, M. (2016). Populism: Ideology, Political Style, Mentality? *Politologický časopis - Czech Journal of Political Science*, 23.
- [36] Temin, P. (2002). The golden age of European growth reconsidered. *European Review of Economic History*, 6 (1).
- [37] Tullio-Altan, C. (1989). *Populismo e trasformismo*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- [38] Zanatta, L. (2002). 'Il populismo. Sul nucleo forte di un'ideologia debole.' *Polis* 16, (2).

Citation: Sibuh Gebeyaw Tareke, "The World from Neo-Liberal Globalization to Neo-Populist Ethno-Nationalism: From the Law of Nature to the Law of Nurture", *Journal of International Politics* 2020, 2(3), pp. 30-38.

Copyright: © 2020 Sibuh Gebeyaw Tareke. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.