From my point of view, there’s 3 big mistakes Yoram makes in his video. These mistakes irreparably influence the rest of the video, rendering the whole thing as misleading and confusing.

First off, he defines the term "nationalism" very narrowly, saying in the video that “A nationalist believes that the world is governed best when nations are free to chart their own independent course, cultivating their traditions and pursuing their interests without interference”. Essentially, he defines nationalism as “advocating for national sovereignty” and so that to be a nationalist basically means “to advocate for a world with independent nations”.

This narrow definition contrasts with the conventional use of the word nationalism, which is much vaguer a term in conventional use. Merriam Webster defines "nationalism" as being “loyalty and devotion to a nation, especially a sense of national consciousness exalting one nation above all others and placing primary emphasis on promotion of its culture and interests as opposed to those of other nations or supranational groups”. Simply put, Yoram redefines a broad term to mean something very specific. (This could be considered a definist fallacy at work)

This narrow definition of nationalism also ignores the many different types of nationalism, such as ethnonationalism, zionism, and so on, all of which would be considered to be distinct forms of nationalism. Ethnonationalism could very well be viewed as “nationalism specifically for a certain ethnic group”, as could zionism but in the context of advocating for “nationalism specifically for a Jewish state”. Essentially, each different type of nationalism builds off the core aspects of the broader term of “nationalism” to create something new.

Yoram’s narrow definition of “nationalism” is so strict that heavily misleading claims like "Hitler was no nationalist" can be and are made within the video, statements which wildly alienate the audience from the video as they have a different understanding of what nationalism is. By the conventional definition, Hitler was both an ethnonationalist and an ultranationalist (which is an aggressive and militarist form of nationalism that overtly glorifies a certain nation as being superior to all other nations). However, ultranationalism is not covered in Yoram’s definition of "nationalism", which is why he makes the claim that Hitler wasn’t a nationalist. (a suppressed correlative)

The second major mistake Yoram makes is that he similarly redefines "imperialism" (which in the video he states is "the attempt to bring peace and prosperity to the world by uniting mankind under a single political authority"). What he essentially does is equate imperialism with globalism, which again is a misleading and reductive approach towards imperialism, even moreso than his approach towards nationalism. Imperialism by conventional means is thought of as a nation prioritizing its interests to the point of spreading its influence over other lands and countries, which, despite being a violation of national sovereignty, is certainly compatible with some conventional definitions of nationalism (though not with Yoram’s definition of “nationalism”, to clarify). Globalism, on the other hand, actually does typically promote a one world government, and thus much better fits Yoram’s definition for “imperialism”.

Yoram’s third mistake happens when he goes on to create a false dichotomy between nationalism and imperialism, saying in the video that "Nationalism is the opposite of imperialism—or globalism or transnationalism". Of course when he says this in the video, he’s referring to his personal interpretations of nationalism and imperialism, which is very much his way of comparing a world of sovereign nations
to a world government. Even using his interpretations though, his dichotomy is heavily reductive and misleading. Take anarchism for example, an ideology which does not advocate for national or international governments, but rather a complete freedom from governments and states, in which political autonomy is fully localized to the individual. Anarchism does not fit into this nationalism-imperialism dichotomy, which shows how oversimplified the dichotomy is. A similar case can be made for communalism (communalism, not communism, to clarify), which advocates not for a larger nation-state but rather for a more localized commune-oriented structure.

On top of this, the way he presents the dichotomy makes it seem as though there's only 2 choices and no spectrum of in-between options, which again is reductive and false. For example, the EU could very well be considered a mix between Yoram's nationalism and his imperialism, as individual nations in the EU still have a decent level of autonomy and some say over what happens in the EU government, despite each member state being distinct separate entities. Even if Yoram decided to change his wording to say that "the choice between nationalism and imperialism is the most important choice of our time" rather than such options being "the only two choices available", he still creates a false binary by presenting the options as if there's no in-between hybrids of his nationalism and his imperialism.